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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Aim of the Research

The Greek version of the Old Testament, commonly known as the Septuagint, is the first biblical translation, but it is not a uniform translation.\(^1\) The Septuagint was translated by different translators over centuries and shows various translation techniques from book to book.\(^2\) The various translation techniques form a spectrum ranging from extreme formal equivalence to a high level of functional equivalence.

How do scholars decide whether a certain translation is free or literal? First, they compare the Greek and the Hebrew texts with respect to syntax and vocabulary. When they observe deviations or discrepancies between the two texts, they must decide whether a given deviation is translational or textual, i.e., due to the approach of the translator. Generally, if it is translational, it will show characteristics, habits, and patterns of the translator, and in particular it will reveal his approach to the task.

The aim of this research is to investigate the translation technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes and to propose the place of the translator of the Greek Ecclesiastes (hereafter

\(^1\)Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: An Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 22. The term Septuagint (LXX) is applicable in a technical sense only to the Greek Pentateuch but is employed here in a loose manner of speaking for the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures as a whole.
the Translator) in the history of the transmission of the Greek text. The present writer will analyze comprehensively and systematically the Greek Ecclesiastes to trace the way in which the translator rendered the Hebrew Vorlage. As a result, the research will provide evidence regarding the philosophy, intention, and possibly even the identity of the translator.

In chapter 2, the Hebrew text of Ecclesiastes and its Greek translation are compared and analyzed on syntactical and lexical levels. The result of the study will reveal that the Translator is not mechanical but is sensitive to context and to the demands of the target language although his translation is labeled as literal. Chapter 3 will deal with the issue of the identity of the Translator. After a comparison with the translation techniques of Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and the Kaige tradition, the present writer concludes the Translator is none of these. His translation is influenced by them in part but also reveals his own distinctive traits.

Text

A critical edition offers the best reconstruction of the original text because the editor presents it after weighing all the manuscripts and other textual witnesses available to him.\(^2\) Unfortunately, a Göttingen edition for the Greek Ecclesiastes is not yet available. Although prepared mainly on the basis of three codices—Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, and Codex Alexandrinus, the best source for the present investigation

\(^2\) Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 82.

\(^3\) Ibid., 81.
is the edition of Rahlfs'. According to Peter Gentry, who is preparing the critical edition of the Greek Ecclesiastes, the project should be ready for publication by 2008. Both Gentry and the present writer project that the critical edition will not differ significantly from that of Rahlfs' text.

When evidence is provided, the first to be cited will be the Masoretic Text (hereafter MT) as the putative parent text of the Greek translation. For the MT of Ecclesiastes, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (hereafter *BHS*) will be utilized. The Tiberian Masoretic vowel points are transcribed from *BHS* for the convenience of reading. Next listed is the Greek translation of Ecclesiastes according to Rahlfs' Edition.

**Research History**

No exhaustive study of the translation technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes exists to this point. Several articles, which have to do with the translation technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes, have been written by Joseph Ziegler and Peter Gentry. In “Die Wiedergabe der *nota accusativi* 'et, 'aet- mit σῶν,” Ziegler investigated all occurrences of *nota accusativi* and categorized them into nine groups according to the manner the Translator used to render them. Providing Text-Groups for each case, Ziegler also classified renderings of the article occurring in the Greek Ecclesiastes in “Der Gebrauch

---


des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes,” which was published posthumously.\(^7\)

These two articles directly inform the rendering patterns of the Translator on \textit{nota accusativi} and articles.

Peter Gentry recently wrote a series of articles dealing with the relationship of Greek Ecclesiastes and the Three (i.e., Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion):

“Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Role of the Syro-Hexapla,” “The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes in the Marginal Notes in the Syro-hexapla,” and “Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three: The Priority of a New Critical Edition of Hexaplaric Fragments.”\(^8\) In these articles, Gentry examined marginal notes in the Syro-Hexapla and concluded that the marginal notes were not derived from the hexaplaric text but from the margin of a different Greek manuscript such as the Catena MSS. By further investigating the evidence, Gentry became more convinced that the Old Greek (hereafter OG) Ecclesiastes was closer to Theodotion or to the \textit{Kaige} tradition than to Aquila. These three articles not only give a new perspective on the relationship of the OG Ecclesiastes and the Three but also provide sound judgments on several difficult textual problems such as 1:17.\(^9\)


\(^9\)Gentry, “Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three,” 160.
A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance of the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ecclesiastes.¹⁰ It provides both a Hebrew-Greek and a Greek-Hebrew concordance. These concordances are derived from the database prepared by the CATSS project (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies).¹¹ Although Jarick’s concordance is useful for this study, several shortcomings should be mentioned. First, Jarick missed some evidence. For example, he did not list the word הֵן in the Hebrew-Greek Concordance section.¹² אָּבָר in 6:2a is also not included in the personal suffixes.¹³ Second, Jarick sometimes failed to identify a verb. Examples are εἱδότες in 4:17 and εἰδὼς in 9:1, which are forms of οἴδα but are misconstrued as ὄραω.¹⁴ Finally, some of his judgments are too raw to be reliable. Jarick regarded מַשְׂא in 10:14 to be rendered by τί τό.¹⁵ The Translator recognized that there was a gapping of הֵן in the Hebrew text and rendered the gapped הֵן by τί. Thus, מַשְׂא is not rendered by τί τό but by τό. In 9:2a, מַשְׂא seems to be rendered by the preposition ἐν, but Jarick posited that מַשְׂא was never


¹²It should be on p. 259 of the Concordance.

¹³It should be on p. 287 of the Concordance, and the 3 m.s. pronoun in a bound form occurs 130 times, not 129.

¹⁴See Jarick, Concordance, 99, 211.

¹⁵Ibid., 164.
translated. Another example is 3:19b where Jarick suggested that מָגוֹר must have been construed as מָגוֹר עִיר. Since he did not clarify whether עיר is a suffix form or participle, one must make a decision based upon a translation pattern of the Translator.

**Methodology**

This dissertation will follow the technical and statistical approach, focusing on all grammatical and lexical elements between the Greek translation and its *Vorlage*. The present writer will basically employ the method which Peter Gentry used for his dissertation, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*. The ultimate goals in using this method are to characterize the Translator's translation technique and to discover his intention.

In order to decide whether the translation is free or literal, syntactical structure and lexical equivalence will be analyzed. Since the syntactical structure of the target language (Greek) is different from that of the source language (Hebrew), the Translator must have faced difficulties in translating the text. He had to choose between following the original as closely as possible or rendering the contents of the Scripture in intelligible Greek.

In addition to studying the grammatical possibilities, the semantic aspect of the translation will be also discussed. Because the semantic fields are never the same in

---

16 Ibid., 162.
18 Ibid., 83.
two languages, studying lexical equivalence will greatly clarify the translation technique.\textsuperscript{19}

The translation technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes will be characterized in terms of literalism. The Greek Ecclesiastes is a literal translation. However, its literalism needs to be described more accurately and in systematic ways. J. Barr provided applicable criteria to distinguish between different modes of literalism. His criteria are as follows:\textsuperscript{20}

1. The division into elements or segments, and the sequence in which these elements are represented. Free translation treats the phrase or sentence as the unit to be translated, and literal translation the individual word.

2. The quantitative addition or subtraction of elements from the original, which indicates loss of literality.

3. Consistency or non-consistency in the rendering, i.e., the degree to which a particular versional term is used for all (or most) cases of a particular term of the original.

4. Accuracy and level of semantic information, especially in cases of metaphor and idiom.

5. Coded “etymological” indication of formal/semantic relationships obtaining in the vocabulary of the original language. Etymological analysis as one aspect of the literal translation technique is related to renderings which are not only translations of Hebrew meanings into Greek, but also a reflection in Greek of the Hebrew form or some kind of indication of that form.

6. Level of text and level of analysis. A literalism that insisted strictly on the written form of the text, i.e., the unvocalized form, would give the translator more freedom of choice as to its interpretation.

These criteria will be useful in judging or clarifying the degree of literalism.

For example, in the third criterion, Barr limits the term “consistency” to stereotypical

renderings where the translator deliberately aimed at increased regularity in the
equivalences chosen. Examples in the Greek Ecclesiastes include תְּעִית, “striving,”
which is consistently translated by προαίρεως, “preference”; and לְבָנָה, “advantage”
which is rendered by περιοσεία, “surplus.” This consistency would be a mark of the
literal translation technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes.

As another example, the sixth criterion may apply to the translation of Eccl
12:9b.

(MT) מִּשְׁלַל עֲמָלֵן
(LXX) καὶ οὐς ἐξευρισκότα ἐκόμιον παραβολῶν

In literal translation, the Hebrew finite verb is normally translated by a finite
verb or by any verbal form functioning as predicate. In 12:9b, מִּשְׁלַל and עֲמָלֵן are vocalized
as Piel suffix forms in MT, but the Translator rendered them by nouns, οὐς and κόσμιον. The equivalences are motivated by different vocalizations of the Translator from MT.
The Translator must have construed the forms in question as nouns, not as verbs. This is
also an indication of a literal translation technique.

Contributions

This study will resolve three issues. First, since the result of the study will be
presented with percentages of literalism, these statistical data will provide a practical
means for comparing the translation techniques of the Greek Ecclesiastes with other
Septuagintal books.21 The characterization of the translation of the Greek Ecclesiastes

20James Barr, The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations
(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 20-49.

will also shed light upon the debate of the place of the Greek Ecclesiastes in the transmission history of Old Greek, as well as its relationship to Aquila and Theodotion.

Second, the result of the investigation will provide a foundation for the textual criticism of the Greek Ecclesiastes. The study of Septuagintal translation technique is closely connected to the textual criticism of the Septuagint. Pietersma calls the study of translation technique “the quest for the Archimedian point,” meaning that Septuagint textual criticism needs a clear understanding of the translation technique in order to evaluate textual witnesses.22 The study of the translation technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes will establish the basis on which the textual critic decides the original wording of Ecclesiastes and therefore, will provide the Archimedian point to produce the critical edition of the book.

Finally, in the field of the textual criticism of the Old Testament, when the textual critic translates from Greek back to Hebrew, he is presumed to know the translation technique of the Greek translator and also the transmission history of the Septuagint.23 The result of the present study, therefore, will provide a fundamental resource for Old Testament textual criticism on Ecclesiastes.24

---


23 Aeijmelaeus, On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators, 79.

24 Ibid., 80.
CHAPTER 2

THE CHARACTERIZATION OF THE TRANSLATION

The aim of this chapter is to characterize in detail the translation technique of the Translator. A careful analysis of the Greek Ecclesiastes will reveal his translation patterns. Proper determination of the place of the Translator in the history of text transmission is only possible after exhaustive analysis of his text.

The method of characterizing the Translator is to compare his Greek translation with the Hebrew. The Translator’s approach to the Hebrew is described comprehensively and systematically. The description of the Translator’s technique starts with the Hebrew of Ecclesiastes and delineates how the Greek corresponds to the Hebrew. Consideration is given to individual parts of speech such as nouns, pronouns, verbs, prepositions, and particles, and their Greek equivalents are discussed with a quantitative methodology used in representing the Translator’s approach. Comparison and analysis are accomplished on two levels: structural and lexical.¹

Nouns

Influenced by Arabic grammar, Hebrew parts of speech are traditionally

¹The method for analyzing the evidence is adopted from Peter Gentry, The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995). See his methodological discussion on pp. 84-87 of that work.
classified into three categories: (1) nouns, (2) verbs, and (3) particles. As O’Connor points out, redundancies exist between categories of nouns and verbs and also between categories of nouns and particles. The continuum between nouns and verbs are seen in verbal nouns, participles, and infinitives. This continuum is discussed in the section on verbs. The redundancies between nouns and particles are related to adverbials. Since certain nouns are used as adverbials, the adverb as a sub-category overlaps the noun system and the particle system. According to O’Connor, the adverbial subgroups belonging to nouns are prepositional, simple, memized adverbials (i.e., noun plus suffix), and adverbial accusatives. In the following study, adverbial accusatives are dealt with under nouns since they are not distinguished formally from non-adverbial nouns, i.e., substantives. Prepositional adverbials and simple adverbs are treated in particles because they can be recognized formally as adverbs. Memized adverbials do not appear in Ecclesiastes.

The noun system in Ecclesiastes is analyzed according to three sub-categories: (1) nouns, (2) adjectives, and (3) pronouns. Nouns and adjectives can be formally distinguished both in Hebrew and in Greek. Nouns have inherent gender and are inflected only for number in both Hebrew and Greek, while adjectives are inflected for all

---


3O’Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 300.

genders and number. Nouns are further classified into proper nouns and common nouns.6

There are three Hebrew words in which the forms can be both nouns and adjectives. The three words are רע, רעה and מכח.7 In order to discern the translation technique, these words need to be distinguished whether they are construed as nouns or adjectives in each occurrence. The decision should be made on the basis of both the perspective of the Translator and the parameters of Hebrew grammar.

In Ecclesiastes, the word רע occurs 15 times, and רעה 15 times.8 Six instances of רע and 11 instances of רעה are nouns, and 9 instances of רע and 4 instances of רעה are adjectives.9 מכח is more difficult than the previous two words. The word מכח occurs 45 times in Ecclesiastes, and the Translator employed ἰγνοθός for all the occurrences.

According to Bauer, ἰγνοθός can be a pure noun in its neuter form as well as an

---

5 Joüon, Grammar, §86.
6 Gentry, Greek Job, 86.
7 Interestingly, רע and רעה are antonyms of מכח. According to KB and BDB, רע and רעה can be either nouns or adjectives. As for מכח, while KB simply categorizes מכח as a noun and מכח as an adjective, BDB discusses the word in two different categories: מכח as a noun and מכח as an adjective.

8 The 5 cases of רע as nouns are 4:17b, 8:9b, 8:11b, 8:12a, 9:3a, 9:3b. The 11 cases of רעה as nouns are 2:21b, 5:12b, 6:1a, 7:14a, 7:15b, 8:6b, 8:11a, 10:5a, 11:2b, 11:10a, 12:1b. The 9 cases of רע as adjectives are 1:13b, 2:17a, 4:3b, 4:8b, 5:13a, 6:2b, 8:3a, 8:5a, 12:14b. The 4 cases of רעה as adjectives are 5:15a, 9:12a, 9:12b, 10:13b. In 5:15a, רעה must be a noun in Hebrew, but the Translator construed it as an attributive adjective modifying a participle. Since the rendering does not deviate from the Translator’s literal tendency, it is treated under the discussion of adjectives. רעה in 5:12a is rendered together with מיכל by a single word ἀρμοστὰ. This case is discussed separately.
adjective. Based upon these two guidelines along with consideration of the Translator’s perspective, 8 cases of are treated as nouns, and 37 cases as adjectives.

There are 7 instances where nouns syntactically function as adverbs. These cases are formally classified under nouns and discussed here.

**Structural Analysis**

**Introduction**

In Ecclesiastes, there are 314 nouns occurring a total of 1363 times. Additionally, there are 17 instances in which the form in MT is not a noun but is rendered by a noun in Greek. These 17 cases are presented and discussed first.

The form is vocalized as a bound infinitive of prefixed by the preposition in MT, and the Translator rendered it by plus the noun .

---

10 Bauer, s.v. "גָּאָרָה.

11 The 6 instances are 2:1a, 2:24a, 3:12b, 3:13a, 7:14a, 7:20b.

12 The 8 cases of nouns are 2:1a, 2:3b, 2:24a, 3:12b, 3:13a, 5:17a, 7:14a, 7:20b. For the remaining 37 instances, see John Jarick, ed., *A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance of the Hebrew and Greek Text of Ecclesiastes* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 208.

13 The 7 instances are 2:15a, 3:21a, 4:12b, 5:11a, 7:16a, 8:10a, and 8:11a.

14 Here structural analysis does not refer to any literary or linguistic analysis practiced by a particular school but broadly designates phonological or morph-syntactical analysis on grammatical features in opposition to lexical analysis.
Translator normally employs a noun for a bound infinitive prefixed by יָקַל.

Thus, it is not necessary as some modern scholars do to presume a different consonantal text of the Translator from the MT.

In 5:16a the יָקַל is rendered by קָאָלְנ—noun with conjunction. The Translator seems to have read יָקַל as wāʾēbel (i.e., עָבַל, a noun with waw).

The different vocalization is probably due to graphic similarities between ו and י, and also between י and י. Not only the יָקַל but also the וֹקַל (וֹכָל) in 5:16b was probably construed as a noun with waw (w'ka'as). In this way, the whole sentence is interpreted as a verbless clause. In the verbless clause, five successive prepositional phrases function as predicate with the gapping of the preposition ב.

15 The total number is composed of 273 nouns occurring 1165 times and 41 adjectives occurring 198 times.

16 See p. 274 of this dissertation.

17 Some modern scholars suggest מִמְמַתָּת (mimmattat) as the Vorlage of יָקַל דּוֹמָא. It may be based upon ancient versions (Aquila, Theodotion, and Jerome), but the Syro-Hexapla has an infinitive in the margin. See BHS-Horst; Roland Murphy, Ecclesiastes, WBC, vol. 23a (Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1992), 45; Frederick Field, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875), 2: 388 n. 35.

18 Cf. BHS-Horst.

The form קֶבֶריִם in 8:10a is vocalized as a participle (q'browser) in MT. The participle functions attributively and modifies the antecedent רָשָׁע. The Translator, however, construed קֶבֶרִים as a plural noun functioning as an adverb modifying the following word, בָּא, which he translated by a participle in the Greek Ecclesiastes. The Translator’s parent text probably read רָשָׁע קֶבֶרִים מֵעָבָדָם, resulting from the dittography of ב. The participle קֶבֶרִים is read as a Hophal plural participle. In this reading, מֵעָבָדָם becomes an attributive adjectival participle modifying קֶבֶרִים, and קֶבֶרִים adverbially modifies מֵעָבָדָם. The Translator’s use of a noun for the Hebrew participle, therefore, may be due to a different Vorlage and to a different understanding of the syntax than that preserved in the MT.

In the MT, מֵעָבָדָם is vocalized as a Hiphil participle m.s. The participle parallels וְשֵׂעָר, which functions as a predicate. The Translator rendered מֵעָבָדָם by ἀπὸ μακρότητος, and the Greek equivalent reflects מֵעָבָדָם (preposition min plus noun ὀρέκ) which adverbially modifies the predicate וְשֵׂעָר. The Translator’s understanding of the text is related to the form מֵעָבָדָם in MT. The form מֵעָבָדָם is rendered by ἀπὸ τότε, and the Greek ἀπὸ τότε indicates that the Translator read the Hebrew as מֵעָבָדָם (mē'āz) which resulted from

20 Cf. BHS-Horst.
21 BHS-Horst.
Then, the Translator took the presumed נָאָר as a parallel adverbial phrase to נָאָר. The Translator’s use of a noun for the participle in 8:12a is, thus, due to a different Vorlage.

The form לֶבֶר in the MT is the preposition ל plus a bound infinitive from the root לֶבֶר or לִבְרָה. The parent text of the Translator probably had לִבְרָה instead of לֶבֶר, and so the Translator employed a noun and a pronoun, קָרְדַּיָּה וֹא, for the form in question. The discrepancy may be due to incorrect word division and dittography.

In 10:1a 2 yiqtol forms (רָבִּית and רָבִּית) are asyndetically joined. The Translator rendered רָבִּית by a noun סֵכָּעְשַׁיָּה. He seems to have construed רָבִּית as a noun סֵכָּעְשַׁיָּה.

23 BHS-Horst; Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 81; and Michael V. Fox, Qoheleth and His Contradictions (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989), 252. It is not likely that the Vorlage of אֶפֶר יִתְכֶה is אֶפֶר (מֵאֶפֶר) as Gordis proposed. See Robert Gordis, Koheleth: The Man and His World (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1955), 287. The form יִתְכֶה (יִתְכֶה) occurs 40 times in Ecclesiastes. Of these times, 39 are rendered by קָרְדַּיָּה, and the last one is construed as the so-called nota accusativi. On the other hand, the form יֵשׁ (יֵשׁ) occurs once in Ecclesiastes and is rendered by יִתְכֶה. According to Hatch and Redpath, יִתְכֶה renders יֵשׁ (יֵשׁ) 103 times in the entire LXX but never יֵשׁ (יֵשׁ). See E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998), 1367-68. There is 1 instance where בָּא יֵשׁ (בָּא יֵשׁ) is rendered by יִתְכֶה (Isa 20:2).

24 Cf. Hatch and Redpath, Concordance, 894.

25 Some scholars explain the root לֶבֶר as a byform of לִבְרָה (see KB, s.v. "לִבְרָה"). Others analyze לֶבֶר as a bound infinitive from a geminate root (לִבְרָה) and explain the form with an analogy with 11-waw verb. See W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar, trans. A. E. Cowley, 25th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), §67r.
(gābīa') functioning as the object of 'וֹדוּוֹת'.

The difficulty of this conjecture lies in the fact that יְבִיעַ is never rendered by σκεύασία or σκεύασις in the LXX. In spite of this difficulty, it is unlikely that יְבִיעַ is construed as a verb.

Four piel verbs describe Qoheleth’s acts in 12:9b. The Translator rendered the second and fourth piel verbs by nouns: יְזֵן by oŭς and קַפָּר by κόσμουν. On his consonantal text, the Translator seems to have read יְזֵן as 'ozen, and קַפָּר as tōgen or t'qōn. The former noun oŭς functions as a subject, and the latter noun κόσμουν functions as an object in the Greek text. The Translator’s construing of קַפָּר as a noun may have been caused by the asyndeton between יְזֵן and קַפָּר. The Greek equivalent ἐξιχνιάσεται (fut. ind.) for יְזֵן suggests that the Translator read יְזֵן as yqtl, i.e., יְזֵן. Therefore, what the Translator read may have been קַפָּר יְזֵן יָדֵּק חַקָּר.

There are 8 instances where a substantival participle is rendered by a noun: 2:2a, 4:1a, 5:11a, 5:12a, 5:15a, 10:1a, 12:3a, and 12:11b. These cases must not be considered as instances in which the Translator interpreted the forms differently from the MT. They simply demonstrate that the Translator frequently employed a noun for a substantival participle.

---

26 Jaricks, *Concordance*, 127; BHS-Horst.


In conclusion, 8 cases out of 17 must be included in the analysis of nouns because the Translator construed them as nouns. Of the 8 cases, 4 are attested elsewhere in Ecclesiastes. Therefore the remaining 4 nouns should be added to the total number of nouns. As for the final 9 cases, which are not to be counted as nouns, the differences are due to a translational pattern rather than to a different vocalization or consonantal text.

On the other hand, there are 11 instances where nouns in MT are not understood as such by the Translator. These instances are excluded for comparison. The evidence is listed below.

3:19b

The form מַהֲרָה in 3:19b is vocalized as a noun (מַהֲרָה) in the MT. The Translator rendered the form by the interrogative וְ and the aorist indicative הָיִיתָם. Modern scholars have suggested that the Translator vocalized מַהֲרָה as מֵהָרָה (interrogative plus Qal active participle). His reading must have involved the confusion of ו (waw) and ה (yod). Nevertheless, the presumed form מֵהָרָה does not seem to have been construed as a participle because it is not attested in the translation pattern of the Translator. The participle form מֵהָרָה (יֹבֶתֶר) occurs 7 times in

\[29\text{The 8 cases are 5:16a, 5:16b, 8:10a, 8:12a, 9:1a, 10:1a, 12:9b, 12:9b.}\]

\[30\text{The 4 nouns are in 5:16a, 5:16b, 9:1a, 12:9b.}\]

\[31\text{The 9 cases are 2:2a, 4:1a, 4:17a, 5:11a, 5:12a, 5:15a, 10:1a, 12:3a, 12:11b.}\]

\[32\text{Hatch and Redpath, }\textit{Concordance,}\ 1126. \text{ Cf. Jaricks, }\textit{Concordance,}\ 215, 235.\]
Ecclesiastes, but it is better treated as a noun.  

All of the instances are rendered by nouns or nouns used adverbially. A Greek indicative never renders the Hebrew participle form יָ֛֥דֶה or יָֽדֶר whether in Ecclesiastes or in the entire MT. The Vorlage of יָֽדֶר probably was a finite verb—i.e., a suffix form. In the MT, the Hebrew verb יָ֛֥דֶר in the Qal stem never occurs in finite forms but only in participle forms. On the other hand Hiphil suffix forms are attested 8 times in MT. The Hiphil form can be used intransitively with an elative meaning “to excel or to have priority.” The Greek equivalent πρεσβεία may also denote an elative meaning in the context: “and in what way did humans excel above cattle?” The form מָה in MT, therefore, may have been construed as an interrogative plus Hiphil suffix 3 m.s. form מָא הֹדִיר or מָא אוֹתִיר with a syncopated ה and defective spelling for the theme vowel hirek yod.

5:10b

33 BDB, s.v. "יָ֣דֶר"; KB, s.v. "ידיר.

34 In 2 instances, πρεσβεία is used (6:8, 7:11); and in 5 instances πρεσβείς (2:15, 6:11, 7:16, 12:9, 12:11). The adjective πρεσβείς functions either as a noun or as an adverb.

35 See A. Even-Shoshan, A New Concordance of the Bible (Jerusalem: Kiryat-Sefer, 1982), 515.

36 KB, s.v. "ידיר"; BDB, s.v. "ידיר.


38 In Ecclesiastes and also in late Hebrew, the preformative ה in Hiphil is frequently syncopated. For example, the form יָ֣דֶה in 5:11b and the form יָ֣דֶר in 8:9b are construed as a Hiphil infinitive with a syncopated ה. See pp. 20 and 21 of this dissertation; E. Qimron, The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Harvard Semitic Studies 29 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), §310.145; M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, Text and Language in Bible and Qumran (Jerusalem: Orient Publishing House, 1960), 105.
The word ἀνδρεία in 5:10b is vocalized as a noun in MT. The Translator likely vocalized the form in question as ἀνδρεῖ, i.e., an infinitive form.

The word ἀνδρεία is a noun prefixed by a preposition in MT. The Translator employed an arthrous infinitive for the form in question. This is the only case where the noun ἀνδρεία is rendered by an infinitive in the LXX. The noun ἀνδρεία occurs 3 times in Ecclesiastes, and twice it is rendered by the adjective πλούσιος. The Translator may have interpreted ἀνδρεία as a Hiphil infinitive with a syncopated Ἰ. The syncopated Ἰ in the infinitive of Hiphil is common in DSS.

In both 1:10a and 8:4a, the noun ἱππὸς is rendered by the verb λαλέω. The noun ἱππὸς occurs 24 times in Ecclesiastes, and in all other instances ἱππὸς is rendered by a noun in Greek. Since the Translator’s approach is literal in all other cases, one would expect the same in these 2 cases. As for 1:10a, the Translator’s rendering of a noun by a verb

---

39 According to the Qere.

40 Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, 1150c.

41 The adjective is used substantively in these 2 cases.

reflects metathesis of ש and ד.\(^{44}\) Since this kind of metathesis is a common scribal error, it is possible that the Translator read רֹבֶרֶך.\(^{45}\) In MT, 8:4a is a verbless clause, and רֹבֶרֶך and רוּל constitute a bound phrase. The Translator also construed רֹבֶרֶך of 8:4a as a verb, not a noun.

(x2)

8:9b יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁלִים וַחֲרוֹן לָהֶם לְעוֹלָם

There are 2 nouns in 8:9b, which the Translator did not construe as such. The noun כָּרָה occurs 40 times in Ecclesiastes and is rendered by קָרָה 39 times. The Translator may have understood כָּרָה in MT as קָרָה due to phonetic confusion between כ and ק. This confusion is common in late Hebrew.\(^{46}\)

Another noun with a preposition (לְדָּמִים) is rendered by an article plus infinitive toũ קָאָדָּא. The Translator probably read the form לְדָּמִים as Hiphil infinitive with a syncopated ה.\(^{47}\)

8:11a וַיַּאֲרֵרָהוּ מַעֲמָשָׁה הָרִישהָ מַעֲמָשָׁה וַיַּעֲרֵרָהוּ מַעֲמָשָׁה מַעֲמָשָׁה

8:11a ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶν γενομένη ἀντίδρασις ἀπὸ τῶν ποιοῦντων τὸ ποιηθὲν ταχὺ

\(^{43}\)By λόγος or ῥῆμα. Cf. Jarick, *Concordance*, 178.

\(^{44}\)Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 110. Metathesis is a common scribal error. See also Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 250-51.


\(^{46}\)This confusion is common in Mishnaic Hebrew. See M. H. Segal, *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), §41. The same phonetic confusion between two gutturals is also attested in 1 Kgs 1:18. See Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 251.

\(^{47}\)Or the Translator's parent text might have had לָדָּמִים. Cf. BHS-Horst.
The word מְשֶׁה in 8:11a is vocalized as a bound form in MT. The noun מְשֶׁה occurs 21 times in Ecclesiastes and is rendered by ποίημα 20 times. According to the pattern, the translation ἀπὸ τῶν πολούντων in 8:11a does not reflect מְשֶׁה but rather reflects מְשֶׁה (a preposition plus Qal active participle pl).48

The noun מֶנֶא in 8:12a is translated by ἀπὸ τότε. The Greek equivalent reflects מֶנֶא (מֵאֶז). This conjecture is based upon 2:15 where מ is rendered by τότε.

10:17b is analyzed as the preposition ἀπὸ plus the noun μέθηρι (drinking’). Its Greek equivalent αἰσχυνθήσονται reveals that the Translator may have understood the form as a verb from μέθηρι.

The noun מִלָּה in 12:4a meaning “mill” is rendered by ἀληθούσῃ an active participle feminine singular. A participle in the feminine plural form from the same root (שַׁמְפַל) appeared in the previous verse 12:3b. The Translator translated מִלָּה by αἱ ἀληθούσαι—an active participle feminine plural. מִלָּה in 12:3b likely influenced the Translator’s interpretation of the noun מִלָּה. Since the noun מִלָּה in 12:4a has the feminine ending, the Translator probably read מִלָּה as an active participle feminine singular (e.g., יָדֵּנָה).

48 Cf. BHS-Horst.
In sum, 4 nouns occurring 8 times should be added for comparison, and 3 nouns occurring 11 times should be excluded. Therefore there are 315 nouns occurring a total of 1360 times. These are classified into three categories: (1) proper nouns, (2) common nouns, and (3) adjectives

**Proper Nouns (47)**

Evidence:

- דָּוִד > דְּאָוִּיא (1:1a)
- יִרְאָא ל (1:12b) 49
- יָרָשָׁא ל > וֶסֶנָא (1:1b, 1:12b, 1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a)
- אֶלָּחָד > אֱלֹא יְה (1:13b, 1:24b, 1:26b, 3:10b, 3:11b, 3:13b, 3:14a, 3:14b, 3:15a, 3:17a, 3:18a, 4:17a, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:3a, 5:5b, 5:6b, 5:17b, 5:18a, 5:18b, 5:19b, 6:2a, 6:2a, 7:13a, 7:14b, 7:18b, 7:26b, 7:29a, 8:2b, 8:12b, 8:13b, 8:15b, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:7b, 11:5b, 11:9b, 12:7b, 12:13b, 12:14a)

Since an appellative אֱלָּחָד can carry the character of a proper name, it is discussed under proper nouns. 50 The epithet הָיָתֹו should be treated as a common noun.

While the article cannot be prefixed to a proper noun, the articular form of הָיָתֹו appears in 12:8a. 51 The Translator translated הָיָתֹו as ἐκκλησιαστής. Its verbal form ἐκκλησιαστάω is already used in Lev 8:3 and also outside of LXX with the meaning of “to summon to an assembly” or “to convene.” 52 With an agent ending -της, ἐκκλησιαστής may denote a descriptive title meaning “convenor” in the Greek Ecclesiastes.

---

49 In 1:1b יִרְאָא ל is added in Greek Ecclesiastes, which lacks in MT.


51 Ibid., §125a.

52 Aeneas Tacticus (4 B.C.) used ἐκκλησιαστάω with the meaning of “to convene.” See LSJ, s.v. “ἐκκλησιαστάω.”
There are 4 proper nouns occurring a total of 47 times. The Translator transliterated 3 proper nouns and rendered 1 proper noun (i.e., 'אֱלֹהִים) by its corresponding proper noun (θεός).53

Common Nouns

There are 269 common nouns occurring a total of 1127 times. The Translator rendered common nouns in Hebew by nouns, adjectives, participles, adverbs, and prepositions in Greek.

The number of total occurrences does not include 4 instances where common nouns in MT are not construed as such but understood as adjectives by the Translator. These are to be treated as adjectives. In 3 instances, the Translator seems to have read 'מש' as an adjective רַשָּׁא while MT has its substantival form reša'.

Example:
3:16b τόπον τῆς κρίσεως έκεί ο άσεθής καὶ τόπον τοῦ δικαίου έκεί ο άσεθής

In 3:16b the noun reša' occurs twice, and the Translator employed an adjective άσεθής for both cases. An expected Greek equivalent for reša' is άσεθεία as in 8:8b.

The adjective άσεθής renders all the cases of רַשָּׁא. Based on this pattern, one could posit that the Translator read 'מש' in 3:16b as an adjective (רַשָּׁא) rather than a noun (reša').

53 In 1:1b, יָרַך, which lacks in MT, is added in Greek Ecclesiastes.

54 The 3 instances are 3:16a, 3:16b, 7:25b.

55 The second one is a pausal form.
5:11b is the fourth instance where the Translator construed a common noun in
MT as an adjective.

In 5:11b the substantival participle ἐμπληθέντα is employed for ὑπῆρ χόρον which is
vocalized as a noun (sābā’) in MT. The noun sābā‘ occurs 8 times in MT, 6 of which
occur in Genesis 41. This implies that sābā‘ is uncommon in biblical Hebrew. A
common form in MT is sābe’a’, a verbal adjective. According to the translation
technique, the Translator frequently used the Greek participle for the Hebrew verbal
adjective. Thus, it is more plausible that the Translator read ὑπῆρ χόρον as sābe’a’ than his
reading the form as sābā‘.

Conversely, there is a case where the Translator understood an adjective in MT
as a substantive and employed a corresponding substantive in Greek.

In 6:3a ῥῆ, an adjective (rab), is rendered by πλήθος, a common noun. The
adjective rab occurs 9 times, and 6:3a is the only case where rab in MT is rendered by
the common noun πλήθος.57 The adjective rab is normally rendered by adjectives μέγας
or πολύς. The noun πλήθος is used for all 6 occurrences of the common noun ῥῆ.
According to this pattern, one may posit that the Translator read ῥῆ in 6:3a as ῥῆ rather
than rab. This case is considered under common nouns.

56 An adjective ἰπσρ occurs 7 times in 3:17a, 7:15b, 8:10a, 8:13a, 8:14a, 8:14a,
9:2a.
Evidence:

Common Noun > Common Noun (964)

In other cases, it is rendered by adjectives 7 times and by an adverb once.
Evidence:

Common Noun > Adjective (148)
The substantive לָא is rendered by the adjective πᾶς in 89 instances.\textsuperscript{58} When לָא stands alone, πᾶς serves as a substantival adjective.\textsuperscript{59} On the other hand, when לָא appears as the \textit{nomen regens} in a bound phrase, πᾶς is an attributive adjective.\textsuperscript{60}

Examples:
1:2b לָא אֱלֹהִים אָדָם
1:2b μεταοικονομήσας τὰ πάντα μεταοικονομήσας
1:3b καὶ διέσχετε τὴν θάλασσαν
1:3b ἐν πάντι μόνιμω αὐτῷ ὑπὸ μοχθεὶ ὑπὸ τὸν Ἥλιον

Further substantival adjectives, which render substantives in Hebrew, occur in 49 instances. They include ἀγαθὸν for בָּשָׂם,\textsuperscript{61} ἀκούσιον for יָשָׂן,\textsuperscript{62} ἀναίδης for וָאֶזְנֵה,\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{58}In 9:2a, לָא אָדָם is rendered by a noun μεταοικονομήσας. The parent text may have had לָא אָדָם.

\textsuperscript{59}The substantival πᾶς occurs in 36 instances, which are 1:2b, 1:13a, 1:14b, 1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:10a, 2:11b, 2:16b, 2:17b, 3:1a, 3:11a, 3:14a, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:20a, 3:20b, 3:20b, 4:16a, 5:8a, 6:2a, 6:6b, 7:15a, 7:18b, 8:3b, 9:1b, 9:2a, 9:3a, 9:3a, 9:6b, 9:10a, 10:3b, 10:19b, 11:5b, 11:8b, 12:13a. In these cases, an article can be compared, but the number is often not matched between Hebrew לָא and Greek substantival πᾶς. Cf. 7:15a.

\textsuperscript{60}The attributive πᾶς occurs in 53 instances, which are 1:3b, 1:7a, 1:8a, 1:9b, 1:14a, 2:5b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:14b, 2:18a, 2:19b, 2:20b, 2:22a, 2:22a, 3:1b, 3:13a, 3:13a, 3:17b, 3:17b, 4:1a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:8a, 4:15a, 4:16a, 5:16a, 5:17a, 5:18a, 6:7a, 7:2a, 7:21a, 7:23a, 7:28b, 8:6a, 8:9a, 8:9a, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:4a, 9:8a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:11b, 11:8a, 11:9b, 12:4b, 12:8b, 12:13b, 12:14a, 12:14a.

\textsuperscript{61}2:3b, 3:13a, 5:17a, 7:20b.

\textsuperscript{62}10:5b.

\textsuperscript{63}8:1b.
There are 2 instances where a substantive in Hebrew is rendered by a

---

64 10:2b.
65 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:16a, 2:16b, 4:5a, 4:13b, 4:17a, 5:2b, 5:3a, 6:8a, 7:4b, 7:5b, 7:6a, 7:9b, 10:2b, 10:12b, 10:15a.
66 2:19a, 10:6a, 10:14a.
67 10:2a.
68 7:15b.
69 9:11a.
70 11:6b. The pronominal suffix is not translated.
71 10:17a.
72 7:8a, 10:13b.
73 4:17b, 8:11b, 8:12a, 9:3a, 9:3b.
74 7:8b.
75 10:16a.
76 2:7a.
77 5:13b, 5:14b, 7:14b.
78 6:11b, 12:9a, 12:12b. The case of 6:11b could be also predicative.
79 10:6b, 10:20a.
80 11:2b.
predicative adjective. These 2 instances include ὀσκηρός in 7:17a, which renders כְַּל, and μακαρία in 10:17a, which renders יִרְחָא.\footnote{Employing ὀσκηρός for כְַּל deviates from the normal approach. The adjective ὀσκηρός could be substantively used here.}

Examples:

3:13a μαλακόν ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ

10:17a μακαρία σοῦ γῆ ής ὁ βασιλεὺς σου υἱὸς ἐλευθέρων

An adjective ἀγαθόν in 3:13a is substantively used. In 10:17a יִרְחָא is the bound form of a plural noun and is used as the formal introduction of a blessing, which is properly rendered by μακαρία, an adjective in Greek, functioning as a predicative adjective in the clause.

Finally, numerals, which are substantives in Hebrew, are adjectives in Greek. Thus, 9 instances of numerals are cases where adjectives render nouns due to the constraints of the target language.

Example:

11:2a δὸς μερίδα τοῖς ἑπτὰ καὶ γε τοῖς ὀκτὼ

**Common Noun > Participle (6)**

Evidence:

5:18a, 6:2a, 8:4a, 10:1a, 10:11b, 10:20b,

In 4 cases, a Hebrew noun is rendered by a substantival participle in Greek.\footnote{The 4 cases are 5:18a, 6:2a, 10:11b, 10:20b. These are the cases where the Translator might have recognized the noun form but deliberately utilized a participle form for the noun.}
Examples:
6:2a אַשָׁ יֵתֵר לְהַלְדִּים פַּעַר הָכָסִים
6:2a ἀνήρ ὁ δῶσει αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς πλοῦτον καὶ ὑπάρχοντα

10:11b καὶ οὕς ἐστιν περισσεία τῷ ἐπάδοντι
10:11b καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα

The Translator utilized a participle neuter plural accusative ὑπάρχοντα for ὑπάρχοντα in both 5:18a and 6:2a. It is unlikely that the Translator read ἐνεμέν as a defective passive participle form meaning of “what is possessed” since no verbal form from the root ἐνεμέν is attested in MT. The Translator probably construed ἐνεμέν as a substantive but rendered the form by a participle in Greek. τὰ ὑπάρχοντα was commonly used as a substantive in Hellenistic Greek and may have been viewed as such by the Translator.83

A compound noun בֵּית הָלַשְׁנָה in 10:11b is rendered by ἐπάδοντι, and בֵּית הָלַשְׁנָה in 10:20b by ὁ ἐξωτικὸς ὑπάρχων.84 These translations for two compound nouns are adequate Greek expressions.

The other 2 instances are the cases where free forms in bound phrases in Hebrew are rendered by attributive participles in Greek.

Example:
8:4a בְּנֵי הָרֶמֶלֶם
8:4a καὶ τῶν λαλεῖ βασιλεὺς ἐξουσιάζων

10:1a μοῦ ἔτειμον σκευασίαν ἐλαίου ἡδύματος
10:1a μοῦ ἔτειμον σκευασίαν ἐλαίου ἡδύματος

The Translator construed 8:4a differently from the tradition in MT. The text of MT must have been understood as a nominal sentence with the bound phrase דירֶב מִלָּח as

83 Cf. Bauer, s.v. "ὑπάρχω."
subject and the noun as predicate. By contrast, the Translator vocalized as 
*dōbēr* (Qal Act. Ptc.) or *dāber* (Qal Pf.) and took as a bound phrase 
functioning as subject.

Another free form functioning as *nomen rectum* in 10:1a is also rendered 
by an attributive participle *θανατοῦσαι*.

**Common Noun > Adverb or Adverbial Phrase (7)**

Evidence:
2:15a, 3:21a, 4:12b, 5:11a, 7:16a, 8:10a, 8:11a.

The nouns in 2:15a and 7:16a, in 5:11a, *κεφαρίς* in 8:10a, and in 
8:11a are construed as adverbial accusatives. The Translator used for the instances 
adverbial accusatives (2:15a, 5:11a, 7:16a), adverb (8:11a) or adverbial phrase (8:10a).

---

84 In 10:20b, the Translator followed a text similar to the *Ketib* reading in Hebrew.

85 Sentences in 2:15 are differently divided in MT and in LXX. Whether 
belongs to 2:15a or 2:15b, it still functions as an adverb in either case.
In 3:21a and 4:12b, nouns מְדִידָה and מְדִידָה, which are usually used as adverbs, occur with prepositions. The Translator employed the same adverbial phrase for 3:21a and simply the adverb for 4:12b.

The evidence demonstrates that the Translator recognized the adverbial uses of the nouns in all these instances and rendered them properly in idiomatic Greek.

**Noun > Article / Relative Pronoun + Preposition (5)**

Evidence:
5:10b, 5:12b, 7:12b, 8:8b, 12:11a.

There are 5 cases where בּוֹלֵא has a pronominal suffix or is followed by a *nomen rectum*. These phrases are rendered by ὁ παρὰ or ὅς παρὰ τιμοῖς.

Example:
5:12b πλοῖστον φιλασσόμενον τῷ παρ’ αὐτὸν εἰς κακίαν αὐτοῦ

---

80 In 8:10a the Translator must have read ἱκανὸς as a plural noun form rather than a participle as MT and construed it as an adverbial accusative denoting place.
Adjectives

There are 41 adjectives occurring a total of 193 times. Not surprisingly, most of the adjectives in Hebrew are rendered by adjectives or participles. Rarely, verbs, nouns, pronouns, and adverbs are used as equivalents.

Adjective > Adjective (166)

Evidence:
1:8a, 1:9b, 1:10a, 1:11a, 1:11b, 1:13b, 2:14a, 2:14b, 2:16a, 2:16b, 2:17a, 2:19a, 2:21b, 2:24a, 2:26a, 2:26b, 3:11a, 3:12a, 3:16b, 3:16b, 3:17a, 3:17a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:20a, 3:22a, 4:3a, 4:3b, 4:6a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8b, 4:9a, 4:9a, 4:9b, 4:10a, 4:10b, 4:10b, 4:12a, 4:13a, 4:13a, 4:13b, 4:15b, 4:16a, 4:17a, 5:1b, 5:4a, 5:7b, 5:7b, 5:7b, 5:11a, 5:11a, 5:13a, 5:14a, 5:15a, 5:17a, 6:1b, 6:2a, 6:2b, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:6b, 6:8a, 6:8b, 6:9a, 6:10b, 6:12a, 7:1a, 7:1a, 7:2a, 7:3a, 7:4a, 7:5a, 7:5a, 7:7a, 7:8a, 7:8b, 7:8b, 7:10a, 7:10a, 7:11a, 7:15b, 7:15b, 7:16a, 7:18a, 7:19a, 7:19b, 7:20a, 7:22a, 7:22b, 7:24b, 7:25b, 7:26a, 7:26b, 7:27b, 7:28a, 7:29a, 7:29b, 8:1a, 8:3a, 8:5a, 8:5b, 8:6b, 8:10a, 8:10a, 8:11a, 8:12b, 8:13a, 8:13a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:17b, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2b, 9:3a, 9:4b, 9:7a, 9:8a, 9:9a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:12a, 9:12b, 9:13b, 9:14a, 9:14a, 9:14a, 9:14a, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:15a, 9:15a, 9:15b, 9:16a, 9:16b, 9:17a, 9:18a, 9:18a, 10:1b, 10:1b, 10:2a, 10:4b, 10:6a, 10:12a, 10:13b, 11:6b, 11:7a, 11:7b, 12:9a, 12:11a, 12:11b, 12:14b, 12:14b.

Adjective > Participle (12)

Evidence:
4:2a, 4:15a, 5:11b, 7:2b, 7:19b, 8:8a, 9:4a, 9:4b, 9:5a, 10:5b, 10:19a, 11:5a.

In 10 instances the Translator employed substantival participles in Greek for substantival adjectives in Hebrew.\(^{87}\)

Example:
4:2b ἀπὸ τοῦ ζωήν ὑπὲρ τοὺς δοῦτος αὐτῶν ζωὴν ἡ ἐκ τοῦ νῦν

The adjective πάντες, which is used substantivally in this clause, is rendered by a

\(^{87}\)The 10 cases are 4:2a, 4:15a, 5:11b, 7:2b, 7:19b, 9:4a, 9:5a, 10:5b, 10:19a, 11:5a.
substantial participle ζων in 4:2b, 4:15a, 7:2b, 9:4a, 9:5a, and 10:19a. In the same way, שֶׁבֶט is rendered by ἐξοσομίζων in 7:19b and 10:5b, שֵׁבֶט by ἐμπληθεῖς in 5:11b, and שֶׁבֶט by κυοφόρον in 11:5a.

There are 2 cases where an attributive adjective in Hebrew is rendered by an attributive participle in Greek.  

Example:  
9:4b δι το ψηφίος τον ζων αὐτος ἁγναθος υπερ τον λεοντα τον νεκρον  
In 9:4b the adjective ζων modifies σαβετ in attributive position. The Translator utilized the attributive participle ζων in Greek for the attributive adjective in Hebrew. Another case is in 8:8a where an attributive adjective שֶׁבֶט is rendered by an attributive participle ἐξοσομίζων.

**Adjective > Verb (9)**

Evidence:  
2:10b, 2:18a, 2:22b, 3:9b, 4:2b, 4:8b, 7:23b, 7:24b, 9:9b.

All adjectives rendered by verbs function as predicate in the clauses. In 6 cases verbal adjectives are involved: שֶׁבֶט is rendered by εὐφράνθη in 2:10b, and שֶׁבֶט by μοχθέω in 2:18a, 2:22b, 3:9b, 4:8b, and 9:9b.

Example:  
2:18a και ἐμμίοσα ἐγώ συν πάντα μοχθεν μου δι εγω μοχθε συν τον θλιον

---

88 The Translator seems to have read שֶׁבֶט as שֶׁבֶטא, a verbal adjective, while MT reads the form in question as שֶׁבֶטא, a noun.

89 The 2 cases are 8:8a and 9:4b.
The adjective יָאָר functioning as predicate is rendered by the present זָיוֹן in 4:2b, and by the aorist ἔμακρύνθη in 7:23b.

7:23b ἐὰν σοφισθήσομαι καὶ αὐτῇ ἔμακρύνθη ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.\(^{90}\)

**Adjective > Noun (2)**

There are 2 adjectives, which can be construed as substantives in Hebrew and are rendered by nouns in Greek.

7:24b καὶ βασθοῦ βάθος τίς εὑρήσει αὐτό

The repetition of the adjective תָּחַם in 7:24b denotes intensification in Hebrew and means “exceedingly deep.”\(^{91}\) This expression is rendered by βασθοῦ βάθος an adjective plus a substantive which means “deep depth.” This appropriately conveys the intensive idea. Therefore, we have a good functional if not formal equivalent.

12:5a καὶ γε ἄπα θύσιος ὑπονται καὶ θάμβοι ἐν τῇ ὅθῃ

In 12:5a ἡ βασθοῦ, which is an adjective and used as a substantive, is rendered by θύσιος a substantive in Greek.

**Adjective > Pronoun (1)**

In 11:6b, the idiomatic expression דְּרָא כ meaning “equally” or “altogether” is rendered also by an idiomatic expression in Greek—ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, which means

\(^{90}\)7:23b and 7:24a in Greek Ecclesiastes.

\(^{91}\)GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §133k.
"together." 92

11:6b

אַזֹּרָנְתִּים כָּאָרָה פּוֹרִים

11:6b בָּאָנָן וַתַּצְוָי אִתָּנָה וָאֹתוֹ אָגָדוּ

Adjective > Adverb (1)

7:23b אֶפְרוֹחַ אָחַרְךָ וְהָיְתָה רַחְמָתְךָ מַמֵּנִים

7:24a וְרוֹאִיתָ חָשָׁבְתַּהּ

7:23b εἰπά σοφισθήσομαι

7:24a καὶ αὐτῇ ἐμακρύνθη ἡ πέτος ἐμοῦ μακρὰν ὑπὲρ τοῦ θυμὸν

The adjective דְּרוֹדִיךְ in 7:24a functions as a predicate in MT. The Translator employed the adverb μακρὰν for דְּרוֹדִיךְ. The discrepancy may be due to different consonantal texts. The parent text of the Translator seems to have been מָשְׁרָה instead of מֶה שָׁרוֹת, and construed the ב as a comparative פָּנִים.

Summary

The evidence demonstrates the high degree of formal correspondence between Hebrew of MT and Greek of the Translator in rendering of nouns. The 47 instances of proper nouns in MT are all rendered by their corresponding proper nouns in Greek (100 percent). In 964 out of 1126 instances the Translator utilized common nouns for common nouns (86 percent). All 148 instances of adjectives rendering common nouns are either functional equivalents or are the only options available to the Translator in Greek. In 4 out of 6 instances substantival participles are utilized for common nouns as

functional equivalents. The other 2 cases of attributive participles rendering common nouns represent appropriate idiomatic renderings. Adverbs occur 7 times in MT, and all of them are rendered by functional equivalents in Greek.

In 166 out of 192 instances adjectives in Greek are employed for adjectives in Hebrew (87 percent). When participles are employed for adjectives, all instances are functionally equivalent. Substantival adjectives are rendered by substantival participles in 10 cases, and attributive adjectives by attributive participles in 2 cases. All 8 instances where verbs in Greek render predicative adjectives in Hebrew are also functionally appropriate. Substantives are employed for substantival adjectives in 2 instances as functional equivalents. There is a case where an adjective is adverbially used in MT, and its corresponding idiomatic expression in Greek is utilized for the adjective. Finally the case where an adverb is used for adjective in 7:24a may result from different consonantal texts. Therefore the correspondence in rendering nouns is higher than 99 percent.

The description of the Translator’s approach in rendering nouns should include his treatment of (1) number, (2) bound structure, (3) attributive phrase, and (4) articulation. Analysis of the Translator’s approach to these issues yields considerable insight into his method.

Number

Three proper nouns out of 4, which occur a total of 7 times, are transliterated in Greek. The 3 proper nouns transliterated in Greek are דָּוִד (David), יִרְאֶשֶׁל (Ierousalēm), and יִשְׂרָאֵל (Israēl). The form יִרְאֶשֶׁל points to a singular probably vocalized as

93 The categories for description are from Gentry, Greek Job, 99-132.
while the vocalization of MT reflects a dual form. The plural noun אָדָלִים is rendered by the singular of the אֵדֶּא in all 40 instances. All the renderings of proper nouns are appropriate and expected with respect to number.

Common nouns and adjectives are considered together for convenience. The 37 cases where nouns are rendered by verbal forms, adverbs, or prepositions are excluded for the consideration since the number was not a factor in the Translator’s choice in these instances.

There are difficulties of comparison due to different grammatical norms between Hebrew and Greek. For example, Hebrew and Greek have different rules governing the number of numerals, dual forms, and סָהֲלָה.

The numerals שֵׁנֶה “seven” and שַׁעֲרָה “eight” are singular substantives in Hebrew, both of which occur in 11:2a. Their counterparts in Greek are respectively ἑπτά and ἥκτα, which are indeclinable nouns. אֵלֶּךָ “thousand” is a singular substantive in Hebrew, but its correspondent in Greek χάλκινον is a plural adjective, which is used in 6:6a and 7:28b. The dual form שֵׁן is a substantive and occurs 4:3a, 4:9a, 4:11a, 4:12a, 11:6b. Its counterpart in Greek is δύο, which is also dual but indeclinable. The word δύο is the only dual form that occurs in the LXX.

---

94 KB, s.v. "יְרוּשָׁלָם"; Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §7.3d.


96 Ibid., 252.
Further 8 nouns occurring a total of 20 instances are dual in Ecclesiastes: שָׁפָר, שָׁפַר, סְנָרִים, סְנָרִים, וָאָרִים, וָאָרִים, הֶפֶלְתִים, הֶפֶלְתִים, and שָׁפָר. Since no dual form except δύο is attested in Hellenistic Greek literature, these instances must be excluded for the comparison with respect to number.\(^{97}\) In 6 instances, a singular noun in Greek is employed for dual in Hebrew, and in 14 instances a plural for a dual. In all 4 of its occurrences, דֵּלֶלֶלֶל is rendered by the singular noun οὐρανός.\(^{98}\) The dual form is also rendered by a singular θυραί in Greek.\(^{99}\) The singular and plural forms of ὀδόωρ in Greek are inconsistently employed for דֵּלֶלֶלֶל in Hebrew.\(^{100}\) In 4:6b the phrase δύο δρακάνω, which denotes a dual sense, is cleverly used for דֵּלֶלֶלֶל. Further there are 12 cases where a dual form in Hebrew is rendered by a plural form in Greek. These include: סְנָרִים in 6:6a;\(^{101}\) by ὑφοῆματι in 2:10a, 2:14a, 5:10b, 6:9a, 8:16b, 11:7b, and 11:9a;\(^{102}\) by χεῖρες in 2:11a, 5:5b, 7:26a, and 10:18b; and סְנָרִים by ὀκτυρία in 10:18a.

The substantive יֵלֶל and its Greek correspondent πᾶς cannot be compared with respect to number. While πᾶς is an adjective and agrees with the noun it modifies in

\(^{97}\)Ibid., 251.

\(^{98}\)The 4 instances are 1:13a, 3:1b, 5:1b, 10:20b. In 2:3b, שָׁפָר is rendered by וָאָרִים. The Translator seems to have וָאָרִים instead of שָׁפָר in a parent text. This case is to be treated as a singular noun in Hebrew rendered by a singular noun in Greek.

\(^{99}\)It is 12:4a.

\(^{100}\)A plural form appears in 2:6a, and a singular in 11:1a.

\(^{101}\)In 7:22a a plural form occurs instead of a dual. It is a normal feature in Hebrew. See Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §7.3c.

\(^{102}\)In 4:8a the Translator followed Qere and employed a singular.
number, נָא is always singular in Hebrew. ¹⁰³

Finally, a case where a noun functions adverbially in a clause must be excluded from the analysis of number.

7:16a דִּבְרֵי מָּקִינָא שָׁמְרוּ חֲמָסָם יִשֶׁר
7:16a μὴ γίνον δίκαιος πολὺ καὶ μὴ σοφίζον περισσά

In 7:16a the substantive זָהָר, which functions adverbially, is rendered by περισσά a plural form in Greek. The word περισσά can function as an adverbial accusative in both its singular and plural forms. ¹⁰⁴

The exceptional situations discussed above total 155 occurrences including the cases of numerals, dual forms, נָא, and the adverbial uses of the noun involved as well as the cases where substantives or adjectives are not rendered by substantives or adjectives. Thus 934 cases remain for the analysis of the Translator’s approach to number.

**Singular Nouns (772)**

There are 772 instances where singular nouns occur in Ecclesiastes, and 759 instances of these are rendered by the singular in Greek (98 percent). In 13 cases the Translator used the plural in Greek for the singular in Hebrew. ¹⁰⁵ Collective or class

---

¹⁰³ When it is attributive, πᾶς follows the number of its antecedent that it modifies. When πᾶς functions as a substantive, it takes the number of its referent and can be a plural. For example, τὰ πάντα in 1:2b, which is a neuter plural form employed for נָא, functions as a substantive, and its number is taken from its referent.

¹⁰⁴ In 2:15a a singular form περισσά is used for זָהָר and functions as an adverbial accusative.

¹⁰⁵ The 13 instances are 2:8a, 3:18b, 4:5b, 5:5b, 7:6a, 7:8a, 7:13a, 7:16a, 8:1a, 8:17a, 9:14a, 10:20a, 11:5b.
nouns represent 5 cases: מְלָא in 2:8a is rendered by περιουσιαμοί, בֵּית in 3:18b by κτήνη, בֵּית in 4:5b by σάρκες, בֵּית in 7:6a by ἀφρονες, and בֵּית in 8:1a by σοφοί.

There are 4 instances where a singular form of מְלָא is rendered by the plural form ποιήματα. All of these cases occur in bound phrases. In 3 cases, “God” serves as the nomen rectum (7:13a, 8:17a, 11:5b), and in 1 case “your hands” serves as the nomen rectum (5:5b). To establish a pattern, 2 more cases in 8:14a need to be considered. In 8:14a, the singular form of מְלָא in a bound phrase is rendered by a singular in Greek.

In both 8:14a and 8:17a, מְלָא functions as nomen regens in a bound phrase.

In 8:14a the nomen rectum is a human being, and in 8:17a “God” is the nomen rectum.

The Translator seems to have differentiated what God has done from what human beings have done by utilizing a plural ποιήματα for the “works of God” and a singular ποιήμα for the “work of human beings.” An exception is the case in 5:5b where מְלָא is rendered by a plural form in Greek even though the nomen rectum is not “God.”

106 The 4 instances are 5:5b, 7:13a, 8:17a, 11:5b. A singular form of מְלָא occurs in 15 instances, and 11 of them are rendered by a singular in Greek.

107 The nomen rectum in 5:5b is “your hands,” i.e., human beings.
In several manuscripts a plural construct form מִינָהָן is attested in 5:5b instead of מִינָהָן.108

Except for the 4 cases discussed above the Translator’s rendering of the number of מִינָהָן is formally equivalent (94 percent).109 This means that the Translator normally followed the number of מִינָהָן in MT except in cases where ‘God’ is the nomen rectum in a bound phrase. Based on this pattern, one can suggest that the parent text of the Translator may have had מִינָהָן in 5:5b. Otherwise, the Translator deviated from his usual approach. This case can, therefore, be counted as a plural noun in Hebrew rendered by a plural in Greek.

In 2 instances, the agreement of the number is adjusted according to the demands of Greek.

10:20a μεσέβας ἀλήθειας 
10:20a καὶ ἐν ταμείοις κοιτώνων σου μή καταράσῃ πλούσιον

In 10:20a, μεσέβας is rendered by a plural in Greek. μεσέβας is used as a distributive singular and does not have to agree in number with מִינָהָן syntactically related to it.110

While a distributive singular is preferred in Hebrew, it is not normal in Greek. For example, Hebrew prefers “their head,” but one may expect “their heads” in Greek.111

---

108 The manuscripts include Cairo Geniza Hebrew codex fragments and many of Eastern Masoretes as well as a few manuscripts cited in the editions of Kennicott, de Rossi, and Ginsberg. Cf. BHS-Horst.

109 מִינָהָן occurs 16 times except the 4 cases discussed above. The number is agreed between Hebrew and Greek in 15 out of 16 instances.

110 Cf. Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §7.2.1b.

Thus, using the plural κοίτονον for the singular מ arsch is due to the norms of the target language.

9:14a πολίς μικρά καὶ ἄνδρες ἐν αὐτῇ ὀλίγοι

The relationship between מ arsch and מ arsch may be construed as appositional.\(^{112}\)

The Translator, however, seems to have reckoned מ arsch as the predicative in a verbless clause. Since the number of the subject and the number of the predicate must agree in Greek, the Translator may have deliberately utilized a plural form ὀλίγοι in accordance with the number of the subject ἄνδρες.

The final case in 7:8a, where a singular דבר is rendered by a plural λόγον, is probably due to dittography.

7:8a ἀγαθή ἑσχάτη λόγων ὑπὲρ ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ

There are 19 instances where דבר is rendered by λόγος. In all the cases except 7:8a the Greek agrees with the Hebrew in number. Rendering a singular form of דבר by a plural form λόγον is not the normal pattern of the Translator, and there is no contextual reason for דבר to be a plural in 7:8a. There may be dittography involved in this deviated case.

The repetition of ר (hireq yod) of the preceding word אדריכים and the following word מ ראשית may create a dittography along with the repetition of נ, which is the beginning letter of the next word. The Translator’s consonantal text might have had

\(^{112}\) The same appositional use of מ arsch occurs in Neh 2:12. Cf. KB, s.v. "מ arsch"; BDB, s.v. "מ arsch."
In sum, the 12 cases where a singular noun in Hebrew is rendered by a plural noun in Greek involve collective or class nouns in 5 cases, theological adjustments in 3 cases, grammatical adjustments according to the contexts in 2 cases, and textual problems in 2 cases.

**Plural Nouns (162)**

Plural nouns occur 162 times in Ecclesiastes. In 138 instances, the Translator employed a plural noun in Greek for a plural noun in Hebrew (85 percent). For the rest, the Translator used singular nouns (15 percent).

In 23 instances the plural nouns in Hebrew, which are rendered by singular nouns in Greek, belong to the group of abstract nouns or pluralia tantum. Abstract nouns, which denote quality or state, normally take plural forms in Hebrew. These abstract nouns, which are rendered by singular nouns in Greek, include rendered by νεότης in 11:9a and 12:1a, γινώσκω rendered by περιφορά in 2:12a and 7:25b, rendered by ὁράον in 11:9a, and finally rendered by ζωή in 12 instances.

In Hebrew the substantive אֵשׁ always occurs in the plural construct form אֵשׁ, which is rendered by an adjective feminine singular μακριά in Greek (10:17a). The word פֶּנֶס, which occurs only in the plural form פֶּנֶס, is rendered in all 5 of its occurrences.

---

113 Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §7.4.2.

114 The 12 instances are 2:3b, 2:17a, 3:12b, 5:19a, 6:8b, 6:12a, 6:12a, 8:15b, 9:3b, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:9b. In 5:17b, MT has a singular form וְיָרָה, which is also rendered by ζωή in Greek. Based upon the pattern of the Translator, וְיָרָה might be construed as וְיָרָה, which is an expected form. Two Cairo Geniza Hebrew codex fragments attest זְיוֹן. See BHS-Horst.
by the singular noun πρόσωπον in Greek.115

In 2:4a, μνημείον a plural noun with 1 c.s. pronominal suffix is rendered by ποιημάτι μου a singular noun with a genitive form of 1 sg. personal pronoun.

2:4a ἡμετέρῳ μνημείῳ 2:4a ἐμεγάλυνα ποιημά τι μου

As discussed above in the section on the singular, the Translator’s rendering the number of μνημείον is literal except the cases of bound phrases, in which the Translator uses the plural for God’s works to differentiate them from the works of human beings. Employing a singular form for a plural in 2:4a deviates from this approach. Since the Translator’s parent text was consonantal, the Translator perhaps read בְּרִית as maʻāši instead of maʻāšay. This case, therefore, can be regarded as a singular noun in Hebrew rendered by a singular noun in Greek.

Summary

Among 934 instances where comparison is possible, 900 cases show the agreement of the number between Hebrew nouns and Greek nouns (93 percent). This result confirms the picture of a literalistic Translator. The discrepancies found are mainly due to the different grammatical demands between the source language and the target language.

Bound Phrases

Bound phrases must also be factored into an analysis of the Translator’s treatment of nouns. For fairer comparison the analysis is restricted to nominal bound

115 The 5 instances, which are 7:3b, 8:1b, 8:1b, 10:10a, and 11:1a, exclude the
phrases. If a pronominal suffix is involved in the bound phrase, the pronominal suffix is not treated as a member of the bound phrase here. Bound phrases where הָלָּי is the nomen regens and is rendered by an attributive adjective in Greek cannot be compared and are excluded from the analysis. Cardinal numbers are also excluded because their surface structures are different in Hebrew and Greek (6:6a).

There are 151 bound phrases that qualify for comparison: 137 two-member phrases, 14 three-member phrases, and 1 four-member phrase. The Translator employed nominals in the genitive case in Greek for the free members in Hebrew bound cases where הָלָּי is used as a semipreposition.

If a bound phrase is ‘a of b of c’ where c is a pronominal suffix, it is treated as a two member bound phrase. Bound forms with pronominal suffix are discussed separately.

If הָלָּי is one of three members in a bound phrase, the bound phrase is regarded as a two member phrase (2:5b, 4:4a, 6:7a, 7:2a, 8:17a, 12:4b). If הָלָּי is one of four members in a bound phrase, the bound phrase is regarded as a three member phrase (9:9a).

Cf. Gentry, Greek Job, 110.

The 152 instances are 1:1a, 1:1a, 1:2a, 1:2b, 1:13b, 1:14b, 1:17b, 1:18a, 1:18a, 2:3b, 2:3b (three member-bound phrase. Hereafter ‘three member’), 2:5b, 2:6a, 2:7a, 2:8a, 2:8b (three member), 2:10b, 2:11b, 2:13b, 2:15a, 2:17b, 2:22a, 2:24b, 2:26b, 3:8b, 3:8b, 3:10b, 3:13b, 3:16b, 3:16b, 3:18a (three member), 3:19a (three member), 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:21a (three member), 3:21b, 4:1b, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:4b, 4:6a, 4:6b, 4:6b, 4:16b, 4:17a, 5:2a, 5:2b, 5:2b, 5:6a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:8a, 5:11a, 5:14a, 5:17b (three member), 5:18b, 5:19a, 5:19b, 6:3a, 6:9a, 6:9b, 6:12a (four member-bound phrase), 7:1b, 7:1b, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:3b, 7:4a, 7:4a, 7:4b, 7:4b, 4:5a, 7:5b, 7:5b, 7:6a, 7:6a, 7:7b, 7:8a, 7:9b, 7:12a, 7:12b (three member), 7:13a, 7:14a, 7:14a, 7:25b, 8:1a, 8:1b, 8:1b, 8:2a, 8:2b (three member), 8:5b, 8:6b, 8:8a, 8:11b (three member), 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:15b, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:3b (three member), 9:9a (three member), 9:9a, 9:12b, 9:16b, 9:17a, 9:17b, 9:18a, 10:1a (three member), 10:2a, 10:2b, 10:4a, 10:10b, 10:12a (three member), 10:12b, 10:13a (three member), 10:13b, 10:15a, 10:17a, 10:18b, 10:20a, 10:20b, 10:20b, 11:1a, 11:1b, 11:5a, 11:5a, 11:5b, 11:8b, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 12:1a, 12:1b, 12:3a, 12:4a, 12:4b, 12:5b, 12:6a, 12:6a, 12:8a, 12:9b, 12:10a, 12:10b, 12:11a, 12:11a, 12:12b, 12:13a.
phrases in 147 of 151 instances (97 percent). The genitive case in Greek is probably the best way to render the free member in Hebrew.

While modern scholars may construe לְבֵן־הָעַץ as an attributive phrase and translate it as “a wise heart,” the Translator read לְבֵן as a substantival adjective and free member of a bound phrase. Thus, the Translator utilized a genitive case in Greek. 120

The other 4 cases show different approaches in rendering bound phrases and need to be discussed.

In 2:7a the Translator used a compound noun οἰκογενεῖς for a bound phrase "house-born slaves," which literally means “ones born in the house,” refers to "house-born slaves,” who are distinguished from slaves who are purchased. 121 The Greek word οἰκογενεῖς has the same literal meaning and also refers to those "born in the house, of slaves” in Hellenistic literature. 122 Therefore, the compound adjective οἰκογενεῖς, which is used as a substantive in the sentence, is an excellent rendering for לְבֵן־הָעַץ.
The free form of the bound phrase in 8:1b is rendered by a dative case in Greek. The dative is probably the dative of respect, “shameless with respect to his face,” or dative of locative, “shameless on his face,” or could be the dative of possession, “shameless of his face.” The dative with adjective are attested in Hellenistic Greek as well as in classical Greek. Employing the dative rather than genitive indicates that the Translator was not mechanical, but sensitive to the semantic relationship between two members in the bound phrase.

In 10:1a the free member of the bound phrase is rendered by an attributive participle. The literal meaning of is “flies of death,” that is understood as “dead flies” by modern scholars. LXX has a somewhat different rendering: “flies that bring death.” The phrase is vague in its meaning, so the Translator may have tried to explain the phrase by utilizing a participle. The Translator must have understood the relationship of as a directly causational one, which is called a genitive of effect by modern scholars. The meaning of “flies of death,” therefore, becomes “flies that cause death,” that is “deadly flies.”

---

123 For these usages of dative, see BDF, Greek Grammar, §197; S. E. Porter, Idioms of the Greek New Testament, 2nd ed. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 97-98; Robertson, Grammar, 523.
124 Cf. Robertson, Grammar, 523; BDF, Greek Grammar, §197.
125 Cf. Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 96-97.
The phrase מַלְאֵךְ הָאָדָם, of which literal meaning is “possessor of wings,” may refer to “a flying creature.” The Translator employed a substantival participle for the bound member and employed an accusative case as an object of the participle for the free member. The approach may be more descriptive in this case than the one employing the genitive construct.

In sum, the default rendering for the free member of the bound phrase in Hebrew is a genitive case in Greek (97 percent). For the other 4 cases, the Translator utilized various approaches, but they still maintain his literalistic character.

**Attributive Phrases**

Adjectives have three functions: (1) substantive, (2) attributive, and (3) predicative. Substantive adjectives are analyzed with other substantives, and predicate adjectives are dealt with under verbs. Attributive adjectives occur 48 times in Ecclesiastes. In all but 2 cases the Translator employed an attributive adjective in Greek (96 percent).

Example:

4:13אַלָּרָם סֶפֶךְ קָדָשִׁים
4:13אֵדָּוָה פַּתַּחַי בַּעֲרָף וַנָּשָׁם כִּי סָרְפָה

---

126 Cf. Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §9.5.2c.

127 *Ketib* has an article in the free form, but *Qere* does not have. The Translator follows *Ketib*.


129 The 48 instances are 1:13b, 2:14b, 2:21b, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:20a, 4:3b, 4:8b, 4:9b, 4:13a, 4:13a, 4:13b, 4:15, 5:13a, 5:15a, 6:2a, 6:2b, 6:3a, 6:6b, 7:1a, 7:10a, 7:19b, 7:22a, 7:24b, 7:28b, 7:29b, 8:2a, 8:5a, 8:5b, 8:8a, 8:10a, 9:2a, 9:3a, 9:4b, 9:7a, 9:12a, 9:12b, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:15a, 9:15b, 9:18a, 10:1b, 10:4b, 10:6a, 10:13b, 12:11b.
An attributive adjective בְּמֵסָף modifying the noun רָאָל in Hebrew is rendered also by the attributive adjective πένης modifying the noun παίς in Greek.

The other 2 cases of attributive adjectives in Hebrew are rendered by participles in Greek. The 2 instances are 8:8a and 9:4b.

8:8a אַחְזַצְתָּ שֵׁלָמִים כָּרָה לְבָלהָ אִיתִּרָהֶז

8:8a οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπος ἐξουσιάζων ἐν πνεύματι τοῦ καλίσαν σίω τὸ πνεῦμα

The adjective שִׁלְמִים occurs 3 times in Ecclesiastes. Two cases function as substantives (7:19b, 10:5b), and the other is attributive (8:8a). For all the cases of שִׁלְמִים the Translator employed the participle form of ἐξουσιάζω in Greek. In 8:8a the attributive adjective שִׁלְמִים modifying כָּרָה is rendered by a participle ἐξουσιάζων, which attributively modifies ἀνθρώπος.

9:4b εἰρήλησεν θεός τὸν μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ

9:4b διὶ ὁ κύριον ὁ ζῶν αὐτὸς ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τὸν λέοντα τὸν νεκρόν

The adjective רָאָל occurs 8 times in Ecclesiastes. Six cases function as substantives, 1 as predicative, and 1 as attributive.130 For all the cases a verbal form of ζῶοι in Greek renders רָאָל in Hebrew. The participle forms of ζῶοι are used for the substantive uses and an attributive use of רָאָל, and its indicative form for the predicative use. In 9:4b an attributive adjective רָאָל is rendered by an attributive participle ὁ ζῶοι.131

There are certain words that are substantives in Hebrew but rendered by attributive adjectives in Greek. In 53 instances, a substantive לָשָׁן in Hebrew is rendered

---

130 The 6 cases of the substantival use of רָאָל are 4:2b, 4:15a, 7:2b, 9:4a, 9:5a, 10:19a. The case of its predicative use is 4:2b. The case of its attributival use is 9:4b.
by an adjective πᾶς having attributive function. These cases are not attributive phrases in Hebrew but transformed into attributive phrases in Greek according to the norm of the target language.

Example:

1:7a πάντες οἱ χείμαρροι πορεύονται εἰς τὴν θαλάσσαν

The translation is evidently literal in 1:7a. The phrase is a bound phrase in Hebrew. This bound phrase is transformed into the attributive phrase πάντες οἱ χείμαρροι in Greek where the case of the adjective agrees with its modifying noun.

There are 2 instances where cardinal numbers, which are substantives in Hebrew, are rendered by attributive adjectives in Greek.

4:3a και ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο τούτους ὄστες οὕτω ἐγένετο

The form is analyzed as the construct form of with 3 m.p. pronominal suffix. The construct form, which is substantive in Hebrew, is rendered by δύο—an attributive adjective in second position.

6:6a καὶ εἶ διησφαν χιλίων ἐτῶν καθόδους καὶ ἀγαθοσύνην οὐκ εἶδεν

The article seems to be due to the fact that the Translator read an indeterminate form as an articler form.

The 53 instances are 1:3b, 1:7a, 1:8a, 1:9b, 1:14a, 2:5b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:14b, 2:18a, 2:19b, 2:20b, 2:22a, 2:23a, 3:1b, 3:13a, 3:13a, 3:17b, 3:17b, 4:1a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:8a, 4:15a, 4:16a, 5:16a, 5:17a, 5:18a, 6:7a, 7:2a, 7:21a, 7:23a, 7:28b, 8:6a, 8:9a, 8:9a, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:4a, 9:8a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:11b, 11:8a, 11:9b, 12:4b, 12:8b, 12:13b, 12:14a, 12:14a.
The cardinal number הָלֵּךְ is also a substantive in Hebrew, but its corresponding Greek word ἔλθων in 6:6a is an attributive adjective.

In sum, all 48 cases of attributive phrases in Hebrew are rendered by attributive phrases in Greek whether the Translator utilized an attributive adjective or an attributive participle. There are 55 instances where attributive phrases in Greek render bound phrases in Hebrew because of the difference between the source language and the target language.

Articulation

Articulation is the final aspect for analysis of the translator's approach to nouns. Nearly all the cases where substantives or adjectives in Hebrew are rendered by substantives or adjectives in Greek are to be included in the analysis. Exceptional cases include those where attributive adjectives or attributive participles render 53 instances of הָלֵּךְ, 2 instances of substantival cardinal numbers, and 2 instances of other substantives. These cases are excluded because when a substantive is rendered by an attributive its articulation is decided by the articulation of the noun that it modifies. Further exceptions are 21 instances where nouns in Hebrew are rendered by verbs, adverbs, articles or relative pronouns with prepositions, and an idiomatic expression. Consequently, 1107 cases are analyzed for the comparison of articulation.

133 See n. 121 of this dissertation.
134 The 2 instances are 4:3a and 6:6a.
135 The 2 instances are 8:4a and 10:1a.
136 The 21 instances are 2:10b, 2:15a, 2:18a, 2:22b, 3:9b, 3:21a, 4:2b, 4:8b, 4:12b, 5:10b, 5:12b, 7:12b, 7:16a, 7:23b, 7:24a, 7:24b, 8:8b, 8:11a, 9:9b, 11:6b, 12:11a.
Proper Nouns

Evidences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דוד &gt; Δωῦνδ</td>
<td>anarthrous &gt; anarthrous: 1:1a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ישראל &gt; Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>anarthrous &gt; anarthrous: 1:12b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ירושלם &gt; Ἰερούσαλημ</td>
<td>anarthrous &gt; anarthrous: 1:1b, 1:12b, 1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anarthrous &gt; arthrous: 1:13b, 3:10b, 5:3a, 7:18b, 8:13b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anarthrous &gt; anarthrous: 3:13b, 5:18b, 8:2b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normally proper nouns do not take the article in Hebrew. As expected, the proper nouns ירושלם, ירושלם, and אלוהים do not have the article in all 7 instances. The Translator also employed anarthrous proper nouns in Greek for all these anarthrous proper nouns.

On the other hand, אלוהים, an appellative which has the sense of a proper name, can take the article. In MT occurs in 40 instances: 32 instances are arthrous, and 8 instances are anarthrous. The Translator employed arthrous Θεός for all the instances of arthrous אלוהים, and also for 5 out of 8 instances of anarthrous אלוהים. Only in 3 instances anarthrous אלוהים corresponds to anarthrous Θεός.

---

137 In 1:1b, Ἰσραήλ is added in Greek Ecclesiastes, which lacks in MT.

138 GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §125d.

139 Ibid., §125d and f.

140 The 32 instances of arthrous אלוהים are 2:24b, 2:26b, 3:10b, 3:11b, 3:14a, 3:14b, 3:15a, 3:17a, 3:18a, 4:17a, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:3a, 5:5b, 5:6b, 5:17b, 5:18a, 5:19b, 6:2a, 6:2a, 7:13a, 7:14b, 7:26b, 7:29a, 8:12b, 8:15b, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:7b, 11:5b, 11:9b, 12:7b, 12:13b, 12:14a. The 8 instances of anarthrous אלוהים are 1:13b, 3:10b, 3:13b, 5:3a, 5:18b, 7:18b, 8:2b, 8:13b.
The 5 instances where anarthrous אַלְדָּהִים is rendered by arthrous וְאָלָדָהִים need to be explained. In 1:13b and 3:10b, אַלְדָּהִים functions as subject and syntactically related to the words נְתִי (predicate) and מְנִיעָה (object). The form לְאַלְדָּהִים in 5:3a is not graphemically distinguishable between arthrous and anarthrous form in a consonantal text. In 7:18b and 8:13b, אַלְדָּהִים functions as object: object of the participle רָא in 7:18b and object of the semipreposition מְלָפֵמי in 8:13b. Both instances are related to the verb רָא. In other words, for the instances where אַלְדָּהִים functions either as subject or as object, the Translator employed arthrous וְאָלָדָהִים. In the other 3 instances where the Translator rendered anarthrous אַלְדָּהִים by anarthrous וְאָלָדָהִים, אַלְדָּהִים functions as nomen rectum in a nominal bound phrase.

In conclusion, the articulation of proper nouns and appellatives between the source language and the target language agrees in 42 instances out of 47 (89 percent). Discrepancies of articulation occurring in the cases of anarthrous אַלְדָּהִים are syntactically motivated.

**Common Nouns**

In a consonantal text, not all instances of the article are graphemically present. Consequently, common nouns can be formally categorized into three groups to analyze articulation: (1) free forms, in which the article is graphically recognized in a consonantal text, (2) indeterminate forms, which have inseparable preposition, so the articulation cannot be graphemically recognized, (3) bound forms, which have pronominal suffixes or

**141 In 8:13b מְלָפֵמי adverbially modifies רָא.**
function as *nomen regens* in bound noun phrases.¹⁴²

**Free forms.** The 632 free forms provide the data for the comparison of articulation. Two instances need to be discussed before the analysis. In 9:2a anarthrous ματαιότης renders arthrous הָבָל in MT. The Translator’s parent text seems to read הָבָל, which is an anarthrous form of הָבָל, instead of הָבָל. This case must be treated as anarthrous. In 10:20b where an arthrous noun τὰς πτέρυγας is employed, the Translator probably followed the *Ketib* form הָבָל, which is arthrous, instead of the *Qere* form הָבָל, which is anarthrous. This case is to be regarded as arthrous.

The evidence categorized below demonstrates that the Translator consistently rendered the article literally.

Arthrous in Hebrew > Arthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes


¹⁴³The 204 instances are 1:2b, 1:3b, 1:4b, 1:5a, 1:5a, 1:6b, 1:6b, 1:7a, 1:7a, 1:7a, 1:7b, 1:8a, 1:9b, 1:13a, 1:13b, 1:14a, 1:14a, 1:14b, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:12b, 2:12b, 2:13a, 2:13b, 2:13b, 2:14a, 2:15a, 2:15a, 2:16a, 2:16b, 2:16b, 2:16b, 2:17a, 2:17a, 2:17a, 2:17b, 2:17b, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:20b, 2:20b, 2:22b, 3:1b, 3:10a, 3:10b, 3:11a, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:13a, 3:16a, 3:16b, 3:16b, 3:17a, 3:18a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:19b, 3:20a, 3:20b, 3:20b, 3:20b, 3:21a, 3:21b, 3:22a, 4:1a, 4:3b, 4:3b, 4:4a, 4:5a, 4:7b, 4:9a, 4:12a, 4:12b, 4:15a, 4:15b, 4:16a, 4:17a, 5:1b, 5:7a, 5:10a, 5:12a, 5:13a, 5:17a, 5:18a, 6:1a, 6:1b, 6:3a, 6:3b, 6:6b, 6:7a, 6:7a, 6:8a, 6:8b, 6:12b, 7:1b, 7:2a, 7:6a, 7:6a, 7:6a, 7:7a, 7:10a, 7:11a, 7:11b, 7:12a, 7:12b, 7:14b, 7:15a, 7:19a, 7:21a, 7:26a, 7:29a, 8:6b, 8:8a, 8:9a, 8:9b, 8:11b, 8:14a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:15b, 8:16a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 9:1b, 9:1b, 9:3a, 9:3b, 9:4b, 9:6b, 9:9a, 9:9b, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:12a, 9:12b, 9:13a, 9:15a, 9:15b, 10:5a, 10:6a, 10:7b, 10:10a, 10:11a, 10:11b, 10:14a, 10:14b, 10:15a, 10:18a, 10:18b, 10:19b, 10:19b, 10:20b, 10:20b, 10:20b, 11:1a, 11:2b, 11:2b, 11:3a, 11:3b, 11:5a, 11:5b, 11:7a, 11:7b, 11:8a, 11:8b, 11:10b, 11:10b, 12:1b, 12:2a, 12:2a, 12:2a, 12:2b, 12:2b, 12:3a, 12:3a, 12:4b, 12:4b, 12:5a, 12:5a, 12:5a, 12:5b,
| Subtotal                                      | 2144 |
| Anarthrous in Hebrew > Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes | 208  |

| Subtotal                                      | 5145 |
| Anarthrous in Hebrew > Arthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes  | 419  |
| Anarthrous in Hebrew > Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes  | 424  |


144 The 2 instances are 5:2a and 8:17a.

145 The 5 instances are 1:2a, 7:27a, 9:2b, 12:11a, and 12:14a.

146 The 419 instances are 1:1a, 1:1b, 1:2a, 1:2b, 1:3a, 1:4a, 1:4a, 1:6a, 1:6a, 1:7b, 1:8b, 1:8b, 1:11a, 1:11b, 1:12a, 1:12a, 1:13a, 1:13b, 1:14b, 1:14b, 1:15b, 1:16a, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:16b, 1:17a, 1:17a, 1:17a, 1:17b, 1:17b, 1:18a, 1:18a, 1:18b, 1:18b, 2:1b, 2:3b, 2:4b, 2:4b, 2:5a, 2:5a, 2:6b, 2:6b, 2:6b, 2:7a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:8a, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:9a, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:12a, 2:12a, 2:13a, 2:14b, 2:15b, 2:16a, 2:17b, 2:17b, 2:19a, 2:19b, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:23a, 2:23b, 2:24a, 2:26a, 2:26a, 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:1a, 3:1b, 3:1b, 3:2a, 3:2a, 3:2b, 3:3a, 3:3b, 3:3b, 3:4a, 3:4a, 3:4b, 3:5a, 3:5a, 3:5a, 3:5a, 3:5a, 3:5b, 3:5b, 3:6a, 3:6a, 3:6b, 3:6b, 3:7a, 3:7a, 3:7b, 3:7b, 3:8a, 3:8a, 3:8b, 3:8b, 3:9a, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:12b, 3:13a, 3:14a, 3:17b, 3:17b, 3:18b, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:20a, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:4b, 4:4b, 4:6a, 4:6a, 4:6b, 4:6b, 4:6b, 4:7a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:9b, 4:11a, 4:13a, 4:13b, 4:13b, 4:14a, 4:16a, 4:16b, 4:16b, 4:16b, 4:17a, 4:17b, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:2a, 5:2b, 5:2b, 5:3a, 5:3b, 5:5a, 5:6a, 5:6a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:8a, 5:8b, 5:9a, 5:9a, 5:9b, 5:10b, 5:11b, 5:12a, 5:12b, 5:13b, 5:13b, 5:14b, 5:15b, 5:16a, 5:16b, 5:16b, 5:17a, 5:17b, 5:18b, 6:1a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2b, 6:2b, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:5a, 6:5b, 6:6a, 6:6a, 6:6a, 6:6b, 6:8a, 6:9a, 6:9a, 6:9b, 6:9b, 6:10a, 6:11a, 6:11a, 6:11b, 7:1a, 7:1a, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:3a, 7:3a, 7:3b, 7:4a, 7:4b, 7:5b, 7:5b, 7:6b, 7:7b, 7:8b, 7:8b, 7:9b, 7:9b, 7:10b, 7:11a, 7:11b, 7:12a, 7:14a, 7:14a, 7:14b, 7:14b, 7:17a, 7:20a, 7:20b, 7:22a, 7:23a, 7:23a, 7:25a, 7:25b, 7:25b, 7:25b, 7:26a, 7:26a, 7:26a, 7:26a, 7:27b, 7:28b, 7:28b, 7:28b, 7:29b, 7:31a, 7:31b, 8:1a, 8:1b, 8:2a, 8:3b, 8:4a, 8:5a, 8:5b, 8:5b, 8:5b, 8:6a, 8:6a, 8:6a, 8:8a, 8:8a, 8:8b, 8:9a, 8:9a, 8:10a, 8:10b, 8:11a, 8:11b, 8:12a, 8:13a, 8:14a, 8:14b, 8:16a, 8:16b, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:1b, 9:1b, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:3a, 9:3a, 9:3b, 9:3b, 9:4a, 9:5b, 9:5b, 9:6b, 9:8a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:10a, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11b, 9:11b, 9:11b, 9:13a, 9:13a, 9:14a, 9:14a, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:15a, 9:15b, 9:16a, 9:16a, 9:18a, 9:18a, 9:18b, 10:1b, 10:1b, 10:1b, 10:2b, 10:3a, 10:3b, 10:4b, 10:4b, 10:5a, 10:6b, 10:7a, 10:7a, 10:7b, 10:8a, 10:8b, 10:9a, 10:9b, 10:10a, 10:10b, 10:10b, 10:11a, 10:11b, 10:12b, 10:13b, 10:13b, 10:14a, 10:15b, 10:16a, 10:16a, 10:17a, 10:18a, 10:18b, 10:19a, 10:19a, 10:20a, 10:20a, 10:20b, 11:2a, 11:2b, 11:3a, 11:3a, 11:3b, 11:4a, 11:8a, 11:8b, 11:8b, 11:9a, 11:9b, 11:10a, 11:10a, 11:10b, 11:12b, 12:1b, 12:1b, 12:4a, 12:5a, 12:6a, 12:8a, 12:9a, 12:9a, 12:9b, 12:9b, 12:10a, 12:10a, 12:10b, 12:10b, 12:12a, 12:12b, 12:12b, 12:12b, 12:13a, 12:14a.
Arthrous free forms occur 208 times, and anarthrous forms 424 times. The translation of articles appears to be literal in 206 instances of arthrous forms (99 percent) and in 419 instances of anarthrous forms (99 percent). The 7 cases where the translator omitted the article or added the article need further discussion.

5:2a קָנַם הָלְולָם בְּרָמַן
5:2a ὦτε παραγίνεται ἐνύψηνον ἐν πλήθει περισσαμοῖο

8:17a οἱ πάντα τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι οὐ δυνήσεται ἀνθρώπως
tοῦ εὑρεῖν σὺν τὸ ποιήμα τὸ πεποιημένον ὑπὸ τὸν ἦλιον

Above are 2 cases where arthrous nouns are rendered by anarthrous nouns. The word מַלְאָך is arthrous in 5:2a and functions as the subject. Another occurrence of the word is in 5:6a where it is anarthrous and functions as the nomen regens in a bound phrase. For both cases the Translator employed an anarthrous noun ἐνύψηνον. The Greek noun ἐνύψηνον is used both with the article and without article in Hellenistic Greek with little difference in meaning. The evidence for מַלְאָך in Ecclesiastes is not enough to posit what the consonantal text of the Translator might have been in 5:2a.

In Ecclesiastes the word כֻלָּה occurs 49 times. In 42 instances it has the article, and in 7 instances it does not. The Translator generally followed the articulation of MT with three exceptions (2:24a, 2:26a, and 8:17a). In 2:24a and 2:26a, כֻלָּה is prefixed by

147 Cf. LSJ, s.v. “ἐνύψηνον”; Bauer, s.v. “ἐνύψηνον.”

inseparable prepositions בְּ and בּ respectively. The form בְּרָשָׁע in 2:24a is vocalized as arthrous in the MT but is rendered by an anarthrous form. On the contrary, the form בְּרָשָׁע in 2:26a is vocalized as anarthrous in the MT, but its Greek equivalent is arthrous. Both Hebrew forms are to be treated as indeterminate since they are not graphemically distinguishable in a consonantal text whether it is arthrous or anarthrous. The instance in 8:17a clearly deviates from a normal approach. In 8:17a, the Hebrew form is arthrous, but an anarthrous Greek form is employed as its equivalent. Since the Translator was normally literal in rendering the articulation of בְּרָשָׁע (48 times out 49—98 percent), the form in question in 8:17a was probably an anarthrous form in the Translator’s parent text.149

The following 5 cases involve anarthrous nouns in Hebrew rendered by arthrous nouns in Greek.

1:2a הֹלֵל הַצִּוָּדִים כַּמְּרָך
1:2a ματαιότης ματαιοτήτων εἶπεν ὁ Ἑκκλησιαστής

7:27a ἠλπὶ λοῦ ἐκλεκτὸς ἐκλεκτῷ
7:27a ἵππο τοῦτο εἴρον εἶπεν ὁ Ἑκκλησιαστής

In 1:2a and 7:27a an anarthrous form ἡλπὶ is rendered by an arthrous ὁ Ἑκκλησιαστής. Since ἡλπὶ is treated as a masculine noun in other places (1:2a, 12:8a, 12:10a), the words ἡλπὶ ἐκλεκτῷ in 7:27a seem to be wrongly divided in MT. The right

---

149 Ziegler does not note the occurrence in 8:17a in “Der Gebrauch des Artikels.”
division may be רֶמְשִׁי, which is reflected in LXX. The Greek equivalent in 7:27a, therefore, is a formally literal rendering with respect to articulation.

The case of 1:2a is probably related to a certain expression: “the Qoheleth says.”

Table 1. Combination of רֶמְשִׁי and קִדְמָה

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:2a</td>
<td>רֶמְשִׁי קִדְמָה</td>
<td>εἶπεν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:27a</td>
<td>רֶמְשִׁי קִדְמָה</td>
<td>εἶπεν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:8a</td>
<td>רֶמְשִׁי קִדְמָה</td>
<td>εἶπεν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστῆς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whenever רֶמְשִׁי followed קִדְמָה, the Translator employed an arthrous form εἰπεν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστῆς. In other places Ἐκκλησιαστῆς is anarthrous. In a consonantal text, 7:27a and 12:8a could be regarded as the same form, and their Greek equivalents reflect רֶמְשִׁי קִדְמָה. Thus, based upon this pattern one can posit that in the consonantal text the Translator also had רֶמְשִׁי in 1:2a.

9:2b καὶ ἐπὶ ζῷον ἐπὶ θρόνον καὶ πετρὶν ἐπὶ θρόνον
9:2b ὡς ὁ ἀγαθὸς ὡς ὁ ἀμαρτάνων ὡς ὁ ἁμὼν καθὼς ὁ τὸν ὥρκον φοβούμενος

12:11a καὶ ὃς ἰδοὺ πεφυτευμένοι οἱ παρὰ τῶν συναγμάτων

150 Cf. Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 74; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 264.

151 Two (1:2a, 7:27a) are anarthrous in MT.

152 There are 4 instances: 1:1a, 1:12a, 12:9a, and 12:10a. All of them are also anarthrous in MT.
The noun שָׁבְרֵעי occurs twice, both times anarthrous in MT (8:2b, 9:2b).\(^{153}\) The Translator uses anarthrous ὀρκος for 8:2b but arthrous ὀρκος for 9:2b. It is unclear why the Translator used an arthrous form in 9:2b. In 12:11a the anarthrous מַסָפָה is a free member of the בּוֹלֶל construct and is rendered by arthrous τῶν συναρχάτων. The noun בּוֹלֶל occurs 7 times in Ecclesiastes and functions as nomen regens in all instances. A Greek equivalent for בּוֹלֶל is always arthrous, and its free member is also treated as definite all the time. Thus, rendering מַסָפָה by τῶν συναρχάτων follows the normal approach.

12:14a

The rendering of articulation of מַסָפָה seems to be related to the rendering of other neighboring words such as רָא or בּוֹלֶל. When these words are combined, certain patterns appear. Table 2 below illustrates the patterns.

The nomen rectum is marked by NR, and pronominal suffix by Sf. NR and Sf are normally rendered by genitive in Greek, which is abbreviated by Gen. The abbreviation Art. stands for an article. The presence of an element is marked by X, and the absence of an element where it is expected is marked by ?. A symbol + represents an element added which is not expected, and * indicates all the cases where a certain element does not match between Hebrew and Greek.

There is a total of 56 elements in Hebrew and 57 elements in Greek according to the table above. All discrepancies between Hebrew and Greek occur in rendering רא

---

\(^{153}\)One in 8:2b appears as a bound form of a bound phrase. Another one in
and articles. In 4 cases the particle σῶν may be expected for ἡ, but instead the article in Greek is employed (5:5b, 7:13a, 9:7b, 11:5b). All these cases show the same arrangement of elements: ἡ + munshah + NR/Sf. Wherever this arrangement occurs, an article in Greek renders ἡ. If the elements are arranged by ἡ + 카 + munshah + (NR), an article is added (8:17a, 12:14a). There is 1 case where σῶν for ἡ is just dropped out (3:11b). This may be abnormal because σῶν for ἡ exists in 4:3b and 8:17a which have 9:2b functions as the object of ἡ.
the same arrangement of words in Hebrew with 3:11b. οὐν is expected in 3:11b based upon the rendering pattern. The evidence indicates that the rendering of the article and הֶלְצַה followed by המישא is motivated by the certain syntagms.\footnote{155}

In sum, 625 occurrences of the article attached to free forms out of 631 are rendered by the article in Greek (99 percent).\footnote{156} There are 3 cases where the evidence is insufficient to detect any pattern (5:2a, 9:2b, 12:11a). In 2 cases, the consonantal text of the Translator may have been different from MT (1:2a, 8:17a). The rendering of 12:4a depends on a certain arrangement of words rather than on the text.

**Indeterminate Forms.** In 6 instances in Ecclesiastes, the prepositions are on the pretonic position or the nouns following an inseparable preposition begin with gutturals. It is difficult to tell whether the 6 nouns following inseperable prepositions are arthrous or anarthrous.\footnote{157} These cases must be eliminated from analysis. The 137 instances of indeterminate forms that remain are legitimate objects for the comparison of the articulation.\footnote{158}

\footnote{154}They are 7 instances: 3:11b, 5:5b, 7:13a, 8:17a, 9:7b, 12:14a.

\footnote{155}The rendering of the nota accusativi ה is fully discussed below.

\footnote{156}They include the case of 7:27a.

\footnote{157}In either case where an inseparable preposition is the pretonic position or an articular noun following an inseparable preposition begins with a guttural, the vowel under the preposition can be qames. Thus, one cannot say whether the noun is arthrous or anarthrous for the cases where the inseparable preposition is pretonic and at the same time, followed by the noun beginning with gutturals. The 6 instances are 3:21b, 5:15b, 7:19b, 7:20a, 8:10a, and 11:6a.

\footnote{158}Excluded are 7 cases where the indeterminate forms have adverbial functions (3:21a, 4:12b) or are rendered by incomparable forms such as a verb or
Arthrous in MT > Arthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes 27
Arthrous in MT > Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes 31
Subtotal 58

Anarthrous in MT > Arthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes 17
Anarthrous in MT > Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes 62
Subtotal 79

Total 137

Literal translations are arthrous in 27 instances out of 59 (46 percent) and anarthrous in 62 instances out of 79 (78 percent). The other 48 instances show discrepancies of articulation between Hebrew and Greek (36 percent). In 11 cases out of the 17 where anarthrous forms are rendered by arthrous forms, the preposition ב is

idiomatic expressions (5:10b, 5:12b, 7:12b, 10:11b, 10:17b). The 2 cases where ב is attributively rendered in Greek are also excluded (7:28b, 11:8a).

159 The 27 instances are 1:3a, 1:13a, 2:13a, 2:18b, 2:22a, 3:1a, 3:19a, 5:1b, 6:11b, 6:12a, 6:12b, 7:23a, 8:8a, 8:15a, 9:2a, 9:3a, 9:9b, 9:11a, 9:12a, 11:3a, 11:4b, 11:7b, 12:3b, 12:5a, 12:11a.

160 The 31 instances are 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:14a, 2:23a, 2:24a, 5:3a, 5:7a, 5:8a, 5:9a, 5:16a, 6:4a, 6:4b, 6:12a, 8:8a, 8:13a, 8:16b, 8:16b, 9:12a, 9:12a, 9:17b, 10:3a, 10:3b, 10:6a, 10:16b, 10:17b, 11:6a, 11:9b, 12:3a, 12:4a, 12:5b.

161 The 17 instances are 1:4b, 1:10b, 2:2a, 2:2b, 2:26a, 3:14b, 4:11b, 4:16a, 5:8b, 6:2a, 7:27b, 9:4b, 9:9b, 9:10a, 9:15a, 11:2a, 11:2a.

162 The 62 instances are 2:1a, 2:1a, 2:1a, 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:11a, 2:14a, 2:15a, 2:15b, 2:16a, 2:21a, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:24a, 3:11a, 3:11b, 3:12b, 3:17a, 3:18a, 3:22a, 4:9b, 5:12b, 5:13a, 5:13b, 5:14b, 5:14b, 5:18a, 6:7a, 7:9a, 7:12a, 7:14a, 7:15b, 7:15b, 8:2a, 8:9b, 8:15b, 8:16b, 9:3a, 9:3b, 9:3b, 9:6b, 9:6b, 9:7a, 9:7a, 9:10b, 9:12a, 9:12b, 9:17a, 10:2a, 10:2b, 10:5b, 10:6b, 10:7b, 10:17b, 10:18a, 10:19a, 10:20a, 11:5a, 11:9a, 12:11a, 12:14a.

163 The cases where pronominal suffixes are attached to the indeterminate forms are included in this total number. They are 31 instances: 2:1a, 2:3a, 2:15a, 2:15b, 2:24a, 3:11a, 3:11b, 3:12b, 3:17a, 3:22a, 4:9b, 5:12b, 5:13b, 5:14b, 5:14b, 5:18a, 6:2a, 6:7a, 7:9a, 7:15b, 7:15b, 8:15b, 8:16b, 9:3b, 9:3b, 9:6b, 9:10a, 9:15a, 10:2a, 10:2b, 10:20a, 11:9a. All of them are anarthrous, and the Translator used arthrous forms only for 4 cases of them (6:2a, 9:9b, 9:10a, 9:15a). Literal is about 90 percent of rendering the cases. The
rendered by the Greek article rather than a corresponding preposition. If these 11 cases are regarded as literal translations, then 72 anarthrous forms are literal renderings (92 percent). More significant discrepancies lie in 31 instances where the Translator employed anarthrous forms for the arthrous forms. It may indicate that the Translator had a tendency to read the indeterminate forms as anarthrous since he used anarthrous forms in 93 instances (68 percent) while he employed arthrous forms in 44 instances (32 percent). It is not probable that the target language demands the anarthrous forms for the head terms of the prepositional phrases because he still employed arthrous for a large portion of the evidence (44 instances). It may be due to the fact that the Translator vocalized the forms differently than the vocalization preserved in MT.

In sum, the Translator's rendering of anarthrous forms reflects the vocalization of MT more than his rendering of arthrous forms.

**Bound Forms Functioning as nomen regens.** There are 165 instances of bound forms functioning as *nomen regens* (hereafter NR). Included are 33 instances of indeterminate forms functioning as NR. All the cases are anarthrous in Hebrew. The Translator employed arthrous forms for 15 instances. In the other cases the Translator rendered the anarthrous forms with anarthrous forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anarthrous in Hebrew &gt; Arthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anarthrous in Hebrew &gt; Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cases where the indeterminate form functions as *nomen regens* are discussed under bound forms.

164 The 11 cases are 2:2a (Dative, hereafter D), 2:2b (D), 2:26a (D), 4:11b (Nominative, hereafter N), 4:16a (D), 5:8b (Genitive), 6:2a (D), 7:27b (D), 9:4b (N), 11:2a (D), 11:2a (D).

165 The 15 instances are 1:13b, 2:3b, 3:10b, 3:19a, 3:19a, 5:5b, 5:19a, 7:7b, 7:13a, 8:17a, 9:12b, 11:5a, 11:5b, 11:8b, 12:4b.
According to modern scholars, a noun in a bound phrase is definite in 3 cases: (1) if the free form is a proper noun, pronoun, or an appellative such as “God,” (2) if the free form bears the article or a suffix, or (3) if the so called *nota accusativi* immediately precedes the construct chain. Based upon this understanding, definite in Hebrew are all 15 cases where the Translator used arthrous nouns for anarthrous bound forms functioning as NR. A free member in a bound phrase has an article in 1:13b, 2:3b, 3:10b 7:13a, 8:17a, 9:12b, 11:5a, 11:5b, 11:8b, and 12:4b, and has a pronominal suffix in 5:5b, 5:19a, 7:7b. Free members in 3:19a and 3:19a are demonstrative pronouns. Among these 15 cases, 7 cases also have the so called *nota accusativi* (5:5b, 5:19a, 7:7b, 7:13a, 8:17a, 11:5b, 11:8b).

Nonetheless, the Translator did not always employ arthrous nouns for all definite bound forms functioning as NR. There are 96 definite bound forms functioning as NR in Hebrew, 81 of which are rendered by anarthrous nouns in Greek.

---

166 The 150 instances are 1:1a, 1:1a, 1:2a, 1:2b, 1:14b, 1:17b, 1:18a, 1:18a, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:5b, 2:6a, 2:7a, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:11b, 2:13b, 2:15a, 2:17b, 2:22a, 2:24b, 2:26b, 3:8b, 3:8b, 3:13b, 3:16b, 3:16b, 3:18a, 3:18a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:21a, 3:21a, 3:21b, 4:1b, 4:4a, 4:4b, 4:6a, 4:6b, 4:6b, 4:16b, 4:17a, 5:2a, 5:2b, 5:2b, 5:6a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:8a, 5:11a, 5:14a, 5:17b, 5:17b, 5:18b, 5:19b, 6:3a, 6:6a, 6:7a, 6:9a, 6:9b, 6:12a, 6:12a, 6:12a, 7:1b, 7:1b, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:3b, 7:4a, 7:4a, 7:4b, 7:4b, 4:5a, 7:5b, 7:6a, 7:6a, 7:8a, 7:9b, 7:12a, 7:12b, 7:14a, 7:14a, 8:1a, 8:1b, 8:2a, 8:2b, 8:2b, 8:5b, 8:8a, 8:11b, 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:15b, 9:1a, 9:3b, 9:3b, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:16b, 9:17a, 9:17b, 9:18a, 10:1a, 10:1a, 10:2b, 10:2b, 10:4a, 10:10b, 10:12a, 10:12a, 10:12b, 10:13a, 10:13a, 10:13b, 10:15a, 10:17a, 10:18b, 10:20a, 10:20b, 10:20b, 11:1a, 11:1b, 11:5a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 12:1a, 12:1b, 12:3a, 12:4a, 12:4b, 12:5b, 12:6a, 12:6a, 12:8a, 12:9b, 12:10a, 12:10b, 12:11a, 12:11a, 12:12b, 12:13a.

167 See Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §10:3b, 13.4a, b, and c.
These statistics demonstrate that the definiteness of the bound phrase did not affect the translation, but for most cases the Translator slavishly translated articulation of bound forms functioning as NR. The question may be on which basis the Translator used the article for 15 cases (16 percent). The Translator always employed arthrous forms if *nota accusativi* immediately precedes a bound form functioning as NR (7 cases). In the other 8 instances, it is difficult to find any contextual or grammatical reason why the Translator used articles in these cases.

**Bound Forms with Pronominal Suffixes.** There are 126 instances of bound forms with pronominal suffixes, 44 of which are rendered by arthrous nouns (35 percent) and the rest of which are literally rendered by anarthrous nouns (65 percent).

Arthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes

---

168 The 81 instances are 1:1a, (2:3b, 2:3b), (2:8b, 2:8b), 2:13b, 2:15a, 2:22a, 2:24b, 3:13b, 3:16b, 3:16b, (3:18a, 3:18a), (3:19a, 3:19a), 3:19a, (3:21a, 3:21a), 3:21b, 4:1b, 4:4a, 4:17a, 5:11a, 5:14a, (5:17b, 5:17b), 5:18b, 5:19b, 6:3a, 6:7a, (6:12a, 6:12a, 6:12a), 7:1b, 7:1b, 7:2a, 7:6a, 7:6a, 7:12a, (7:12b, 7:12b), 7:15a, 8:1b, 8:2b, 8:6b, 8:8a, (8:11b, 8:11b), 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:15b, 9:1a, (9:3b, 9:3b), (9:9a, 9:9a), 9:9a, 9:16b, 10:4a, 10:10b, (10:13a, 10:13a), 10:13b, 10:15a, 10:20a, 10:20b, 11:1a, 11:1b, 11:5a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 12:1a, 12:1b, 12:3a, 12:4a, 12:4b, 12:5b, 12:6a, 12:6a. The parenthesis indicates three member-bound phrases or four member-bound phrases. If a definite bound form is in three member-bound phrases or four member-bound phrases, an arthrous form in Greek is never employed for it.

169 See p. 68 of this dissertation for full discussion on the so-called *nota accusativi*; also J. Ziegler, “Die Wiedergabe der *nota accusativi* "et, "aet- mit ouv,“ in *Lebendige Forschung im Alten Testament, ZAW* 100, supp. vol. (1988): 229, 231-232. To be excluded are the cases of *νη* followed by *μι*, which is rendered by adjective *πασι* (2:14a, 2:18a, 4:1a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:15a, 8:17a, 12:14a). In these cases the Translator did not use an article before the phrases.

170 The 44 instances are 1:5b, 1:13a, 2:3a, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:14a, 2:20a, 2:23a, 2:23a, 2:24a, 4:3a, 4:4a, 4:5a, 4:5b, 4:8b, 4:10a, 5:1b, 5:5a, 5:5a, 5:16a, 5:18a, 5:19a, 7:18a, 7:18b, 7:21b, 7:25a, 7:28a, 8:9a, 8:16a, 9:5b, 9:7b, 9:10a, 9:12a, 10:16a,
Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By their nature bound forms with pronominal suffixes are definite. The Translator, however, tended to render the articulation of the bound forms with suffixes in a literal way and employed anarthrous forms in Greek for about two thirds of the cases (65 percent). In 21 instances where *nota accusativi* precedes the forms in question, the Translator always used the article for the particle. The *nota* may be the reason for the article in these 21 instances. For the other 23 cases of arthrous forms employed for bound forms with suffixes, it is difficult to find any pattern.

**So-called Nota Accusativi.*\(^{173}\)** The above analysis on articulation reveals that *nota accusativi* has a certain effect on articulation in Greek. The *nota accusativi* occurs 75 times in Ecclesiastes.\(^{174}\) In his study, "Die Wiedergabe der nota accusativi..."

---

\(^{171}\) The 82 instances are 1:3b, 1:6b, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:17a, 2:3b, 2:4a, 2:9b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:18a, 2:20a, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:22a, 2:23a, 3:13a, 3:22a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:14b, 4:17a, 5:1a, 5:1a, 5:5b, 5:5b, 5:10b, 5:14a, 5:16b, 5:17a, 5:17b, 5:17b, 5:19b, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:4b, 6:10a, 6:12a, 7:2b, 7:8a, 7:15a, 7:17b, 7:21a, 7:22a, 7:26a, 7:26a, 8:1b, 8:1b, 8:15b, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:6a, 9:6a, 9:6a, 9:6a, 9:7a, 9:7a, 9:8a, 9:8a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:9b, 9:16b, 10:3a, 10:4a, 10:13a, 10:13b, 10:17a, 10:20a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:10a, 11:10a, 12:1a, 12:5b, 12:12a. The pronominal suffix in 5:16b is not rendered in Greek Ecclesiastes.

\(^{172}\) The 21 instances are 1:13a, 2:3a, 2:10b, 2:20a, 2:24a, 4:5a, 4:5b, 4:8b, 4:10a, 5:5a, 5:18a, 7:18a, 7:18a, 7:21b, 8:9a, 8:16a, 9:7b, 9:12a, 11:6a, 12:13b. See the discussion on *nota* below.

\(^{173}\) The particle is traditionally called *nota accusativi*. Since sometimes it occurs with the nominative in biblical Hebrew, there is debate on the particle’s function. For the summary of the recent views on the particle, see Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §10.3.

\(^{174}\) They include 8:9b where *nota* is read as *nota*.

---
et, `aet- mit σου,” Ziegler categorizes the renderings of ηκ in Greek Ecclesiastes into eight groups: 175

1. ηκ + Art(icle) > + Art.
2. ἑκ > σου τα παντα
3. ἑκ > σου πασιν αυτοις
4. ἑκ + Subst(antive) > σου παν + Subst.
5. ἑκ > σου τα σοι
6. ηκ > Masked σου
7. ηκ + Art. > σου missing
8. ηκ > Art.

There are 4 Instances which are not included by Ziegler: the 2 instances of ηκ in 4:3a and 7:13b, and 2 instances of ηκ rendered by article in 7:21b and 8:8b.

Sometimes, his categories are not comprehensive. For example, in category (3), Ziegler presents three references (2:14b, 9:11b, 7:18b), but only one (9:11b) fits into the category. The other two do not correspond to the description of the heading.

There may be a simpler way to present the evidence comprehensively. Here, the Translator’s renderings for ηκ are categorized into three groups 176. First, if bound forms functioning as NR or bound forms with pronominal suffixes follow ηκ, the


176 Rahlfs believes that this approach is that of Aquila and comments that Aquila usually renders ηκ by the preposition σου, but if an article is absent, an article renders ηκ. However, Rahlfs does not correctly and fully present the cases where ηκ occurs. See his note on τα δοκεα in 2:12.
Translator employed an article for נק.\textsuperscript{177} None of the 31 instances in the first group has an article following נק in Hebrew.\textsuperscript{178}

Examples:
(bound form with a pronominal suffix)
1:13a וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל הָאָדָמָה הנַחֲלֵךְ לְרֹאשׁ הַגּוֹיִם
1:13a כִּי אָדָם חָי יָדַע כְּלִי חֲדָשׁ פַּרְעֹה
5:19a וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל אֱלֹהִים יָדַע נַחֲלֵךְ לְרֹאשׁ הַגּוֹיִם
5:19a וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל אֱלֹהִים יָדַע נַחֲלֵךְ לְרֹאשׁ הַגּוֹיִם

There is a case, which is not a bound form but rendered by an article.

3:15b וַיָּלַךְ אֶל הָאָדָמָה הנַחֲלֵךְ
3:15b עַל אֶל אֱלֹהִים יָדַע נַחֲלֵךְ לְרֹאשׁ הַגּוֹיִם

The participle נַחֲלֵךְ is not a bound form. The reason that the Translator renders נק by an article may be because נַחֲלֵךְ is anarthrous.

The second group comprises the cases where נק is rendered by the preposition ב. In 33 instances, the Translator employed ב for נק preceding an article or be, whether be is articular or not.

Examples:
1:14a וַיֶּאֱרָא אֶת עֵינֶיהָ הָעֵינִים הָעֵינִים
1:14a וַיֶּאֱרָא אֶת עֵינֶיהָ הָעֵינִים הָעֵינִים
2:17a וַיֶּשֶׁם אֱלֹהִים כִּיּוֹם כָּל הַגּוֹיִם
2:17a וַיֶּשֶׁם אֱלֹהִים כִּיּוֹם כָּל הַגּוֹיִם

---

\textsuperscript{177}The cases include be plus pronominal suffix (2:14b, 9:11b) and exclude be functioning as NR.

\textsuperscript{178}The 31 cases are 1:13a, 2:3a, 2:10b, 2:14b, 2:20a, 2:24a, 4:5a, 4:5b, 4:8b, 4:10a, 5:5a, 5:5a, 5:5b, 5:18a, 5:19a, 7:7b, 7:13a, 7:18a, 7:18b, 7:21b, 8:8b, 8:9a, 8:16a, 9:7b, 9:11b, 9:12a, 11:5b, 11:6a, 11:8b, 12:1a, 12:13b.
Just as in 1:14a, σῶν renders ἀν ἐν all 11 cases where ἐν follows ἀν.179 If the noun has an article like 2:17a, the Translator normally translated ἀν by σῶν (22 instances).180

There are 4arthrous nouns where σῶν is expected for ἀν but is missing (3:11b, 8:16a, 9:15a, 12:13b). One example of these exceptional cases is presented as an illustration.

Example:

9:15a καὶ διασώσει αὐτὸς τὴν πόλιν ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ

In 9:15a, one would expect σῶν for ἀν because of the presence of the article, but the Translator deviated from the normal approach.

The final group includes 5 instances where ἀν- clauses follow ἀν.181

According to Rahlfs’ text, the Translator always employed τὰ ὅσα for ἀν ἀν which adverbially functions in accusative case (2:12b, 8:9b).182

2:12b ὅτι τὸς ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὃς ἐπελεύσεται ὀπίσω τῆς βουλῆς τὰ ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν

8:9b τὰ ὅσα ἐξουσιάσατο ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ κακῶσαι αὐτὸν

179The 11 cases are 1:14a, 2:18a, 4:1a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:15a, 8:9a, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:1a, 12:14a. These exclude the cases of articular ἐν.

180The 22 instances are 2:17a, 3:10a, 3:11a, 3:11b, 3:17a, 3:17a, 4:2a, 4:3b, 5:6b, 7:14b, 7:15a, 7:26a, 7:29a, 8:8a, 8:15a, 8:17a, 9:15b, 10:19b, 10:20b, 11:5b, 11:7b, 12:9b. These include the cases of articular ἐν. In 7:14b, a demonstrative pronoun ἦν follows ἀν, and the demonstrative pronoun is to be treated like an articular noun.

181See p. 96 of this dissertation.

182In 8:9b, the Translator construed ἦν as ἀν.
However, Rahlfs is unsure of the original text in the case of 2:12b since witnesses are divided into two groups, and both approaches are equally attested in Greek Ecclesiastes. B (Codex Vaticanus), S" (original reading of Codex Sinaiticus), and A (Codex Alexandrinus) follow the approach of 8:9b and have the article for ἡ. On the other hand, based upon weight of the witnesses and Ziegler’s study, Gentry takes σον τὰ δοκει as original.183

When ἡ clause functions as nominal clause, the approach is more varied. In 5:3b, ἡ introduces an object clause. For its equivalent, Rahlfs follows SC and V1 which contain σον.

5:3b σον δοκει ἐξέχητεν ἀπὸ ἰδοῦ
5:3b σον δοκει ἐξέχητεν ἀπὸ ἰδοῦ

In the other 2 instances (4:3a, 7:13b), the Translator renders ἡ by ὅτι in 4:3a (subject clause) or ὅν ἃν (object clause).

Major discrepancies between Rahlfs and Ziegler are shown in 2:12b and 9:11b. 2:12b is still a difficult case because there is no fixed pattern in rendering ἡ. For the case of 9:11b, Rahlfs seems to make a sound judgement. When ἡ followed a substantive with a suffix, the article always renders ἡ. Therefore, ἡ in 9:11b, which is a substantive with article, must be included in this category, and Rahlfs recognizes it.

Summary

For the cases of proper nouns and free forms where the article is explicit, the

translations of articulation are literal more than 92 percent of the cases. Part of the reason for the disagreements may be related to the syntactical functions of the nouns. When the article was not explicit in the consonantal text (i.e., indeterminate forms), the Translator agreed with the articulation of MT in 65 percent of the cases. It is a relatively low percentage, but does not have any affect on the portrayal of the literalistic Translator. As for bound forms, the Translator seems to have viewed the definiteness of nouns differently than modern scholars. The Translator rendered articles for the bound forms functioning as NR in 91 percent of the cases, but for bound forms with pronominal suffixes only in 35 percent of the cases. Finally, the so-called nota accusativi plays an important role in the Translator’s decision to include the article in Greek.

Pronouns

Under the heading Pronouns four categories are discussed: (1) personal pronouns, (2) demonstratives, (3) interrogatives, and (4) relatives. The term demonstratives is preferable to demonstrative pronouns because demonstratives comprise not only demonstrative pronouns but also demonstrative adjectives, which are also discussed here. The terms interrogatives and relatives are preferable to interrogative pronouns and relative pronouns respectively because interrogative particles and relative particles are not marked for person in Hebrew. However, their equivalents are pronouns

184 Demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative adjectives are not distinguished in form, but are distinguished in function. Demonstrative adverbs will be discussed under Adverbs. For the demonstrative adverbs, see Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §17.2b.
Personal Pronouns: Free Forms

The personal pronouns occur both as free forms and bound forms. The free forms are also called independent personal pronouns, and the bound forms are called pronominal suffixes. The pronouns in bound forms are affixed to nouns, prepositions, verbs, and the so-called *nota accusativi*. Free forms occur 78 times in Ecclesiastes, and bound forms occur 297 times. The evidence for the rendering of free and bound forms is presented separately.

יא (1 c.s. Pronoun)

The personal pronoun יא occurs 29 times in Greek Ecclesiastes, and in 28 instances it is rendered by ἐγώ (97 percent). There is 1 instance where יא is not rendered as such. In 8:2a there is no Greek equivalent for יא at all.

8:2a ἀνε κατέληξεν Σάμπον

The pronoun יא does not fit syntactically into the sentence. Some scholars suggest emending יא in MT as יא (᾿ει) based upon the ancient versions which include LXX. The Translator, however, would have used the article for יא since the presumed *nota*

---


187 The 28 instances are 1:12a, 1:16a, 1:16a, 2:1a, 2:11a, 2:12a, 2:13a, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:15a, 2:15a, 2:18a, 2:20a, 2:24b, 3:17a, 3:18a, 4:1a, 4:2a, 4:4a, 4:7a, 4:8b, 5:17a, 7:25a, 7:26a, 8:12b, 8:15a, 9:16a.

accusativi precedes a bound phrase. Therefore, one cannot argue that the parent text of the Translator had \( \text{אין} \) instead of \( \text{אני} \). Other suggestions have been made to explain the \( \text{אין} \) in MT. For example, Gordis suggests that \( \text{אני} \) is an elliptical form for \( \text{אמירה אין} \),\(^{190}\) and Whitley proposes that \( \text{אני} \) must be read as \( \text{אמירה מלך} \) ("in the presence of king").\(^{191}\) Greek Ecclesiastes gives no indication of such changes. Since the translation of the form \( \text{אני} \) is strictly literal elsewhere, it is likely that the Translator did not have the form \( \text{אני} \) in his parent text.\(^{192}\)

אינ (2 m.s. Pronoun)

The personal pronoun 2 m.s. \( \text{אינ} \) occurs 4 times in Greek Ecclesiastes (5:1b, 7:22b, 9:9b, 9:10b). All of them are rendered by \( \sigma\).

איה (3 m.s. Pronoun)

The form \( \text{איה} \) occurs 27 times. In 13 instances, the Translator construed the form in question as the 3 m.s. personal pronoun and rendered it by the corresponding personal pronoun \( \alpha\upomega\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron; \): 1:5b (LXX 1:6a), 1:9a, 1:9a, 2:22b, 3:9b, 3:14a, 3:22a, 5:17b, 8:15b, 9:4b, 9:9b, 9:15a, 10:10a.

Example:

---

\(^{189}\) For the translation technique on the so-called *nota accusativi*, see p. 68 of this dissertation.


\(^{192}\) Gentry suggests a haplography (personal conversation). The form \( \text{אני} \) is preceded by \( \text{נסע} \). The verb ends \( \text{נא} \), and the next word begins \( \text{נא} \). Thus \( \text{אני} \) could have been erroneously omitted.
In 9 instances, אָדָם is construed as the copula and rendered by a form of εἶμι:

1:10a, 1:17b, 2.23b, 3:15a, 4:8b, 5:8a (Qere), 6:2b, 6:10a, 10:3b. If the subject exists in the clause, the Translator always rendered אָדָם by a form of εἶμι. All 7 instances where אָדָם occurs at the end of the clause are included in this category.194

Example:

2:23b אָדָם הָעֶבֶר
2:23b καὶ γε τούτο ματαιότης ἐστὶν

The Translator rendered אָדָם by the conjunction ὅτι once (1:13b).

1:13b ὅτι περισσαπέριν ποιητῶν
1:13b ὅτι περισσαπέριν ποιητῶν

Modern scholars analyze the form אָדָם as demonstrative pronoun and ὅτι ὅτι as nominative predicate. The following clause is an asyndetic relative clause and modifies ὅτι ὅτι: “it is a sorry business (which) God has given human beings to be afflicted with.”

The Translator avoided the asyndetic clause and simplified the syntax by using the ὅτι-clause: “for an unhappy preoccupation God has given to human beings with which to be preoccupied.”195 The function of ὅτι is not strictly causal here but rather explanatory.196

193“What is that which has happened? It is that which will happen!” See Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 1.

194The 7 instances are 1:10a, 2.23b, 3:15a, 4:8b, 5:8a (Qere), 6:2b, 10:3b.


196For the loose relationship between a main clause and a subordinate clause connected by ὅτι, see BDF, Greek Grammar, §456, Robertson, Grammar, 962-63.
The Translator brilliantly employed ὅτι to clarify the ambiguity of what the demonstrative pronoun ἦν refers to. The ὅτι-clause provides a comment on what Qoheleth has discovered, which is the referent of ἦν in the Translator’s understanding.

Though the conjunction ὅτι is not formally equivalent to ἦν, it is functionally equivalent.

In the other 4 instances, ἦν is rendered by demonstratives (2:1b, 5:13a, 7:2a, 9:15b). These cases will be discussed under Demonstratives.

.stride-highlight {color: #006600!important} (3 f.s. Pronoun)

The form ἦν occurs 12 times in Ecclesiastes. In 4 instances, the Translator construed the form in question as the personal pronoun 3 f.s. and renders it by the form of ἄυτός (3:21a, 3:21b, 4:4a, 7:23b). In the other 8 instances, the Translator took ἦν as the copula and renders it by a form of εἰμί (2:24b, 3:13b, 5:5a, 5:8a Ketib, 5:18b, 6:1b, 7:26a, 9:13b). When ἦν is clause initial or follows a participle, the Translator took it as a subject and renders it by the form of ἄυτός.

Examples:

(N ἦν in the second position following participle)
3:21b ἐπηρέασεν την καθήμενην ἦν τῇ πέμπσῃ ἐν ηὗ ἄρρητῷ
3:21b καὶ πνεύμα τοῦ κτήριου εἰ καταβαίνει ἄυτό κάτω εἰς γῆν

(N ἦν in the first position of the clause)
4:4a εἰ τὸ ἄνθρωπον ἢ ἄνδρον ἢ τοῦ ἔταιρον ἄυτον

If ἦν is in non-initial position—unless it follows a participle—it is always rendered by the copula.197 9:13b is a good example:

197In 5 instances out of 8, the verb ἦν is located at the end of the clause.
In 9:13b, neither occurs in initial position nor follows the participle, so the Translator employed the copula rather than αυτος.

ה (3 m.p. Pronoun)

The form ה occurs 6 times. A form of αυτοι is employed for 5 cases (1:7b, 3:18b, 4:2b, 7:29b, 12:12a) where ה is construed as the personal pronoun 3 m.p. functioning as the subject or the object of the preposition. The form of ειμι is used for 1 case (3:18b) where ה follows the subject and is construed as the copula.

3:18b ἦν τὸ αὐτοῖ πρῶτον εἰσιν καὶ γε αὐτοῖς

Personal Pronoun: Bound Forms

There are two different grammatical features between the source language and the target language with respect to bound pronouns. First, the second person pronoun is not marked for gender in the target language while the second person bound pronoun in the source language is. Both the 2 m.s. pronouns and the 2 f.s. pronouns in Hebrew are rendered by the 2 c.s. pronoun in Greek. Second, although possessive forms and objective forms of the pronouns in the source language all share the same form, the target language has a distinct form for each case. For example, if the suffix is affixed to the noun in Hebrew, the suffix is mostly rendered by the genitive. On the other hand, if the suffix is affixed to the verb or preposition in Hebrew, the case of the pronoun can be

198 Only distinct forms in Hebrew are the possessive form and the objective form in the first person. Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §16.4a.
genitive, dative, or accusative in Greek.\footnote{Greek has three genders (masculine, feminine, neuter) while Hebrew has only two (masculine, feminine). Problems arising from the different gender systems between the two languages will be discussed under the third category below.}

The evidence for the bound forms is arranged in six categories. First, all the instances are given where the equivalent in Greek matches the Hebrew pronoun in gender, number, and person. Second, all the cases are listed where the Translator rendered the existential pseudoverb יְהִי with pronominal suffixes. Third are instances where the equivalent in Greek does not match the Hebrew pronoun in gender. Fourth, the cases are discussed where the equivalent in Greek does not match the Hebrew pronoun in number. Fifth, the instances are listed where person does not match between Hebrew pronoun and Greek pronoun. Finally, the cases are discussed where the Translator did not render the Hebrew personal pronouns. The number in parentheses at the end of each heading indicates the frequency.\footnote{The categorization is borrowed from Gentry, \textit{Greek Job}, 151-67.}

**Personal Pronoun > Personal Pronoun:**

**Matching Gender, Number, Person**

\footnote{The Translator might have read יָאִים in MT as עָלָיוֹן.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{1 c.s. Pronoun (51)}
\item 1:13a, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:17a, 2:1a, 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:4a, 2:4b, 2:5a, 2:6a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:9a, 2:9b, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:11a, 2:15a, 2:15a, 2:15b, 2:17a, 2:17a, 2:18a, 2:18b, 2:19a, 2:20a, 3:17a, 3:18a, 4:8b, 7:15a, 7:23b, 7:25a, 7:28a, 8:9a, 8:16a, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:13b, 12:1b, 12:12a.
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{2 m.s. Pronoun (47)}
\end{itemize}

2 f.s. Pronoun (6)

10:16a, 10:16a, 10:17a, 10:17a, 10:17b.

3 m.s. Pronoun (116)

1:3b, 1:5b, 1:13b, 2:14a, 2:14a, 2:18b, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:22a, 2:22a, 2:23a, 2:23a, 2:24a, 2:24a, 2:26a, 3:10b, 3:11a, 3:12b, 3:13a, 3:14a, 3:14a, 3:14b, 3:22a, 3:22a, 3:22b, 3:22b, 4:4a, 4:5a, 4:5b, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:10a, 4:10b, 4:10b, 4:12a, 4:14b, 4:15b, 4:16a, 5:10b, 5:11b, 5:12b, 5:12b, 5:13b, 5:14a, 5:14b, 5:14b, 5:15b, 5:16a, 5:17a, 5:17b, 5:17b, 5:17b, 5:17b, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:19a, 5:19a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3b, 6:4b, 6:7a, 6:10a, 6:10b, 6:12a, 6:12b, 7:1b, 7:2b, 7:8a, 7:13b, 7:14b, 7:15b, 7:15b, 8:1b, 8:1b, 8:3a, 8:4b, 8:6b, 8:7b, 8:9b, 8:12a, 8:12b, 8:15b, 8:15b, 8:15b, 8:15b, 8:16b, 9:12a, 9:15a, 9:16b, 10:2a, 10:2b, 10:3a, 10:8a, 10:8b, 10:12b, 10:13a, 10:13b, 10:14b, 10:14b, 11:1b, 12:5b, 12:13b.

3 f.s. Pronoun (12)


1 c.p. Pronoun (1)

1:10b.

3 m.p. Pronoun (41)

1:11b, 2:3b, 2:5b, 2:6b, 2:10a, 2:14b, 3:11b, 3:12a, 3:18a, 3:18b, 3:19a, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:3a,\textsuperscript{203} 4:9b, 4:9b, 4:11a, 4:16a, 5:7b, 6:12a, 8:11b, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:1a, 9:1b, 9:3b, 9:3b, 9:5b, 9:5b, 9:6a, 9:6a, 9:6a, 9:6b, 9:11b, 9:12b, 9:12b, 10:9a, 10:9b, 11:8a, 12:1b.

\textbf{Pseudoverbs With Pronominal}

\textsuperscript{202}It is a doublet, i.e., the Hebrew is rendered twice in 7:22a.

\textsuperscript{203}The 3 m.p. pronoun is rendered by the demonstrative pronoun \(\omega \tau o\). The deitic force of the pronoun is emphasized.
Suffixes (12)

There are 12 instances where the existential pseudoverb ἔσται with pronominal suffixes is rendered. The 3 m.s. pronoun is affixed to ἔσται in 7 instances, the 3 m.p. pronoun in 3 instances, and the 3 m.p. pronoun in 2 instances. In 10 instances out of 12, the negative οὐκ plus copula verb renders the pseudoverb ἔσται with pronouns. The copula in Greek is marked for person and number, which matches person and number of the Hebrew pronoun in all 10 instances.

Example:

1:7a καὶ η ἁλάσσα <ouk> ἔσται ἐμπιπταμένη

There are 2 instances, which deviate from the default rendering (9:2a and 11:6b):

9:2a καὶ τῷ θυσιάζοντι καὶ τῷ μὴ θυσιάζοντι

11:6b ὅτι συν γυνώσκεις πολὺν στοιχήσει ἡ τοῦτο ἡ τοῦτο

In 9:2a the ἔσται-clause is the object of the preposition. The Translator used for the clause the articular participle functioning as substantive. The pseudoverb ἔσται is rendered by the negative μὴ, and the 3 m.s. pronoun affixed to ἔσται is expressed in the person of participle.

In 11:6b the participle ὑπέρ is rendered by the present indicative γυνώσκεις, in which

---

204 The 7 instances of the 3 m.s. pronoun are 1:7a, 5:11b, 6:2a, 8:7a, 8:13b, 8:16b, 9:2a; the 3 instances of the 3 m.p. pronoun are 4:17b, 9:5b, 9:16b; and the 2 instances of 2 m.s. pronoun are 11:5a and 11:6b.

205 The 10 instances are 1:7a, 4:17b, 5:11b, 6:2a, 8:7a, 8:13b, 8:16b, 9:5b, 9:16b, 11:5a.
person and number are already marked. In late Hebrew a participle is used as a main predicate.\(^{206}\) Therefore, the approach of the Translator in 11:6b is not surprising.

**Personal Pronoun > Personal Pronoun:**  
**Non-Matching Gender (5)**

In 3 instances the 3 m.s. pronoun in Hebrew is rendered by the 3 f.s. pronoun in Greek (2:12b, 5:3a, 8:8b). The disagreement in gender is because the referent of the pronoun is a feminine noun in Greek as opposed to a masculine noun in Hebrew. The 3 m.s. pronoun in 7:24b is rendered by a 3 n.s. pronoun in Greek. It is also because the referent of the pronoun is a masculine noun in Hebrew but a neuter noun in Greek. Finally, in 12:7b a 3 f.s. pronoun in Hebrew is rendered by a 3 n.s. pronoun in Greek. The referent of the pronoun is neuter in Greek while feminine in Hebrew. These discrepancies in gender are due to the necessity for grammatical concord in the target language.

Example:

\[12:7b\text{ קלח אלייָּאlocalized to tiveuכ ידוהי אוטו} \]

The 3 f.s. pronoun in ידוהי refers to ידוהי, which is a 3 f.s. noun. The Translator used the 3 n.s. pronoun אוטו for the 3 f.s. pronoun in Hebrew because its referent in Greek is the neuter noun πνεῦμα.

**Personal Pronoun > Personal Pronoun:**  
**Non-Matching Number (2)**

There are 2 instances where the number of the Greek pronoun differs from that of the Hebrew pronoun (9:3b, 10:15a). In both instances 3 m.s. forms are rendered by 3

\(^{206}\text{Segal, Mishnaic Hebrew, §322.}\)
In Hebrew it is not clear to what the 3 m.s. pronoun in הָנָה refers because everything is plural in 9:3b except the distributive singular בַּל, which does not seem to be the referent of the pronoun. The Translator might have understood by the context the referent to be “the sons of the man.”207 By using the plural pronoun instead of singular, he removed the ambiguity of the Hebrew pronoun.

Context requires that the pronoun 3 m.s. in הָנָה refer to the plural noun. The lack of concord in gender presents a textual problem. Several Hebrew manuscripts attest the singular הבּכָל, which agrees with the pronoun in number.208 LXX also have ἀφρόνος and αὐτῶν. The singular forms fit well with the singular verb ἐγνω in the next line. Nonetheless, the difficult reading (MT) is preferred, and the disagreement in number in MT can be explained within the norms of Hebrew. In Biblical

---

207 Since the other forms are all singular in Greek (καρδία, πονηροῖς, περιφέρεια, ζωῆς), the “sons of the man” is the only option for the referent of the pronoun.

208 BHS-Horst.
Hebrew, the suffixes in singular frequently refer to plurals. The Translator probably understood the singular pronoun as distributive and employed the plural pronoun. In both instances the Translator's equivalent was, therefore, decided by the context.

**Personal Pronoun > Personal Pronoun:**

**Non-Matching Person (1)**

2:25a רָפָא אֲנָחָנוּ וּמִשָּׁהְנוּ קַמָּה
2:25a διὰ τῶν διαφέροντα καὶ τῶν χωρίζοντα πάρεξ αὐτῶν

The 1 c.s. pronoun in 2:25a is rendered by a 3 m.s. pronoun in Greek. The Greek words πάρεξ αὐτῶν reflect ἡμῖν rather than ἡμῖν. The reading of MT in 2:25a emphasizes the subject of enjoyment—the one who eats and drinks. The emphasis is connected to 2:24a. On the other hand, the rendering in Greek focuses on the sovereignty of God—the One who provides everything. It is directly related to 2:24b and 2:26. Some modern scholars argue that the pronoun ἐ- is actually 3 m.s. However, the pronoun ἐ- is never used as 3. m.s. elsewhere in Ecclesiastes. The letters ἐ and ἐ can be easily confused, and the context seems to support the reading of the 3.m.s. pronoun. The Translator, therefore, might well have understood the pronoun in question as 3.m.s.

**Personal Pronoun > Zero (3)**

In 3 instances personal pronouns are rendered by zero. All the instances need

---

209 For example, the verbal suffixes in Deut 21:10, 22:48, Amos 6:10, etc. See GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §145m.


211 Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 141.
to be considered in their contexts.

5:16a כִּי יָדַעְתָּ יֵשׁוּעַ אֵלֶּךָ
5:16b וְהָפַךְ הַרְבֵּה הַלְיָלִים הַכָּתוּבִים
5:16a כִּי יָדַעְתָּ אִי אָמְרָא אֲרוּתֵן בְּעָנִי
5:16b כִּי יָדַעְתָּ אַחֲרָא אֲרוּתֵן בָּלַי

7:18b ὅτι φοβοῦμενός τὸν θεὸν ἐξελεύσεται τὰ πάντα

11:6b καὶ ἕαν τὰ δύο ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀγαθά

In 5:16 the Translator understood that five successive nouns connected by the conjunction waw are all governed by the preposition ב. He must have read הָלָל (noun plus 3 m.s. pronoun) in 5:16b simply as a noun הָלָל with the waw resulting from haplography. Noun without pronoun is more natural in the context than one with pronoun. In 7:18b and 11:6b 3 m.p. pronouns are affixed to nouns, both of which denote quantity: בּ ("all") in 7:18b and בּ ("two") in 11:6b. The Translator did not render the pronouns. It is possibly because the nouns themselves could convey the idea of quantity.

Demonstratives

The near demonstratives occur 51 times in Ecclesiastes, and the far demonstratives 4 times.

---

212 The Translator read the verb יָדַעְתָּ in MT as a noun with waw (wā’ēbel), and the verb יָדַעְתָּ also as a noun (ka’as).

213 If the reading of LXX is orginal, then the reading in MT is due to dittography.
The form נ (zeh) occurs 37 times in Ecclesiastes. In 35 instances, נ is construed as the near demonstrative m.s. and is rendered by some form of מֵתוּה.\textsuperscript{215} Example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{2:19b} מֵתוּה יֵמָה
  \item \textit{2:19b} הָאָרֶץ
\end{itemize}

In the other 2 instances, נ follows the interrogative ה and is construed as interrogative (2:3b, 11:6b). These 2 cases will be presented under Interrogatives.

The near demonstrative pronoun f.s. נ (zōh) occurs 11 times in MT, and 6 of them are in Ecclesiastes.\textsuperscript{216} אָנָה is not used in Ecclesiastes.\textsuperscript{217} The Translator employed the neuter forms of מֵתוּה for all occurrences.\textsuperscript{218} Example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{2:2b} מֵתוּה יֵמָה
  \item \textit{2:2b} הָאָרֶץ
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{214} However, the 3 m.p. pronoun affixed to בֵּינֵה or נַע is rendered by the corresponding pronoun in 2:14b, 4:3a, 9:11b, 11:8a.

\textsuperscript{215} The 35 instances are 1:10a, 1:17b, 2:10b, 2:15b, 2:19b, 2:21b, 2:23b, 2:26b, 3:19a, 3:19a, 4:4b, 4:8b, 4:16b, 5:9b, 6:2b, 6:5b, 6:9b, 7:6b, 7:10b, 7:14b, 7:14b, 7:18a, 7:18a, 7:27a, 7:29a, 8:9a, 8:10b, 8:14b, 9:1a, 9:1b, 9:3a, 11:6b, 11:6b, 12:13b. In 6:5b, the preposition נ plus נ is simply rendered by the dative form of מֵתוּה.


\textsuperscript{217} Ibid., §17 n 6.

\textsuperscript{218} For the feminine used as a neutum in Hebrew, see Waltke and O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Syntax}, §17.4.3b.
הַלַּא (m.p. Near Demonstrative)

The near demonstrative m.p. form הַלַּא occurs 3 times. The Translator used the plural form of οὗτος for all occurrences.

Example:
11:9b וַיֶּלֶד עַל-כָּל אַלְאַה יֹנֵיא הָאָלָרֵי בְּמַעְמֶסֶפֶּן
11:9b וַיְנַחָּה בֵּית וְאַדָּו תְּוֹנֵי נֶאְסָיָה סֵהָּ עָנָה וְזֶה בִּנְיָמִין

והַ (m.s. Far Demonstrative)

In 4 instances, והַ is rendered by demonstratives: twice by the near demonstrative τούτο (2:1b, 7:2a) and twice by the far demonstrative έκείνος (5:13a, 9:15b). There may be a reason why the Translator rendered והַ with the Greek near demonstrative in 2:1b and 7:2a. The Translator seems to have differentiated the demonstrative pronoun from the demonstrative adjective by using τούτο for the former and έκείνος for the latter.

Examples:
2:1b וַֽהַ תְּוֹנֵי נֶאְסָיָּה קָרָל
2:1b וַֽהַ יְדַעְתֶּם וַֽהַ גֶּרֶם טַוּטוֹ מָתָאֵֽוַתָּהּ
5:13a וַֽהַ אֵבֵֽר הָעָֽשֶׁה הַוָֽהְוָֽא בּוֹנִיָּה יִעְבּוֹר
5:13a וַֽהַ אֶפְֽלֶאֵיתָא עַֽל פּוּלַוְּתֹסְךָ έκείνος וְנַפְּשַֽׁאָתָא פָּנַיָּרְבָּו

When והַ is used as a substantive in anarthrous form, it is rendered by the near demonstrative pronoun τούτο. On the other hand, when והַ is articular in Hebrew and functions as an attributive adjective, the Translator used the far demonstrative έκείνος.219

219Joüon argues that only the articular form והַ can function as demonstrative but not the anarthrous form והַ (see Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar, §143j). However, Waltke and O’Connor provide evidence that the anarthrous form may be used as demonstrative in MT. See Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §17.3c.
Interrogatives

(Animate Interrogative)

The animate interrogative ו מי occurs 17 times in Ecclesiastes: 2:19a, 2:25a, 2:25a, 3:21a, 3:22b, 4:8b, 5:9a, 6:12a, 6:12b, 7:13b, 7:24b, 8:1a, 8:1a, 8:4b, 8:7b, 9:4a, 10:14b. All of them are rendered by τίς. 220 The rendering of ו מי is straightforwardly literal.

(Inanimate Interrogative)

The inanimate interrogative מה המ occurs 29 times in Ecclesiastes. 221 The evidence shows various approaches to מה המ according to the context. In 4 instances, the preposition ὅ is combined with מה המ. The relative א follows מה המ 7 times. The form מה המ stands alone in 15 instances. Finally, there are two problematic cases requiring analysis.

למה with Preposition ὅ (4)

In Hebrew, מה המ is mainly used for a simple question: “why?” ב לה in 2:15a is understood in this way and rendered by ἓνα τί, which also asks “why?”

2:15a καὶ ἓνα τί ἕως ἴδε τὸτε περισσόν

Sometimes, מה המ is used in a rhetorical question and introduces an undesirable

220 In 4:8b, the Translator used τίνι (the dative of τίς) for ὅ mü (fmi).

221 The total number includes the case of 3:19b where מה המ might have been understood as μὴ yōtar. See p. 18 of this dissertation.
alternative: “lest something else happen,” or “otherwise something else will happen.”

The Translator likely interpreted the clauses in 5:5b, 7:16b, and 7:17b as the kind of rhetorical questions expecting negative answers and so used מִן מַה or מְָּמַה for reflecting the negative sense of the clauses. The conjunction מְָּמַה is a stylistic variation of מִן מַה. Both mean: “in order that / so that . . . not.”

Example:
7:16a נַגְַּלֵּנִים יְתוּר
7:16b לָקֵחַ תַּשׁוֹם
7:16a כִּי מַה סְָּפָרִים וְגֵרֹסִים
7:16b מְָּמַה אָּכְלָה בַּלָּוָא

In 5:5b and 7:17b as well as 7:16b, מְָּמַה follows a negative command while מַה in 2:15a follows an assertive sentence. The מְָּמַה-clauses after negative commands should be understood as rhetorical questions. On the other hand, the מַה-clause following an assertive sentence introduces a simple question “why?” The Translator was aware of the difference of the sentence structures. His different equivalents for מְָּמַה betray that he understood Hebrew sentences in their deep structures.

רָּאָל followed by ש (7)

ש מַה > רָּאָל (4). The occurrences are 1:9a, 1:9a, 8:7a, and 10:14b.

1:9a מַה מַרְגָּרִים, מַיָּרִים מַרְגָּרִים
     מַרְגָּרִים מַרְגָּרִים
1:9a רָּאָל לָא גֶּה שָׁוִי לָא גֶּה שָׁוִי
     כָּל רָּאָל לָא גֶּה שָׁוִי לָא גֶּה שָׁוִי
8:7a כְּרָאָא ומַרְגָּרִים
8:7a שָׁוִי עָלֶה בַּשָּׁוִי לָא גֶּה שָׁוִי לָא גֶּה שָׁוִי

222 Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §18.3c.
10:14b γένομεν τί το καθεχόμεθα

*ἐπὶ τὸ γενόμενον.*

Sh > τὸ (1). The single example occurs in 3:15a.

3:15a ἀρχὴν ἦσαν τοῖς ἑστίν

3:15a το γενόμενον ἦσσαν ἑστίν

Sh > ἐν ψ. ἕλθ (1). The one example occurs in 3:22b.

3:22b οὗτος της δεξεῖ αὐτῶν τοῦ ἱδείν ἐν ὑπάρχου γένηται μετ' αὐτῶν

Sh > εὐτ. τὸ (1). The one example occurs in 6:10a.

6:10a αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐγένετο ζητήσει δυνάμει αὐτοῦ

Four instances of ἦν in 1:9a, 1:9a, 8:7a, and 10:14b function as the interrogative “what?” and ἦν as the headless relative.224 The Translator used the interrogative τί for ἦν and nominalizes the ἦν-clause by the articular participle. Two instances of 1:9a are interpreted as the direct question while 8:7a and 10:14b are the indirect questions.

223 Cf. Bauer, s.v. "μήποτε."

224 The “headless relative” is also called the “independent relative.” Waltke and O’Connor criticize the use of the term “independent relative” because it is a contradiction in terms (see Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §19.1c). The term “headless relative” is used here for the relative, which does not have a head (i.e., antecedent), but the head is implied (e.g., I would like to order what you have recommended”). For the definition of the headless relative, see Robert D. Holmstedt, “The Relative Clause in Biblical Hebrew: A Linguistic Analysis” (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2002), 71-79.
In 3:15a, יְהֵמָה is rendered simply by the article יָהּ. The Translator probably rendered יְהֵמָה by the article and did not render יָהּ on purpose. By doing this he made clear that he construed 3:15a as one sentence rather than two. If he rendered יְהֵמָה by יָהּ יָהּ, 3:15a could be understood as two sentences.\(^{225}\) As a result, the indefinite sense has been weakened.

There are 2 instances (3:22b, 6:10a) where the Translator interpreted יְהֵמָה as the indefinite relative according to the context and employed two different ways of introducing the indefinite relative clauses in Greek.\(^{226}\) In 3:22b, יְהֵמָה is not only followed by the relative particle יָהּ but also associated with the preposition ב. The relative clause becomes the object of the preposition in this verse. The Translator rendered יְהֵמָה by δὲ εἶναι. Since δὲ εἶναι can function as the indefinite relative and can be governed by the Greek preposition, his rendering is functionally literal in 3:22b. In 6:10a, the יְהֵמָה-clause is also understood as the indefinite relative clause. The Translator used the so-called conditional relative for the יְהֵמָה. The conditional relative clause introduced by εἵ τῷ can also express the indefinite sense.\(^{227}\) Therefore, εἵ τῷ is also a functional equivalent for יְהֵמָה in 6:10a.

---

\(^{225}\)For the analysis, the present writer is indebted to Gentry (private conversation).


\(^{227}\)For the indefinite sense of the conditional relatives, see Robertson, *Grammar*, 956.
In sum, the approach to מַעְרָא followed by ש is varied but functionally literal.

Each rendering reflects the Translator’s sensitivity to the context.

מַעְרָא Standing Alone (16)

מַעְרָא > τί n.s. (10). The occurrences are 2:2b, 2:22a, 3:19b, 5:10b, 6:11b, 6:12a, 6:12b, 7:10a, 8:4b, 11:2b.228

Example:
2:22a מַעְרָא לָאָבְרָהָמֵר בַּכַּלְמָלוֹת
2:22a וְתֵי γίνεται τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν πᾶντι μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ

מַעְרָא > τίς f.s. (5). The occurrences are 1:3a, 3:9a, 5:15b, 6:8a, 11:5a.

Example:
1:3a מַעְרָא לָאָבְרָהָמֵר
1:3a τίς περιοσεία τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ

מַעְרָא > τίς m.s. (1). The one example occurs in 2:12b.

2:12b מַעְרָא אֶלֶף אֱלֹהִים מַעְרָא
2:12b וְתֵי τίς δ ἀνθρώπος δʹ ἑπελεύσεται ὑπόσω τῆς βουλῆς

When מַעְרָא stands alone not connected to any preposition or relative, 15 instances out of 16 are literally rendered by the inanimate interrogative pronoun. In 5 out of the 15 instances, the form τίς (m./f.s.) is used rather than τί (n.s.) because the inanimate objects are indicated by feminine nouns in Greek: ἡ περιοσεία (1:3a, 3:9a, 5:15b, 6:8a) and ἡ δόος (11:5a). In 1 instance the translator used the animate pronoun τίς

228 The Translator probably read מַעְרָא in 3:19b as מָא יְלֵיש. See p. 18 of this dissertation.
(m./f.s.) for הָּנָּה (2:12b). In 2:12b, הָּנָּה is rhetorically used for self-abasement or insult.\(^{229}\)

Since the referent of הָּנָּה is “the man,” the Translator employed the animate pronoun according to the context.

**Problematic Cases**

There are 2 cases, which deviate from the above patterns. Each case requires explanation.

6:8a בֵּית מָרַיָּה הָּנָּה מְאָרָהּ בָּא
6:8b מַעְתָּךְ וְזֹהֲרַת לֹא הָּנָּה יָרַיָּהּ מִן הָּנָּה מְאָרָהּ בָּא
6:8a ὀ̂ τίς περισσεύει τῷ σωφρόνι ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀφρόνα
6:8b διότι ο εἶναι οίδειν πορεύθηναι κατέναντι τῆς ζωῆς

Only in 6:8b the Translator rendered הָּנָּה by διότι. A few manuscripts have διὰ τί instead of διότι.\(^{230}\) διὰ τί is much more likely to be the original text and is a translation for Hebrew הָּנָּה which makes sense. διὰ τί seems to be confused for διότι paleographically in an early stage of transmission. Furthermore, the change from ὀ̂ τί to διότι as in 6:8a and 6:8b is standard.\(^{231}\)

7:24a ἐξήκουσεν ἡμᾶς
7:24a μακρὰν ὑπὲρ ὁ ἦν

The preposition ὑπὲρ probably renders the comparative ὁμοίος rather than the interrogative ὁν. The Translator’s rendering of 7:24aβ reflects הָּנָּה (מיסֶהַהוּ) or

---


\(^{230}\) 123\(^{\text{II}}\), 542, 543, 549, Syh. In private conversation, Gentry confirmed the witnesses from the Göttingen collation books.

\(^{231}\) The analysis from Gentry (private conversation). For διότι used as ὀ̂ τί, see LSJ, s.v. διότι II.
and Related Form א

ח-א > ποιον (2:3b, 11:6b)

Example:
11:6b ότι οῦ γινώσκεις ποιον στοιχήσει ἡ τοῦτο ἡ τούτο

א > πῶς (2:16b, 4:11b)

Example:
2:16b καὶ πῶς ἀπεθανεῖται ὁ σοφὸς μετὰ τοῦ ἀφρόνος

The word א is interrogative in use and locative in reference ('where?').

With the emphatic ח-א means literally 'where indeed.' Both instances of ח-א in
2:3b and in 11:6b occur in indirect questions with the meaning of 'which?' Its Greek
equivalent ποιον had already been used for ח-א by other LXX translators.

The form כא ('how?'), which is a related form to א, occurs in direct questions
in 2:16b and 4:11b. The form in question is rendered by πῶς. The Greek interrogative
πῶς is a both formally and functionally equivalent to כא.

Relatives

232Waltke and O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §18.4a.
233Ibid., §18 n.25.
234Hatch and Redpath, Concordance, 1170.
The form רָשָׁה occurs 89 times in Ecclesiastes. Whether רָשָׁה is construed as a relative or not, all the occurrences of the form will be discussed here for the sake of completeness. The form רָשָׁה is translated in various ways in Ecclesiastes. All the renderings of רָשָׁה can be grouped according to their functions:

רָשָׁה > הָזָּה (36) / הָסָּה (8) / הֶסָּה (4) / הָזְּה (1)

The Greek relative הָזָּה renders רָשָׁה in 36 occurrences (40 percent). The relative הָזָּה is an appropriate and expected rendering of רָשָׁה functioning as relative.

Example:
12:7b כִּיָּהוּ הַשָּׁם אֲלָקָדְיוֹן רָשָׁה נִקָּז
12:7b καὶ τῷ πνεῦμα ἐπιστρέφει τρός τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ

In 5:17a, the second רָשָׁה is rendered by הָזָּה הָיָה. The adjective רָשָׁה functions as a predicate in the relative clause. Although the relative and the adjective together can be a

235 The 89 instances are 1:10b, 1:13a, 1:16a, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:10a, 2:12b, 3:9b, 3:10b, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:14a, 3:15a, 3:22a, 4:1a, 4:2b, 4:3a, 4:3b, 4:3b, 4:9b, 4:13b, 4:15b, 4:16a, 4:17a, 5:3a, 5:3b, 5:4a, 5:14a, 5:17a, 5:17b, 5:18a, 5:18a, 6:1a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:10a, 6:12b, 7:2a, 7:13b, 7:18a, 7:19b, 7:20b, 7:21a, 7:21a, 7:22a, 7:26a, 7:28a, 7:29a, 8:3b, 8:4a, 8:7b, 8:9a, 8:9b, 8:10a, 8:11a, 8:12a, 8:12b, 8:12b, 8:13b, 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:15a, 8:15b, 8:16a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 8:17b, 9:1a, 9:2a, 9:2b, 9:3a, 9:4a, 9:4b, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:9b, 9:10a, 9:10b, 10:14b, 10:15b, 11:5a, 11:5b, 12:1b, 12:1b, 12:2a, 12:6a, 12:7b.


237 The 36 instances are 1:16a, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:10a, 3:9b, 3:10b, 3:11b, 3:22a, 4:3b, 4:9b, 4:13b, 4:15b, 5:17a, 5:17b, 5:18a, 6:1a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:10a, 7:20b, 7:21a, 7:28a, 7:29a, 8:9a, 8:12a, 8:13b, 8:14a, 8:16a, 9:4a, 9:9b, 10:15b, 11:5a, 12:1b, 12:2a, 12:7b.
sentence in Hebrew, those two elements alone do not constitute a sentence in Greek. The Translator added the copula to complete the relative clause.

The quantitative relative ὰοός also renders ἃ in 8 instances (9 percent). 238 The function of ὰοός in 6 of the 8 instances seems to be equal to that of the relative ὰς. 239 The word ὰοός is often used instead of ὰς in Hellenistic Greek. 240 Good examples are the cases where ἀλλ' comes as the antecedent of ὰοός and is rendered by τὰς. In such places, ὰοός is rendered by ὰς 3 times and by ὰοός 2 times without any significant difference. 241

Example:

3:14a Ἐν χειρὶ ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ὢν, ἡ ἀλληλολογία τῆς ἀλληλολογίας ἐστιν ἡ ἐν ἀλληλολογίᾳ τῆς ἀλληλολογίας ἐστιν.

There are 2 cases in which ὰοός is rendered by τὰς functioning as an adverbial accusative (2:12a, 8:9b). 242 In both instances, ὰοός is preceded by so-called the nota accusativi. 243 The construction ὰοός ἃ occurs 5 times in Ecclesiastes. 244 The Translator rendered it by τὰ ὰοός only when interpreting ὰοός ἃ as an adverbial accusative. 245

---

238 The 8 instances are 2:12b, 3:14a, 3:15a, 4:2b, 4:16a, 8:9b, 8:15b, 11:5b.
239 The 6 instances are 3:14a, 3:15a, 4:2b, 4:16a, 8:15b, 11:5b.
240 Robertson, Grammar, 732.
241 ὰς is used in 1:16a, 2:10a, 6:2a; ὰοός is used in 3:14a, 4:16a.
242 See p. 68 of this dissertation.
243 In 8:9b, ἃ must be read as ἃ. See p. 21 of this dissertation.
244 The 5 instances are 2:12a, 4:3a, 5:3b, 7:13b, 8:9b.
Example:
2:12a οτι τις ο άνθρωπος ος επελεύσεται οπισω της βουλης τα οσα επαιτησεν αυτην
5:3b òσα ανατριχείται σχεδη
The Translator construed the clause introduced by òνα ðαι in 2:12a as adverbial accusative clause ("in as many things as he made it") and used τα òσα for ðαι ðαι. On the other hand, the ðαι-clause in 5:3b must be the object of the main verb σχεδη, so the Translator employed a different approach.

The Translator used ðοτίς for ðαι in 4 instances (5 percent). The complete evidence is presented below:

4:3a καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τούς δύο τούτους ðοτίς οὐπώ εγένετο
7:26a καὶ εὐρίσκω ἐγώ πικρότερον ὑπὲρ θάνατον οὐν τὴν γυναίκα ἡτις ðοτίς θηρεύματα καὶ σαραγώνια καρδία αὐτῆς δεσμοι χείρες αὐτῆς
12:1b ἦτε ðαι λαβομενοι ἀποκριθησθαι
12:6a ἦτε ðαι ἀνατραπῆ ἐπιστρεψαι τοῦ ἀργυρίου
The ðοτίς in 4:3a must be an indefinite and headless relative with a general

---

245 This is based upon Rahlfs' text. Ziegler and Gentry propose οὐν τα οσα as original. See p. 71 of this dissertation. Other clauses function as substantival clauses: 4:3a (subject clause), 5:3b (object clause), 7:13b (object clause).

reference: “anyone who.”

This is a normal use of ὅστις. In 7:26a, ὅστις functions as a definite relative. The indefinite relative ὅστις frequently takes the place of the simple relative ὃς in Hellenistic Greek. The phrase ἐκ τοῦ ὅστις in 12:1b and 12:6a is a fixed expression and an excellent rendering for ἔνα

As mentioned above, ὃς and ὅσος are often indistinguishable in Hellenistic Greek. The particle ἐαν is also frequently used in place of ἀν after relatives. The relative clauses introduced by ὃς or ὅσος become modal with ἐαν or ἀν. They denote not concrete realities but general assertions or suppositions. In all 5 instances, the Translator understood the clause as implying a modal sense and so used the subjunctive for the verbs.

Examples:

So-called nota accusativi in Hebrew is construed as the marker of the subject in this verse. The nominative function of ἄν is also attested elsewhere in MT: Neh 9:34, 1 Sam 17:34, Judg 20:44, etc. See Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §10.3.2a, b.

LSJ, s.v. “ὁστις”; Bauer, s.v. “ὁστις.”

BDF, Greek Grammar, §293; Bauer, s.v. “ὁστις.” Cf. LSJ, s.v. “ὁστις.”

For the equivalents of ἔνα, the Translator uses ὃς ἐαν in 4:17a and 8:3b, ὃς ἀν in 7:13b, ὅσος ἐαν in 5:3b, and ὅσος ἀν in 9:10a.


BDF, Greek Grammar, §380.
In 5:3b, the Translator emphasized the reference by using ἃα and adding ἐὰν: “whatever you vow.” If ἀν is rendered by πᾶν precedes the relative clause as in 8:3b, the indefiniteness of the reference becomes more general with ἐὰν: “anything that he wants.”

In 8:17a, the phrase ἀνάριστος Ἀραβίας is rendered by ἃα ἄν. The form ἀνάριστος is analyzed as the *lamed* of possession with the relative particle ἦ and is the standard marker of possession in late Hebrew. The literal meaning of the phrase, ἀνάριστος Ἀραβίας, may be “through that which belongs to,” but the phrase is not common in Biblical Hebrew. It is regarded as the translation of Aramaic יְבַסְלָא, meaning “on account of the fact that” i.e., “because” or “since.” In Hebrew, 8:17a is probably a ground statement (“since”), and 8:17b begins with a concessive clause (אַשָּׁגֵר “although”). The Translator rendered both ἀνάριστος Ἀραβίας in 8:17a and ἀν in 8:17b by ἃα ἄν. When introducing the indefinite relative clause, ἃα makes its reference more general by adding the particle...

---


The Translator construed both the causal clause in 8:17a and the concessive clause in 8:17b as indefinite relative clauses and emphasized the idea that man is never able to find the works of God.

In 13 occurrences, רָצוּן is rendered by the definite article (15 percent). The Translator nominalized the relative clauses in Hebrew by articular participles in 11 instances and by articular infinitives in 2 instances. Both the articular participle and articular infinitive are excellent equivalents for the Hebrew relative clause.

Examples:
1:10b 'נָתַן לֵאמֹר אָזַר הָדוּ קָנָה
1:10b הַקָּרְב וְגָּזַעְתָּה אֶנֶּבּ בַּעֲמָמָה אֵלָה יִפְגַּעְתָּה אֶלְּפָּה יִמְסָרֶה הַמְּלַע
5:4a 'נַבְנְיָה לְאַרְשָׂה
5:4a אֵגֶּבְתָּהוּ אֶלֶּה אֶלֶּה

Interestingly, in 9 out of 11 instances where articular participles are used for a relative clause, the Hebrew verbs in the relative clauses are either the Qal form of הָדוּ or the Niphal form of יִמְסָרֶה. When the Translator used the articular infinitive, he added the

---

255 BDB, s.v. "ץ" cf. KB, s.v. "ץ."
256 Bauer, s.v. "זזץ."
257 The 13 occurrences are 1:10b, 1:13a, 4:1a, 4:3b, 5:4a, 7:18a, 7:19b, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:2a, 9:6b, 9:9a, 10:14b.
258 The 11 instances of the articular participles are 1:10b, 1:13a, 4:1a, 4:3b, 7:19b, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:2a, 9:6b, 9:9a, 10:14b. The 2 instances of the articular infinitives are 5:4a, 7:18a.
259 The exceptions are 9:2a and 9:9a where the verbs are יְבָשָׁה and יִמָּסָר respectively. The Qal perfect form of יָבֶשׁ is attested in 1:10b, 7:19b, and its Qal imperfect form is attested in 10:14b. According to MT, the Niphal perfect 3 m.s. form of
personal pronoun following the infinitive as the subject of the infinitive.

9:2a קְנָהַהּ אֲשֶׁר תָּבִיבָהּ קְנוֹתָהּ
9:2a כֵּן תָּבִיבָהּ כֵּן תָּבִיבָהּ מִיְּתָכָנָהּ

In 9:2a, the verb in the רְשָׁא-clause is a participle. The Translator construed the *lamed* before רְשָׁא as the marker of dative, and rendered רְשָׁא by the article.

10:14b לָאֹרְדִי מִיְּתָכָנָהּ מִיְּתָכָנָהּ
10:14b οὐκ ἐγὼ ὁ ἀνθρώπος τί τό γενόμενον
καὶ τί τό ἐσομένον ὁπίσω αὐτοῦ τίς ἀναγγέλει αὐτῷ

In 10:14b, the Translator must have understood רְשָׁא to be gapped before רְשָׁא. In other words, the רְשָׁא-clause is construed as the indirect question introduced by רְשָׁא, which is assumed. The interrogative τί is used for the gapped רְשָׁא. The indirect question functions as the object of the verb רְשָׁא.

9:3a הָקְנָה בֵּלָל אֲשֶׁר-תְּרֹעַת הָדָא הָדָא
9:3a τότε ταυτόν ἐν ταυτί πεποιημένῳ ὑπὸ τὸν Ἁλίῳ

There is one place where רְשָׁא is rendered by zero (9:3a). One would expect the articular participle for the רְשָׁא-clause, but the article before the participle πεποιημένῳ is missing. This case deviates from the Translator’s normal approach.

רְשָׁא > διότι (7) / ὅτι (1)

רְשָׁא is attested in 1:13a, 4:3b, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:6b, and its Niphal participle form is attested in 4:1a.

Another place where the participle is the verb of the רְשָׁא-clause is 4:1a. In other places, the verbs in the רְשָׁא-clauses are all finite verbs.

See its parallel clause מִשְׁכַּה in the previous line.
There are 7 instances where ὅτι renders רָשָׁא (8 percent). The Translator used ὅτι because he construed the רָשָׁא-clauses as causal in 6:12b, 8:10a, 8:11a, and 8:15a, and as nominal in 8:12b, and 8:14a, and finally as consecutive in 8:14a.

Examples:
(causal)
8:10a ὅτι δικαίως ἀρνήσεις ἀνὴρ πρόκειται
8:10a καὶ ἐπηρεάσθησαν ἐν τῇ πόλει ὅτι οὕτως ἔποιήσαν
(nominal)
8:12b ὅτι καὶ γε γινώσκω ἡγώ ὅτι ἔσται ἁγαθὸν τοῖς φοβουμένοις τῷ θεῷ
8:12b ὅτι καὶ γε γινώσκω ἡγώ ὅτι ἔσται ἁγαθὸν τοῖς φοβουμένοις τῷ θεῷ
(consecutive)
8:14a εἰςοι δικαίοι ὅτι φθάνει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποιήμα τῶν ἀσεβῶν
8:14a εἰςοι δικαίοι ὅτι φθάνει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποιήμα τῶν ἀσεβῶν

There is a textual problem in 8:10a where the Translator translated the main verb שָׁמַר in MT by ἐπηρεάσθησαν. He must have understood the verb as שָׁמַר. Consequently, the following רָשָׁא-clause is understood as causal explaining why they were praised. In 8:15a, the רָשָׁא-clause provides the reason why Qoheleth commends joy. The causal sense of the רָשָׁא-clause in 6:12b is somewhat loose. The conjunction ὅτι is often used for such loose subordination in Hellenistic Greek. In 8:11a, the preceding line, which begins with על, clarifies that the רָשָׁא-clause is the ground statement.

262 The 7 instances are 6:12b, 8:10a, 8:11a, 8:12b, 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:15a. ὅτι is mainly focused on 8:10-8:15.

263 In MT, the רָשָׁא-clause could be the relative clause modifying “the city” or could be the epexegetical clause explaining the specific contents that they forgot (“with regard to the fact that”).

264 Robertson, Grammar, 962f; BDF, Greek Grammar, §456.1.
The בֵּית-בָּרֶךְ-clause in 8:12b is understood as the object clause of the main verb בָּרֶךְ. The Translator interpreted the בֵּית-בָּרֶךְ-clause in 8:14a as another nominal clause, which is the apposition of בָּרֶךְ. The appositional function of בָּרֶךְ is well attested in Hellenistic Greek.265

In 8:14a, בָּרֶךְ is probably used consecutively.266 The consecutive use of בָּרֶךְ is apparent in Hellenistic Greek.267 Other translators of LXX also used בָּרֶךְ for the consecutive clauses (e.g. Exod 3:11; 2 Kgs 8:13).268

9:1a
ֶּרֶצֵּר וּמֻשָּׁבֶת עֵינָּיִית עֵינָּיִית עֵינָּיִית עֵינָּיִית
אֱרֹרֶת עֵינָּיִית עֵינָּיִית עֵינָּיִית עֵינָּיִית
9:1a בָּרֶךְ וֹעֲנֵי הַמִּשְׁמַעְתָּהּ הַמִּשְׁמַעְתָּהּ הַמִּשְׁמַעְתָּהּ הַמִּשְׁמַעְתָּהּ

There is 1 instance where בָּרֶךְ is rendered by אֱלֹהִים. In 9:1a, אֱלֹהִים introduces a substantive clause, which is the appositive for תָּבוּעַ and functions as the object of the verb אֵלֹהִים.269 The conjunction אֱלֹהִים is a functional equivalent to בָּרֶךְ in this verse.

בָּרֶךְ > δισως (4) / δίσου (1)

The Translator employed δισως for בָּרֶךְ in 4 instances (5 percent).270 Two of them are used as conjunctions introducing final clauses (3:11b, 7:21b), and two function as relative adverbs (7:22a, 8:12b).

265Robertson, Grammar, 400.
266Cf. GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §166b.
267Robertson, Grammar, 1001.
268Ibid.
269Cf. בָּרֶךְ in 8:14a.
Examples:

3:11b  Kal yE ouv tOV alwva EOWKEV EV KapOlf!, autwv

7:22a  C~'r1~ J;17~P nK-C~ ,;;~
7:22b  OTIWC; Kal yE ou KatTJpaow EtEpOUC;

In 3:11b 'WK means “without which.”271 The relative clause in Hebrew is transformed into the final clause in Greek (“in order that”). By employing the final clause, the Translator emphasized the intention of God and the inability of man.

In 7:22b, the Translator interpreted רָאָשָׁ as a relative adverb denoting manner (“as,” “in such manner as”) and used ὅπως.272 His interpretation arises from a different reading of כי in 7:22a, which MT vocalizes yāda (”to know”), but the Translator read yārēa ("to mistreat").273 The different reading is due to the graphic confusion between י and ב. The servant very often mistreats him in the way as he cursed others.274

There is one place where רָאָשָׁ is rendered by the relative adverb ὅπου (9:10b).

9:10b  כ רא שם יושבנ רשת הרכבת פשיאל

270 The 4 instances are 3:11b, 7:21b, 7:22a, 8:12b.
271 Cf. KB, s.v. "בלא.

272 For the use of רָאָשָׁ as adverbial accusative, see R. J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax: An Outline, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), §492.

273 yārēa is analyzed as hiphil impf. 3m.s. from בָּמַע.
The locative adverb מָקוֹם is the resumptive element in the מָקוֹם-clause and becomes the signal to interpret מָקוֹם as the relative adverb denoting place. Using the locative כַּהַד for מָקוֹם is, therefore, an appropriate rendering.

> καθός (4) / καθός ἐν (I)
> בַּעַד (4) / καθότι (I)

The form מָקוֹם occurs 5 times in Ecclesiastes, and 4 of them are translated by καθός (5:14a, 8:7b, 9:2b) or καθός ἐν (5:3a). In the other 4 instances, the form מָקוֹם in MT is rendered by ἐν (4:17a, 8:16a, 9:2a, 11:5a). The Greek equivalents reflect מָקוֹם not in these 4 instances. In 9:2a, the confusion between ב and ב begins with the preceding word בָּלֵךְ in MT (ḥakkōl), which is translated by ματαιότης, evidently from בָּלֵךְ (hebel).275 On the other hand, the Translator used καθός for the form מָקוֹם in 8:4a. Since the default rendering for מָקוֹם is καθός, and מָקוֹם is never rendered by καθός elsewhere in Ecclesiastes, he probably read the form in question as מָקוֹם. Therefore, one can posit that the Translator may have read the form מָקוֹם in 5:3a, 5:14a, 8:4a, 8:7b, and 9:2b, and the form מָקוֹם in 4:17a, 7:2a, 8:16a, 9:2a, 11:5a.

The Translator's interpretation of מָקוֹם can be divided into the comparative sense and the temporal sense.

Examples:
5:14a מָקוֹם אֲנָה הַיָּמִים אֲנָה מָקוֹם
5:14b מָקוֹם לָלֵךְ לָלֵךְ מָקוֹם
5:14a καθός ἐξῆλθεν ἀπὸ γαστρὸς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ
5:14b γυμνὸς ἐπιστρέψει τοῦ πορευθήσαται

274 The ὁποῖος of 8:12b is also used as relative adverb denoting manner (“as”).
275 All the 38 instances of לְבָכָר are rendered by ματαιότης.
The clause introduced by רָאָשׁ in 5:14a is understood as comparative. The Translator conveyed the comparative idea by employing קַנִּי: "just as." The case of 9:2b is also interpreted as comparative. In 8:7b, however, רָאָשׁ seems to be interpreted as temporal: "when it happen, who will inform him?" Two other instances in 5:3a and 8:7b are also temporal. In 5:3a, the Translator used קַנִּי and emphasized the indefinite sense: "whenever."

There are 5 occurrences of רָאָשׁ where the Translator did not confused them with רָאָשׁ (4:17a, 7:2a, 8:16a, 9:2a, 11:5a):

Examples:

7:2a מֶלֶךְ הַלֵּבָנָה אֲלֵהַיָּה לֹא-פָּשַׁת
בָּאשׁוֹר לֵא אֹה-כַּל פֶּסַח
7:2א וַיַּחַדְוּ תְּרֵעֶתֶהוּ וְיָמָה מָּשְׁחַת
כַּהָּדוּ וַיַּחַדְוּ נַחֲסָא תֶּלֶש תַּחֲסָא
9:2א מֶלֶךְ מְבָאָשׁ לֵבָנָה
9:2א מַעָּשֵׂהוֹן 엽 תוֹאֶה פָּהוּנ

The Translator construed רָאָשׁ in 7:2a as causal and employed קַנִּי for the form. The use of קַנִּי for the causal clause is a normal practice in Hellenistic Greek. The רָאָשׁ in 9:2a is rendered not by conjunction or relative but by the preposition 엽 denoting location. Consequently, the relative clause in Hebrew becomes the prepositional phrase. The approach of 9:2a is functionally literal.

---

276 For the adverbial use of רָאָשׁ, see Williams, Hebrew Syntax, §256. For the use of קַנִּי for comparison, see Bauer, s.v. "קַנִּי."
The form $\psi$ occurs 68 times in Ecclesiastes. The Translator employed various approaches to render the form in question. Whether $\psi$ is construed as relative or not, all the instances will be discussed here in this section for convenience. 278

$\psi > \delta\zeta \ (20) / \delta\zeta \ \epsilon\alpha\nu \ (2) / \delta\omicron\tau\varsigma \ (1)$

In 20 instances, the Translator construed $\psi$ as relative and renders it by the relative $\delta\zeta$ (29 percent). 279 The relative $\delta\zeta$ is a both formal and functional equivalent of the relative $\psi$.

Example:
1:3a το ιερον το λαος
1:3b το περιοσεια τον άνθρωπον
1:3a ο παντε μοχθω αυτου ο μοχθει υπο τον ήλιον
1:3b τον χερια το παιδευτην

The Translator interpreted 2 instances of $\psi$-clause as indefinite relative clauses and uses $\delta\zeta \ \epsilon\alpha\nu$ for $\psi$ (5:17a, 12:3a).

5:17a δια μεν ην σοφος ο άγαθος και τον παιδευτην ευτυχης τον ηλιον
5:17b ο περιοσεια τον άνθρωπον
12:3a εν ημερα η ειναι σαλευθοςιν φιλακες της οικιας

277 Robertson, Grammar, 963; Bauer, s.v. “καθοτ.”

278 So one can compare the renderings of $\psi$ with those of רְשָׁם.

279 The 20 instances are 1:3b, 1:7b, 2:11a, 2:11a, 2:12b, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:19a, 2:20b, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:22b, 2:24a, 3:13a, 5:15b, 7:24a, 10:5b, 10:16a, 10:17a, 11:3b.
In 5:17a, the referent of the relativeわ is generalized: “in all his toil at whatever he toils under the sun.”\(^\text{280}\) In 12:3a, the relative clause is temporal. By using ἐὰν with the subjunctive in temporal clause, the Translator describes the event with probability. The event can and will occur, but its time is uncertain.\(^\text{281}\)

There is 1 instance where the Translator rendered ὡ by ὅς τι (6:3a).

6:3a ἦν δὲ γὰρ ἡ ἡμέρα ὑπὸ τῶν ἑρμηνευμένων ἡμερῶν ἡμῶν

The indefinite relative ὅ τι is probably used in the same way as the definite relative ὅ in 6:3a. The same practice is observed in 7:26a where the relative ὥστε is rendered by ὅς τις.

Alternating between ὅς τις and ὅς is a normal feature in Hellenistic Greek.\(^\text{282}\)

\[\omega > \delta (19)\]

There are 19 instances where the article renders ὡ (28 percent).\(^\text{283}\) In 16 instances, the ὡ- clauses are rendered by articular participles. As in ἄρα- clauses, the verbs ὅτι (x 9) and ἄρα (x 4) are predominant as the main verbs in the ὡ- clauses.\(^\text{284}\) Eleven instances of the articular participles are substantive, and 5 are attributive.\(^\text{285}\)

\(^{280}\)Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 5.

\(^{281}\)Cf. Bauer, s.v. “ὡς.”

\(^{282}\)BDF, Greek Grammar, §293; Bauer, s.v. “ὅς τις.” Cf. LSJ, s.v. “ὅς τις.”

\(^{283}\)The 19 instances are 1:9a, 1:9a, 1:9a, 1:11b, 1:11b, 1:14a, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:17a, 2:18b, 2:26a, 4:2a, 5:4b, 6:10b, 8:7a, 9:12a, 10:14b, 11:8b.

\(^{284}\)The verb ἄρα is predicate in 1:9a, 1:9a, 1:11b, 1:11b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:18b, 8:7a, 10:14b; the verb ἄρα is predicate in 1:9a, 1:9a, 1:14a, 2:17a.

\(^{285}\)The 11 articular participles used as substantive are 1:9a, 1:9a, 1:9a, 1:11b, 1:11b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:26a, 5:4b, 6:10b, 8:7a, 10:14b, 11:8b; the 5 articular
Examples:
(substantive)
1:9a ἡ σάρκινι ἡν ἀνθισθένη
1:9a τί το γεγονός αὐτὸ το γεννησόμενον 286

(attributive)
1:14a ἐρέσεις οὖν ταῖς δοκίμαι πεποιθήσεις ὑπὸ τῶν ἡλίουν
1:14a εἶδον σὺν πάντα τὰ ποιήματα τὰ πεποιθήσεις ὑπὸ τῶν ἡλίουν

The translation of 1:11b seems to deviate from the normal approach.

1:11a ἑκάστης ἐκράτησει
1:11b ἦν ὁ ἡσυχασμὸς τῶν πρῶτοι
1:11a συν ἐστὶν μνήμη τοῖς πρώτοις
1:11b καὶ γε τοῖς ἐσχάτοις γενομένοις

The preposition ἦ is understood as marking the dative of respect and is reflected in the dative case of the articles. According to the normal pattern by the Translator, one would expect that the ὁ-clause in 1:11b would be translated by the articular attributive participle, i.e., καὶ γε τοῖς ἐσχάτοις τοῖς γενομένοις. By omitting the expected article before γενομένοις, the Translator modified the syntax of 1:11b. The ὁ-clause is an adjective clause and functions attributively. However, the Translator rendered the clause by a substantival participle. On the other hand ἑκάστῃς is a substantival adjective in Hebrew, but the Translator made its equivalent ἐσχάτοις as attribute adjective. Therefore, the article τοῖς must go with γενομένοις not ἐσχάτοις: “indeed of those born later.”287

286 “What is that which has happened? It is that which will happen.” See Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 1.

287 Ibid., 1.
There are 2 instances where an adjective functions as the predicate in the ω-clause, and the ω-clause is rendered simply by the articular adjective (2:26a, 6:10b). The articular adjective in 6:10b is used as a substantive which functions as the object of a preposition and another in 2:26a is used as an attributive modifying the noun. The articular adjectives in Greek functionally match the ω-clauses in these 2 cases.

 attributive
2:26a ὡς τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ἐγαθήν πρὸς προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν σοφίαν

(substantive)
6:10b καὶ οὐ διωγμέναι τοῦ κριθήματι μετὰ τοῦ ἱσχυροῦ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν

One instance of the ω-clause is rendered by the articular infinitive, which functions as the object of a preposition.

5:4a ἔστη ἀλαξιθαλή
5:4b μεταθείρθη ὡς ἔστηθη
5:4a ἐγαθήν τῷ μὴ εὐδοκεῖσθαι σε
5:4b ἢ τῷ εὐδοκεῖσθαι σε καὶ μὴ ἀποδοῦναι

The ω-clause in 5:4b is a substantive clause and is parallel with the ω-clause in 5:4a. The Translator employs the substantive infinitives for both clauses and makes the two clauses formally parallel in Greek.

ω > ὡς (11)

The Translator uses ὡς for ω in 11 instances (16 percent). In 9 instances out

---

288 In 5:17a where the ω-clause functions as attribute, and the predicate in the clause is an adjective, the copular ἔστιν is added before the adjective.

289 The Translator probably followed Qere (שֵׁתאַחֵג, settaqqîp). The form שֵׁתאַחֵג may have resulted from weakening of guttural ה out of שֵׁתאַח. Cf. 10:3a.
of 11, ὅτι introduces a nominal clause: subject clause in 7:10b, object clauses in 1:17b, 2:13a, 2:14b, 2:15b, 3:18b, 8:14b, 9:5a, and elliptical use in 12:9a. There is 1 instance where the Translator used ὅτι because he interpreted the ἢ-clause as causal (2:18b).

Finally, the ἢ in 8:14a seems to be construed as consecutive. The ὅτι used for ἢ in 8:14a is parallel to the ὅτι, which renders ἢ on the previous line. In MT the relatives ἢ and ἢ are functionally parallel in 8:14a, but in LXX ὅτι is used for both forms and makes the two clauses formally parallel as well as functionally parallel. This is another case where the Translator strived for functional parallelism as well as formal parallelism.

Examples:

(Nominal)
1:17b ἢ γνων ὅτι καὶ γε τοῦτ' ἐστιν προαίρεσις πνεύματος

(Causal, 2:18b)
2:18a καὶ ἐμπνεόμενοι ἔγινον πάντα μόχθου μου ὑπὸ τὸν ἡλίου
2:18b ὅτι ἀφίειν αὐτὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ γινομένῳ μετ' ἐμὲ

(Consecutive, ὅτι 2°)
8:14a ἐδοικαίω ὅτι φθάνει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποίημα τῶν ἁρετῶν
καὶ εἰσίν ἁρετεῖς ὅτι φθάνει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποίημα τῶν δικαίων

290 The 11 instances are 1:17b, 2:13a, 2:14b, 2:15b, 3:18b, 8:14b, 9:5a, 12:9a.

291 When the clauses are understood as object clauses, the main verbs convey perception: "to see (or to show)" "to know" or "to say (or to speak)."

292 See 5:4 where the Translator used two articular infinitives as parallel for the ἢ-clause in 5:4a and the ἢ-clause in 5:4b.
In 3 instances where מַעַלְנַא introduces a final clause or result clause, the Translator rendered the מַעַלְנַא by מַעַלְנַא. The מַעַלְנַא clause in 3:14b may be analyzed as final, the מַעַלְנַא clause in 5:14b as result, and the מַעַלְנַא clause in 7:14b as final/result. 293

Example:
3:14b καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν Ἰνα φοβηθῶσιν ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ

In 1:10a, the relative מַעַלְנַא is rendered by καὶ. The relative clause δὲς λαλήσει probably reflects מַעַלְנַא rather than מַעַלְנַא מַעַלְנַא. The form מַעַלְנַא is analyzed as relative plus imperfect 3 m.s. form. 295 The different reading is due to the metathesis of יֹדֶד and סִינ. If מַעַלְנַא is in the parent text of the Translator, two מַעַלְנַא clauses are connected asyndetically: מַעַלְנַא שְׁאֵנָה. The Translator might have made the awkward sentences smooth by translating the second מַעַלְנַא simply by conjunction καὶ.

293 The distinction between purpose and result is frequently blurred in Hellenistic Greek. In his lexicon, Bauer comments that it may be because purpose and result are regarded as identical in declarations of the divine will both in Jewish and pagan thought. See Bauer, s.v. “ינא”. The sense of result in 5:14b is somewhat loose in Greek Ecclesiastes. It can also be understood as temporal.

294 Fox, Qohelet, 173.

295 Seow, Ecclesiastes, 110.
In Hellenistic Greek, ὅταν can be temporal or causal.\textsuperscript{296} ὁ by itself is never used temporally in Biblical Hebrew nor in Mishnaic Hebrew. When denoting time, the particle ὁ is always preceded by prepositions such as ἐκ or ἐπί, or nouns such as ἀπὸ.\textsuperscript{297} Therefore, the Translator probably construed the clause as causal: “Woe to him who is alone because he may fall, but there is no one else to raise him up.”

\textbackslash n > ὅταν (2) / ὅς (2)
\textbackslash n > καθότι (1)

The form ὁ follows the preposition ἐπί in 4 instances.\textsuperscript{298} The Translator interpreted 2 instances (9:12b, 10:3a) as temporal and rendered them with ὅταν, and another 2 instances (5:14a, 12:7a) as comparative and rendered them with ὅς.

Examples:
(temporal)
10:3a καὶ γε ἐν δόξῃ ὅταν ἀφρων πορεύεται καρδία αὐτοῦ ἵστερήσει\textsuperscript{299}

(comparative)
12:7a καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ὁ χοῦς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὅς ἦν

\textsuperscript{296}LSJ, s.v. “ὁταν.”

\textsuperscript{297}For the use of ὁ in Biblical Hebrew, see Williams, Hebrew Syntax, §470-474; BDB, s.v. “ὁ”; KB, s.v. “ὁ.” For ὁ in Mishnaic Hebrew, see Segal, Mishnaic Hebrew, §513. For the grammatical difference between ἐν and ὁ in biblical Hebrew, see Roger Schwarzschild, “The Syntax of ἐν in Biblical Hebrew with Special Reference to Qoheleth,” HS31 (1990): 7-37.

\textsuperscript{298}The 4 instances are 5:14a, 9:12b, 10:3a, 12:7a.

\textsuperscript{299}The Greek equivalent seems to reflect Qere ( isNaN , κ'σεσσάκαλ). The form may have resulted from weakening of guttural ὁ out of isNaN. Cf. 6:10b.
By using the present subjunctive in the ὅταν clause of 10:3a, the Translator expressed contemporaneous and repeated action in the temporal clause: “whenever a foolish one walks...” In 12:7a, ὅς functions as a conjunction denoting comparison: “as it was.”

The approach of the Translator on ἣ is compared with his treatment on τοί. For τοί, the Translator used καθώς, whether it is temporal or comparative, while he used ὅταν for temporal ἣ and used ὅς for comparative ἣ.

When the form ἣ is prefixed by the preposition ὧ, the Translator used καθότι for ἣ as he did for καθαρά. The clause in 2:16b introduced by ἢ is construed as causal, and καθότι is a good choice for the causal conjunction.

2:16a ἦν ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται ῥήματα ἀκριτά ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλήθειας
did they come words by words with the truth
2:16b καθότι ἦδει αἱ ἡμέραι αἱ ἐρχόμεναι τὰ πάντα ἐπελήφθη
since they saw the days the coming all taken in

There are 3 instances where the form ἄ is preceded by the interrogative ὡμ. In 2 instances the Translator construed the clauses introduced by ὡμ ἄ as indefinite clauses and uses ὅς ἐκαίν (3:22b) and ἐπὶ τις (6:10a). The indefinite use of ὡμ with ἄ is quite common in late Hebrew. In 3:15a he simply used the article ὁ for ὡμ ἄ to avoid

300 Cf. Bauer, s.v. “ὅταν.”

301 The 3 instances are 3:15a, 3:22b, and 6:10a. Excluded are 4 instances where ὡμ is rendered by the interrogative pronoun ὃ, and the ἄ-clause is rendered by an articular participle functioning as substantive (1:9a, 1:9a, 8:7a, 10:14b). These have been discussed above. The ὡμ preceding ἄ in 7:24a is also excluded because the form ἄ in MT seems to be construed as preposition ἄ. See p. 93 of this dissertation.

302 Segal, Mishnaic Hebrew, §436; GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §137c.
confusing syntax. All these instances have been discussed under Interrogative הָנָּא. 303

_modern scholars suggest that the Greek words ὅσπερ γάρ may reflect
kil'um mat se (נַחַלָה) not kol'um mat se as MT. 304 From the perspective of Hebrew, the
word נָה is always combined with the preposition ל in Biblical Hebrew, and the
combination functions as a preposition meaning “corresponding to.” 305 The ב-clause
becomes the objective of the preposition לָנָה. Consequently, the first letter ב is isolated
and must be understood as the defective spelling of conjunction כ. The conjunction γάρ
is an excellent rendering of כ (כ). The Translator used a pair of comparative adverbs:
ὅσπερ in the protasis and οὖτως in apodosis. The ὅσπερ is the functional equivalent of
למד, and οὖτως fits well not only functionally but also formally to כ.

**Summary**

The renderings for the personal pronouns in Hebrew are 100 percent literal.
Although the Translator seems to have had a different consonantal text from MT in
2:25a, 5:16b, and 8:2a, he was always faithful to his parent text, and his literalness is
maintained. For demonstratives, the Translator did not render the Hebrew forms in a
mechanical way but carefully discerned their grammatical relationship with other words.

---

303 See p. 89 of this dissertation.

304 BHS-Horst; Jarick, *Concordance*, 275; KB, s.v. "נה." 

305 KB, s.v. "נה"; BDB, s.v. "נה."
His shrewdness, for example, is shown in his rendering the form את. The equivalents to the Hebrew interrogatives are also either functionally or formally literal but not at the expense of intelligibility. The Translator's approach to לְמָה, for example, reflects how he appreciated the deep structure of Hebrew sentences. There is 1 instance (6:8b) where an early scribal error is suspected in rendering בה. Finally, the Translator rendered the relatives in various ways, but all of them are properly construed according to their function and expressed in good Greek style.

**Lexical Analysis of Nouns**

Focus is now shifted from a syntactical or structural analysis to the lexical perspective. The approach of the Translator to Hebrew nouns is to render analysis on the basis of lexical equivalency. The Translator's treatment of adjectives and common nouns is discussed first followed by the presentation of the equivalents to proper nouns.

**Adjectives and Common Nouns**

The scope of this analysis includes adjectives and common nouns. The evidence is categorized into three groups according to levels of variation in equivalents used. Category 1 comprises cases of one Hebrew lexeme rendered by one Greek lexeme and cases of many Hebrew lexemes rendered by one Greek lexeme. Since these are mostly stereotypical renderings, the first category is labeled as stereotype equivalents. Category 2 lists the instances where one Hebrew lexeme is rendered by more than one Greek lexeme. Since the variety of equivalents is due to the Translator's contextual

---

306 The categorizations and method to analyze the evidence are adopted from Gentry, *Greek Job*, 132-47.
interpretation or due to the demands of the target language, category 2 is called regular equivalents. Finally, category 3 includes cases of more than one Hebrew lexeme rendered by more than one Greek lexeme. Textual problems or stylistic selection may motivate the variation in category 3. It is conveniently entitled non-standard equivalents.

The evidence is first presented in the format: X > Y, which signifies “X is rendered by Y.” The frequency is given following the Greek equivalent, and all occurrences are given in parentheses next to the frequency. Where it is necessary to list the alternative equivalencies, they are given at the end of each entry in square brackets.

**Category 1 – Stereotype Equivalents:**
One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered by One Greek Lexeme

1. לָבָב > πένθος 3 (5:16a, 7:2a, 7:4a)
2. רוּחַ > λίθος 3 (3:5a, 3:5a, 10:9a)
3. רֹעַ > δινθρωπός 49 (1:3a, 2:13b, 2:3b, 2:8b, 2:12b, 2:18b, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:22a, 2:24a, 2:26a, 3:10b, 3:11b, 3:13a, 3:18a, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:21a, 3:22a, 5:18a, 6:1b, 6:7a, 6:10a, 6:11b, 6:12a, 6:12b, 7:2a, 7:14b, 7:20a, 7:28b, 7:29a, 8:1b, 8:6b, 8:8a, 8:9b, 8:11b, 8:15a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 9:1b, 9:3b, 9:12a, 9:12b, 9:15b, 10:14b, 11:8a, 12:5b, 12:13b)
4. שָׁא > φῶς 3 (2:13b, 11:7a, 12:2a)
5. שָׁא > ὀμήρο 10 (1:8a, 4:4a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:3a, 7:5b, 9:14b, 9:15a, 9:15b, 12:3a)
6. שָׁא > γνήσι 3 (7:26a, 7:28b, 9:9a)
7. הָדֹם > κτήνος 4 (3:18b, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:21b)
8. בֵּן > υἱός 15 (1:1a, 1:13b, 2:3b, 2:8b, 3:10b, 3:18a, 3:19a, 3:21a, 4:8a, 5:13b, 8:11b, 9:3b, 9:12b, 10:17a, 12:12a);
נָחַב > οἰκογενής 1 (2:7a)
9. בֵּש > σάφξ 5 (2:3a, 4:5b, 5:5a, 11:10a, 12:12b)
10. כְתִים > γνώσις 8 (1:16b, 1:17a, 1:18b, 2:21a, 2:26a, 7:12a, 9:10b, 12:9b)
| 11. | ἀρνεῖς > ὑπὸς 4 (10:3a, 11:5a, 11:9a, 12:5a) |
| 12. | ἅθη > ματαιότης 38 (1:2a, 1:2a, 1:2b, 1:2b, 1:2b, 1:14a, 2:1b, 2:11b, 2:15b, 2:17b, 2:19b, 2:21b, 2:23b, 2:26b, 3:19b, 4:4b, 4:7b, 4:8b, 4:16b, 5:6a, 5:9b, 6:2b, 6:4a, 6:9b, 6:11b, 6:12a, 7:6b, 7:15a, 8:10b, 8:14a, 8:14b, 9:2a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 11:8b, 11:10b, 12:8a, 12:8a, 12:8b) |
| 13. | ἔρχομαι > ἔως 8 (4:2b, 4:2b, 4:15a, 7:2b, 9:4a, 9:4b, 9:5a, 10:19a) |
| 14. | ἔχων > ἅθη 13 (2:3b, 2:17a, 3:12b, 5:17b, 5:19a, 6:8b, 6:12a, 6:12a, 8:15b, 9:3b, 9:9a, 9:9b) |
| 15. | παρίσταμαι > ἕκκλημα 21 (2:14a, 2:16a, 2:16b, 2:19a, 4:13a, 6:8a, 7:4a, 7:5a, 7:7a, 7:19a, 8:1a, 8:5b, 8:17b, 9:1a, 9:11a, 9:15a, 9:17a, 10:2a, 10:12a, 12:9a, 12:11a) |
| 16. | ἔποιησα > ἔποια 28 (1:13a, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:17a, 1:18a, 2:3b, 2:9b, 2:12a, 2:13a, 2:21a, 2:26a, 7:10b, 7:11a, 7:12a, 7:12b, 7:19a, 7:23a, 7:25a, 8:1b, 8:16a, 9:10b, 9:13a, 9:15a, 9:16a, 9:16b, 9:18a, 10:1b, 10:10b) |
| 17. | ἐποίησα > ἐκότος 6 (2:13b, 2:14a, 5:16a, 6:4a, 6:4b, 11:8b) |
| 18. | ἔγαγος > ἐγάος 45 (2:1a, 2:3b, 2:24a, 2:24a, 2:26a, 2:26b, 3:12a, 3:12b, 3:13a, 3:22a, 4:3a, 4:6a, 4:9a, 4:9b, 4:13a, 5:4a, 5:17a, 6:3b, 6:9a, 6:12a, 7:1a, 7:1a, 7:2a, 7:3a, 7:5a, 7:8a, 7:8b, 7:10a, 7:11a, 7:14a, 7:18a, 7:20b, 7:26b, 8:12b, 8:13a, 8:15a, 9:2a, 9:2b, 9:4b, 9:7a, 9:16a, 9:18a, 11:6b, 11:7a, 12:14b) |
| 19. | ἐγάζων > ἐγάζωνη 7 (4:8b, 5:10a, 5:17a, 6:3a, 6:6a, 7:14a, 9:18a) |
| 20. | ἕρπει 13 (2:11a, 2:24b, 4:1b, 4:5a, 5:5b, 5:13b, 5:14b, 7:18a, 7:26a, 9:1a, 10:18b, 11:6a) |
| 21. | ὑπάρχει 26 (2:3b, 2:16b, 2:23a, 5:16a, 5:17b, 5:19a, 6:3a, 6:12a, 7:1b, 7:1b, 7:10a, 7:14a, 7:14a, 7:15a, 8:8a, 8:13a, 8:15b, 8:16b, 9:9a, 9:9a, 11:1b, 11:8b, 11:9a, 12:1a, 12:1b, 12:3a) |
| 22. | ὑπερί > ὑπερί 3 (2:3a, 9:7a, 10:19a) |
| 23. | ἦλθεν > ἦλθεν 87 (1:2b, 1:3b, 1:7a, 1:8a, 1:9b, 1:13a, 1:14a, 1:14b, 1:16a, 2:5b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:11b, 2:14b, 2:16b, 2:17b, 2:18a, 2:19b, 2:20b, 2:22a, 2:23a, 3:1a, 3:1b, 3:11a, 3:13a, 3:14a, 3:14a, 3:17b, 3:17b, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:20a, 3:20b, 4:1a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:8a, 4:15a, 4:16a, 4:16a, 5:8a, 5:16a, 5:17a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 6:6b, 6:7a, 7:2a, 7:15a, 7:18b, 7:21a, 7:23a, 7:28b, 8:3b, 8:9a, 8:9a, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:1b, 9:2a, 9:3a, 9:3a, 9:3a, 9:4a, 9:6b, 9:8a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:10a,
+ τάς 2 (8:6a, 10:3b)
+ ματαιότης 1 (9:2a)

24. τεκτονέας > ἀργύριον 6 (2:8a, 5:9a, 5:9a, 7:12a, 10:19b, 12:6a)

25. ἐπεξεργάζομαι > θυμός 4 (2:23a, 7:3a, 7:9a, 11:10a);
> γνώσις 1 (1:18a)

26. μαθητής > ἀνδρεία 3 (2:21a, 4:4a, 5:10b)

27. λόγος > ἄρτος 4 (9:7a, 9:11a, 10:19a, 11:1a)

28. μαθητής > βασιλεύς 11 (1:1b, 1:12a, 2:8a, 4:13b, 5:8b, 8:2a, 8:4a, 9:14b, 10:16a, 10:17a, 10:20a);
> βουλή 1 (2:12b)

29. μάθημα > ὄλιγος 4 (5:1a, 5:11a, 9:14a, 10:1a)

30. μάθημα > ποιήμα 20 (1:14a, 2:4a, 2:11a, 2:17a, 3:11b, 3:17b, 3:22a, 4:3b, 4:4a, 5:5b, 7:13a, 8:9a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 9:7b, 9:10b, 11:5b, 12:14a)

31. μυθέρα > τόπος 9 (1:5b, 1:7b, 3:16b, 3:20a, 6:6b, 8:10a, 10:4a, 11:3b)

32. μυθέρα > συνάντησις 7 (2:14b, 2:15a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 9:2a, 9:3a)

33. την > ἀνάπαυσις 3 (4:6a, 6:5b, 9:17a)

34. σέμα > ψυχή 7 (2:24a, 4:8b, 6:2a, 6:3a, 6:7b, 6:9a, 7:28a)

35. περίβολος > δοῦλος 4 (2:7a, 7:21b, 10:7a, 10:7b)

36. πείρα > ἀιών 7 (1:4b, 1:10b, 2:16a, 3:11b, 3:14a, 9:6b, 12:5b)

37. πνεύμα > ὀφθαλμός 9 (1:8b, 2:10a, 2:14a, 4:8a, 5:10b, 6:9a, 8:16b, 11:7b, 11:9a)

38. πνεύμα > μοίρας 13 (1:3b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:20b, 2:21a, 2:22a, 2:24a, 3:13a, 4:4a, 4:6b, 4:8a, 4:9b, 5:14b, 5:17a, 5:18a, 6:7a, 8:15b, 9:9b, 10:15a)

39. πνεύμα > περιπατομένος 8 (1:13b, 2:23a, 2:26b, 3:10a, 4:8b, 5:2a, 5:13a, 8:16a)

40. πνευμ > χοῦς 3 (3:20b, 3:20b, 12:7a)

41. πνεύμα > ξύλον 5 (2:5b, 2:6b, 10:9b, 11:3a, 11:3b)
42. ἐστὶν > πλούς 6 (4:8a, 5:12b, 5:13a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 9:11a)

43. ἑστὶν > καλός 39 (3:1b, 3:2a, 3:2a, 3:2b, 3:2b, 3:3a, 3:3a, 3:3b, 3:3b, 3:4a, 3:4a, 3:4b, 3:4b, 3:5a, 3:5b, 3:5b, 3:6a, 3:6b, 3:6b, 3:7a, 3:7a, 3:7b, 3:7b, 3:8a, 3:8a, 3:8b, 3:8b, 3:11a, 3:17b, 3:17b, 7:17b, 8:5b, 8:6a, 9:8a, 9:11b, 9:12a, 9:12b, 10:17b)

44. ἀν > στόμα 7 (5:1a, 5:5a, 6:7a, 8:2a, 10:12a, 10:13a, 10:13b)

45. καὶ > πρόσωπον 6 (7:3b, 8:1b, 8:1b, 8:3a, 10:10a, 11:1a);

> ἐπί πρόσωπον 6 (2:26a, 2:26b, 5:1a, 5:5a, 7:26b, 9:1b);

> ζημπροσθέν 4 (1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a, 4:16a)

> καὶ > ἀπὸ προσώπου 4 (3:14b, 8:12b, 8:13b, 10:5b)

> ἀπὸ ζημπροσθέν 1 (1:10b)

46. χρισμός > δίκαιος 8 (3:17a, 7:15b, 7:16a, 7:20a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:1a, 9:2a)

47. ἡλίων > σκιά 4 (6:12a, 7:12a, 7:12a, 8:13a)

48. κλή > φωνή 6 (5:2b, 5:5b, 7:6a, 10:20b, 12:4a, 12:4b)

49. λόγος > περασμός 3 (4:8a, 4:16a, 12:12b)

50. κύριος (rāšū) > ἀσεβής 10 (3:17a, 7:15b, 8:10a, 8:13a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:2a)

51. χρισμός > γέλως 4 (2:2a, 7:3a, 7:6a, 10:19a)

52. διάνοια > εὐφροσύνη 8 (2:1a, 2:2b, 2:10b, 2:26a, 5:19b, 7:4b, 8:15a, 9:7a)

53. στῆν > ἀρχων 3 (10:7b, 10:16b, 10:17b)

54. καλὸς > ἐξουσιάζω 3 (7:19b, 8:8a, 10:5b)

55. ἐστὶν > ἀνομία 3 (6:4b, 6:10a, 7:1a)

56. χρισμός > οὐρανός 4 (1:13a, 3:1b, 5:1b, 10:20b)

> χρισμός > ἡλίος 1 (2:3b)

57. θυσία > θαλαθ 3 (7:1a, 9:8b, 10:1a)

58. χρισμός > θαλαθ 35 (1:3b, 1:5a, 1:5a, 1:9b, 1:14a, 2:11b, 2:17a, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:20b, 2:22b, 3:16a, 4:1a, 4:3b, 4:7b, 4:15a, 5:12a, 5:17b, 6:1a, 6:5a, 6:12b, 7:11b, 8:9a, 8:15a, 8:15b, 8:17a, 9:3a, 9:6b, 9:9a, 9:9b, 9:11a, 9:13a, 10:5a, 11:7b, 12:2a)

> χρισμός > θαλαθ 1 (2:3b)
59. יְהוָה > ἦτος 5 (6:3a, 6:3a, 6:6a, 11:8a, 12:1b)

60. יְהוָה > δεύτερος 3 (4:8a, 4:10b, 4:15b)

Category I – Continued:
More Than One Hebrew Lexeme
Rendered by One Greek Lexeme

61. יְהוָה > ἐσχατος 3 (1:11b, 1:11b, 4:16a) [יְהוָה > ἐσχατος 2 (7:8a, 10:13b)]

62. יְהוָה > μέγας 4 (9:13b, 9:14b, 9:14b, 10:4b) [יְהוָה > μέγας 2 (2:21b, 10:6a); מֻטש > μέγας 1 (10:1b)]

63. יְהוָה > περισσεία 10 (1:3a, 2:11b, 2:13a, 2:13b, 3:9a, 5:8a, 5:15b, 7:12b, 10:10b, 10:11b) [יְהוָה > περισσεία 2 (6:8a, 7:11b)]

64. לֹא > καρδία 42 (1:13a, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:17a, 2:1a, 2:1a, 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:15a, 2:15b, 2:20a, 2:22a, 2:23a, 3:11b, 3:17a, 3:18a, 5:1a, 5:19b, 7:2b, 7:3b, 7:4a, 7:4b, 7:7b, 7:21a, 7:22a, 7:25a, 7:26a, 8:5b, 8:9a, 8:11b, 8:16a, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:3b, 9:7a, 10:2a, 10:2b, 10:3a, 11:9a, 11:9b, 11:10a) [לֹא > καρδία 1 (9:3b)]

65. נָא > οὐδείς 3 (5:13b, 5:14b, 9:5b) [נָא > οὐδείς 1 (3:19b)]; > μηδείς 1 (7:14b)

66. נָא > πόλεμος 3 (3:8b, 8:8a, 9:11a) [נָא > πόλεμος 1 (9:18a)]

67. μοιχ > πένθς 4 (4:13a, 9:15a, 9:15b, 9:16b) [μοιχ > πένθς 2 (4:14b, 5:7a); μοιχ > πένθς 1 (6:8b)]

68. נָע > πόλις 5 (7:19a, 8:10a, 9:14a, 9:15a, 10:15b) [נָע > πόλις 1 (10:16a)]

69. ב (rāḇ) > πλήθος 6 (1:18a, 1:18a, 5:2a, 5:2b, 5:6a, 11:1b) [ב (rāḇ) > πλήθος 1 (6:3a); ב (rāḇ) > πλήθος 1 (5:10a); ב (rāḇ) > πλήθος 1 (5:9a)]

70. רְמִית > προαίρεσις 7 (1:14b, 2:11b, 2:17b, 2:26b, 4:4b, 4:6b, 6:9b) [רְמִית > προαίρεσις 3 (1:17b, 2:22a, 4:16b)]

71. רְמִית > προαίρεσις [רְמִית > προαίρεσις]

72. נָע > δύο 5 (4:3a, 4:9a, 4:11a, 4:12a, 11:6b) [נָע > δύο 1 (4:6b)]
Category 2 – Regular Equivalents
One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered by
More Than One Greek Lexeme

73. דָּרָא > εἶς 18 (2:14b, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:20a, 4:8a, 4:9a, 4:10a, 4:10b, 4:11b, 4:12a, 6:6b, 7:27b, 7:27b, 7:28b, 9:2a, 9:3a, 9:18b, 12:11b);
> αὐτός 1 (11:6b)

74. תִּיב > οἶκος 8 (2:4b, 4:14a, 4:17a, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:4a, 7:4b, 12:5b);
> οἰκία 2 (10:18b, 12:3a);
> ἡ θύρα > οἰκογενεία 1 (2:7a)

75. בֶּל > παρά 3 (5:10b, 5:12b, 8:8b);
> δ’ παρά 1 (7:12b);
> δς παρά 1 (12:11a);
> ἐξω 1 (10:20b);
> ἐπίξοδος 1 (10:11b)

76. נָב > υψηλός 4 (5:7b, 5:7b, 5:7b, 7:8b);
> νησσος 1 (12:5a)

77. הֶל > μερίς 7 (2:10b, 2:21b, 3:22a, 5:17b, 9:6b, 9:9b, 11:2a);
> μέρος 1 (5:18a)

78. יָס > πράγμα 4 (3:1b, 3:17b, 5:7a, 8:6a);
> θέλημα 3 (5:3a, 12:1b, 12:10a)

79. תָּנ > θάνατος 5 (3:19a, 3:19a, 7:1b, 7:26a, 8:8a);
> θανάτω 1 (10:1a)

80. מְפָש > κρίσις 5 (3:16b, 8:5b, 8:6a, 11:9b, 12:14a);
> κρίμα 1 (5:7a)

81. קָס > δφων 3 (2:19a, 10:3a, 10:14a);
> δφοσύνη 1 (10:3a);
> σκληρός 1 (7:17a)

82. בֵּב > νέφος 2 (11:3a, 12:2b);
> νεφέλη 1 (11:4b)

83. מָש > κάθοδος 2 (6:6a, 7:22a);
> δ + מָש > πλειονάκις 1 (7:22a)

84. צָר > κεφαλή 2 (2:14a, 9:8b);
> αρχή 1 (3:11b)
85. תור > προέδρος 21 (1:6b, 1:6b, 1:14b, 1:17b, 2:11b, 2:17b, 2:26b, 3:19a, 3:21a, 3:21b, 4:4b, 4:6b, 4:16b, 6:9b, 7:8b, 7:9a, 8:8a, 8:8a, 10:4a, 11:5a, 12:7b);
> ἀνεμος 2 (5:15b, 11:4a);
> μακρόθυμος 1 (7:8b)

Category 3 – Non-Standard Equivalents
More Than One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered by More Than One Greek Lexeme

86. מִסְרָה > πόλις 1 (10:16a) [ְעַש] > πόλις 5 (7:19a, 8:10a, 9:14a, 9:15a, 10:15b)];
> γῆ 12 (1:4b, 3:21b, 5:1b, 5:8a, 7:20a, 8:14a, 8:16a, 10:7b, 10:17a, 11:2b, 11:3a, 12:7a)

87. דָרֶך > λόγος 19 (1:8a, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:2b, 6:6a, 6:11a, 7:8a, 7:21a, 8:3a, 9:16b, 9:17a, 10:12a, 10:13a, 10:14a, 10:20b, 12:10a, 12:10b, 12:11a, 12:13a) [דְּבַר > λόγος 1 (8:2b)];
> δῆμα 3 (1:1a, 8:1a, 8:5a)

88. דָבַר > λόγος 1 (8:2b) [דָבַר > דָבַר 19 (1:8a, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:2b, 5:6a, 6:11a, 7:8a, 7:21a, 8:3a, 9:16b, 9:17a, 10:12a, 10:13a, 10:14a, 10:20b, 12:10a, 12:10b, 12:11a, 12:13a)];
> λαλία 2 (3:18a, 7:14b);

89. הָוַי (hōlēloī) > περηφορά 2 (2:12a, 7:5b) [הָוַי > περηφορά 1 (2:2a)];
> περιψέφεια 1 (9:3b) [הָוַי > περιψέφεια 1 (10:13b)];
> παραβολή 1 (1:17a) [מָשָׁה > παραβוλή 1 (12:9b)]

90. הָשָׁב (hešbôn) > λογισμός 2 (7:27b, 9:10b) [הָשָׁב (hīšābôn) > λογισμός 1 (7:29b)],
> ψηφιος 1 (7:25a)

91. הֲשָׁרָה > περισσεία 2 (6:8a, 7:11b) [הֲשָׁרָה > περισσεία 10 (1:3a, 2:11b, 2:13a, 2:13b, 3:9a, 5:8a, 5:15b, 7:12b, 10:10b, 10:11b)];
> περισσός 5 (2:15a, 6:11b, 7:16a, 12:9a, 12:12a)

92. סָכָל > αφρων 17 (2:14a, 2:15a, 2:16a, 2:16b, 4:5a, 4:13b, 4:17a, 5:2b, 5:3b, 6:8a, 7:4b, 7:5b, 7:6a, 7:9b, 10:2b, 10:12b, 10:15a) [סָכָל (sākāl) > αφρων 3 (2:19a, 10:3a, 10:14a)];
> αφροσύνη 1 (9:17b) [סָכָל > αφροσύνη 5 (2:3b, 2:12a, 2:13a, 10:1b, 10:13a);
סָכָל (kesel) > αφροσύνη 1 (7:25b); סָכָל (sākāl) > αφροσύνη 1 (10:3b)]

93. סָכָל > αφροσύνη 5 (2:3b, 2:12a, 2:13a, 10:1b, 10:13a) [סָכָל > αφροσύνη 1 (9:17b);
סָכָל > αφροσύνη 1 (7:25b); סָכָל > αφροσύνη 1 (10:3b)];
> σκληρία 1 (7:25b);
> ἐπιστήμη 1 (1:17a)
94. פַּרְעֹה > δίκαιος 2 (3:16b, 7:15b) [צֵירִים > δίκαιος 8 (3:17a, 7:15b, 7:16a, 7:20a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:1a, 9:2a)];
> δίκαιος 1 (5:7a)

95. רב (rab) > πολὺς 5 (6:1b, 6:3a, 7:22a, 7:29b, 8:6b) [רָב > πολὺς 15 (1:16b, 2:7b, 5:6a, 5:11a, 5:16b, 5:19a, 6:11a, 7:16a, 7:17a, 9:18b, 11:8a, 11:8a, 12:9b, 12:12b, 12:12b)];
> μέγας 2 (2:1b, 10:6a) [רָב > μέγας 4 (9:13b, 9:14b, 9:14b, 10:4b)];
> πλήθος 1 (6:3a) [רָב (rōb) > πλήθος 6 (1:18a, 1:18a, 5:2a, 5:2b, 5:6a, 11:1b); דַּב > πλיהו 1 (5:10a); רָב + בָּשָׁם > πλειοστάκις 1 (7:22a)]

96. דְּרֵי > πονηρός 13 (1:13b, 2:17a, 4:3b, 4:8b, 5:13a, 6:2b, 8:3a, 8:5a, 8:12a, 9:3a, 9:3b, 10:13b, 12:14b) [דְּרֵי > πονηרός 4 (5:15a, 8:11a, 9:12a, 11:2b)];
> κακός 3 (4:17b, 9:2a? 9:12a)

97. דָּרְעָה > κακία 4 (5:12a, 7:14a, 7:15b, 12:1b) [דְּרָע > κακία 1 (7:3b)];
> πονηρός 4 (5:15a, 8:11a, 9:12a, 11:2b) [דְּרָע (ra') > πονηρός 13 (1:13b, 2:17a, 4:3b, 4:8b, 5:13a, 6:2b, 8:3a, 8:5a, 8:12a, 9:3a, 9:3b, 10:13b, 12:14b)];
> πονηρία 4 (2:21b, 6:1a, 10:5a, 11:10a);
> דַּב > אַפְרָסוֹת 1 (5:12a) [דַּב > אַפְרָסוֹת 2 (5:12b); דַּב > אַפְרָסוֹת 2 (5:16b, 6:2b)]

Commentary

Category 1 accounts for 74 percent of the equivalency patterns in nouns—60 out of 97 (62 percent) in the one-to-one list and 12 of 97 (12 percent) in the many-to-one equivalency list. This points strongly to the literalness of the translation. Category 1 may represent stereotypical renderings in most cases. Among the cases where the Translator employed one Greek lexeme for more than one Hebrew lexeme, the identical Greek equivalent is used for the etymologically related Hebrew words. The cases are פַּרְעֹה and חָרָב rendered by ἐσχατός in entry 61, וַיִּתיָר rendered by περισσότερον in entry 63, בָּשָׁם and לִבּות rendered by καρδία in entry 64, רב (rōb), רב (rab) and רב rendered by πλήθος in entry 69, and רָב and רֶעָה rendered by προάρχως in entries 70 and 71.
Thus the evidence supports the strong tendency to stereotypical renderings.  

There are apparent variations in certain entries of category 1 that needs clarification. In entry 8, the Translator used the compound noun οἰκογενής for בֵּן בֵּית (‘ones born in house’). Since does not mean “sons” here and the phrase בֵּן בֵּית is an idiomatic expression, the Greek equivalent can hardly be considered a deviation from the rendering of בֵּן by υἱός.

According to entry 10, the Translator seems to have read the form רֵעַ in MT as רֵעַ in 8:6a by the visual confusion between ר and ר. The rendering יִגֵּד by γνῶσις in 1:18a may be explained by the context. The noun רֵעַ occurs in 1:17a and 1:18b. Thus, it is likely that γνῶσις in 1:18a reflects רֵעַ than than יִגֵּד. Wisdom and knowledge are introduced in 1:17a, and the relationship between them is now explained in 1:18a. Additionally, the Translator normally employed stereotypical renderings for both רֵעַ and יִגֵּד.

307 Even though his renderings are stereotypical in most cases, it does not mean that the Translator was mechanical. Rather, he was sensitive to the syntax. A good example is 10:1b.

10:1b יִגֵּד מַיַּעַבד מְבָכְרָת מְשָׂכְלָה מַעַם

The Hebrew sentence is syntactically awkward for two reasons: (1) disagreement of gender between the alleged subject מְשָׂכְלָה (f.) and the alleged predicate יִגֵּד (m.); (2) the asyndetic relationship between מְבָכְרָת and מְשָׂכְלָה. The Translator may have construed מְשָׂכְלָה as partitive and may have rendered it by ὀλίγον. Then, the subject is ὀλίγον σοφίας (m.מְבָכְרָת). The adjective μεγάλης does not necessarily reflect מְבָכְרָת. The Translator may have contextually interpreted מְשָׂכְלָה and rendered it by μεγάλης. μεγάλης makes a semantic balance with ὀλίγον. This is an example of freedom.

308 Jarick, Concordance, viii and 179.
In entry 23, the Translator rendered 2 instances of "ב" + "ל" by forms of παζ. He seems to have construed "ל" as marking the case or function of "ב". Thus in these 2 instances, "ב" is rendered by παζ as in the other occurrences, and "ל" is rendered by the cases of παζ. The instance in 9:2a is not to be regarded as a variation because the Translator read "ב" + "ל" in MT as the noun "רָבָּה".

In entry 28, the Translator interpreted "מע" in 2:12b as meaning "will" or "counsel." Thus this case is not a variation of "מע" > βασιλεύς.

In entry 45, when "מע" is prefixed by other prepositions ("ל" or "מ" + "ל") and functions as a semipreposition, he employed πρὸ προσωπου, ἐμπροσθεν, ἀπὸ προσωπου, or ἀπὸ ἐμπροσθεν in different combinations. Although none of the Greek equivalents are idiomatic Hellenistic Greek except ἐμπροσθεν, certain patterns are observed. The Translator used πρὸ προσωπου or ἀπὸ προσωπου for the spatial use of "לע" or of "לע" respectively but used ἐμπροσθεν or ἀπὸ ἐμπροσθεν for the temporal use of "לע" respectively. Since the Translator treated "מע" or "מע" differently from "מע" in other syntactic settings, the establishment of the stereotypical rendering of "מע" by προςωπου is still maintained.

In entries 56 and 58, the Translator may have read "ונב" in 2:3b rather than "וּב" as in MT. The confusion may be due to the preposition "ונב", which is followed by the

---


310 Cf. Gentry, Greek Job, 137.
lexeme in question. The expression רוח נפש is more dominant in Ecclesiastes than רוח נפש and may have been regarded as the standard idiom.  

The word כַּלִּים is stereotypically rendered by γη. In entry 68, πόλις is employed once for כַּלִּים. In the preceding stich (10:15a), עיר appears and is rendered by πόλις. Thus the contextual interpretation may have motivated such variation.

Categories 2 and 3 entail a variety of lexical selections. One can easily confirm good idiomatic Greek, contextual interpretations, and stylistic variations in these two categories. In entry 73, קס וָד is rendered by επί το αὐτό in 11:6b. This is idiomatic Greek and the only instance where קס is not rendered by ες.

In entry 74, οἶκος is used in a functional sense while according to the context οίκια denotes a general dwelling place. For example, οἶκος in 2:4b implies a royal palace. In 4:14a, it is a prison, and in 4:17a, a temple. For the most part, οἶκος is modified by genitives although it is modified by dative in 2:4b. The modifier decides the function of the house.

For דָּב in entry 78, the Translator discerned the meaning by context. For example, where he interpreted דָּב as human will, wish, or desire to do, he used θέλημα for the Hebrew. On the other hand, if the context indicated “matter” as the meaning for דָּב, he rendered it by πράγμα.

---

311 כַּלִּים is seen in 1:3b, 1:9b, 1:14a, 2:11b, 2:17a, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:20b, 2:22b, 3:16a, 4:1a, 4:3b, 4:7b, 4:15a, 5:12a, 5:17b, 6:1a, 6:12b, 8:9a, 8:15a, 8:15b, 8:17a, 9:3a, 9:6b, and 9:9a; but כַּלִּים is just in 1:13a and 3:1b. Cf. Seow, Ecclesiastes, 120, 128; Gordis, Koheleth, 206.

312 See entry 86.
According to entry 80, the Translator used κρίμα for בָּשָׂם in 5:7a rather than κρίσις as in the other instances. He may have interpreted בָּשָׂם (> κρίμα) in 5:7a as a personal legal right by the context, while he understood the other instances (> κρίσις) in the broader sense of justice or judgment.

In entry 81, כָּלָל is translated by σκληρός once. This rendering is probably explanatory. “Hardness” is understood as one of the main characteristics of the foolish. Thus the Translator may have wanted to specify the foolishness in 7:17a on the basis of the context. For the same reason and in the extended context, he used the cognate noun σκληρόν for כָּלָל in 7:25b (see entry 93).

The Translator’s semantic discernment is seen in his rendering of שָׂם in entry 84. He used κεφαλή for the “head” of human beings and used ἀρχή for the temporal sense of “beginning.”

In entry 85, one may question whether the Translator used ἀνεμός for ἔρα as a stylistic variation for πνεῦμα or if he used two different words for two distinct contextual meanings. In 5:15b, ἔρα has a metaphorical sense connoting “evanescent.” The ἔρα in 11:4a represents natural wind, which the sower may detect. The Greek equivalent ἀνεμός for these 2 instances seems to signify objective, passive, and inanimate substance. On the contrary, πνεῦμα appears to denote subjective, active, and animated substance. For example, ἔρα in 1:6b indicates natural wind, but the Translator used πνεῦμα for it because ἔρα is described as a subject moving actively. Another example is the recurrent expression προοιμίας πνεύματος for ἔρα ἐν ἰδίᾳ, in which πνεύματος may be better understood as the subjective genitive: “spirit’s choice” not “choosing spirit.” The Translator probably intended to view πνεῦμα in 1:6b as being contextually related to
In entries 87 and 88, the Translator seems to have used λόγος for individual or specific utterance. On the other hand, he probably employed ρήμα to signify either a “whole discourse” (1:1a) or “matter” (8:1a, 8:5a).

Although all other manuscripts support παραβολή, it is surprising that the Translator rendered παραβολή by παραβολή once in entry 89. The motivation behind this deviation in the normal translation pattern is not evident contextually. The matter is not likely interpretative but textual. The word παραβολή may have been confused either graphically or phonetically with περιφορά, which is an expected equivalent to παραβολή based upon the translation technique of the Translator. If such scribal error actually occurred, it probably happened so early that it dominated the textual tradition.

According to entry 90, the form Ἰτανμίφα occurs 3 times in 7:25-7:29. There are parallel expressions in 7:25a and 7:29b where the verb ἠκούω is followed by Ἰτανμίφα. The Translator used ζητῶ ψῆφον for one (7:25a) and ζητῶ λογισμὸν for another (7:29b). The context does not demand different meanings between these two instances. Thus

---

313 Gentry, “Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three,” 160-61.
314 Ibid.
315 Ibid.
316 The form in 7:29b is Ἰτανμίφα (pl.).
ψηφος may be understood as a stylistic variation of λογισμός without any semantic distinction.

According to entry 93, בֶּשֶלֶת occurs only once, not only in Ecclesiastes, but also through the entire MT, and modern scholars generally analyze the form as a variation of בֶּשֶלֶת with the support of most manuscripts. However, in rendering the form by אֵלֶּסֶת, the Translator evidently interpreted בֶּשֶלֶת as a derived form from בֶּשֶלֶת ("to be prudent").

In entry 97, an abnormal rendering is observed for רָעַה in 5:12a. The Translator used ἀφροστησία for רָעַה or ἄλη in the other instances. Twice, ἄλη or ἄλη appear with רָעַה, and he translated both רָעַה and ἄλη by ποιησία. Based upon the translation pattern, one would expect ποιησία ἀφροστησία for רָעַה ἄλη in 5:12a. Did the Translator fail to translate ἄλη, or does ἀφροστησία stand for two words, ἄλη ἄλη? Two minuscules (766I, 766II) have δεινή ἀφροστησία, but all other manuscripts and papyri attest only to ἀφροστησία. Not only in Greek Ecclesiastes but also in the entire Septuagint, the adjective δεινή ("fearful, "terrible") is never used as the equivalent of רָעַה. Thus δεινή ἀφροστησία may be a later scribal correction toward the Hebrew text. In considering that

317 A. Schoors, The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth (Leuven: Peeters Press and Department Orientalistiek, 1992), 19; Whitley, Koheleth, 16; Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 12; BHS-Horst.
318 Cf. BDB, s.v. "שַׁכֶלֶת"; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 125.
319 The attestation is confirmed from the Göttingen Collation Books.
320 Cf. Hatch and Redpath, Concordance, s.v. "δεινός."
focus on 5:12-6:2, one could posit that the Translator may have rendered by ἀρροστιὰ in the first instance, then changed his approach, and used ἀρροστιὰ only for thereafter. The motivation for the change is probably seen in 5:16b where ἀρροστιὰ occurs alone, and where the Translator may have felt it necessary to differentiate the rendering for the ἀρροστιὰ in 5:16b from the renderings for the immediately preceding ἀρροστιὰ in 5:15a and the following ἀρροστιὰ in 6:2b. 321

In sum, generally stereotypical renderings of one-to-one equivalences and many-to-one equivalences comprise 74 percent of total occurrences of nouns and adjectives. In the remaining 26 percent, the translation pattern shows one-to-many or many-to-many equivalence. The variations may be motivated by three factors: (1) idiomatic Greek, which is according to the demand of the target language, (2) different nuances, which are contextually decided, and (3) stylistic variations, which mostly occur in close proximity.

Proper Nouns

In this section, the equivalents for proper nouns are evaluated. A complete list of proper nouns occurring in Ecclesiastes is given with their Greek equivalents. As in the nouns, the presentation of the evidence precedes commentary and is given in the format: X > Y, which signifies X is rendered by Y. The number immediately following indicates the frequency, and the references in the parenthesis are all occurrences.

321 For the hypothesis, the present writer is indebted to Gentry (private conversation).
Evidence

98. אֶלְדַיְם > θεός 40 (1:1b, 2:14b, 2:26b, 3:10b, 3:11b, 3:13b, 3:14a, 3:14b, 3:15b, 3:17a, 3:18a, 4:17a, 5:1a, 5:3a, 5:5a, 5:5b, 5:6b, 5:17b, 5:18a, 5:18b, 5:19b, 6:2a, 6:2a, 7:13a, 7:14b, 7:18b, 7:26b, 7:29a, 8:2b, 8:12b, 8:13b, 8:15b, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:7b, 11:5b, 11:9b, 12:7b, 12:13b, 12:14a)

99. דוד > Δαυίδ 1 (1:1a)

100. יְרֶשֶׁלֶם > Ιερουσαλήμ 5 (1:1b, 1:12b, 1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a)

101. יִשְׂרָאֵל > Ισραήλ 2 (1:1b? 1:12b)

102. קִבְרָה > εκκλησιαστής 7 (1:1a, 1:2a, 1:12a, 7:27a, 12:8a, 12:9a, 12:10a)

Commentary

Only 4 proper nouns are attested in Ecclesiastes. The rendering of אֶלְדַיְם by θεός in entry 98 is standard for all Septuagint translators. In entries 99, 100 and 101, Ιερουσαλήμ, Δαυίδ and Ισραήλ are faithful transliterations for יְרֶשֶׁלֶם, וּדֹרֵד and יִשְׂרָאֵל respectively. On the other hand, the rendering εκκλησιαστής for קִבְרָה in entry 102 is etymologically motivated. The noun קִבְרָה occurs only in Ecclesiastes, and its equivalent εκκλησιαστής is also attested only in Greek Ecclesiastes. However, the Greek cognate noun εκκλησία rendering Hebrew nouns קִבְרָה, קָבֵר, or קִבְרֵי is ubiquitous in the Septuagint. The verb εκκλησιασίω is also used 6 times for the verb קִבְרָה in hiphil by the other Greek translators. The Translator seems to have followed this translational

322 Hatch and Redpath, Concordance, s.v. “θεός”; also see Gentry, Greek Job, 146.

323 Hatch and Redpath, Concordance, s.v. “εκκλησία.”

324 The 6 instances are: Lev 8:3, Num 20:8, Deut 4:10, 31:12, 31:28, 1 Chr 13:5. See Hatch and Redpath, Concordance, s.v. “εκκλησιασίω.” The compound form
tradition. In sum, the evidence for proper nouns may be scant in establishing a translation pattern for some cases but fully supports the literal characteristic of the Translator.

Verbs

The next part of speech to be analyzed is verbs. As O’Connor points out a continuum exists between nouns and verbs.\(^{325}\) Deverbative nouns and denominative verbs may be good evidence for this. Infinitives and participles certainly occupy the border ground between the two parts of speech.\(^{326}\) On formal grounds, infinitives and participles are to be treated as verbs since they are construed morphologically from verbal roots. Pseudoexistentials ϕ and υ are traditionally treated as particles.\(^{327}\) The Translator generally translated them by verbs (i.e., forms of ειμι), so they are best taken as verbs (i.e., pseudo-verbs) in the analysis.\(^{328}\) The pattern of the Translator’s rendering of finite verbal forms is analyzed first followed by his approaches to treating the non-finite verbs (participles and infinitives) and pseudo-verbs (ϕ and υ).

Structural Analysis of Finite Verbs

The features of the verbal system of Hebrew are quite different from those of

\(\epsilon\xi\epsilon\kappa\lambda\tau\rho\iota\alpha\zeta\omega\) is also employed for הָנַע in the niphal or hiphil stems. See, Muraoka, "Index," 336c.

\(^{325}\) O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, §3.0.

\(^{326}\) Ibid., §3.2.4.

\(^{327}\) GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §100o; JM, Grammar, §102k.

\(^{328}\) Cf. O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, §3.1.3.
the Greek verbal system. First, the Hebrew verbal system is based upon the two
conjugations: prefix forms (yqtl) and suffix forms (qtl). These two different
formations provide different aspects, tenses, and modality. The imperative, a distinct
modal form, follows the prefix conjugation. On the other hand, the Greek verb has seven
aspects / tenses (present, imperfect, future, aorist, perfect, pluperfect, future perfect) and
four moods, which are formally distinct (indicative, imperative, subjunctive, optative).
Second, the Hebrew verb inflects for two numbers (singular and plural), for three persons
(1st, 2nd, 3rd), and two genders except 1st person (masculine and feminine). The Greek
verb also inflects for two numbers (singular and plural) and for three persons (1st, 2nd, 3rd)
but not for gender. Finally the Hebrew verbal roots can be inflected in seven stems (Qal,
Niphal, Piel, Pual, Hiphil, Hophal, Hithpael). These seven Hebrew stems may partially
match three voices of Greek in function, which are active, middle, and passive. The three
categories, therefore, need to be compared to analyze how the Translator rendered
Hebrew finite verbs in Ecclesiastes: (1) aspect / tense / modality, (2) number and person,
and (3) voice.

Aspect / Tense / Modality

There is still continuous debate on the Hebrew verbal system—whether its

329 For the following formal comparison between the source language and the
target language, see J.W. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus, SBLSCS 30
(Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), x-xi; and also idem, “The Use of Versions for Text
Criticism: The Septuagint,” in La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea ed. N.

330 The term ‘verbal system’ only indicates the finite verbs in this section.

331 For the analytic frame the present writer is indebted to Gentry, Greek Job, 176.
nature is temporal or aspectual. E. J. Revell claims that the opposition of the two categories of the indicative, qtl and yqtl, represents time reference: qtl ‘past’ versus yqtl ‘present/future’ because “there is no real reason to suppose that Hebrew does not.” On the other side, in studies on the verbal aspect in Biblical Hebrew, M. Eskhult concludes that the Biblical Hebrew verbal system is preferably understood in terms of ‘aspect’: cursive (yqtl) versus constative (qtl). Gentry proposes a combined theory that the base form of the Hebrew verb is primarily understood as aspectual but with temporal deixis, which is decided in a discourse-pragmatic setting. In his definition, tense is the presentation of time as points in a sequence. He further explains, “If the point of reference is the moment of speaking, we have a system of absolute tense; if the point of reference is not identical to the moment of speech, we have a system of relative tense.” Aspect is defined as the relationship between an event and the frame within which it is perceived or viewed. He clarifies further, “If the event is seen as a whole within the frame of the viewer, then it is perceived globally; conversely if the boundaries of the event (either beginning or end) extend outside of the frame of the viewer, then the event

---


is perceived as an ongoing process."³³⁸

For Gentry, the opposition between qtl and yqtl or between wayyqtl and wəqtl is, first of all, described in terms of aspect. The form qtl and wayyqtl are perfective, and yqtl and wəqtl are imperfective. The tense is secondary and decided by the combination of aspect and the discourse framework. If the discourse framework is narrative, then the tense is always past.³³⁹ If the discourse framework is conversation, the perfective (i.e., qtl or wayyqtl) normally defaults for past tense while the imperfective (i.e., yqtl or wəqtl) defaults for non-past tense.

With respect to modality, assertive and projective are distinguished not by different forms but by different positioning of the prefix forms.³⁴⁰ The theory is only applied to the first person and the third person. The second person imperative is distinguished by its form. Following Revell, Niccacci, and Shulman, Gentry contends that initial position is marked as projective, while non-initial position is assertive.³⁴¹

With regard to aspect, the short yqtl form marks perfective, and the long yqtl form marks

³³⁷Ibid., 14-15.
³³⁸Ibid., 15.
³³⁹Ibid.
³⁴⁰The term assertive is used for indicative and the term projective for modal. For an explanation as to why these terms are preferable, see Gentry, “System of the Finite Verb,” 21.
imperfective.\textsuperscript{342} In Hellenistic Greek, most modern scholars understand the Greek verbal system as describing aspect not time.\textsuperscript{343} Two aspects have been agreed upon among scholars (i.e., perfective and imperfective), and another two aspects are still controversial (i.e., stative and future). Perfective aspect presents “an external viewpoint, seeing the occurrence in summary without regard for the internal details, but viewed as a whole, including its end-points.”\textsuperscript{344} Imperfective aspect reflects “an internal viewpoint, which focuses on the progress of the occurrence and sees it in regard to its internal make-up, without beginning or end in view.”\textsuperscript{345} Perfective aspect is represented by aorist, and imperfective by present and imperfect. Porter claims the third aspect—stative, which Fanning does not accept. The stative aspect is defined as a condition or state of affairs in existence and represented by the perfect or pluperfect.\textsuperscript{346} The stativity as an independent aspect may be supported by the morphological peculiarity (i.e., reduplication) in the

\textsuperscript{342}Gentry, “System of the Finite Verb,” 32-33.


\textsuperscript{346}Porter, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 91.
formation of the perfect or pluperfect verb.\textsuperscript{347} In short, Greek seems to have stative aspect, which is grammaticalized.\textsuperscript{348}

The more controversial aspect may be the future. McKay takes future as an aspect to represent an intention or expectation.\textsuperscript{349} Many others do not accept this theory. Through historical research, Evans follows the traditional view and concludes that the future conveys only time value.\textsuperscript{350}

It is not necessary for the present study to judge which aspects are to be in Greek or which theory is more plausible for the Hebrew verbal system.

Methodologically, inductive analysis is preferable to deductive. In other words, the starting point for the analysis should be not any modern theory but the evidence itself, since the main purpose of the present work is not to prove any modern theory but to illuminate the perspective of the Translator—i.e., how the Translator understood the Hebrew verbal system in Ecclesiastes. One of the best ways to achieve the purpose may be to compare the evidence between the two languages as much as possible on formal


\textsuperscript{348}There are two types of verb in Hebrew: stative and stative. The stative verb is not regarded as denoting the stative aspect in Hebrew, but rather stativity implied in the stative verb is regarded as an \textit{Aktionsart} (cf. Waltke and O'Connor, \textit{Hebrew Syntax}, §20.2k). Note that the Translator did not employ the Greek perfect form for the stative verbs. See p. 173 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{349}For Porter, the term “expectation” is a unique category apart from aspects. See Porter, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 427.

grounds rather than functional grounds. Modern theories may be applied if they can explain any case or pattern.

There are 456 finite verb forms in Ecclesiastes. Additionally 4 forms are to be included for analysis because they are nouns in MT but are construed as verbs by the Translator. The 4 forms are יָדַע (yqtl > noun) in 3:19b, יָדָע (yqtl > noun) in 1:10a and 8:4a, יָדָע (yqtl > noun) in 10:17b. On the contrary, in 6 instances, the forms are finite verbs in Ecclesiastes but are not construed as such in Greek Ecclesiastes. The 6 forms are יָדַע (yqtl > noun) in 5:16a, יָדָע (yqtl > noun) in 5:16b, יָדָע (yqtl > participle) in 8:10a, יָדָע (yqtl > noun) in 10:10b or יָדָע (yqtl > noun) and יָדָע (yqtl > noun) in 12:9b. These 6 instances are excluded from the total verbs to be analyzed. The legitimate finite forms for analysis, therefore, total 454.

The Hebrew verbs in Ecclesiastes can be categorized into three groups according to their forms. The first group includes prefix forms, which are formed by adding prefixes (yqtl). The combined forms with waw (wyqtl and wayyqtl) are also

---

351 The method for analysis is borrowed from Gentry, Greek Job, 176-215.
352 See p. 18 of this dissertation.
353 See p. 20 of this dissertation.
354 See p. 20 of this dissertation.
355 See p. 22 of this dissertation.
356 See p. 14 of this dissertation.
357 See p. 14 of this dissertation.
358 See p. 15 of this dissertation.
359 See p. 17 of this dissertation.
added in the first group. The second group is suffix forms, which are formed by adding suffixes (*qtl*). The suffix form with *waw* (*wqtl*) is considered together in the second group. The final group is modal forms. The traditionally designated cohorative, which is marked by an ending á on *yqtl*, is categorized in the third group as the first person modal form although some recent studies do not agree. The evidence will indicate if the Translator construed the so-called cohortative forms as modal. The second person modal is imperative, which is equivalent to *yqtl* minus the prefix and is formally distinct. A problematic form may be the third person modal known as jussive because formal distinction between short and long prefix cannot be made in most roots and stems.\(^{361}\) The jussive forms can be distinguished only when the negative ב precedes or the short *yqtl* form exists.\(^{362}\) In the analysis below, all the indistinguishable *yqtl* forms are categorized into the prefix forms for convenience.

The analysis begins with prefix forms, and suffix forms and modal forms follow in succession. The forms are further classified into nine headings according to the relation with *waw*.\(^{363}\) Each heading is followed by subheadings, and the subheadings indicate which Greek form is used for the Hebrew form and how many instances are

---

\(^{360}\) See p. 17 of this dissertation.

\(^{361}\) So the jussive form and jussive function should be distinguished. Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §34.2.1; Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, §114g.


\(^{363}\) The nine headings are *yqtl*, *wyqtl*, *wayyqtl*, *qtl*, *wqtl*, Imperative with *waw* prefix, Imperative without *waw* prefix, Short *yqtl/yqtl* + á suffix: with *waw* prefix, and finally, Short *yqtl/yqtl* + á suffix: without *waw* prefix.
attested for the pattern. For example, the subheading, \( yqlt > \) Future Indicative (114),
means the \( yqlt \) form is rendered by the future indicative in 114 instances. The
occurrences are listed below the subheading. A commentary discussing the evidence
follows.

**Prefix Forms (196)**

**\( yqlt (179) \).** For \( yqlt \) forms, the Translator employed future indicative, aorist
subjunctive, present indicative, participle, aorist indicative, present subjunctive,
infinitive, and present imperative.

\( yqlt > \) future indicative (114). The translator rendered \( yqlt \) by a future
indicative 114 out of 179 times (64 percent). The future indicative is a default rendering
for \( yqlt \) in Greek Ecclesiastes.

Evidence:

1:8a, 1:8b, 1:8b, 1:10a, 1:10a, 1:11b, 1:15a, 1:15b, 1:18b, 2:3b, 2:12b, 2:14b, 2:15a,
2:16b, 2:19a, 2:21b, 2:24a, 2:24a, 2:25a, 2:25a, 3:13a, 3:14a, 3:15b, 3:17a, 3:22a,
3:22b, 4:10a, 4:12a, 4:12b, 4:15b, 4:16a, 5:9a, 5:11a, 5:14a, 5:14b, 5:15a, 5:19a, 6:2a,
6:2a, 6:2a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:4a, 6:7b, 6:10b, 6:12b, 7:2b, 7:3b, 7:9b, 7:12b, 7:13b,
7:18b, 7:19a, 7:20b, 7:20b, 7:21a, 7:21b, 7:24b, 7:26b, 7:26b, 8:1b, 8:1b, 8:3a, 8:3b, 8:4b, 8:4b,
8:5a, 8:7b, 8:7b, 8:12b, 8:13a, 8:13a, 8:15b, 8:17a, 8:17a, 8:17b, 9:5a, 9:11b, 9:18b,
10:1a, 10:4b, 10:6b, 10:8a, 10:8b, 10:9a, 10:9b, 10:10a, 10:12b, 10:14b, 10:15a, 10:17b,
10:18a, 10:18b, 10:19b, 10:20b, 10:20b, 11:1b, 11:2b, 11:3b, 11:4a, 11:4b, 11:5b, 11:5b,
11:6b, 11:8a, 11:8a, 11:8b, 11:9b, 12:1b, 12:5a, 12:14a

Both the \( yqlt \) and its equivalent, the Greek future indicative, seem to represent
non-past time and imperfective aspect in these instances. Two examples are given for
illumination.

Examples:

2:14b καὶ ἔγνων καὶ γε ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν συνάντησα ἐν συνάντησε τοῖς πάσιν αὐτοῖς

2:16b ἐξεύρεσα τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἐπιστήμης ἡ γενέσθαι

orgen, noort, ephemer, ephemer, ephemer
In 2:14b the yqtl form יִרְעַ֖ל occurs in a gnomic statement. What 
Qoheleth relates is not a particular event, but an event generally true to life. 364 This kind of gnomic statement may denote non-past time and possibly imperfective aspect. 365 The Translator probably employed the Greek future for the gnomic sense, so the Greek future may imply non-past imperfective notion. The NETS translation reflects this sense by using the present tense in English: “and I know, indeed I, that one eventuality befalls them all.” 366

The יִרְעַ֖ל-clause in 2:16b is a rhetorical question and implies that both the wise and the fool die and are soon forgotten. The adverb יָפָֽתָֽ(“already”) refers to a near future. 367 Death may imply not only physical death but also forgetfulness of them. The rhetorical question states a recurring universal truth, which can be expressed in


365 The theory proposed by Gentry on the Hebrew verbal system may be applied to support the analysis of the example. The discourse framework of the clause is non-sequential monologue. The monologue is regarded as conversation—i.e., self-conversation. The mood is assertive because the verb is non-initial position. According to Gentry’s theory, when yqtl occurs in the non-sequential monologue and in assertive it represents non-past time and imperfective aspect. More precisely, the gnomic statement belongs to the category of epistemic modality. Gentry employs the terms assertive and projective for Hebrew moods. He uses the term assertive for both assertive and epistemic modality. According to Hendel’s definition, epistemic modality involves that “speaker’s opinion or knowledge about a proposition, as in statements of doubt, belief, or other shades of expectation or opinion.” The projective covers deontic modality, which is signaled by initial position. See Gentry, “System of the Finite Verb,” 21-35, 39; R.S. Hendel, “In the Margins of the Hebrew Verbal System: Situation, Tense, Aspect and Mood,” *ZAH* 9 (1996): 169.


367 Fox, *Qoheleth*, 184.
imperfective aspect. The Greek gnomic future is chosen to be an equivalent to the *yqtl* in 2:16b. ³⁶⁸

*yqtl > aorist subjunctive (32).* In 32 instances *yqtl* is rendered by an aorist subjunctive (18 percent). Thirty one instances occur in dependent clauses and 1 case in an independent clause. ³⁶⁹ The dependent clauses include conditional, temporal, final, and indefinite relative clauses.

Evidence:
2:3b, 3:11b, 3:14b, 3:22b, 4:10a, 4:10b, 4:11a, 4:11b, 4:12a, 5:3a, 5:3b, 5:5b, 5:7a, 6:3a, 7:14b, 7:16b, 7:17b, 7:21b, 8:3b, 8:17a, 8:17b, 9:10a, 9:12b, 10:4a, 10:11a, 11:3a, 11:3a, 12:1b, 12:2a, 12:3a, 12:6a, 12:7b.

In 9 instances *yqtl* occurs in a conditional clause and follows the particle אֶל. ³⁷⁰ The conditional particle אֶל is rendered by ἐὰν, which is regularly followed by subjunctive. ³⁷¹ The subjunctive is employed for *yqtl* to fit to the protasis of the Greek conditional sentences. ³⁷² In the following example the Translator employed the aorist

³⁶⁸ Once more Gentry's theory is tested by this case. The discourse framework is a non-sequential monologue. Since the statement implies expectation of death, and the *yqtl* is non-initial position, the mood is assertive (i.e., epistemic modality). These data produce imperfective aspect with non-past time. Gentry, "System of the Finite Verb," 39.

³⁶⁹ The 3 instances in 5:5b, 7:16b, and 7:17b occur in independent clauses (rhetorical questions) in Hebrew, but the independent clauses are rendered by dependent clauses. The one instance of the independent clause both in Hebrew and in Greek is 4:11b.

³⁷⁰ The 9 instances are: 4:10a, 4:11a, 4:12a, 5:7a, 6:3a, 10:4a, 10:11a, 11:3a, 11:3a.

³⁷¹ LSJ, s.v. "ἐὰν."

³⁷² Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 188.
(πέσωσιν) for yqtl (יִשְׁלָל) to describe the “falling” in a consummative sense.\textsuperscript{373}

Example:
4:10a δει ςε ςεσωςιν ὧν εἰς ἐγερθεὶ τὸν μέτοχον αὐτοῦ

In 8 instances the yqtl occurs in a temporal clause. The Translator construed five independent clauses introduced by ἐστιν as temporal and employed Greek temporal clauses for them, introduced by ἔσομεν οὐ or ἔσομεν ὡς (2:3b, 12:1b, 12:2a, 12:6a, 12:7b)\textsuperscript{374} The temporal conjunctions ἔσομεν οὐ or ἔσομεν ὡς generally take either aorist indicative or aorist subjunctive.\textsuperscript{375} The Translator understood the clause as indefinite and employed the subjunctive for yqtl.\textsuperscript{376}

Example:
12:1a ἡμέρας εἰρήνης ἡ ἡμέρας ἁρματίκης
12:1b ὡς ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητος σου
12:1a καὶ μνήσθητε τοῦ κτίσαντός σε ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητος σου
12:1b ἔσομεν ὡς σου μὴ ἔλθωσιν ἡμέραι τῆς κακίας

The event in 12:1b is expected to occur at an uncertain future time, so the subjunctive is a proper mood to express the indefinite time. The aorist presents perfective aspect describing the arrival of the evil days in a summary picture.

\textsuperscript{373}For the consummative sense of aorist aspect in subjunctive, see Fanning, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 394; Wallace, \textit{Greek Grammar}, 559-561.

\textsuperscript{374}The yqtl form יִשְׁלָל in 12:7b is understood to be governed by ἐμύθα in 12:6a. For the case in which ἔσομεν takes the subjunctive the particle ἐν has been allowed to fall out in Hellenistic Greek, see Moulton, \textit{Prolegomena}, 168; BDF, \textit{Greek Grammar}, §383 (2).

\textsuperscript{375}Bauer, s.v. “ἔσομεν.”

\textsuperscript{376}Cf. LSJ, s.v. “ἔσομεν.”
The relative particle י in 4:10b and its compound form י in 9:12b are also construed as temporal and are rendered by ὅταν.

Example:

4:10b καὶ οὐκ ἀυτῷ τῷ ἐνὶ ὅταν πέσῃ καὶ μὴ ἢ δεύτερος τοῦ ἐγείραν αὐτὸν

In 4:10b the temporal particle ὅταν is parallel to ἐάν in the previous line (4:10b) and is used almost in the conditional force.377 In Hellenistic Greek ὅταν usually takes a subjunctive as ἐάν does.378 The aorist is used again to provide the global picture of the event.

In 5:3a the Translator employed the aorist subjunctive (ἐξῆκεν) for the יָדָל (יָדָלָה), which is in the temporal clause introduced by וַיַּהֲנָה.

5:3a καὶ ἀκόμη ἄν εὐχὴν τῷ θεῷ μὴ χρονίσῃς τοῦ ἀποδοθήναι αὑτῷ

The relative וַיָּהֲנָה is rendered by καθὼς Ἀν, which requires a subjunctive verb. The Translator used the aorist because he understood the activity of “making a vow” with a constative sense.

There are 7 instances where יָדָל is rendered by an aorist subjunctive, which occurs in a final clause. The Translator construed the particles י in 3:14b and 7:14b, and ו in 3:11b and 7:21b as final, so rendered them by ἢνα and μὴ ποτε respectively.

Example:

3:14b καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἢνα φοβηθῶσιν ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ

377 Cf. LSJ, s.v. “ὅταν.”

378 See Robertson, Grammar, 1411f.; Porter, Idioms, 214.
In 3:14b, the subjunctive (φοβητω) is used for ἔγγισ (ἐν) because of ἵνα. The aorist portrays the fearing action in perfective aspect—perhaps in the constative sense.

In the other 3 instances the Translator employed the final clause for the rhetorical question introduced by ὅμως (5:5b, 7:16b, 7:17b).379

In all 3 instances the rhetorical question introduced by ὅμως follows two negative commands (ἐν plus jussive). For the rhetorical question the Translator employed hypotaxis begun with ἵνα or μήποτε. The Greek final conjunctions ἵνα and μήποτε are generally followed by subjunctives.380 The aorist in 5:5b may be ingressive, and the other two are consummative.

In 7 instances the Translator construed the relative clause as an indefinite and employed the aorist subjunctive for ἔγγισ in the indefinite relative clause. The relative ὅτα

379See p. 89 of this dissertation.
is rendered by ὡνα ἔλαν in 5:3b and by ὅ ἔλαν in 8:3b; ᾿Α is rendered by ὡνα ἔν in 8:17b; κ is rendered by ἡ ἔλαν in 12:3a; and the compound relative κη κ is rendered by ὅ ἔλαν in 3:22b and ἔν is rendered by ὡνα ἔν in 8:17b. The particle ἔλαν or ἔν requires subjunctive.

Example:
5:3b ἔν ὡνα ἔλαν ἔν ἐποδὸς

The subjunctive is suitable for the indefinite relative clause with ἔλαν. The Translator employed the aorist aspect to depict the activity of making a vow in a consummative sense.

In sum, there is justification for the Translator’s use of the aorist subjunctive for ὑετ in the dependent clause since Greek particles above normally take subjunctives. The norm of the target language requires the subjunctive. The aorist may be contextually chosen for perfective aspect mostly with a consummative or constative sense. According to Fanning, “the general pattern of usage in the subjunctive very strongly favors the aorist

---

380 For ἵνα indicative is also possible with ἔν. See LSJ, s.v. “ἵνα.” For μὴ ποτε, see Bauer, s.v. “μὴ ποτε.”

381 Both ἀνα ἐν in 8:17a and ἀνα in 8:17b are rendered by ὡνα ἔν because they are understood as a parallel.

382 F. C. Conybeare, and St. George Stock, Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), §105. The particle ἔλαν appears frequently instead of ἔν after relatives in Hellenistic Greek. After analyzing the papyri (Pentateuch), Thackeray concluded that “Ὁς ἔν was, thus, the usual form in iii/-ii/B.C. down to 133 B.C., when ὅς ἔλαν begins to come to the front, and from i/B.C. onwards the latter is always the predominant form.” Ibid., 68; also see BDF, Greek Grammar, §107.
over the present” in Hellenistic Greek. 383

Finally, 1 instance of the aorist subjunctive rendering $yqtl$ occurs in an
independent clause.

4:11b ἄρα ἔγρα καὶ
4:11b καὶ ὅ εἰς πῶς θερμανθῇ

The interrogative πῶς introduces a deliberative question in 4:11b, and one would expect a
negative answer. The deliberative question employs the deliberative subjunctive. 384 In
Hellenistic Greek πῶς noticeably favors the aorist subjunctive over the present
subjunctive. 385 The Translator, therefore, used the aorist subjunctive $θερμανθῆ$ for the
$yqtl$ ὅριον because of πῶς.

$yqtl >$ present indicative (12). Twelve times $yqtl$ is rendered by a present
indicative (7 percent). One can recognize the long prefix forms in 4:8a, 10:14a, and
11:2b, 386 and cannot distinguish the other forms whether they are long or short prefix
form.

Evidence:
1:3b, 4:8a, 5:15b, 6:4a, 7:7a, 8:5b, 9:4a, 10:14a, 10:16b, 10:19a, 11:2b, 11:3a

Since the Greek present denotes imperfective aspect, the Translator may have

383 Fanning’s remark is based on the aspect-frequency of NT subjunctive. See
Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 400, 402-04.

384 Bauer, s.v. “πῶς”; BDF, Greek Grammar, §366; Robertson, Grammar, 934f.

385 Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 400, 403.

386 The $yqtl$ forms in 4:8a and 11:2b follow negative particle $καί$, which are
always with a long prefix form; and $בָּרָב$ (III-ו verb) in 10:14a appears clearly as long
prefix form in Hiphil 3 m.s.
employed Greek present indicative to portray the imperfective aspect of Hebrew *yqtl*,
carrying the conception of a process as event in progress.\(^{387}\)

In 11 instances *yqtl* occurs in a gnomic sentence (92 percent). The Translator
employed the gnomic present for the *yqtl*.\(^{388}\) Eight instances of the 11 occur in proverbial
sayings,\(^{389}\) and another 3 instances describe regularly recurring actions in human life.\(^{390}\)

Examples:

\[
\begin{align*}
10:14a & \quad \text{καὶ ὁ ἀφρων πληθύνει λόγους} \\
10:14a & \quad \text{καὶ ο} \text{δ} \text{αφρων πληθύνει λόγους} \\
1:3a & \quad \text{δισεχθηρός ἐστιν ἡμιἀθήρα} \\
1:3b & \quad \text{ἐστιν ἡμιἀθήρα} \\
1:3a & \quad \text{τίς περισσεύει τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ ἐν παντὶ μόχθω αὐτοῦ} \\
1:3b & \quad \text{ἔστω μορφηὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου}
\end{align*}
\]

Structurally 10:14a is located in a collection of proverbs on wisdom and folly.
Qoheleth compares the wise and the fool in 10:1-15. Speaking many words is described
as a characteristic of the fool. Qoheleth expresses this universal character of the fool by
the *yqtl* form. In Hellenistic Greek, the gnomic present conveys this type of generic idea.
The Greek present indicative in 10:14a, therefore, is the proper equivalent for *yqtl* to
convey the gnomic notion.

The statement in 1:3 specifies the general statement in 1:2b (“All is vanity”).\(^{391}\)
By this phrase in 1:2b, Qoheleth teaches that all human efforts are meaningless (1:3).


\(^{389}\) The 8 instances are 7:7a, 8:5a, 9:4a, 10:14a, 10:16b, 10:19a, 11:2b, 11:3a.

\(^{390}\) The 3 instances are 1:3b, 5:15b, 6:4a.
This is further explained in 1:4-11 with the analogy between the relentless circularity of nature and that of human activities. The circularity of human activities (1:9-11) is noted in 1:3b. Every man toils, and the toiling recurs. The yqtl (יָדוֹת) captures the indefinite repetition in imperfective aspect. The Greek gnomic present is properly employed for the gnomic yqtl.

In 1 instance Qoheleth uses yqtl to relate an event that he has seen (4:8a). The present indicative used for the yqtl may be historical present.

4:8a אֲנִי אֵלֵךְ כֹּל נָשִׁים בַּגָּדֶשׁ נָשָׁה קָוָה לְכוֹל יִשְׂרָאֵל
יָדוֹת לְכָל הָעֵדֶן
4:8a ἐστίν εἰς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν δεύτερος καὶ γε νῦν καὶ ἀδελφὸς οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν περασμός τῷ παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ
cαι γε ἰδίως αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐμπίπτεται πλοῦτου

A person, who is alone without an heir, achieves wealth through continual labor. Nonetheless, the wealth does not satisfy him. This general situation of the person is conveyed in verbless clauses. The yqtl (יָדוֹת) highlights the message of Qoheleth. Even though the message is proverbial, Qoheleth presents it as an historical event. Its temporal reference is past in the context. The aspect of the verb is imperfective. Dissatisfaction of the rich is described as an on-going state. The Greek historical present is an excellent equivalent to the yqtl, which is used for the vivid narration of the past

391English translation is from NASB.


3938:7 “Then I looked again at vanity under the sun” (NASB).
event. 394

*yqtl > participle* (8). Eight instances of *yqtl* are rendered by participles (4 percent), and all follow relatives ו or ראש. 395 The Translator employed arthrous participles for all the Hebrew relative clauses.

Evidence:
1:9a, 1:9a, 1:11b, 1:11b, 2:18b, 8:7a, 10:14b, 10:14b.

Functionally, 7 instances are substantival participles, and 1 is an attributive participle in the second attributive position. 396

Examples:
(substantival)
1:11b
לארכיחת להב ו Türkiye לארכיחת
1:11b קא יכ יוחס אコーヒ גנומנוכיס
ואכ יאכ איכ יוחס מיהמ מיתא תוני גנומנוכיס אל ככ יוחס

(attributive)
2:18b
שאינת אלאכ שיארכחא אקית

394 Fanning argues that the historical present is aspectually neutral. On the contrary after presenting four different views on the historical present Porter contends that the historical present is to be aspectually imperfective. The Translator seems to have understood the *yqtl* in 4:8a as imperfective and so employed the present indicative to convey the same aspect. See Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 226-39; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 189-98. All the 12 instances above are in non-initial position (assertive) and are non-sequential form. The non-sequential *yqtl* in non-initial position may signify imperfective aspect according to Gentry (see his “System of the FiniteVerb,” 39). The eleven gnomic sentences are recounted in the mode of monologue, and the one historical *yqtl* is expressed in the narrative manner even though the form is poetic. If one applies Gentry’s theory, the temporal reference for the former is non-past, and that of the latter is past. The analysis based upon Gentry’s theory well matches the perspective of the Translator in these 12 instances. The gnomic present may denote imperfective in non-past time, and the historical present may be also imperfective but in past time.

395 Seven instances occur in the ו-clauses (1:9a, 1:11b, 1:11b, 2:18b, 8:7a, 10:14b); and 1 instance appears in the רָשָׁא-clause (10:14b).

396 The 7 instances of the substantival participles are in 1:9a, 1:9a, 1:11b, 1:11b, 8:7a, 10:14b, 10:14b. The 1 instance of the attributive participle is in 2:18b.
There are two identical $w$-clauses in 1:11b. The first $w$-clause modifies the antecedent $כערנ$. One would expect a Greek attributive participle for the Hebrew relative clause modifying the antecedent, but the Translator did not follow the syntax of 1:11b in Ecclesiastes. He employed a substantival participle for the attributive relative clause and took the antecedent as the predicate adjective for the participle. On the other hand, the second $w$-clause functions as a substantival clause, and the Translator employed a substantival participle for it as a functional equivalent. The forms of the two clauses are the same in Hebrew, but their functions are different: one is attributive, and the other is substantival. The Translator made the two clauses functionally parallel by using the substantival participles for both clauses.

In 2:18b, the Translator rendered the relative particle $w$ by the article τῷ and the $yql$ ἡμί by the participle γενόμενον. The relative clause functions as an attributive and modifies $יְהָנָא$. The Greek articular participle for the $w$-clause maintains the same attributive function.

As for tense and aspect, Greek tense seems to be related to function in the instances where the $yql$ is rendered by the articular participle. For the substantival participles, 5 instances are future (1:9a, 1:9a, 1:11b, 8:7a, 10:14b), and 2 are aorist (1:11b, 10:14b). For the attributive participle, the present is used.

---

397 See p. 109 of this dissertation.

398 See p. 108 of this dissertation.
Both aorist forms are parallel to two future forms respectively in the context. In 1:11b and 10:14b, *yqtl* forms are rendered by two pairs of participles (i.e., aorist and future). The aorist is employed for the relative past time, and the future for the relative future time. The case of 10:14b is presented as an example:

10:14b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>אָוַקּוּ</th>
<th>הָּגָּנֵו</th>
<th>הָּגָּנֵו</th>
<th>הָּגָּנֵו</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָּגָּנֵו</td>
<td>הָּגָּנֵו</td>
<td>הָּגָּנֵו</td>
<td>הָּגָּנֵו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same *yqtl* forms (יהוה) in the relative clauses are rendered by the aorist (גֶּנֶּמֶנָּן) in the first line and by the future (אָסוּמֵנָּן) in the second line. The adverbial phrase מָאָהָהָה הָּן (“after it”) supports that the future denotes the relative future time. Consequently the aorist is used for the relative past time. In 1:11b the Translator also employed two different tenses (the aorist גֶּנֶּמֶנָּן and the future גֶּנֶּמֶנָּן) for the same forms (יהוה) to signify the different temporal reference.

The other 3 future forms are also employed to specify the relative future time according to the contexts (1:9a, 1:9a, 8:7a).

Example:

1:9a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>תִּזְנוּ</th>
<th>הָּגָּנֵו</th>
<th>הָּגָּנֵו</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָּגָּנֵו</td>
<td>הָּגָּנֵו</td>
<td>הָּגָּנֵו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1:9a *qtl* הָּהָה contrasts with *yqtl* הָּהָה. The Translator also used the perfect גֶּנֶּמֶנָּן for the *qtl* and the future גֶּנֶּמֶנָּן for the *yqtl* as contrast. The future must signify a future time, in which the event has not yet happened.

The Translator used the present tense in 2:18b where the articular participle was used as an attributive.

2:18b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>לָאָבְּד הָּרֵה</th>
<th>הָּרֵה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָּרֵה</td>
<td>הָּרֵה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The adverbial phrase clearly indicates the relative future time. One would expect the future tense for the *yqtl* based upon the normal pattern of the Translator and upon the context. Codex Alexandrinus attests to the future γένησόμενον instead of γνωσόμενον, which is in Rahlf’s text. The future tense seems to be the original. If the present is original, the Translator may have understood the situation not as future but as contemporary time and viewed the action as on-going.

In sum, when *yqtl* is rendered by the substantival participle, the Translator normally employed the future participle for the *yqtl* (63 percent) and used the aorist to elucidate different temporal references. The present participle, which is used attributively in 2:18b, may be not an original but could be employed to express the contemporary on-going situation.

**yqtl > aorist indicative (4).** In 4 instances the Translator rendered *yqtl* by the aorist indicative. Three of these are long prefix forms, and 1 instance is not distinguishable as either a long or short prefix form. The former instances are all either proverbial sayings or the theological propositions. An example is given for illustration.

**Evidence:**
3:14a, 8:10a, 9:12a, 10:14b.

**Example:**
3:14א הָעָמַד לְכָלָא אָשָׁר יְשֻׁשָׁשׁ אֶלָּא אֶלָּא אֶלָּא לְעָשַׁל
3:14א ἐγὼν ὅτι πάντα οὐκ έποίησεν ὁ θεός αὐτὰ ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

---

399 For how the Translator rendered the *yqtl* after a similar adverbial phrase (מִבָּאָרָר), see above discussion on 10:14b.

400 The 3 long forms are in 3:14a, 9:12a, 10:14b; and the indistinguishable form is in 8:10a.
The aorist indicative ἔποιησεν is employed for the yiqtol הָנָשָׁה in a theological proposition. There is a temporal and aspectual contrast between God making all and it having existed forever. The former activity is portrayed as a whole and perceived in the relative past time by the context. The latter state is, on the contrary, depicted as imperfective and in the relative future time. Here the aorist is used in contrast to the future with respect to tense and also with respect to aspect. The aorist (γίνω) in 9:12a is clearly gnomic, and the aorist (γίνω) in 10:14b is employed for relative past time contrasting with relative future time (ἔγαγελεί).

8:10a καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πόλει οἱ ἄγιοι ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ ἔπηκεθησαν ἐν τῇ πόλει

In 8:10a the Translator construed the yiqtol form הָלָךְ to have a preterite value and employed the aorist indicative (ἐπορεύθησαν). The preterite value is judged by the sequence, not by the form, because the form is not distinguishable as either a long or short prefix. The yiqtol is followed by וְיִקְתָל (וְיוֹשֵׁב), and the וְיִקְתָל is evidently a short prefix form. The yiqtol, therefore, is to be construed as short. The aorist indicative is a proper equivalent to the alleged short yiqtol. The action of going from the temple is portrayed in a constative sense and is seen as antecedent to the time of speaking.

yiqtol > present subjunctive (4). In 4 instances yiqtol is rendered by a present subjunctive, all in dependent clauses. The Translator strongly favored an aorist

401 According to Gentry, yiqtol within a narrative frame may be rendered as a customary imperfective in the past time: “he would go.”

402 It is a short form because of the pronominal suffix יָוָה. The long form would have יָוָה. See Gentry, “System of the Finite Verb,” 12.
subjunctive (32 times) over a present subjunctive (4 times) for *yqtl*.403

Evidence:
2:18b, 4:17a, 5:17a, 8:12b.

The Translator construed the רְשָׁאָם-clause in 4:17a and the ש-clause in 5:17a as indefinite relative clauses and employed ϕ ἐὰν for both relatives. In 2:18b he interpreted the particle ש as causal and rendered it by ἐν.404 Finally the Translator understood the רְשָׁאָם-clause in 8:12b as a final clause and utilized a διὰ τοῦ. According to Greek norms, the subjunctive is appropriate for such a dependent clause. The evidence for the present subjunctive may not be sufficient to generalize why the Translator chose the present subjunctive over the aorist in these 4 instances. Comparison with respect to aspect may be helpful to understand the Translator’s decision. Good examples are 5:17a and 8:17a.

(yqtl > present subjunctive)
5:17a καὶ τούτων ἀγαθωσύνην ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐὰν μικρὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἥλιων

(yqtl > aorist subjunctive)
8:17a διὸ καὶ μικρὸν ὑπὸ ἐνθρωπίας τοῦ ζητήσας καὶ αὐξένασε

The same yqtl form יאמ is rendered by the present subjunctive μικρὸν in 5:17a and an aorist subjunctive μικρὸν in 8:17a. In 5:17a the Translator viewed יאמ as an activity in the customary sense, of multiple repetitions.405 Thus, the imperfective aspect is the preferred form. On the other hand, the יאמ in 8:17a should be depicted as a

---


404 Both of them are introduced by ϕ ἐὰν.

complete action because the subsequent result clause (οὐχ ἐφησε) presupposes completion of the previous action. The perfective aspect is the form of choice.

The present subjunctive ἐάφιω in 2:18b may denote progression, in which “leaving wealth to posterity” is depicted as an activity in progress at the present time. In 4:17a the present πορεύθη signifies the customary activity of “going to the temple.” The focus is on the habitual repetition without regard for its beginning or end. Finally, φοβῶνται in 8:12b may be understood in the ingressive sense. The sinners should begin to fear God. In these examples, the Translator employed the present subjunctive to describe imperfective aspect in various senses.

Additionally, two interesting grammatical features are observed when the instances of the present subjunctive are compared to those of the aorist subjunctive. First, the aorist subjunctive never occurs in a causal clause, but the present subjunctive does in 2:18b. Second, the aorist subjunctive occurs in ὅπως clauses always with μὴ (3:11b, 7:21b), but a present subjunctive occurs in a ὅπως clause without μὴ (8:12b).

yqtl > infinitive (4). In 4 instances the Translator rendered yqtl by the infinitive. All of these occurrences are in nominal clauses in Ecclesiastes.

Evidence:
5:4a, 5:4b, 5:4b, 7:18a.

The Translator employed the substantival infinitives for the yqtl forms in the nominal clauses. The nominal clauses in 5:4a and 7:18a function as subjects. The instance in 5:4a is taken as an example.

Example:
5:4a ὁρὰς οὐκ ἀποκρίθη
5:4b μὴ προσέγγισην
5:4a ἄγαθον τὸ μὴ εὐδοκέως σε
5:4b ἂν τὸ εὐδοκέως σε καὶ μὴ ἀποδοθῶ
In 5:4a the Translator employed the substantival infinitive (εὐξαόθαμ) for 'yqtl (וּבַּרְכָּ֫ו) in the nominal clause, and the nominal clause functions as the subject. The relative particle 'אָל is translated by the article τό, and the accusative of the second person pronoun follows the infinitive as a subject of the infinitive. The articular infinitive in nominative could function as a subject in Hellenistic Greek. The infinitive, therefore, is a good functional equivalent to the 'yqtl in the nominal clause.

In 5:4b, 2 'yqtl forms (חָיָר and חָמַל) are found in the nominal clause functioning as the object of the preposition 'ב. The preposition 'ב is comparative and is rendered by the Greek comparative particle ἐπί. The Translator utilized the substantival infinitives for the 'yqtl forms as functional equivalents.

'yqtl > present imperative (I). Finally there is 1 instance where 'yqtl is rendered by a present imperative. Although one can not determine whether the form is a long or short 'yqtl, by the context it must have been construed as a modal.

The same pattern of translation is seen in 7:18a.

The short 'yqtl is not in initial position. Gentry argues that the projective can be in non-initial position when the initial position is used for focus. The adverbial
The Translator recognized the parallelism and employed imperatives for the 2 yqtl. One may expect the aorist for the short yqtl because the short yqtl has a preterite value. The Translator used the aorist ὄστερησέω for the ἔφπρασε, but the present ἑστῶσαν for ἔδρα, because the verb εἰμί does not have an aorist form for imperative.

**w*̇yqtl (14).** A w*̇yqtl form occurs fourteen times in Ecclesiastes. The Translator employed six different combinations of Greek tenses and moods to render w*̇yqtl: aorist subjunctive, future indicative, present indicative, aorist indicative, aorist imperative, and participle. The translation pattern for w*̇yqtl is roughly identical to that of yqtl. For yqtl, the Translator mainly employed a future indicative (63 percent), aorist subjunctive (18 percent), and present indicative (7 percent). These are the major three tenses, which the Translator employed for w*̇yqtl: an aorist subjunctive (36 percent), future indicative (21 percent), and present indicative (14 percent). The first place is switched between yqtl (future indicative) and w*̇yqtl (aorist subjunctive), but the future indicative is functionally parallel to the aorist subjunctive in Hellenistic Greek. The data, therefore, indicate that the Translator treated the functional value of w*̇yqtl as similar to that of yqtl.

---

phrase ָלֶֽךְ may be understood as a focus in 9:8a. The short form following ָלֶֽךְ (such as ἐπιμελ in 9:8b) has more freedom in word order because it could hardly be read as anything but a projective. See Gentry, “System of the Finite Verb,” 35-38.

408 The order is according to frequency.

409 It totals 88 percent.

410 It totals 71 percent.

411 Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 411; Robertson, *Grammar*, 924-25;

w^qtl > aorist subjunctive (5). The Translator employed an aorist subjunctive for w^qtl 5 times out of 14 (36 percent). These instances are concentrated in 12:5-6.

Evidence:
12:5a, 12:5a, 12:5a, 12:6a, 12:6b.

In 12:5a, 3 w^qtl forms (יָנָה, יָנָה, and יָנָה) are rendered by aorist subjunctives (אָנֹת, פָּחַסְתִּי, and דָּיוֹסָכָּלָהִי) with the conjunction קאֵל. The Translator seems to have construed qqt (לִבּוּ) in the previous line as a main verb and rendered it by a future indicative (דַּגְּשׁוֹת). He understood the following 3 w^qtl forms as contingent and employed aorist subjunctives. Gentry’s translation reflects properly the sense of contingency carried in these subjunctives: “Indeed they will see from heights, and terror will be in the road; when the almond tree blossoms, the grasshopper becomes fat and the caper-berry is scattered.”

In 12:6a and 12:6b the Translator rendered 2 w^qtl forms (חַבּוּ and רָמַה) by aorist subjunctives (פָּחַסְתִּי and דָּיוֹסָכָּלָהִי) with קאֵל. The Translator had to utilize the subjunctives because the verbal forms must be compatible with the indefinite temporal

413 For the first weyqtl הָיְנָה, the Translator understood its root as הָיְנָה not הָיְנָה. cf. GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §73g.
conjunction ἐως ὑπο. There are 5 instances where ὑγτ is rendered by an aorist subjunctive following ἐως ὑπο or ἐως ὑ ο (2:3b, 12:1b, 12:2a, 12:6a, 12:7b). The evidence demonstrates that Translator may have treated the functional value of ὑγτ as nearly equivalent to ὑγτ.

\[ \text{węęgte} > \text{future indicative (3).} \] The Translator employed a future indicative for ὑęgte 3 times out of 14 (21 percent).

Evidence:
11:8b, 12:4b, 12:4b.

In these instances the Translator seems to have treated the value of ὑęgte as that of ὑγτ. 11:8b is taken as an example.

11:8a ἡμὴ ἡ ἡσαβάθεν
11:8b ἠμὴ ἡ ἡσαβάθεν
11:8a ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς εὐφρανθῆται
11:8b καὶ μηθῆται τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ σκότους

The structure of 11:8a and 11:8b is a chiastic parallelism (A B / B' A'). By the context, the ὑγτ (ῥήμα) and ὑęgte (ῥήμα) are identical in their functional values. The Translator recognized this and employed the same future indicative for both forms.

\[ \text{węęgte} > \text{present indicative (2).} \] In 2 instances the Translator rendered ὑęgte by a present indicative (14 percent). In both cases the imperfective aspect of the present indicative is emphasized.

Evidence:
2:19a, 7:7b.

2:19a ἡμὶ ἡμὴ ἡ ἡσαβάθεν ἡ ἡσαβάθεν ἡ ἡσαβάθεν
2:19a καὶ τίς οἶδεν εἰ σοφὸς ἦστε ἡ ἀπρων καὶ ἡσουσιάζεται εἰν παντὶ μόχθῳ μου

\[ \text{414 Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 11.} \]
The temporal reference is future by context. Since the $\text{yqtl}$ is rendered by the future indicative $\varepsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$, one would expect the future indicative also for $\text{w'yqtl}$. The Translator employed the present indicative $\varepsilon\zeta\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha\zeta\varepsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ with $\kappa\alpha\iota$ for $\text{w'yqtl}$. The present is probably a futuristic present. The future event is described as though it were already present. The futuristic present provides vividness and certainty. By utilizing the present indicative the Translator depicted the future scene as an on-going process with vividness.  

7:7a ἢ ἡ ὑπόθεσις ἤχολλα ἰχθὺς
7:7b ῶ ἐν οἴκῳ ἀμεθέω
7:7a δὲ ἡ συκοφαντία περιφέρει σοφῶν
7:7b καὶ ἀπόλλυσι τὴν καρδίαν εὐτονίας αὐτοῦ

The statements in 7:7 are proverbial. The $\text{yqtl}$ and $\text{w'yqtl}$ must be gnomic. The Translator employed gnomic presents for both $\text{yqtl}$ and $\text{w'yqtl}$. This instance provides another evidence that the Translator understood $\text{w'yqtl}$ to be functionally identical to $\text{yqtl}$. He used the present to portray the process of “destroying” as being in progress and not as complete.

$\text{w'yqtl} > \text{aorist indicative (2)}$. There are 2 instances where the Translator employed an aorist indicative for $\text{w'yqtl}$ (14 percent).

Evidence:
6:12a, 8:10a.

---

415 For the futuristic present, see Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 221-26; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 230-32; Robertson, *Grammar*, 869-70; DBF, *Greek Grammar*, §323.

416 For the gnomic present, see Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 208-17; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 217-25; Robertson, *Grammar*, 866.
The \( w^\varepsilon yqtl \) in 8:10a has been addressed above in the discussion of \( yqtl \) in 8:10a.\(^{417}\) The \( w^\varepsilon yqtl \) in 6:12a must now be examined.

The form \( yqtl \) in 6:12a is indistinguishable whether it is a long prefix and a short prefix. It is possible that the Translator read \( w^\varepsilon yqtl \) as \( wayyqtl \) having preterite value. In context, the temporal reference of 6:12a is relative past to that of 6:12b. The \( yqtl \) in 6:12b implies relative future, and it is clarified by the adverbial phrase \( \text{εἰς} \)...

The Translator understood the contrasting temporal references and employed the aorist for the past event and the future for the future event. The perfective aspect of the aorist is the form of choice to describe the transient character of human existence, which is numbered.\(^{418}\) In this context, the use of the imperfective aspect may not be suitable because of the emphasis on the brevity of life.\(^{419}\)

\( w^\varepsilon yqtl > \text{aorist imperative (I).} \) In 11:9a the Translator employed aorist imperative for \( w^\varepsilon yqtl \).

\(^{417}\)See p. 155 of this dissertation.

\(^{418}\)Cf. Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 58;

\(^{419}\)Cf. Gordis, *Koheleth*, 254
καὶ ἀγαθοῦνται σε ἡ καρδία σου ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητός σου
καὶ περιπάτει ἐν ὀδοῖς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὄρεσι ὀφθαλμῶν σου

The w'ytqtl form has a pronominal suffix (יְשִׁיבָ), so one is unable to determine whether it is a long or short prefix. The form follows the imperative שָׁמֵה and precedes another imperative with waw, וָּוָ. The subjects of the verbs change from the second person to the third person, and again to the second person. Volitional forms may be connected in various combinations by the conjunctive waw in Biblical Hebrew. The Translator construed the w'ytqtl as projective, presumably by the context and employed the imperative ἀγαθοῦνται for it as he did for the other two Hebrew imperatives. The aorist seems to denote the ingressive sense—“to begin doing good.”

w'ytqtl > participle (I). In 1:18b the w'ytqtl form יְשִׁיבָ is rendered by the articular participle ὁ προστιθείς with καὶ. The articular participle functions as a subject.

There may be more than one way to explain the rendering. First, the Translator could have read יְשִׁיבָ as a Qal participle. There are 2 instances in MT where the form is a participle (יְשִׁיבָ) but vocalized like Hiphil yqtl (yōsip) in defective spelling (Isa 29:14; 38:5). The form יְשִׁיבָ in 1:18 may be understood as the same as the 2 instances in Isaiah but with plene spelling. Another possibility is that the Translator might have read the form as a w'ytqtl but deliberately translated it by the participle. There

420 Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §39.2.5.
421 For the general aspects of the aorist imperative, see Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 366-70.
is a case where the Translator rendered *yqtl* by a substantival participle in Greek Ecclesiastes (1:11b). Whether the Translator construed the form in question as a participle or as a simple *yqtl* with *waw*, either form can be understood to be a subject clause for the main clause. The articular participle, therefore, is an excellent functional equivalent to ידוע.

*wayyqtl* (3). The form *wayyqtl* occurs 3 times in Ecclesiastes, and all are rendered by an aorist indicative.

*wayyqtl > aorist indicative* (3). The *wayyqtl* forms are ידוע in 1:17a and ידוע in 4:1a and 4:7a.

Evidence:
1:17a, 4:1a, 4:7a.

The form ידוע in 1:17a has the so-called cohortative י-, but the Translator did not construe the form as a projective. This evidence may support the theory by Gentry and Shulman who argue that the י- suffix does not mark projective but indicates an action directed towards the speaker. All the 3 *wayyqtl* forms in Ecclesiastes follow *wqtl* or *qtl* in sequence. One example is given for illustration.

Example:
4:1a ידוע אָנִי ידוע אָנִי ידוע

4:1a καὶ ἐπέστρεψα ἐνώ καὶ εἶδον σὺν πάσας τὰς συμφαντίας

The Translator understood the *wqtl* (רשב) as having perfective aspect and past time reference. He construed the following *wayyqtl* (אָנִי) as having the same

---

422 BDB, s.v. "ימא"
functional value as the $w^qtl$. The aorist indicative is a proper equivalent to the $waw$ consecutive form.

In sum, the default equivalent for $yqtl$ is a future indicative. The translation pattern of $w^yyqtl$ is akin to that of $yqtl$. The Translator frequently employed an aorist subjunctive for $yqtl$ or $w^yyqtl$ either as an alternative for a future indicative or according to the norms of the target language, which requires the subjunctive in certain dependent clauses. He used the gnomic aorist for proverbial statements and used the present indicative when the imperfective aspect is to be highlighted. The $waw$ consecutive form ($wayyqtl$) occurs only 3 times. They are all rendered by the aorist indicative as one would expect. Thus, the Translator was contextually sensitive and not entirely mechanical.

**Suffix Forms (202)**

$qtl$ (157). For $qtl$ forms, the Translator employed aorist indicative, participle, present indicative, perfect indicative, imperfect indicative, aorist subjunctive, and future indicative.

$qtl > aorist$ indicative (121). The Translator employed an aorist indicative for $qtl$ 121 times out of 157 (77 percent).

Evidence:
1:2a, 1:12a, 1:13b, 1:14a, 1:16a, 1:16a, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:17b, 2:1a, 2:2a, 2:3a, 2:4a, 2:4b, 2:4b, 2:5a, 2:6a, 2:7a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:9b, 2:10a, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:11a, 2:12b, 2:15a, 2:16b, 2:19a, 2:19a, 2:20a, 2:21b, 2:24b, 2:26a, 2:26b, 3:10a, 3:10a, 3:11a, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:12a, 3:14a, 3:14b, 3:16a, 3:17a, 3:18a, 3:19b, 3:20b, 4:3a, 4:3b,

The aorist indicative becomes the default rendering for *qtl* in Greek Ecclesiastes. This approach is standard. The data enhance the picture of a literalistic translation. No further discussion is necessary for the expected pattern. Focus is now to be turned to the evidence, in which *qtl* is not rendered by an aorist indicative.

*qtl > participle (18).* In 18 instances out of 157 *qtl* is rendered by a participle (11 percent). All *qtl* forms occur in relative clauses and follow the relative particle *הין* or *ו* except 5:8b where a relative particle is omitted.424

Evidence:
1:9a, 1:9a, 1:10b, 1:13a, 1:14a, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:17a, 3:15a, 4:2a, 4:3b, 5:8b, 7:19b, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:6b, 9:9a, 11:8b.

With regard to function, the attributive participle is dominant. In 16 instances the Translator employed an attributive participle for a relative clause, which functions attributively.425 The other 2 relative clauses function substantively and are rendered by the substantival participles.426

Examples:
(attributive)
1:10b קֶבֶרּ הָה הֹלְמַיִם וָאַרְשֵׁה יַדְּהֵי מֶלֶנְגַנֶּה

---

424 *ו*-clauses occur 8 times in 1:10b, 1:13a, 4:3b, 7:19b, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:6b, 9:9a; and *ו*-clauses also 8 times in 1:9a, 1:14a, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:17a, 3:15a, 4:2a, 11:8b.

425 The 16 instances are 1:10b, 1:13a, 1:14a, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:17a, 3:15a, 4:2a, 4:3b, 5:8b, 7:19b, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:6b, 9:9a, and 11:8b.
In 1:10b the second qtl follows-cat. The Translator rendered the relative clause by the articular participle. This participle is in the second attributive position modifying τοῖς αἰώνοι. In Ecclesiastes, היה he disagreed in number with its antecedent which is plural. The verb he occasionally neglects gender and number in Biblical Hebrew. The word is generally treated as singular. The disagreement, therefore, is allowed within the convention of Biblical Hebrew. The Translator literally rendered the antecedent as a plural and took the participle in plural, γενομένος, for היה he to match αἰώνοι rendering עלימים. The Translator seems to have noticed the inconsistency of the usage of היה, and corrected it to agree with the number of the antecedent. The translation is literalistic but not mechanical.

In 1:9a 2 qtl forms (יה and נשא) in כ- clauses are rendered by the substantival participles (γεγονός and πεποιημένον): "What is that which has happened? It is that which will happen! And what is that which has been done? It is that which will

---

426 The 2 instances are 1:9a and 1:9a.
427 The same problem of disagreement in number is observed in 1:13a and 2:9a.
428 Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar, § 150 k-m.
429 The plural form is treated as a singular in Isa 26:4, 45:17, and Dan 9:24. Isa 51:9 is the only place where is treated as a plural, and Ps 145:13 cannot be judged. In other places appears adverbially or in adverbial construction (1 King 8:13, Isa 45:17, Ps 61:5, 77:6, 77:8, 2 Chr 6:2). See Even-Shoshan, Concordance, s.v. עלימים; cf. Seow, Ecclesiastes, 110-11.
be done.”431 The Translator construed the ו- clauses as headless relative clauses.432 The
articular participles are excellent functional equivalents to the headless relative clauses.

With regard to tense and aspect, the perfect form occurs 9 times (50 percent),
aorist 6 times (33 percent), and present 3 times (17 percent). The perfect participle
denotes stativity resulting from the anterior occurrence.433 It could imply the
completeness of action or the resultant state. The temporal reference may be decided in
relation to the main verb but must describe some time influenced or continued from the
past.434

Example:

In 1:14a the perfect participle (πεποιημένα) signifies the completeness of the
action. The temporal reference of the action may be relatively past to the main verb “to
see.” The deeds had been done before Qoheleth saw. The verbal root of qtl rendered by

430 The Translator also changed the number of qtl in 1:13a and 2:9a from
singular to plural by the context. In both cases, the antecedent is בֵּן.

431 Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 1. Italics is mine.

432 It is headless because the relative clause does not have an antecedent (i.e.,
head) but implies it. The headless relative clause is often referred as an independent
relative clause.

433 The 9 instances of the qtl rendered by the perfect participle are 1:9a, 1:9a,
1:14a, 2:17a, 4:3b, 5:8b, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:6b. For the aspect of the perfect participle, see
Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 416-418.

434 Cf. Porter, Verbal Aspect, 394-400; Robertson, Grammar, 909.
the perfect participle is mostly concentrated on the *Niphal* form of נֶשֶׂךְ (7 times).\(^{435}\)

The Translator employed the aorist participle 6 times for *qtl*.\(^{436}\) Four of these are forms of רָהָד, which are rendered by γενόμενος.\(^{437}\) The aorist participle basically denotes the summary aspect.\(^{438}\) 1:10b is given for illustration.

Example:
1:10b קָרַת לָעַלְמָם אֵלָה יְהֹוָה מִשְׁפַּטֵנִי
1:10b הָעֵקְבָּה יַגְנָה אֲנַוְאִים אֲנַוְאִים יִנְסְבּוּ אֲנַוְאִים אֲנַוְאִים אֲנַוְאִים

The “ages” (τοῖς αἰῶναί) is summarized in aorist aspect (γενόμενος). The aorist participle implies the constative sense, which presents the occurrence of the “ages” as a whole.

Finally, present participles are used for 3 *qtl* forms.\(^{439}\) All contextually imply gnomic or universal facts and can be better understood in imperfective aspect. 1:13a provides an illustration:

1:13a כִּי חָלְלוּ לְהוֹדַע לְרֹאשׁ הַיּוֹם לְרֹאשׁ הַיּוֹם
1:13a כִּי בָּרַד לְהוֹדַע לְרֹאשׁ הַיּוֹם
1:13a כִּי בָּרַק לְהוֹדַע לְרֹאשׁ הַיּוֹם
1:13a כִּי בָּרַק לְהוֹדַע לְרֹאשׁ הַיּוֹם
1:13a כִּי בָּרַק לְהוֹדַע לְרֹאשׁ הַיּוֹם
1:13a כִּי בָּרַק לְהוֹדַע לְרֹאשׁ הַיּוֹם
1:13a כִּי בָּרַק לְהוֹדַע לְרֹאשׁ הַיּוֹם
1:13a כִּי בָּרַק לְהוֹדַע לְרֹאשׁ הַיּוֹם

The Translator must have understood the activities of Qoheleth expressed in *wqtl* and 2 infinitives (להמר, ויתר, and more) as past actions in perfective aspect since he expressed

\(^{435}\)The other two verbs are בָּעֵד (5:8b) and רָהָד (1:9a).

\(^{436}\)The 6 instances are 1:10b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 3:15a, 4:2a, 9:9a.

\(^{437}\)The verb רָהָד rendered by a participle occurs 5 times. One instance in 1:9a is rendered by a perfect participle which parallels the πεποιημένον in 1:9a. The other 2 verbs rendered by an aorist participle are רָהָד (4:2a) and תֶּבֶן (9:9a) and מָח (11:8b).

\(^{438}\)Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 413-16.

\(^{439}\)The 3 instances are 1:13a, 7:19b, 11:8b.
them in the aorist. The object (הָיָה) which Qoheleth explores is described in qtl (נְשָׁה).

The Translator interpreted נְשָׁה as occurrence in progress and so employed the present (γεννάω). Qoheleth examined something omnitemporal, which was happening at that moment.

In sum, the perfect participle renders qtl to portray the completeness or stativity of the occurrence. The aorist participle is used for qtl when the occurrence or activity is depicted as a whole in summary picture. The present participle is employed for something gnomic better described in progress. The temporal reference of the participle is decided in context.

qtl > present indicative (6). In 6 instances out of 157 qtl is rendered by a present indicative (4 percent).

Evidence:
2:23a, 3:20b, 5:2a, 5:14a, 8:4a, 12:13a.

Five instances of qtl are used in gnomic sentences, and the Translator usually employed the present indicative to express the non-past temporal deixis of the gnomic sayings in imperfective aspect.\(^{440}\) 3:20b is taken as an example:

3:20a
הָלֵֽלּ הָלֵֽלּ אֵלָֽהִים אֵלָֽהִים
3:20b
הָלֵֽלּ חָנֹֽן מַרְבָּעַֽים הָלֵֽלּ שׁוּמָֽה לָֽחָֽם
3:20a τὰ πάντα πορεύται εἰς τὸν θόν τίνα
3:20b τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνος καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐπιστρέφει εἰς τὸν χούν

A general statement is given in 3:20a and is specified in 3:20b. In 3:20b, the Translator rendered the first qtl form (הָלֵֽלּ) by an aorist indicative (ἐγένετο) and the

\(^{440}\)For the gnomic present, see Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 208-17; Porter, Idioms, 32-3; Wallace, Greek Grammar, 523-25.
second qtl (בַּש) by a present indicative (ἔπιστρέφει). By doing this, the Translator
contrasted the two events not only with respect to aspect but also with respect to temporal
reference. The present indicative reveals a progressive sense. Life is portrayed as a
process going back to dust and as a nonpast event. On the other hand “coming into
eexistence from dust” is depicted in a whole picture occurring in past time related to
“going back to dust.” The present indicative, therefore, is properly employed for the
parallel in the proverbial saying.

The qtl in 5:14a is also in gnomic sentence, but the case is related to the lexical
nature of the target language rather than context.

5:14a ἔπιστρέφει τοῦ πορευθήναι ὡς ἤκελ

The qtl form αἰε is rendered by a present indicative ἤκελ.441 The form ἤκελ is a
present form, but its sense is perfect: “to have come.”442 The qtl form may be understood
as the present perfect, which signifies a resulting perfect state in present time.443 The
perfect sense of ἤκελ, therefore, corresponds well to αἰε denoting a present perfect state.

There is 1 instance where the qtl is not gnomic but is rendered by the present
indicative.

12:13α τέλος λόγου τὸ πάν ἄκουεται

441 The line division of Rahlfs’ text is different from that of MT in this verse. An adjective ‘naked’ goes with the second line in MT, but with the first line in LXX.

442 LJS, s.v. “ yyn”; Bauer, s.v. “ yyn”; Robertson, Grammar, 337.

443 Cf. Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §30.5.2,
may convey a present perfect state emphasizing the completion of “hearing” in the context. The Translator employed the present πανίεται for qtl. The verb πανίω is often used as a perfective present in Hellenistic Greek.\footnote{Robertson, Grammar, 881.} Another possibility is that the Translator might have interpreted נתיות as performative.\footnote{For the discussion on the performative perfect, see Max Rogland, Alleged Non-Past Uses of Qatal in Classical Hebrew (Assen, Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003), 115-30.} The action “to be heard” is done in the very act of speaking. The Greek present indicative can also express the performative sense. In either case, the Translator was sensitive in rendering the subtle nuance of the qtl.

qtl > perfect indicative (5). There are 5 instances where qtl is rendered by a perfect indicative.

Evidence:
1:10b, 3:15a, 6:10a, 8:9a, 8:14a.

In 3 instances qtl follows the adverb עבד (1:10a, 3:15a, 6:10a).

Example:
1:10b מנה לה ישליטים אשר ישתים עלים
1:10b זה ימיון אם יואים יואים יתנויים ואתו י ePubthen הילום

The first מנה in 1:10b represents a present state, which has existed from the past. The present perfect state of the qtl is clarified by the adverb עבד (“already”). The Greek perfect indicative is an excellent equivalent to the qtl denoting the stativity.\footnote{Robertson, Grammar, 881.}

In the remaining 2 cases the Niphal form of לישן is construed as a perfect (8:9a, 8:14a).
Example:
8:9a

The noun מִשְׁפָּת is an antecedent of the אָב-clause and implies what has been already done by man—i.e., the present state of affairs resulting from a past action. The Translator interpreted the qtl 네ש in the relative clause as denoting stativity by the context. The verb is a transitive, so the emphasis may be on a completed action along with its results.447 The Greek perfect is a good choice to express the completed action.

qtl > imperfect indicative (3). In 3 instances qtl is rendered by an imperfect indicative. All of them are היה verbs occurring in the ו-clause.448

Evidence:
7:10a, 7:24a, 12:7a.

Example:
7:10a

The qtl form היה is rendered by the imperfect indicative היה.449 The Translator utilized the imperfect indicative to signify imperfective aspect and past-time reference.450 The former days (past) are compared to these days (present). The situation

---

446 For the stative aspect of the perfect, see Porter, Verbal Aspect, 251-59.
447 It is called the extensive perfect. See Robertson, Grammar, 893; Wallace, Greek Grammar, 577.
448 The particle ו is rendered by ὅτι (7:10a), ὥ (7:24a), or ὡς (12:7a).
449 When he construed היה as an action verb, the Translator used γίνομαι.
450 For the imperfect aspect and tense, see Porter, Verbal Aspect, 198-208; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 240-55.
of the past time seems to be described in a customary sense.\textsuperscript{451} The other 2 instances of $qtl$ (7:24a, 12:7a) are also rendered by the same customary imperfect in similar context where the state of the past is compared to that of the present.

$qtl >$ aorist subjunctive (2). There are 2 $qtl$ forms rendered by aorist subjunctives. Both instances occur in dependent clauses.

Evidence:
7:13b, 10:10a.

7:13b פִּ יְגִל לְחָטָא אַ שָּׁרַ שְׁנָא
7:13b בֵּי נַי קְדֹם קְוֵםָא אֲנָ דָּאֶ וחָדֶךְ בַּיְאָ הָאִ אֲנָ

The $qtl$ מְיַּשְׁרָא occurs in a headless relative clause, which functions as an object. Qoheleth used a rhetorical question to emphasize that no man can alter what God has done. The Translator employed an indefinite relative clause to highlight the emphasis by Qoheleth: “Whomever…” The indefinite relative clause with אֲנָ requires the subjunctive in Greek. The subjunctive in Hellenistic Greek strongly favors the aorist tense over the present.\textsuperscript{452} In aorist aspect the activity of God (“making crooked”) is summarized as a whole. The temporal deixis of the $qtl$ מְיַּשְׁרָא is understood as a relative past to the time of the main verb רְדַל לְהָקָא (“to be able to make straight”), which is rendered by the future indicative with the aorist infinitive (דַּעָּהְרָא תּוּ קְוֵםָא).\textsuperscript{453} Therefore, the aorist is used by the context, and the subjunctive is employed according to the norm of the target language.

10:10a בַּיְאָ הָאִ אֲנָ

\textsuperscript{451} For the customary imperfect, see Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 242-49.

\textsuperscript{452} Ibid., 402-04.

\textsuperscript{453} Turner, Syntax, 107.
10:10a ἐὰν εἰκέσῃ τῷ σιδήριον

The *qtl* ἡ δέ occurs in the protasis of the conditional sentence introduced by ἦν. The Translator employed ἐὰν for ἦν and the aorist subjunctive εἰκέσῃ for ἡ δέ. The subjunctive is the proper mood for the ἐὰν-clause in Hellenistic Greek. The aorist may denote the consummative sense emphasizing the conclusion of the process of “falling off.” The situation is relative past to that of the main verb in 10:10b where *qtl* is rendered by the future indicative.

*qtl > future indicative (2).* In 2 instances *qtl* is rendered by a future indicative.

Evidence:
4:14a, 7:22a.

Both cases are presented and are discussed.

(สัญญา in 4:14a)

4:13a ὁλὴ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἡ ἁμαρτία
4:13b τῶν μεταμορφομένων διὰ τῆς ἀναπείσθησις
4:14a ἀγαθὸς παῖς σένης καὶ σοφὸς
4:13b ὑπὲρ βασιλεά πρεσβύτερου καὶ ἀφρωνε οὐκ ἐγνώ τοῦ προσέχειν ἐτι
4:14a ὅτι ἐξ οἴκου τῶν δεσμῶν ἐξελύσεται τοῦ βασιλέως

The statement of 4:14a functions as a basis of the proverbial saying in 4:13. In 4:13 a poor and wise lad is compared with an old and foolish king. The one who becomes a king in 4:14a seems to be the lad in 4:13a. The Translator employed the future indicative ἐξελύσεται for the *qtl* ἡ δέ and accordingly, emphasized the relative future time of “becoming a new king” over the lad’s poor origin. It may be also possible that the Translator read ἡ δέ as *yēšē* (prefix form 3 m.s.).

---

454 The suffix form can be used for perfective future. See Gentry, “System of the Finite Verb,” 18-19; Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §30.4c.
There is a textual problem involved in 7:22a. The whole line in Greek Ecclesiastes shows *lectio duplex*. The adverbial phrase "plaintly" is rendered twice by πλειοστάκις and again by καθόδους πολλάς. The main verb ἡλθαί is probably read as ἦλθα because of the confusion of ἦ and ἦ. The presumed ἦλθα is also duplicated as πονηρεύσατελ and κακώσει. Since the Translator read the form in question as ἵπτελ not ἱπτεῖ, the future indicative is an expected equivalent for the presumed ἵπτελ.

It is noticeable that both instances rendered by future indicative involve *I-waw* verbs in Ecclesiastes. *I-waw* verbs in ἵπτελ 3 m. s. can be easily confused with ἵπτελ 3 m. s. in an unvocalized text.

*wqtl* (45). For *wqtl* forms, the Translator employed aorist indicative, aorist subjunctive, future indicative, present indicative, and noun.

*wqtl > aorist indicative* (25). In 25 out of 45 instances, the *wqtl* form is rendered by an aorist indicative (56 percent).

Evidence:
1:13a, 1:16a, 2:5b, 2:9a, 2:11a, 2:18a, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:15b, 2:17a, 2:18a, 2:20a, 3:22a, 4:1a, 4:4a, 4:7a, 5:13b, 5:18a, 8:15a, 8:17a, 9:16a, 12:3b, 12:5b.

---

*455* ἦλθα (vēra) is a 3 m.s. prefix form from the root הושע. The verb הוושע is rendered by כהכּ in 8:9b and also in 10:15 of B. Its adjective forms הוושע (rā`) or הוושע (rā`a) are rendered by כהכּ or כהכּ 7 times, and by πονηρός or πονηρία 22 times. The data support the suggestion that both πονηρεύσατελ and κακώσει in 7:22a are employed for הוושע. Cf. Jarick, *Concordance*, 268-269.

*456* *I.e.*, נַע in 4:14a, and הושע in 7:22a.
The *wqtl* follows *qtl* or is in the series of *wqtl* following *qtl* in 23 instances.\textsuperscript{457}

The Translator also employed the aorist indicative for the *qtl* beginning the sequence. The *waw* is, therefore, construed as a conjunctive not consecutive in these instances, and the functional value of *wqtl* is regarded to be identical to that of *qtl*.\textsuperscript{458} The instance of 1:13a is given for an example.

\begin{quote}
(תניח in 1:13a)

1:12 אַל הַכָּלָה חֵיקָה מִכָּל עֶשְׁרֵי נַעַר בְּדֶרֶךְ הַלֵּטַחְו

1:13a בְּתֵיתָּא אַבָּלוּ חֵיקָה מִכָּל הַלֵּטַחְו

1:12 אָי יִֽקְּרָא יִֽקְּרָא בְּאֵלָּתָא אַבָּלוּ בְּאֵלָּתָא עֵֽלֶּחְו יִֽקְּרָא

1:13a כָּל עַדָּוָא צָאַה קָרְדָּאָה מַעְּלָה תְּחַלְּגָּה כָּל קָרְדָּאָה מַעְּלָה תְּחַלְּגָּה

A *wqtl* form תניח in 1:13a follows *qtl* in 1:12. The Translator employed the aorist indicative for both *qtl* and *wqtl*. He must have understood the value of סָּרַסְתָּא to be the value of סָּרַסְתָּא and the *waw* to be a simple conjunction not a consecutive *waw*. In most instances where *wqtl* is rendered by aorist indicative, the form of *wqtl* is 1 c.s. The exceptions are 5:18a (3 m.s.) and 12:5b (3 m.p.). The broken *waw* consecutive is, therefore, focused on the cases where the Qoheleth introduces a narrative unit as a speaker or narrator.

For the other *wqtl* forms (5:13b and 12:3b) the aorist indicative is not employed by the sequence but by the contextual reason. Each case is discussed.

\textsuperscript{457}They are 1:13a, 1:16a, 2:5b, 2:9a, 2:9a, 2:11a, 2:12a, 2:13a, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:15b, 2:17a, 2:18a, 2:20a, 3:22a, 4:1a, 4:4a, 4:7a, 5:18a, 8:15a, 8:17a, 9:16a. The *wqtl* form בְּתֵיתָּא in 12:5b follows the active participle סָּרַסְתָּא (hônāḵ) in Ecclesiastes. The Translator employed the aorist indicatives for both forms. He probably read סָּרָס as hônāḵ (qtl 3 m.s.). See p. 248 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{458}For the *wqtl* having the value of *qtl* in Ecclesiastes, see E.J. Revell, "The Conditioning of Stress Position in Waw Consecutive Perfect Forms in Biblical Hebrew," \textit{HAR} 9 (1985): 279-80.
(\textit{wqtl} in 5:13b)

\begin{tabular}{l}
5:12a \textit{wqtl} \textit{hēn} \textit{hēn} \textit{hēn} \\
5:12b \textit{wqtl} \textit{hēn} \textit{hēn} \textit{hēn} \\
5:13a \textit{wqtl} \textit{hēn} \textit{hēn} \textit{hēn} \\
5:13b \textit{wqtl} \textit{hēn} \textit{hēn} \textit{hēn}
\end{tabular}

The \textit{wqtl} form in 5:13b is rendered by aorist indicative, which may denote perfective aspect and past-time reference. The difficulty lies with the previous \textit{wqtl} in 5:13a, which is rendered by a future indicative, not aorist indicative. The Translator understood the \textit{wqtl} as having the value of \textit{yqtl} by context not by the sequence since the form is not preceded by \textit{yqtl}. He seems to have intended to compare two pairs of events. The first comparison is made between 5:12b and 5:13a where the wealth kept and the wealth lost are compared: “riches being kept by him...those riches will be lost...”\textsuperscript{459} The Translator employed the future indicative in 5:13a to clarify that the loss of wealth is a relatively future event compared to the situation of 5:12b. The second comparison is made between two events in 5:13b, “and he begot a child, and there is nothing in his hand.”\textsuperscript{460} The Translator switched tenses from aorist (\textit{ēγέννησεν}) to present (\textit{ἐστιν}). He interpreted the temporal reference of the former event as relative past. Aspectually the aorist indicative reflects the constantive sense of “begetting the child.” This perfective aspect is also compared with the imperfective aspect of \textit{ἐστιν}.

\textsuperscript{459} Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 5.

\textsuperscript{460} Ibid., 5.
Two different tenses used for the same \textit{wqtl} forms must be appreciated within each comparison. By employing different Greek tenses, the Translator clarified the comparisons and thus made the story more vivid. This case demonstrates that the translation is done not by mechanical means but by the sensitive interpretation of the context.

A difficult case is in 12:3a-12:4a. There are 4 \textit{wqtl} forms in this unit. The Translator employed three different moods / tenses for the \textit{wqtl} forms. The first \textit{wqtl} is rendered by an aorist subjunctive, and then the second \textit{wqtl} is rendered by an aorist indicative, and finally the next 2 \textit{wqtl} forms are rendered by future indicatives.

The temporal clause is introduced by \textit{καὶ}. The first verb in the temporal clause is \textit{yqtl}. The \textit{yqtl} is followed by 4 \textit{wqtl} forms (אָרֻב, וְשֵׁר, וְשֵׁל, וְהָעַנָּה). The sequence indicates that all of the \textit{wqtl} forms have the functional value of \textit{yqtl}, which they follow. The temporal clause beginning at 12:3a and ending at 12:4a, therefore, comprises of 5 finite verbs all having \textit{yqtl} value.

The Translator construed the temporal clause as an indefinite by using \textit{εἰδόν}. The indefinite temporal clause with the relative pronoun and \textit{εἰδόν} normally takes the
The Translator employed the aorist subjunctives (αἰτεθῶσιν and διαστραφῶσιν) for the first 2 verbs in 12:3a—i.e., γειτ (יוּשִׁ) and the first וּקִת (וּקִית). He switched from subjunctive to the aorist indicative (יְרַגְּשִׁ) for the second וּקִת (וּקִית) in 12:3b. He used another tense—future indicative (σκοτάσουσιν and κλείσουσιν)—for the following 2 וּקִת (וּקִית) in 12:3b-12:4a.

The 2 aorist subjunctives (αἰτεθῶσιν and διαστραφῶσιν) used in 12:3a are proper choices for the Greek indefinite temporal clause. The aorist indicative (יְרַגְּשִׁ) in 12:3b may be futuristic or proleptic aorist because the context implies future time. Fanning notes that the proleptic aorist is used in the apodosis of a sentence, which contains a future condition (either explicit future or implicit future). The Greek indefinite temporal clause with לָע has a conditional force. The aorist indicative in 12:3b may be used for a logical future-referring statement—i.e., apodosis of the conditional-like statement: “in the day when the guards of the house shake and the strong men are twisted, and [then] the women who grind ceased [would cease] working because they are few.” The aorist denotes perfective aspect, so the proleptic aorist may portray the future occurrence (“would cease working”) as if it were already done (“ceased working”).

---

461 LSJ, s.v. “וּשִׁ,” §(A) B. I. 2.
463 LSJ, s.v. “וּשִׁ,” §(A) B. I. 2.
465 Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 270.
The following 2 future indicatives for *wqtl* can be either alternative forms for the aorist subjunctive or can be prophetic futures. If it is used for the aorist subjunctive, then the future indicatives are connected to the indefinite temporal clause in 12:3a. If it is prophetic future, the future indicatives describe the future events following the aorist indicative in the apodosis clause. A prophetic future implies fulfillment of the events. The semantic function of the future indicative may be roughly the same as that of the aorist indicative in the context, but the aorist is highlighted and focused because the Translator used 4 future indicatives after 1 aorist indicative. The aorist indicative followed by 4 future indicatives emphasizes the certainty of the occurrence. The evidence proves that the translation is not at all mechanical but contextually motivated.

*wqtl* > *aorist subjunctive* (10). In 10 instances *wqtl* is rendered by the aorist subjunctive (22 percent). Each case needs to be discussed.

Evidence:

The Translator construed the first *wqtl* to be a verb of the ἡ-clause along with *yqtl* and employed the future indicatives for the two verbs. Eating and drinking were probably considered as a word pair.\(^{466}\) On the other hand he seems to have understood the second *wqtl* as a main verb to the relative clause and used the aorist subjunctive ἢ. The Translator may have construed ἢ as a projective because he

\(^{466}\) The Translator's interpretation also corresponds with the masoretic accents in Ecclesiastes.
regarded the whole statement as an implicit condition. The relative clause with future indicative can function as a protasis, and the aorist subjunctive is to begin the apodosis. The aorist aspect summarizes the future occurrence.

In 5:5b where \textit{wqtl} is rendered by present subjunctive (5:5b), the Hebrew rhetorical question introduced by \textit{לָלֶךְ} is transformed into a result/purpose clause in Greek—i.e., \textit{ἵνα} clause.

\begin{verbatim}
5:5b לָלֶךְ יְבַקַּע וַחֲלֵיתָר שָלֹאֵל יְבַקַּע וַחֲלֵיתָר יְבַקַּע
5:5b ἵνα μὴ ὁργισθῇ ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ φωνῇ σου καὶ διαφθείρῃ τὰ ποιήματα χειρῶν σου
\end{verbatim}

In the \textit{ἵνα} clause, two Hebrew verbs, \textit{yqtl} (יְבַקַּע) and \textit{wqtl} (וַחֲלֵיתָר) are rendered by aorist subjunctives, ὁργισθῇ and διαφθείρῃ with καὶ respectively. The first aorist subjunctive seems to have an ingressive sense here emphasizing the point of transition at which God becomes angry. The following aorist subjunctive may denote a constative idea viewing God’s destroying activity as a whole.

The \textit{wqtl} follows the \textit{yqtl} in its functional value according to the sequence. Both \textit{yqtl} and \textit{wqtl} in the rhetorical question can be understood as a projective. The subjunctive is an appropriate mood for the Hebrew projective.

\begin{verbatim}
9:14a νῦν μὴ κεραίη ἐπὶ κυμαῖς καὶ νῦν μὴ κεραίη ἐπὶ κυμαῖς
9:14b καὶ ἀκραίηθεν μῆλῳ ἐπὶ κύπεσθαι ἀπεκθάτῳ
\end{verbatim}

\textit{467} It may be the first class condition. Cf. BDF, \textit{Greek Grammar}, §380, Wallace, \textit{Greek Grammar}, 688.

\textit{468} See p. 146 of this dissertation. Even though διαφθείρη can be either the present subjunctive or the aorist subjunctive, the form is construed as aorist according to a translation technique. The Translator never used the present subjunctive for \textit{wqtl} elsewhere.

The story above can be divided into two events. The first event, which is in 9:14a-9:15a, is a kind of sub-story that a poor but wise man delivered a city. The second event in 9:15b is also a sub-story, which may be the real conclusion of the whole story: no one remembers the savior afterwards. With respect to time reference, the former part (9:14a-9:15a) is remote past relative to the latter (9:15b). In MT, these two events of the story are contrasted by a disjunctive waw in 9:15b. The Translator demarcated the two events by employing different tenses. He generally employed aorist subjunctive for the former event and aorist indicative for the latter event. In so doing, the Translator made the story more vivid.

In the former event, the Translator employed 4 aorist subjunctives (ἐλθῇ, κυκλώσῃ, οἰκοδομήσῃ, and εὑρῇ) and 1 future indicative (διασώσει) for 5 qatil forms. The future indicative in 9:15a, which may have been used as a variation of the aorist subjunctive, highlights the climax of the story, which is that the poor but wise man saved the city—a happy ending. The Translator may have used subjunctives for the former event not because the story implies potentiality but because the first event related in

---

470 For the relations between the aorist subjunctive and future indicative, see Robertson, Grammar, 924-25.
9:14a-9:15a is assumed to be forgotten based upon 9:15b. Only the narrator Qoheleth remembers the man who saved the city.\(^{471}\) That the man saved the city no longer remained in the memory of the people, so the event could not be related as a reality. That may explain why the Translator avoided the indicative in 9:14a-9:15a. The aorist aspect provides a complete picture of the event. On the other hand, the Translator employed the aorist indicative (ἐμνήσθη) in 9:15b because the oblivion itself is viewed as a reality.

In sum, the Translator used 4 aorist subjunctives for \(wqt\) in 9:14b-9:14a to portray the forgotten story. The translation is not mechanical in these instances, but contextually and literarily sophisticated.

In 12:1b, 12:2b, and 12:6b, the aorist subjunctive employed for \(wqt\) occurs in the indefinite temporal clause introduced by ἔως ὄτου or ἔως οὗ.\(^{472}\)

Example:

12:6b ἔως ὄτου μὴ ἀνατραπῇ σχοινίον τοῦ ἀργυρίου καὶ συνθλίβῃ ἀνθέμιον τοῦ χρυσίου

The \(wqt\) is preceded by \(yqt\), so its value is probably that of \(yqt\).

The Translator used the aorist subjunctive for the two Hebrew forms according to the norm of the target language. He rendered the compound temporal particles רצ \(yqt\) by ἔως ὄτου. The subjunctive is an appropriate mood for the indefinite temporal clause introduced by ἔως ὄτου.\(^{473}\) In Hellenistic Greek the aorist tense is highly preferred to the

---

\(^{471}\) Or only Qoheleth remembers the fact itself that the man saved the city.

\(^{472}\) ἔως ὄτου or ἔως οὗ are employed for רצ.

\(^{473}\) LSJ, s.v. "ἔως"; Bauer, s.v. "ἔως."
present tense in a εως-clause.\textsuperscript{474} Finally the aorist subjunctive rendering \textit{wqtl} in 12:3a has been already discussed above.\textsuperscript{475}

\textit{wqtl} > \textit{future indicative} (7). In 7 instances out of 45 \textit{wqtl} is rendered by future indicative (16 percent).

Evidence:
3:13a, 5:13a, 9:15a, 10:3b, 12:3b, 12:4a, 12:9b.

The 6 instances in 3:13a, 5:13a, 9:15a, 12:3b, 12:4a, and 12:9b have been already discussed. The \textit{wqtl} form in 3:13a follows \textit{yqtl} and is construed as having the same functional value as \textit{yqtl}.\textsuperscript{476} The future indicative is employed for the \textit{wqtl} form in 5:13a to reflect the relative future time according to the context.\textsuperscript{477} In 9:15a, the Translator used the future indicative for \textit{wqtl} as a variation of aorist subjunctive.\textsuperscript{478} The 2 future indicatives for \textit{wqtl} in 12:3b and 12:4a denote prophetic future.\textsuperscript{479} The \textit{wqtl} form in 12:9b seems to be read as \textit{yqtl} by the confusion between \textit{י} and \textit{י}.\textsuperscript{480} Finally, the instance in 10:3b is discussed as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
10:3a והם ברויאו משמאלכסכל לולוכ.valueOf. הבוא
10:3b לולך ככלהArmy
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{474}For the temporal clauses with εως, the present subjunctive is never used in NT, but the aorist subjunctive is used 50 times. See Fanning, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 400 (Table 6.2).

\textsuperscript{475}See p. 180 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{476}See p. 182 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{477}See p. 179 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{478}See p. 184 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{479}See p. 180 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{480}See p. 17 of this dissertation.
A *wqtl* form in 10:3b is translated with an asyndetic relative clause. The context is that the fool reveals his foolishness wherever he goes and whatever he says. The main character of the fool is described in the two verbs ἀφροῦν and ἀναστάτων, both of which are rendered by future indicatives ἵστορεσί and ἀναστάτων. Since the statement in 10:3 is proverbial, the future indicatives must be a gnomic future.\(^{481}\)

**wqtl > present indicative (2).** There are 2 *wqtl* forms, which are rendered by present indicative. Both instances occur in 1:5a.

**Evidence:**
1:5a, 1:5a.

1:5a ἐνάπαντα ἐνάπαντα ἐνάπαντα ἐνάπαντα
1:5a καὶ ἀναστέλλει ὁ ἥλιος καὶ δύνει ὁ ἥλιος

The recurring natural phenomena are described in 1:4-7. For the description 17 participles and 2 *wqtl* forms are used in the unit. The Translator employed the present indicative for both *wqtl* forms and 14 participles out of 17.\(^{482}\) The evidence provides 2 possible explanations for the 2 present indicative rendering *wqtl* forms (ἐν and ἀναστάτων) in 1:5a. One is that the 2 *wqtl* forms may have been construed as a perfect consecutive.\(^{483}\)


\(^{482}\)The Translator used a perfect indicative for the participle in 1:4a because the stative aspect of the perfect is suitable by the context. Adverbial participles in present tense are employed for 2 Hebrew participles in 1:6a and 1:6b. The Hebrew participle in 1:7a is rendered by a periphrastic participle in Greek.

Since they follow participles in 1:4 the Translator may have understood the functional value of הָרֹאשׁ and מַשָּׁמַר as that of the participle and used the present indicatives for the wqtl forms as he did for the preceding participles. Another suggestion is that the Translator may have vocalized the 2 wqtl forms as participles with waw. The finite verb is never used in the unit in 1:4-7 with the exception of the two forms in question. The predicate forms are dominated by the participles, so it may be natural to construe the wqtl forms as participles. Sunrise and sunset occur every day. The imperfective aspect of the present indicative may be effective in portraying the daily recurring natural phenomena in 1:5a.

\[ \text{wqtl > noun (1). In one example, the Translator rendered wqtl by a noun.} \]

4:11a םַשָּׁמַר שָׁמָּה לְהָבָה
4:11b םַשָּׁמַר אֵין
4:11a כַּלָּה, וְאֵין אֵין תֶּרֶם אֵין אָנוֹכֵי
4:11b כַּלָּה וְאֵין אֵין הָרֹאשׁ אֵין אָנוֹכֵי

The verb הָרֹאשׁ occurs twice in Ecclesiastes, and both of them are in 4:11. In Greek Ecclesiastes they are rendered differently. The wqtl form הָרֹאשׁ in 4:11a is translated by the noun תֶּרֶם with כַּלָּה. On the other hand the yiqtol form הָרֹאשׁ in 4:11b is rendered by the aorist subjunctive תֶּרֶמֶע. The question is whether the Translator construed the form הָרֹאשׁ as a verb or noun. The Hebrew means “and it will be warm to them.” By the noun and the dative of the pronoun the Greek translation means “they have warmth.” If the Translator construed the form in question as a noun he may have vocalized הָרֹאשׁ as w'חֲמ. However, since the contextual meaning is not changed, it is also possible that he read the form הָרֹאשׁ as a wqtl but used the noun intentionally. If this is the case, he pursued

\[ 484 \text{The dative (אָנוֹכֵי) may denote possessive.} \]
stylistic variation in translating בְּרִית in 4:11a and בְּרֵית in 4:11b, while maintaining the sense of the sentence.

*Modal Forms (57)*

**Imperative with waw prefix (8).** The Translator utilized the aorist imperative and the present imperative for the Hebrew imperative with waw prefix.

*Imperative with waw prefix > aorist imperative (7).* The occurrences are 2:1a, 5:3b, 9:7a, 11:9b, 11:10a, 11:10a, 12:1a.

*Imperative with waw prefix > present imperative (1).* The single example is 11:9a.

**Imperative without waw prefix (21).** For the imperative without waw prefix, the aorist imperative, present imperative, or adverb are used.

*Imperative without waw prefix > aorist imperative (14).* The occurrences are 1:10a, 4:17a, 7:13a, 7:14a, 7:27a, 7:29a, 8:2a, 9:7a, 9:9a, 9:10a, 11:1a, 11:2a, 11:6a, 12:12a.

*Imperative without waw prefix > present imperative (5).* The occurrences are 5:6b, 7:14a, 11:9a, 12:13b, 12:13b.

*Imperative without waw prefix > adverb (2).* The occurrences are 2:1a, 9:7a.

There are 8 imperative forms with waw prefix occurring in Ecclesiastes. All are rendered by Greek imperatives (100 percent). The Hebrew imperative without waw occurs in 21 instances in Ecclesiastes, and its translation pattern is similar to that of the imperative with waw. The Greek imperative is employed for 19 instances out of the 21 (90 percent). Greek imperatives are the expected standard renderings for Hebrew imperatives and reflect formally literalistic translation.
The Translator used the aorist imperative 21 times (78 percent) and the present imperative 6 times (22 percent). Two different Greek tense forms (i.e., aorist and present) may reflect aspectual distinction not temporal distinction. The aorist imperative denotes perfective aspect of the action and is used for action viewed as a single whole. The present implies imperfective aspect and focuses on multiple applications. A good example for comparison between two aspects is the imperative cluster in 11:9a-12:1a.

11:9a

11:9b

11:10a

12:1a

The present imperative is used for the first 2 imperatives (/umd and /md/ in 11:9a, and for the other 4 imperatives (md/ and md/ in 11:9b-21:1a, the aorist is employed. The Translator seems to have understood the commands “rejoice” and “walk” as continual and repetitive activities in a life-long period, so the imperfective aspect of the present may have been suitable for them. On the other hand, he probably viewed “to know,” “to remove,” “to divert,” and “to remember” as single whole activities and employed the aorist aspect for them.

485 Cf. BDF, Greek Grammar, §335; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 325-26.
Certain words may be preferred. For example, the imperative for הָבָּר ("to see, consider") always occurs in the aorist form (2:1a, 7:13a, 7:14a, 7:27a, 7:29a, 9:9a). The word for הָרָא ("to fear") takes the present form in the imperative (5:6b, 12:3b). The imperative for הָרָא ("to keep") occurs in the aorist form in 4:17a, but in the present in 12:3b. The different aspect may have been primarily decided by context and in some cases by the inherent lexical nature.

There are 2 instances where the Hebrew imperative without waw is not rendered by an imperative but by an adverb. In 2:1a and 9:7a, the imperative הָבָּר is rendered by the adverb δεῦρο.\(^{487}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
2:1a & \text{δεῦρο δὴ πειράσω σε ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἱδο ἐν ἀγαθῷ} \\
9:7a & \text{δεῦρο φάγε ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ ἄρτον σου καὶ πλε ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀγαθῇ οἶνον σου}
\end{align*}
\]

In both instances the imperative הָבָּר is followed by a volitive: cohortative in 2:1a, and imperative in 9:7a. When הָבָּר is followed by the volitive, it functions as an introductory word: "Come!" or "Go!"\(^{488}\) The Greek adverb δεῦρο also has the function of the opening word when it precedes an imperative: "Come on!"\(^{489}\) Therefore δεῦρο is a preferable functional equivalent as well as lexical equivalent to the הָבָּר.

\(^{486}\) Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 329.
\(^{487}\) In 2:1a, the form (הָבָּר) has a paragogic he. Cf. Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, §48d.

\(^{488}\) BDB, s.v. "ָבָּר," *Qal* 5. f.

\(^{489}\) Cf. LSJ, s.v. "δεῦρο."
Short *yqtl / yqtl* + ą suffix with *waw* prefix (2). Short *yqtl / yqtl* + ą suffix with *waw* prefix (2) are rendered by either aorist indicative or aorist subjunctive.

*Short *yqtl / yqtl* + ą suffix with waw prefix > aorist indicative (1).* The equivalent occurs in 1:17a.

The Translator construed the form *רואים* in 1:17a as *wayyqtl* following *qtl* (רואות) in 1:16b. It is not evident how he understood the suffix ą in *רואות*. Modern scholars such as Gentry, propose that the suffix ą is not a modal morpheme marking the modality of the verb but marks action directed toward the benefit of the subject.490

*Short *yqtl / yqtl* + ą suffix with waw prefix > aorist subjunctive (1).* The equivalent occurs in 12:7a.

The form *שאיב* in 12:7a is a short *yqtl* in both the consonantal form and the vocalization in Ecclesiastes. The Translator, however, did not treat the form as a modal, but as a long *yqtl* form with a simple *waw* and employed the aorist subjunctive ἐπιστρέψη with καί for it. He likely understood that the form fits the indefinite temporal clause

introduced by נָשַׁם בָּע in 12:6a. The succeeding 6 aorist subjunctives from ἀναρπαμὴ in 12:6a to ἔπιστρέψῃ in 12:7b seem to have been construed as verbs for the temporal clause. Consequently the Translator may have assumed the negative particle נל to be gapped before בָּע. Since the negative נל always precedes a long prefix form, his analysis of the form as a long yqtl with waw is appropriate. It is also possible that he vocalized the form as וּיָנָב—i.e., a long yqtl with a defective spelling.491

**Short yqtl / yqlt + ʿa suffix without waw prefix (26).** For short yqtl / yqtl + ʿa suffix without waw prefix (26), the Translator employed the aorist subjunctive, present or aorist imperative, or future indicative.

**Short yqtl / yqlt + ʿa suffix without waw prefix > aorist subjunctive (15).** The occurrences are 5:3a, 5:5a, 5:5a, 5:7a, 5:14b, 7:9a, 7:10a, 7:17a, 7:18a, 7:21a, 8:3a, 8:3a, 10:4a, 10:20a, 10:20a.

In 15 instances out of 26 a short yqtl is rendered by an aorist subjunctive (58 percent). Fourteen instances are 2 m.s. and are clearly jussive forms following the negative particle נל. Functionally, the negative נל plus the jussive in the second person expresses a prohibition.493 The Greek equivalent to this Hebrew negative command is μὴ plus the aorist subjunctive in the second person. Since the subjunctive

491 Cf. BHS-Horst.

492 The 14 instances are in 5:3a, 5:5a, 5:5a, 5:7a, 7:9a, 7:10a, 7:17a, 7:18a, 7:21a, 8:3a, 8:3a, 10:4a, 10:20a, and 10:20a.

with ἢ also denotes prohibition, the prohibitory subjunctive is an excellent functional equivalent to the 14 Hebrew jussive forms.\textsuperscript{494} An example is given for illustration.

5:5a

The aorist denotes perfective aspect. The prohibition is urgent and forbids the whole act (“allow your mouth to lead your flesh into sin”) ever to occur.\textsuperscript{495}

There is 1 instance, which is not with ἢ, but the Translator construed it as jussive (5:14b).

5:14b

The form ἔλθῃ is vocalized as a Hiphil jussive in Ecclesiastes (“to take,” or “to carry”).\textsuperscript{496} In context, the implied subjective of ἔλθῃ is the rich (cf. 5:13). On the other hand, the Translator vocalized the form in question differently from MT. Its Greek equivalent πορευθή reflects יָלֵךְ (“to go”) in Hebrew—i.e., a Qal jussive form. If the verb is read as Qal, then its subject is ἡμᾶς. The Translator interpreted 5:14b to imply future expectation rather than reality and so employed the future indicative for the main verb and the aorist subjunctive for the ὥ-clause. The subjunctive is required by the ἵνα-clause which renders the ὥ-clause. The aorist aspect portrays the expected future occurrence (“nothing may go in his hand”) as a whole. The aorist subjunctive is a proper rendering

\textsuperscript{494}For the prohibitive subjunctive, see BDF, Greek Grammar, §364; Roberston, Grammar, 932.

\textsuperscript{495}Cf. Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 337. Translation is from Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 5.

\textsuperscript{496}For its meaning in Hiphil, see BDB, s.v. “הָלָךְ”; KB, s.v. “וֹלַךְ.”
for the Hebrew jussive according to context and complies with the demand of the target language.

*Short yqtl / yqtl + å suffix without waw prefix > present imperative (5).* The equivalent occurs in 5:1a, 5:1b, 7:16a, 7:16a, and 7:17a.

*Short yqtl / yqtl + å suffix without waw prefix > aorist imperative (3).* The equivalent occurs in 5:1a, 9:8b, and 11:6a.

A short *yqtl* is rendered by an imperative in 8 instances (31 percent). Only 3 forms (7:16a, 7:17a, and 11:6a) are distinct short prefix forms. Nevertheless, 7 forms, including these 3, are preceded by a negative *לכ* and so must be jussive.497 Jussive with *לכ* is rendered in two ways in Greek Ecclesiastes: 1) by *μή* plus aorist subjunctive, or 2) by *μή* plus either present or aorist imperative. In Hellenistic Greek, the values of the aorist subjunctive with *μή* is identical with that of the imperative with *μή*, and both of them denote prohibition.498 An example is 7:17a.

7:17a לכו הרבח וברחךポイント כל ו׳icina צלופך,
7:17a μή ἀπεβιβάσας πολέμικόν καὶ μή γίνου σκληρός

The first *לכ* plus jussive (﴾יניוו) is rendered by *μή* plus an aorist subjunctive (μή ἀπεβιβάσας), and the second *לכ* plus jussive (﴾יניוו) is rendered by *μή* plus a present imperative (μή γίνον). There is no functional difference between the aorist subjunctive and the present imperative in this instance. The reason that the present imperative is employed rather than the aorist imperative may be because the copular verb (γίνομαι) is

497 The 7 instances are 5:1a, 5:1a, 7:16a, 7:16a, 7:17a, 9:8b, and 11:6a.

aspectually vague, but in the context, “to be hard” can be better understood with the imperfective aspect. Thus, the context motivated the choice of the aspect. 499

5:1b וְהָאָדָם בְּשֵׁם גֵּדֹה יַעֲשֶׂה וְלֹא יַעֲשֶׂה יְהֹוָה כֹּהֵן עָשֶׂרִים בְּשֵׁם גָּדוֹלִים

5:1b διὰ τὸ θεὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ οὐ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἔστωσαν οἱ λόγοι σου ὀλίγοι

The form רִּיִּים in 5:1b is not preceded by the negative ל and is not formally distinguishable whether it is a long or short prefix. Nonetheless, the form in question must be a jussive by the context: “therefore, let your words be few.” 500 The previous statements (“God is in heaven, but you are on the earth”) become the logical basis for the prohibition. Once again the form is in initial position, which may mark the projective. 501 The Greek imperative is a good functional equivalent to the Hebrew jussive in this case.

The Translator employed the present imperative 5 times (63 percent) and the aorist 3 times (37 percent). They differ only in aspect. The instance in 5:1a is taken as an example.

5:1a וְלָכֵץ אֲלֵיהָ וְלָכֵץ אֲלֵיהָ וְלָכֵץ אֲלֵיהָ וְלָכֵץ אֲלֵיהָ וְלָכֵץ אֲלֵיהָ

5:1a μὴ σπεάδε ἐπὶ στόματί σου καὶ καρδία σου μὴ ταχύνατω τοῦ ἐξενέγκαι λόγον πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ

While there is no aspectual difference between רִיִּים and רִיִּים in form the Translator aspectually distinguished 2 jussives in his translation. He employed the present

499 It is noticeable that negative prohibition in third person is always rendered by imperative not by aorist subjunctive. See 5:1a and 9:8b.


imperative, which denotes the imperfective aspect, for the first jussive and the aorist imperative for the second jussive to express the perfective aspect. Each aspect may have been decided by context. The prohibition of “being in hurry with your mouth” is understood as a general precept and as customary in sense (“make it your habit not to do”). The imperfective aspect is proper for the general and customary sense. On the other hand the second prohibition (“nor let your heart be quick to utter a word before God”) is more specific than the first prohibition and denotes a more intense or imminent act (‘never do’). The perfective aspect emphasizes forbidding the whole act ever to occur.

Short yqtl / yqtl + á suffix without waw prefix > future indicative (3). The occurrences are 2:1a, 7:23b, and 11:3b.

In 2 instances the Translator understood yqtl with a suffix as modal (2:1a, 7:23b). Both instances can be analyzed in the same way, and 2:1a is taken as an example.

2:1a אֶפְרָה יְאִיר בֵּלְבֵּל לְפָּה אֶפְרָה יְאִיר בֵּלְבֵּל לְפָּה אֶפְרָה יְאִיר בֵּלְבֵּל
2:1a εἰπών εἶγω ἐν καρδίᾳ μου δεύον δὴ πειρᾶσον σε ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἰδὲ ἐν ἀγαθῷ

The form אֶפְרָה is analyzed as 1 c.s. yqtl form of נכה with a 2 m.s. suffix in plene spelling. Formally אֶפְרָה is indistinguishable whether it is a long or short yqtl, but the introductory word נכה is frequently followed by projectives in Biblical Hebrew. The initial position of נכה may also indicate that the form is a projective—

---

502 Cf. BDF, Greek Grammar, §335, 336; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 335-36.
503 Cf. BDF, Greek Grammar, §335, 337; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 337.
504 Cf. Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar, §94h; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 125-126.
505 For example Gen 31:44; 1 Sam 9:9; Isa 2:3. See BDB, s.v. אֶפְרָה, §1.5.f.(2).
i.e., cohortative. The Translator rendered the form by a future indicative, which is probably a deliberative future. The deliberative future (or modal future) conveys the intention of an agent.\footnote{Porter, \textit{Idioms}, 45.} Porter notes that the future can carry “a higher degree of expectation for fulfillment regarding the action” than the hortatory subjunctive.\footnote{Ibid., 45.} Therefore, the modal use of the future indicative is suitable for the Hebrew cohortative: “Come now, let me test you with enjoyment.”\footnote{English translation is from Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 2.}

Lastly, the problematic form אָזַח in 11:3b is discussed here.

Gordis suggests that the form אָזַח is a conflation of אָזַח and אָזַח, but most modern scholars tend to analyze the form in question as a short prefix form אָזַח (יָזִּח) from אָזַח with anomalous א.\footnote{Gordis, \textit{Koheleth}, 320-321; Murphy, \textit{Ecclesiastes}, 108; Whitley, \textit{Koheleth}, 93. Cf. GKC, \textit{Hebrew Grammar}, §23i, 75s; Seow, \textit{Ecclesiastes}, 336.} The verb אָזַח occurs in 2:22a as a participle, and the Translator rendered it by the present indicative of אָזַח. One could argue that the Translator may have interpreted the form in question as אָזַח (יָזִּח).\footnote{Cf. BHS-Horst; GKC, \textit{Hebrew Grammar}, §75s.} The pronoun אָזַח (יָזִּח) occurs 27 times. When it is used as a copular verb (9 instances), it is always rendered by אָזַח (present indicative of אָזַח). The form אָזַח (יָזִּח) is never translated by
the future indicative. As do modern scholars, the Translator likely construed the form in question as an anomalous short prefix form rather than כָּנַּה.

Even though כָּנַּה is understood as a short prefix form, its function does not seem to be a modal in 11:3b. The context indicates that the form denotes customary or gnomic sense. The occurrence ("there it will be") represents a natural consequence of the previous occurrence ("a tree falls to the south or to the north"). The future indicative, which the Translator employed for כָּנַּה, is probably gnomic future. The Translator’s rendering, therefore, is not a formal equivalent but a functional equivalent.

**Summary**

The Translator was not at all mechanical in rendering the finite verbs. He considered both aspect and temporal reference. For יְקַל, not only the future indicative but also the aorist indicative and the present indicative are used when a different aspect is demanded or when the relatively different temporal references need to be clarified by the context. The subjunctive for יְקַל is employed normally for dependent clauses and is decided by the norm of the target language. The Translator treated the וְיְקַל forms in the same manner as he treated יְקַל while he construed וְיְקַל as having the value of qtl. This is a standard way of treating these forms.

As the Translator rendered qtl forms, he generally employed the aorist indicative. The present indicative is used for gnomic sayings, and the perfect indicative

---


512 English translation is from Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 10.

513 Cf. BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §349.
is employed because other lexical elements require it in the clause. The substantival participle is utilized for the relative clause. The Translator valued \textit{wqtl} as \textit{qtl} and employed the aorist indicative for most cases. The subjunctive is used in dependent clauses or for describing a remote past story. The future indicative is employed for two main reasons: for the relative future time (\textit{yqtl} value) and for the variation of aorist subjunctive.

Finally, the Translator employed imperatives for all the Hebrew imperatives. For the other modal forms, he decided whether or not they were modals by the context and used the correct equivalents. He rendered the Hebrew negative command either by \textit{μη} plus aorist subjunctive or \textit{μη} plus imperative as a stylistic variation. Different tenses signify different aspects not temporal deixes.

\textbf{Number and Person}

Second in description of how the Translator rendered Hebrew finite verbs is the Translator's treatment of their number and person. Both the Hebrew and Greek verbs inflect for number and also for person\textsuperscript{514}. Gender cannot be compared because the Greek verb does not inflect for gender while the Hebrew verb inflects for gender in 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} persons. In Ecclesiastes, there are 454 finite verbs to analyze by aspect and tense. For the analysis of number and person 3 verbs are excluded from the 454 because the finite verbs in Hebrew are rendered either by adverbs (2:1a, 9:7a) or by noun (4:11a) in Greek. There remain, then, 451 instances of finite verbs where one may compare Greek Ecclesiastes with Hebrew Ecclesiastes with respect to number and person.

\textsuperscript{514}Wevers, “Use of Versions for Text Criticism,” 17.
It is not necessary to discuss the 442 instances out of 451 (98 percent), which show agreement in number and person. The remaining 9 verbs (2 percent) where number does not agree are presented for analysis.\footnote{There is no instance where person does not agree.} There are 2 prefix forms (10:1a, 10:12b) and 7 suffix forms (1:10b, 1:13a, 1:16a, 2:7a, 2:9a, 2:12b, 4:16a). With the exception of 2:12b the Hebrew singular is changed to plural in Greek. In 2:12b the plural form in Hebrew is rendered by a Greek singular.

In 4 instances the Hebrew verb is in a relative clause with the antecedent \( \text{ליע} \) (kol).\footnote{The relative clauses are introduced either by \( \text{ליע} \) or by \( \text{ש} \).} Whereas \( \text{ליע} \) is treated as a singular in Hebrew the Translator rendered \( \text{ליע} \) by the plural forms of \( \text{πας} \) in all 4 instances, probably according to context.\footnote{The word \( \text{ליע} \) seems to be used distributively, meaning “any.” See Whitley, \textit{Koheleth}, 15-16; Schoors, \textit{The Preacher}, 157.} Consequently the Greek verb in the relative clause follows the number of the antecedent—i.e., the plural form of \( \text{πας} \). 1:13a is given as an example.

\begin{verbatim}
1:16a καὶ προσέθηκα σοφίαν ἐπὶ πάσιν οὐ εὐγένειόν ἔμπροσθέν μου
1:16a

1:10b ἡδὲ γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς ἁλώσιν τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπὸ ἐμπροσθέν ἡμῶν
1:10b
\end{verbatim}

In 1:10b the antecedent \( \text{ליע} \) is plural, but the verb \( \text{היו} \) in the relative clause does not agree with the number of the antecedent.

\begin{verbatim}
1:10b καὶ Ἱωνᾶς ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τοῖς ἁλώσιν τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπὸ ἐμπροσθέν ἡμῶν
1:10b

The form \( \text{ליע} \) may be understood as a plural of extension and denotes a lengthened period of time.\footnote{GKC, \textit{Hebrew Grammar}, §124b; Murphy, \textit{Ecclesiastes}, 6.} Since the plural is used for intensification, it can be construed as a
Some Hebrew manuscripts have the plural form דְּרָי, which may be a scribal correction towards harmonization. Either the Translator had an already harmonized parent text or he matched the verb with the antecedent in number in translating the text.

In the Hebrew of 2:7a, 10:1a, 10:12b the subject is plural, but the verb is singular. All the 3 instances have bound phrases as subjects.

Several manuscripts attest the plural form דְּרָי rather than דְּרַי in 2:7a, but this may indicate scribal correction for harmonization. The singular of the verb may be either impersonally used (“there was to me”) or be attracted to the number of דְּרַי. Joōon and Muraoka note that the plural is sometimes neglected with דְּרַי in Biblical Hebrew, and דְּרָי tends to remain uninflected. The singular verb in Hebrew in 2:7a, therefore, appears to be conventional. The Translator used the plural verb ἔγενετο perhaps because either he or his parent text harmonized the number of the verb with that of the subject.

---


520 BHS-Horst; Schoors, *The Preacher*, 22;


522 Joōon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, §150k-l. The other instances that they provide are Gen 47:24, Exod 28:7; 30:4; Isa 16:8; Hab 3:17; etc.
For 10:1a modern scholars propose emendation or attraction. Fox and Seow argue that נִבְרַיָּהּ מֶדְחָּא—a singular with asyndeton. Horst and Whitley expect the singular form ניברָא to accord with the singular verb. Gordis suggests the attraction to ניבר. The parent text of the Translator evidently had a plural subject ניברָא, which is rendered by the plural מָאִית. He harmonized the number of the verb with that of the subject.

The subject ניברָא is a feminine dual noun, but the verb is feminine singular. The Translator treated the subject in a collective sense. In Biblical Hebrew the feminine plural or dual noun sometimes takes a singular verb. The Translator followed the Greek convention and employed the plural form of the verb (καταποντίονιον) to harmonize the number with the subject.

In sum, the subject of each of the three preceding cases is a bound phrase. The nomen regens is always plural, but the nomen rectum is singular. In Hebrew the bound phrase (subject) is treated as a singular, which agrees with the number of the nomen rectum, and thus, the verb is a singular in Hebrew. However, the Translator harmonized the number of verb with the nomen regens.

In 1 instance the plural verb is rendered by the singular (2:12b).

523 Fox, Qoheleth, 264-65; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 311-12.
524 BHS-Horst; Whitley, Koheleth, 83.
525 GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §145k; Jouon and Muraoka, Grammar, §150d, g;
In 2:12b, the lack of a main verb, the function of נ_sal, and the plural form הָרָּהַ create difficulties for modern scholars. Based upon the Greek translation, the parent text of the Translator did not have a main verb, and the nota accusativi is taken as an adverbial accusative. Based upon Rahlfs' text, the Translator used the singular הָרָּהַ for the plural הָרָּהַ. He read the form הָרָּהַ with an Aramaic meaning ("plan" or "counsel") and probably understood הָרָּהַ not as the subject of the verb. Although many Hebrew manuscripts attest the singular form הָרָּהַ, one cannot be sure whether the Translator had the singular or the plural form in his parent text. If it is the plural form, then he adjusted the number of the verb by his contextual reading.

In conclusion, the change of number by the Translator is generally made according to the demands of the target language. The source language allows for disagreement in number between the subject and the predicate, but the target language demands accord in number for these cases.

Voice

---

526 The plural הָרָּהַ is attested in A, 161, 248, 252, 254-357, the Syh and the Sahidic. Gentry, “Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three,” 166.

527 In Hebrew, if the singular הָרָּהַ is the original reading, the subject is the king. On the other hand, if the original reading is הָרָּהַ, then the subject is indefinite royal predecessors. See Schoor, The Preacher, 157; Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 20.

528 Gentry argues that הָרָּהַ may be considered a defective spelling for הָרָּהַ and that הָרָּהַ is the original text of OG. See Gentry, “Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three,” 165-67. For the evidence of the singular form הָרָּהַ, see BHS-Horst; Gordis, Koheleth, 211; Schoors, The Preacher, 156-57.
The Hebrew verbal inflection is built upon a seven-stem system. Qal represents simple active, which includes fientive and stative verbs. Niphal basically marks either middle or passive. Piel is an active stem denoting factitive with intransitive verbs and resultative with transitive verbs. Pual is the passive counterpart of Piel. Hithpael is used primarily as a reflexive counterpart of the Piel and is used secondarily as passive. Hiphil, a causative stem, denotes the active voice, which can be used either intransitively or transitively. Hophal is the passive opposition to the Hiphil stem. In sum, Qal, Piel, and Hiphil represent an active voice; Pual and Hophal are used for passive; and Niphal and Hithpael signify a middle as well as a passive notion.

The Greek voice is traditionally understood as having a tripartite system with

---

529 Waltke and O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §22.2.1; Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar, §41a; GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §43.

530 Waltke and O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §23.2.1-2; Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar, §51c; GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §51c-f.


532 Waltke and O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §25.1-3; Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar, §56c; GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §52h.

533 Waltke and O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §26.2-3; Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar, §53i; GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §54d-g.

534 Waltke and O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §27.1-3; Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar, §54d; GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §53c.

535 Waltke and O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §28.1; Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar, §57c; GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §53h.
respect to function: active, middle, and passive. The active voice has its own distinctive endings and includes transitive and intransitive verbs. The endings of middle and passive voices are morphologically identical in all tenses except aorist and future, where the passive endings are different from the middle endings. Recently, a new voice system has been suggested based upon comparative linguistics. Sihler asserts that in proto-Indo-European there was no passive. He describes passive as a type of morphosyntax with the direct (or indirect) object as the subject of the verb, with an agent in an oblique case. In other words, from its parent language, Greek inherited only two voices: active and medio-passive. Passive has been regarded as a late development in Greek. C. W. Conrad goes further by arguing that -η- endings were never essentially passive and are forms “developed in the course of the history of ancient Greek to function for the medio-passive in the aorist and future tenses. The -η- endings competed with

---

536 For the traditional description on the Greek voices, see BDF, Greek Grammar, §307-317; Robertson, Grammar, 330-343; Smyth, Greek Grammar, 389-98.

537 Active voice is functionally agent-focused. In other words, topicality is on the agent. Transitive verbs in active voice are patient-directed, but intransitive verbs are not patient-directed (e.g., βαίνω). On the other hand, middle voice is agent-focused and mostly agent-directed; passive voice is patient-focused and also not agent-directed. See Peter J. Gentry, “Transitivity and Voice in Hellenistic Greek” (classroom lecture notes, 22430—Advanced Greek Grammar, Spring 2002, photocopy), 1-3. For the extensive understanding on the voice see T. Givón, Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction (Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1990), 563-644.


539 In Homer, the passive has no distinct form in the future and not always in the aorist. Robertson, Grammar, 332-33.

540 Conrad alleges that the forms originated as intransitive aorists coordinated with οα-aorists. Carl W. Conrad, “New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek
and finally took the place of the older medio-passive forms in the aorist and future tenses. Conrad uses the term MP1 to designate the -μην / -σο / -το etc endings and MP2 to designate the -θην / -θης / -θη etc endings. Semantically MP2 forms denote intransitive/quasi-passive or even convey middle function and not exclusively passive function. In short, as their forms overlap extensively, so the MP1 and MP2 forms overlap in function extensively.

Conrad concludes in his significant study that Hellenistic Greek did not have an active versus passive opposition as does English. He prefers to use the term ‘basic’ instead of active since this form is the most common and therefore unmarked. He calls MP1 and MP2 'subject-focused.' In addition, Conrad shows that intransitivity is indicated by basic, MP1, and MP2 forms. These diverse systems create difficulty in comparing Greek and Hebrew. However, it is important to note that in the Hellenistic period, many verbs use a medio-passive form in one tense for the same function that is normally indicated by the basic form in another. Thus, one must distinguish whether the medio-passive form has an intransitive function or a true middle or passive function.

Verb,” §3.2, 3.5 [on-line]; accessed 15 June 2004; available from http://www.greek-language.com/bibliographies; Internet.

Ibid., §5.1.

MP2 includes the -ην / -ης / -η etc endings.

For example, the verb ἔγειρω can be either (1) transitive and active or (2) passive or (3) intransitive. The form ἔγειρθη is not exclusively passive but rather conveys either middle (“he woke up”) or passive meaning (“he was awakened”). Also note the middle sense in the form ἑπεκρίθη. Ibid., §4.3; Robertson, Grammar, 332.

Gentry, “Transitivity and Voice in Hellenistic Greek,” 3.

There are 453 instances which are legitimate for the analysis of voices in Ecclesiastes. The evidence is arranged by stem in Hebrew: Qal, Niphal, Piel (Pilpel, Poel), Pual, Hithpael (Hithpolel), Hiphil, and Hophal in order. The analysis will answer two questions: which Greek voice is used for each Hebrew stem and why the Greek voice is used.

**Qal (327)**

The Hebrew finite verb in Qal stem occurs in 327 out of 453 instances (72 percent). The Greek active form is found in 191 out of 327 instances (58 percent), and medio-passive in 136 instances (42 percent). The medio-passive forms are categorized into three groups according to the nature of each verb. Under each subheading the evidence is presented first, followed by the commentary.

**Qal > active form (191).** That the Translator used the active form for Qal is an expected pattern for a literal translation. These instances are not only formal equivalents but also functional equivalents to the Hebrew. They involve either transitive or intransitive verbs in Hebrew.

Evidence:
1:2a, 1:3b 1:5a, 1:9a, 1:10a, 1:10b, 1:13b, 1:14a, 1:16b, 1:17a, 1:17a, 1:17b, 1:19a, 2:1a, 2:1a, 2:2a, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:4b, 2:4b, 2:5a, 2:5b, 2:6a, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:10a, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:11a, 2:12a, 2:12b, 2:13a, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:17a, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:20a, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:24b, 2:26b, 3:10a, 3:10a, 3:11a, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:12a, 3:13a, 3:14a, 3:14b, 3:15a, 3:16a, 3:17a, 3:17a, 3:18a, 3:19b, 3:20b, 3:22a, 4:1a, 4:1a, 4:2a, 4:3b, 4:4a, 4:7a, 4:7a, 4:10a, 4:10b, 4:13b, 4:14a, 4:15a, 4:17a, 5:1b, 5:5a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:12a, 5:14a, 5:14a, 5:15b, 5:17a, 5:17a, 5:17b, 5:18a, 6:1a, 6:2a,

---

546 Ibid., §4.0-4.5.

547 The instances in 2:1a, 4:11a, and 9:7a are excluded because the Hebrew finite verbs in the 3 instances are rendered by either an adverb or a noun.
Examples:

(intransitive)

1:3b ἵλινινιαν ἤθελεν τὴν ἕρμην
1:3b ἐν παντὶ μοχθεὶν αὐτῷ ὡς μοχθεὶς ὑπὸ τὸν ἱλιον

(transitive)

3:11α ἀφανήλοις ἄνα κλέμεν
3:11α καὶ γε σὺν τὸν ἀλώνα ἐδώκεν ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν

In 1:3b the Hebrew intransitive verb ἵλινινιαν (ἵλινιαν “to labour”) in Qal is rendered by the Greek active form μοχθεὶν, (μοχθεῖ “to labour”), which is also intransitive. In 3:11a the form ἀφανήλοις is a Qal and a transitive verb having an object (Ἀρἀνηλοι). The Greek transitive verb ἐδώκεν is employed for the Hebrew transitive verb.

Qal > medio-passive form (136). The 136 instances where the Qal form is rendered by the Greek medio-passive form can be categorized into three groups according to the nature of each Greek verb. The first group includes 68 Greek verbs which do not have active forms but always take medio-passive forms in Hellenistic Greek.

---

548 The Translator probably construed מְנֶה, which is vocalized in MT as suggaru, a Pual suffix form in MT, as the Qal suffix form suggar. Accordingly, the subject is the “doors” in MT but “they” is implied in Greek Ecclesiastes.

549 The word can be also used as a stative with a meaning of “to be weary” or “to be worn with toil.” Here it is used with an active meaning. LSJ, s.v. “μοχθεῖο”; BDB, s.v. “μοχθεῖο.”
(50 percent). In other words, the medio-passive forms of these verbs were the only option for the Translator and thus, are functional equivalents to the Hebrew. Both intransitive and transitive verbs are found in this group, but none with a stative meaning. Evidence is presented, and two examples are given for illustration.

Evidence:

1:8a, 1:9a, 1:10b, 1:11b, 1:12a, 1:13a, 1:15a, 1:15b, 1:16a, 2:3a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:10b, 2:12b, 2:18b, 2:23a, 2:25a, 3:14b, 3:15a, 3:20b, 3:22b, 4:3a, 4:11a, 4:11b, 4:12a, 4:16a, 4:17a, 5:2a, 5:3a, 5:3b, 5:4a, 5:4b, 5:5b, 5:6b, 5:14b, 5:15a, 5:15a, 5:19a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:4a, 6:10a, 6:10b, 7:10a, 7:13b, 7:17a, 7:18b, 7:18b, 7:22a, 8:3a, 8:10a, 8:12b, 8:17a, 8:17b, 9:15b, 10:3b, 10:14b, 11:8b, 11:8b, 12:1a, 12:2a, 12:9a, 12:13b.

Examples:

(intransitive)

2:18b οὖν καὶ τὸν κρατήρ τῶν άνθρώπων τῶν γυνομένων θεὸς έπέμε

(transitive)

5:3a καθώς καὶ εὐχής τῷ θεῷ μὴ χρονίσῃς τοῦ ἀποδοῦσαι αὐτήν

The second group comprises 36 instances, which are all future forms (26 percent). They have active forms in the present tense but always medio-passive forms in

---

550 For example, πονηρεύομαι can be a stative ("to be in a bad state") but is used in 7:22a as an intransitive with a fientive meaning ("to act wickedly"). Cf, LSJ, s.v. "πονηρεύομαι."

551 The verb ὑσος (ḥūs) means "to make haste." Its Greek equivalent φείδομαι ("to spare") seems to reflect ὑσος for ḥūs. See BHS-Horst; Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 25.

552 MT vocalizes יָלָקַה as a Hiphil prefix form (yōlek), but the Translator probably read it as a Qal prefix (yēlek).

553 In MT, the form יָלָקַה occurs 3 times in the Piel stem (4:15a, 8:10a, 11:9), translated by the Greek verb περιπατέω in 4:15a and by πορεύομαι in 8:10a. When יָלָקַה occurs in the Qal stem, it is always rendered by πορεύομαι. Therefore, while the MT vocalizes the form יָלָקַה in 8:10a as the Piel prefix form yō'halēkū, the Translator
the future tense. In these instances, the medio-passive form in the future tense is the only available option to the Translator, and it signals the same kind of voice as the Hebrew Qal.

Evidence:
1:11b, 2:16b, 2:19a, 2:24a, 2:24a, 2:25a, 3:13a, 3:13a, 3:22a, 4:16a, 5:11a, 5:14b, 6:2a, 6:3a, 6:12b, 7:20b, 8:5a, 8:7a, 8:7b, 8:12b, 8:13a, 8:15b, 9:5a, 10:8a, 10:8b, 10:14b, 10:17b, 10:19b, 11:2b, 11:3b, 11:3b, 11:5b, 11:8a, 11:8a, 11:8b, 12:2a, 12:5a.

Examples:
(intransitive)
11:3b "אֶתְכִּי מַעֲשָׂה תְּפֻלָּתְךָ וּלְעָדוֹתְךָ וּלְעָדוֹתְךָ
11:3b "וַתֹּסֵא וּפְסֵטָה וַתִּצְוָה אֶל הַבְּיֵלָה וַתֹּסֵא אֶל הַבְּיֵלָה
(transitive)
11:5b "אֶתְכִּי מַעֲשָׂה תְּפֻלָּתְךָ וּלְעָדוֹתְךָ וּלְעָדוֹתְךָ
11:5b "וַתֹּסֵא וּפְסֵטָה וַתִּצְוָה אֶל הַבְּיֵלָה
(stative)
2:19a "כִּי יָדַעְתִּי אֶת义ֲכִּי
2:19a "וַיָּדַע אֶת义ֲכִּי אֶת义ֲכִּי
do possibly construed it as the Qal prefix form yahal'ku (cf. Jer 9:4, Job 14:20, Ps 73:9) or yetku (נָדוּ). See p. 155 of this dissertation.

554 The form φάγομαι is a new form used in Hellenistic Greek instead of ἐδομαί. See BDF, Greek Grammar, §74 (2); LSJ, s.v. “ἐδομά.”

555 The active form ζηνω sometimes appears along with the medio-passive form ζηνω in Hellenistic Greek. See Bauer, s.v. “ζην”; BDF, Greek Grammar, §77, Robertson, Grammar, 356.
The verb הָנַח in Qal stem ("to rejoice") is rendered by εὐφραῖνω in the medio-passive form ("to rejoice" in the medio-passive form; "to gladden" in the active form) in 11:9a. The meaning of the medio-passive form is semantically comparable to הנח.556

A medio-passive form of συναντάω ("to happen" in the medio-passive form, "to encounter" in the active form) is used for פָּרַה ("to meet," "to encounter") in 2:14b, 2:15a, and 9:11b.557 In Hellenistic Greek, when the subject is not a person but an event or thing, the verb usually takes a medio-passive form in Hellenistic Greek ("something happens to someone").558 Thus, the choice of the Greek form is motivated by the demands of the target language.

In 2:15a, 2:19a, and 7:23b, the verb מָכַב ("to become wise," "act wisely") is rendered by medio-passive forms of αἰσθάνομαι ("to become wise" in the medio-passive form; "to make wise" in the active form).559 The meaning in the medio-passive forms is semantically equivalent to the Qal forms of מָכַב.560

In 2:19a and 8:9b, the verb עָלַס in the Qal stem ("to have power over") is followed by the preposition ב, which denotes locative.561 In 5:18a and 6:2a, the Hiphil forms of עָלַס occur. The Translator employed medio-passive forms of ἐξουσιάζω for the Qal and active forms for the Hiphil. He seems to have understood the active form of

556 KB, s.v. "הָנַח"; LSJ, s.v. "εὐφραῖνω"; Bauer, s.v. "εὐφραῖνω."
557 LSJ, s.v. "συναντάω"; Bauer, s.v. "συναντάω."
558 LSJ, s.v. "συναντάω"; Bauer, s.v. "συναντάω."
559 KB, s.v. "מָכַב"; LSJ, s.v. "αἰσθάνομαι."
560 Cf. Bauer, s.v. "αἰσθάνομαι."
The medio-passive form of ἐξουσιάζω with causative conception ("to cause someone to have power over," "to give someone power") to be comparable to the Hiphil form while using the medio-passive form of ἐξουσιάζω with a middle sense in English ("to cause oneself have power over," "to have power over," ) for the Qal form. 562

In 7:9b, ἀναπαύω in a medio-passive form ("to rest" in the medio-passive form; "to make to stop" in active form) renders ἑστια in the Qal stem ("to rest," "stay settled"). 563 The meaning of the medio-passive form signals the same kind of intransitivity as ἑστια in the Qal.

A medio-passive form of καθίζω ("to sit" in the medio-passive form; "to let fall," "to send down" in the active form) renders πάστι in 10:6b. 564 The meaning of καθίζω in the medio-passive form is equivalent to the meaning of πάστι.

A Qal form of βηπ ("to rise," "to stand up") in 12:4b is rendered by the medio-passive form of ἀνέστησι ("to rise" in the medio-passive form; "to make to stand up, "to raise up" in the active form). 565 ἀνέστησι is transitive in the active forms and intransitive in the medio-passive forms. The medio-passive form is semantically comparable to βηπ in the Qal stem.

561 KB, s.v. "πάστι."
562 LJS does not list the causative meaning under ἐξουσιάζω in the active voice. It should be supplemented.
563 KB, s.v. "πάστι;" LSJ, s.v. "ἀναπαύω."
564 KB, s.v. "ἐστια;" LSJ, s.v. "καθίζω."
565 KB, s.v. "βηπ;" LSJ, s.v. "ἀνέστησι."

The verb נָבַע ("to stand," "to remain standing") is rendered by the medio-passive forms of נָטַן ("to stand" in the medio-passive form; "to make to stand" in the active form) in 2:9b, 4:12a, and 4:15b. While its active form denotes a causative sense, a medio-passive form of נָטַן is used in an intransitive sense and is equivalent to the meaning of נָבַע in the Qal stem.

In 2:9a the verb מְלַא in Qal ("to become great") is rendered by the medio-passive form of מַגִּיעִשׁ ("to become great" in the medio-passive form; "to make great," "to magnify" in the active form). The medio-passive form of the Greek word is used intransitively and is semantically comparable to the Hebrew.

The verb רָדַב in Qal ("to tremble") is rendered by the medio-passive form of רַאֲשׁוּ ה ("to be shaken" in the medio-passive form; "to cause to rock," "to make to vibrate" in the active form) in 12:3a. The Hebrew verb is used intransitively, and the meaning of רַאֲשׁוּ ה in the medio-passive form may be comparable to the Hebrew.

The verb מָאַת in 1:8b, 4:8a, 5:9a, and 6:3a is normally categorized as a stative verb in nature ("to be satisfied with"), but there is a certain development of meaning towards a fientive sense for this verb. The Translator used medio-passive forms of מֵסְתַּנֶּס or of מִסְתַּנֶּס (both "to be filled with" in the medio-passive form; "to fill full

566 KB, s.v. "לֶחָה"; LSJ, s.v. "טוֹטָה.

567 KB, s.v. "לֶחָה"; BDB, s.v. "לֶחָה"; LSJ, s.v. "רַאֲשׁוּ א"; Bauer, s.v. "רַאֲשׁוּ א.

568 BDB treats the verb מָאַת as a stative in origin ("to be sated"), but KB places more emphasis on its fientive meaning with a reflexive sense ("to eat one's fill," "to satisfy oneself with"). For the fientive sense of the stative verb, Waltke and O'Connor use the term "quasi-fientive," and Jošon and Muraoka call the phenomenon as "the
of” in the active form) for הָרָע. The meaning of the medio-passive forms is comparable to that of the Hebrew verb.

The verb מָלַל ("to be full of") occurs in the Qal stem in 1:8b, 6:7b, 9:3b, and 11:3a. The verb is formally a stative verb, but sometimes functions as a fientive verb. The verb is followed by an accusative, which is “hearing” in 1:8b, “evil” in 9:3b, or “rain” in 11:3b. The accusative “toiling for mouth” may be implied in 6:7b. In Hebrew, the contents of the verb מָלַל are indicated by a direct object whereas in Greek one uses the genitive. The Greek equivalents to מָלַל are medio-passive forms of πληρόω ("to be filled" in the medio-passive form; "to make full" in the active form). The meaning in the Greek medio-passive form is equivalent in function to that of the Hebrew verb. For מָלַל in 8:11b, the Translator used a different verb—πληροφορέω in a medio-passive form ("to be fully bent on" in the medio-passive form; "to bring to full measure" in the active form). The meaning of the Greek form is contextually comparable to the Hebrew verb.

The two Qal forms of מָרַש ("to perish,” "to be destroyed") in 5:13a and 9:6a respectively are rendered by medio-passive forms of ἀπολλυμι ("to be lost" in the medio-

---

569 LSJ, s.v. “עָמַיָּלַמ” and also s.v. “נָמַלַמ.”

570 KB, s.v. "סָלִים."

571 Ibid.

572 LSJ, s.v. “πληρόω.”

573 Ibid., s.v. “πληροφορέω.”
passive form; “to destroy utterly,” “to kill” in the active form). The meaning “to be lost” in the Greek forms corresponds to the meaning of הָצָא.

The verb בָּשָׁם (“to be or become numerous”) in 5:10a is rendered by a medio-passive form of πληθυνω (“to be multiplied,” “to increase” in the medio-passive form; “to make multiple” in the active form). The meaning of the Greek form is intransitive and approximately compares in sense to the Qal of בָּשָׁם.575

In 7:3b, the verb בָּשָׁם (“to be glad” or “to becomes glad”) in Qal is rendered by a medio-passive form of_gallery_ "to become glad” in the medio-passive form; “to cheer,” “to magnify” in the active form). The Translator chose the Greek medio-passive form because its lexical meaning matches the Hebrew.

In 12:3b a medio-passive form of_gallery_ “to become few” in the medio-passive form; “to lessen,” “to diminish” in the active form) is used for the verb בָּשָׁם (“to be or become few”) in Qal.577 According to the context, the meaning of the medio-passive form is equivalent to the meaning of the Hebrew verb form.

The verb בָּשָׁם (“to crush,” “to oppress”) in 12:6a is vocalized as a Qal imperfect form (tāruz) in MT.578 In BDB, the form is construed as a Qal form with

574 KB, s.v. “בָּשָׁם”; BDB, s.v. “בָּשָׁם”; LSJ, s.v. “πληθυνω.”
575 Cf. Bauer, s.v. “πληθυνω.”
576 KB, s.v. “בָּשָׁם”; BDB, s.v. “יִמְשָׁם”; LSJ, s.v. “ἀγαθούνω.”
577 KB, s.v. “בָּשָׁם”; BDB, s.v. “יִמְשָׁם”; LSJ, s.v. “ὀλιγός.”
578 BDB, s.v. “יִמְשָׁם.” Cf. KB, s.v. “יִמְשָׁם.”
intransitive or quasi-passive sense ("to get crushed"). Some modern scholars suggest a Niphal imperfect (tērōz) for the form since by context the verb is to have a passive meaning ("to be crushed"). Whether the Translator construed the form as a Qal or Niphal, a medio-passive form of συνθλίβω ("to be crushed" in the medio-passive form; "to crush" in the active form) is semantically comparable to the Hebrew in context.

In conclusion, the Translator's choice of the form is related to the lexical meaning of the verb. The Greek verbs just discussed normally have factitive or causative meanings in their active forms. Their medio-passive forms which the Translator used correspond semantically to the intransitivity of the Hebrew verbs in the Qal stem. In 3 instances (2:14b, 2:15b, 9:11b), the medio-passive forms are employed by the demands of the target language. In 2 instances (2:19a, 8:9b), different Hebrew stems are distinguished by different Greek forms. All the Greek medio-passive forms in the third category are functional equivalents of the Hebrew verbs.

Niphal (43)

Niphal > medio-passive form (40). In 39 instances the Hebrew verbs may function as passive, and 1 instance (1:13a) as intransitive. Thus, the Greek medio-passive forms for the Hebrew verbs in the Niphal stem are expected formal equivalents as well as functional.

Evidence:

579 BDB, s.v. "רָצַר."
580 BHS-Horst; KB, s.v. "רָצַר."
581 LSJ, s.v. "συνθλίβω", Bauer, s.v. "συνθλίβω."
Niphal > active form (3). There are 3 instances where a Hebrew verb in the Niphal stem is rendered by an active form in Greek (8:3a, 10:9b, 12:6b). Each instance is presented and discussed.

In 8:3a לְבַלָּה, a Niphal prefix form of לְבַלָּה ("to be in haste" in Niphal), is rendered by σπουδάσσομαι, an active subjunctive form of σπουδάζω ("to be hasty," "to be anxious"). In the context, the Greek verb is used intransitively describing an emotionally anxious state. The verb לְבַלָּה is used in the Piel stem in other two places.

---

582 The form לְבַלָּה is vocalized as nāṭan, a Qal active in MT, but is rendered by the medio-passive participle δοθείας. The Translator seems to have vocalized לְבַלָּה as nittan (Niphal perfect). In reading the form as a Niphal, he interpreted “days” as the subject while “God” is the subject in MT.

583 8:2b in Greek Ecclesiastes.

584 BDB, s.v. "לְבַלָּה"; LSJ, s.v. "σπουδάζω"; Bauer, s.v. "σπουδάζω." Cf. KB, s.v. "לְבַלָּה.

585 Peter Walters argues that σπουδάζω used as an equivalent for לְבַלָּה in Niphal has the sense of "to be frightened" which is Hebraism. Peter Walters, The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 144. Cf. LSJ, s.v. "σπουδάζω"; Bauer, s.v. "σπουδάζω," and also BDF, Greek Grammar, §392; Robertson, Grammar, 1077-78.
(5:1a, 7:9a), and they are rendered by the verb σπεύδω ("to hasten"). Both Piel forms are followed by infinitives, but the Niphal form in 8:3a is not. These different syntactical conditions along with different stems may have motivated the Translator’s use of different terms—σπουδάζω for Niphal and σπεύδω for Piel.

In 10:9b the verb כָּשֶׁם in Niphal ("to be endangered," "to endanger oneself") is rendered by כָּשֶׁמֶש (kušmēš), a future active form of כָּשֶׁמֶש ("to run a risk"). The meaning of כָּשֶׁמֶש in the active form corresponds approximately to the reflexive sense of the Niphal form ("to endanger oneself"), and thus the Greek rendering is a functional equivalent to the Hebrew.

The form יָרֵס in 12:6b is analyzed as a Niphal suffix 3 m.s. (nārōs) from יָרֵס ("to be crushed") according to the MT. The Translator rendered the form with συντροχάση, a subjunctive aorist active form from συντροχάζω ("to run together"). His rendering seems to reflect the prefix form יָרֵס (vārus) from יָרֵס ("to run") as in Syriac and Targum. Since it is in wُyqṭl sequence, the form in question may have been construed as a wُyqṭl rather than wُqṭl. Another possibility may be that συντροχάση is used for a functional equivalent to the Niphal יָרֵס as in MT. Since the Niphal stem can have a reciprocal meaning, the Niphal form may have been contextually interpreted with a reciprocal notion and rendered by συντροχάζω "to run together," which also denotes

---

586 KB, s.v. "כָּשֶׁם"; BDB, s.v. "כָּשֶׁם"; LSJ, s.v. "כָּשֶׁמֶשַיָּהוּכָּשֶ׆
reciprocity. Furthermore, by doing this the Translator had the subject τροχίς and the verb συντροχίζω to share the same root τροχ- which creates assonance.

**Piel (36) / Pilpel (1) / Poel (1)**

**Piel > active form (32).** In 32 instances, the Translator used the active voice for the Piel form which is an appropriate equivalent. No further discussion is needed.

Evidence:
1:10a, 1:16a, 2:1a, 2:15b, 3:15b, 5:1a, 5:1a, 5:3a, 5:4b, 5:5b, 7:7b, 7:9a, 7:12b, 7:13b, 7:21a, 7:23a, 7:28a, 7:29b, 8:4a, 8:8b, 8:15a, 9:15a, 9:18b, 10:10a, 10:10a, 10:12b, 10:15a, 10:19a, 10:20a, 10:20a, 11:1a, 11:9a, 12:9b, 12:10a.

**Piel > medio-passive form (4).** The Translator utilized the medio-passive forms for 4 Piel forms.

Evidence:
7:22b, 10:20a, 10:20a, 12:9b.

In 7:22b, 10:20a, and 10:20a Piel forms of ἐλπίς ("to declare cursed") are rendered by aorist indicative medio-passive forms from καταράωμαι ("to call down curses upon"). An active form for the Greek verb does not exist in Hellenistic Greek, and thus, a medio-passive form is the only option for the Translator.

The Piel form ἱκανότης (hippēr, "to search out") in 12:9b is rendered by ἐξελεξεκεφαλεῖται, a future indicative medio-passive form of ἐξελεξεκεφαλεῖ ("to track out"). The

---

590 The subject is singular but may be understood in a collective sense. For the reciprocal notion of Niphal, see Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §23.4e.

591 KB, s.v. "ἐλπίς"; LSJ, s.v. "καταράωμαι"; Bauer, s.v. "καταράωμαι."

592 KB, s.v. "ἱκανότης"; LSJ, s.v. "ἐξελεξεκεφαλεῖ". Cf. BDB, s.v. "ἱππην."
Greek medio-passive form may signal here an indirect reflexive ("to track out for himself"). Then, the meaning fits the context well.

In all 4 instances where the Greek medio-passive form is employed for the Hebrew verb in Piel, the Greek form is functionally equivalent to the Hebrew.

**Pilpel > active form (1)**. The single example occurs in 10:10a.

**Poel > active form (1)**. The single example occurs in 7:7a.

The minor stems, Pilpel and Poel, occur each once. They follow the normal rendering pattern for the Piel stem and are rendered by the active voice in Greek.

**Pual (3)**

The Hebrew verb in the Pual stem occurs 4 times in Ecclesiastes, but the Translator construed 12:4a as a Qal form. For the other 3 instances, he employed the medio-passive forms twice, and the active form once.

**Pual > medio-passive form (2)**. The occurrences are 6:4b and 8:1b. The Pual forms in 6:4b and 8:1b are rendered by medio-passive forms. Since the Pual stem is the passive counterpart of the Piel, the renderings are appropriate with respect to voice.

**Pual > active form (1)**. The equivalent occurs in 9:4a. In 12:4a, as in many Hebrew manuscripts, the Translator seems to have followed Qere יְעֵבֵר (yehubbar, Pual imperfect from הָעֵבֵר, "to be united to" in Pual) rather than Ketib יִבְבָהּר (yibbahar, Niphal imperfect from בָּהּר, "to be chosen" in Niphal).\(^{593}\) The Greek equivalent κοινώπωλη, an

---

\(^{593}\) A Niphal form of בָּהּר never occurs in MT. See BDB, s.v. "בָּהּר" and s.v. "בָּהּרָה"; KB, s.v. "בָּהּרָה" and s.v. "בָּהּרָה." Cf. BHS-Horst; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 89.
active form of ἑπιθυμεῖν ("to have in common with," "to share"), may be a contextual interpretation for the Pual meaning "to be united." Although it shows disagreement in form, the Hebrew and Greek are semantically comparable.

**Hithpael (5) / Hithpolel (1)**

The Hithpael form occurs 5 times and the Hithpolel form once in Ecclesiastes. The Translator used an active verb once, and a medio-passive form in the other instances.

**Hithpael > active form (1).** The equivalent occurs in 6:2a. The verb ἐπιθυμεῖν ("to desire" in Piel) occurs in a Hithpael form ("to crave for," "to long for" in Hithpael) in 6:2a. The Translator used an active form of ἑπιθυμεῖν ("to long for") for the Hebrew. Since the meaning in the active form is comparable to the Hebrew Hithpael in this case, it is functionally equivalent. Hithpael > medio-passive form (4). The occurrences are 7:16a, 8:10a, 12:3a, and 12:5a. Hithpolel > medio-passive form (1). The example occurs in 7:16b. The medio-passive forms for the Hebrew verbs in Hithpael

---

594 KB, s.v. "ἐπιθυμεῖν," BDB, s.v. "ἐπιθυμεῖν."

595 LSJ, s.v. "ἐπιθυμεῖν."


597 There is 1 instance in Ecclesiastes where the Hithpolel occurs. The precise meaning for the form ἐπιθυμεῖν (Hithpolel prefix form from ἔπιθη "to be deserted," "to be appalled" in Qal) in 7:16b has been disputed. Some Hebraists suggest "to bring oneself to destruction" in a middle sense, and others "to be ruined" or "to be appalled" in a passive sense. Whybray confesses that "our knowledge of the interpretations of the word is insufficient to justify any such precise interpretation." For the detailed linguistic analysis, see R. N. Whybray, "Qoheleth the Immoralist? (Qoh 7:16-17)," in *Israelite*
and in Hithpolel are expected and appropriate because these stems denote a reflexive or passive sense in English. The Greek equivalents are formally and functionally comparable to the Hebrew verbs.598

**Hiphil (35)**

The Hiphil form occurs in 36 instances. Since the Translator construed one of them (12:5a) as a Hophal form, it will be excluded from the analysis of Hiphil forms. Consequently, 35 forms are analyzed as Hiphil forms with respect to the voice.

**Hiphil > active form (34).** In 34 instances out of 35 the Greek active form is employed for the Hiphil form (97 percent). They are formally and functionally equivalent. No further discussion is necessary.

Evidence:
1:16a, 1:18b, 2:4a, 2:8a, 2:18b, 2:24a, 3:22a, 4:10a, 5:13b, 5:18a, 6:2a, 6:3a, 6:12b, 7:18a, 8:1b, 8:7b, 8:13a, 10:1a, 10:4a, 10:4b, 10:14a, 10:14b, 10:20b, 10:20b, 11:3a, 11:6a, 11:9a, 11:9b, 11:10a, 11:10a, 12:1b, 12:5a, 12:14a.

**Hiphil > medio-passive form (1).** The equivalent occurs in 1:16a. The Hiphil suffix form הָרָה from הָרָה (“to become great” in Qal) in 1:16a is rendered by the aorist indicative medio-passive form ἀγαθοῦσαν from μεγαλῶν (“to grow” in the medio-passive form; “to make great” in the active form). The meaning of the medio-passive

---

598 In 8:10a ἐπηνεμήσαν, a medio-passive form of ἐπηνεμέω (“to praise”), renders יתבורה, a Hithpael form from יתבורה (“to become forgotten”). The Translator probably read Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien, ed. John G. Gammie et al. (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 197-199. For the passive meaning, Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 68; Fox, Qoheleth, 235; Gordis, Koheleth, 267; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 254; BDB, s.v. “חָשׁוּם.” For the middle sense, Lohfink, Qoheleth, 96; KB, s.v. “חָשׁוּם.”
form corresponds well to the Hebrew.\footnote{There is possibility in which \( \varepsilon\mu\gamma\alpha\lambda\omega\theta\eta\nu \) reflects the Qal suffix form \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu\). First, the same medio-passive form \( \varepsilon\mu\gamma\alpha\lambda\omega\theta\eta\nu \) renders the Qal form \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \) in 2:9a. The prefix \( \tau\tau \) can be explained by a dittography or haplography with the preceding \( \tau \) of \( \tau \). Secondly, the Hebrew verb is followed by \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \) as a word pair in both 1:16a and 2:9a, so the same renderings are expected in both places. Finally, the other Hiphil form \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \) in 2:4a is rendered by the active form \( \varepsilon\mu\gamma\alpha\lambda\omega\nu \), not a medio-passive form. Nevertheless, while the word pair \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \) in 2:9a does not have any external object, \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \) in 1:16a has the object \( \tau\tau \) and thus, \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \) is expected to have an object too. The other Hiphil form in 2:4a has an external object, and so, the Greek active voice is appropriate for the Hebrew. In conclusion, if one carefully examines the different syntactical environments for each case, the Hebrew form in question in 1:16a is not required to be a Qal form, and the Greek medio-passive form with the middle meaning is suitable for the internal Hiphil. For the analysis for the word pair \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \) in the perspective of Hebrew, see Whitley, \textit{Koheleth}, 14-15; Schoors, \textit{Preacher}, 30; Seow, \textit{Ecclesiastes}, 123-24.} Thus, \( \varepsilon\mu\gamma\alpha\lambda\omega\theta\eta\nu \) is a functional equivalent to \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \).

**Hophal (I)**

**Hophal > medio-passive form.** The form \( \tau\tau \) in 12:5a is vocalized in MT as \( \tau\tau \) a Hiphil prefix form of \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \) ("to frustrate" in Hiphil).\footnote{BDB, s.v. "\( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \); KB, s.v. "\( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \)."} The Translator rendered \( \tau\tau \) by the aorist subjunctive medio-passive form \( \delta\iota\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\delta\varepsilon\alpha\sigh\upsilon \) from \( \delta\iota\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\delta\varepsilon\alpha\sigh\upsilon \) ("to disperse" in active).\footnote{LSJ, s.v. "\( \delta\iota\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\delta\varepsilon\alpha\sigh\upsilon \)."} The subject \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \) is a hapax legomenon in Biblical Hebrew but is interpreted as a caper-berry (\( \kappa\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\rho\pi\iota\zeta \)). The Greek verb \( \delta\iota\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\delta\varepsilon\alpha\sigh\upsilon \) denotes a passive meaning in context ("the caper-berry is scattered") and reflects the Hophal \( \tau\tau \) ("to be the form \( \tau\tau \) as \( \tau\tau \) a Hithpael form from \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \) ("boast of," "to pride oneself about something") due to the graphical confusion between \( \tau \) and \( \tau \).

\( \tau\tau \) is a functional equivalent to \( \nu\lambda\tau\lambda\iota\nu \).
frustrated") not the Hiphil. If the Translator construed the Hebrew form as Hophal, 
διασκέδασθαι is a formal and functional equivalent to the Hebrew.

Summary

An unexpected Greek form for a Hebrew stem is found in 146 instances out of 453 (32.2 percent). The medio-passive form is used for the Qal stem in 136 instances. In most cases the Greek medio-passive form is the only option to the Translator in Hellenistic Greek. In the Niphal forms, the active voice is employed 3 times. In all 3 instances the Greek equivalents semantically correspond to the Hebrew verbs. The active voice is used once for Pual. Using the active voice for the Pual stem is due to a contextual interpretation by the Translator. The formal equivalent comprises 67.8 percent, and the 32.2 percent of formal disagreement between the source language and the target language can be explained with semantical or functional correspondence.

Structural Analysis of Non-Finite Verbs

Participle

A total of 135 forms appear as participles in Ecclesiastes. The Translator probably did not construe 2 of them as such (8:10a, 8:12a). In 8:10a, the Translator construed the form בִּבְרָא as a plural noun (q̄brid), which is vocalized as a participle (q̄brid) in MT. The form מָאָר in 8:12a is vocalized as a Hiphil participle from מָאָר in MT, but the Greek equivalent reflects the preposition מ plus מ (orean). Since

602 Cf. Gordis, Koheleth, 336.
603 See p. 15 of this dissertation.
604 Ibid.
both קֶרֶם in 8:10a and פָּאָר in 8:12a were construed as nouns by the Translator, they must be excluded from analysis.

On the contrary, the Translator construed two forms vocalized as nouns in MT as participles: חָשָׁם in 8:11a and חָשָׁם in 12:4a. These two forms have already been discussed under nouns and are included here in the analysis of participles. Therefore, the total number of participle forms available for analysis are 135. The Hebrew participle is rendered by participles (71), indicative verbs (47), nouns (8), adjectives (8), and infinitives (1) in Greek. The evidence for each case is presented first followed by an analysis of form and function.

**Participle > Participle (71)**

Evidence:
1:5b, 1:6b, 1:7a, 1:15a, 2:6b, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:16b, 2:26b, 3:2b, 3:9a, 3:15b, 4:1a, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:2a, 4:15a, 4:17b, 5:9a, 5:10a, 5:11b, 5:12b, 6:2a, 6:11a, 7:5b, 7:11b, 7:15b, 7:15b, 7:18b, 7:21b, 7:26b, 8:5a, 8:7a, 8:11a, 8:12b, 8:13b, 8:16b, 9:1b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:5b, 9:11a, 9:12a, 9:12a, 9:16b, 9:16b, 9:17b, 9:18b, 10:4a, 10:7b, 10:8a, 10:8b, 10:9a, 10:9b, 11:4a, 11:4b, 11:5a, 12:1a, 12:3b, 12:3b, 12:4a, 12:5b, 12:10b, 12:11a, 12:14a.

There are 71 instances where the Translator employed a participle in Greek for a participle in Hebrew (53 percent). The following analysis will consider both formal and functional comparison. First of all, these 71 cases can be formally analyzed and compared with respect to (1) number, (2) aspect, (3) voice, and (4) articulation.

**Number.** A total of 69 participles in Greek match their corresponding

---

605 See p. 21 and 22 of this dissertation.

606 These formal categories are from Gentry, *Greek Job*, 247.
participles in Hebrew (97 percent).\textsuperscript{607} This statistic demonstrates the Translator’s literal tendency. Two cases require further explanation.\textsuperscript{608}

(דָבָרָה בָּאָרֶץ בָּאָרֶץ בָּאָרֶץ)
9:17a דָבָרָה בָּאָרֶץ בָּאָרֶץ בָּאָרֶץ
9:17b המַשָּל בָּאָרֶץ בָּאָרֶץ
9:17a לָוָי תְּכוֹנָה בָּאָרֶץ בָּאָרֶץ בָּאָרֶץ
9:17b עַל-כֵּן בָּאָרֶץ בָּאָרֶץ בָּאָרֶץ

In 9:17b, the singular participle מַשָּל is rendered by the plural מַשָּליִמִּים. It is not evident whether the parent text of the Translator read מַשָּל בָּאָרֶץ due to dittography of מַשָּל. A better explanation may be that the Translator harmonized מַשָּל with its parallel noun בָּאָרֶץ in number.\textsuperscript{609}

12:1a וּלְהֵבָא אָדָם לָהַל תִּשְׁמָרֶנָּה
12:1b וּלְהֵבָא אָדָם לָהַל תִּשְׁמָרֶנָּה

In 12:1a, the form בָּהַל may be analyzed as an active participle plural with a 2 m.s. pronominal suffix. The plural participle is rendered by the singular participle בָּהַל. Modern scholars have various opinions regarding the form בָּהַל. Most of them agree that the referent of the form must be a singular.\textsuperscript{610} Some propose that the

\textsuperscript{607}Singular participles both in Hebrew and in Greek occur 45 times (1:5b, 1:6b, 1:7a, 1:15a, 2:6b, 2:16b, 2:26b, 3:2b, 3:9a, 3:15b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 5:9a, 5:11b, 5:12b, 6:2a, 6:11a, 7:5b, 7:15b, 7:15b, 7:18b, 7:21b, 7:26b, 8:5a, 8:7a, 8:11a, 8:13b, 8:16b, 9:1b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:16b, 9:18b, 10:4a, 10:8a, 10:8b, 10:9a, 10:9b, 11:4a, 11:4b, 11:5a, 12:10b, 12:14a). Plural participles both in Hebrew and in Greek occur 21 times (2:8b, 2:8b, 4:1a, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:2a, 4:15a, 4:17b, 5:10a, 7:11b, 8:12b, 9:5b, 9:11a, 9:12a, 9:12a, 9:16b, 10:7b, 12:3b, 12:3b, 12:5b, 12:11a).

\textsuperscript{608}They are 9:17b and 12:1a.

\textsuperscript{609}Gordis, \textit{Koheleth}, 302.

\textsuperscript{610}Some suggestions such as “well” or “pit” other than “the creator” for the form in question. The Translator understood the form as “the creator.”
form is an honorific plural.\textsuperscript{611} The form בָּרָאָק is, however, never used as honorific plural elsewhere in MT.\textsuperscript{612} Second, following several manuscripts, some argue that the original form is the singular בָּרָאָק (בּוֹרָא'קָא), and the form בָּרָאָן is a scribal error.\textsuperscript{613} The lectio difficilior is not according to the context, so בָּרָאָן seems to be a later correction for a smoother reading. Finally, others suggest that בָּרָאָן can be understood by analogy to III-ד verbs, which is not unusual in the Mishnaic vocalization.\textsuperscript{614} Fox contends that the yod does not indicate a plural ending but is a full representation of the e-vowel.\textsuperscript{615} The last position is the most plausible. Even if the Translator had בָּרָאָן in his parent text, he could have understood the form in question as singular based upon normal Mishnaic orthography along with the context. Therefore, there is no need to posit a variant reading (בָּרָאָן).

\textbf{Aspect.} The Translator employed a present participle in 62 instances, aorist participle in 1 instance, and perfect participle in 8 instances. With respect to the aspect

\textsuperscript{611} Gordin, Koheleth, 330; Schoor, Preacher, 73; Christo H. J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze, A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 185.


\textsuperscript{613} Whitely, Koheleth, 95-96.

\textsuperscript{614} Gordin, Koheleth, 330; Fox, Qoheleth, 299. For other examples on the confusion of III-ח and III-ג, Schoor suggests רָאוּפִּים (2:26, 8:12, 9:2, 18), רָאוּפִּים (7:26), (8:1). See Schoor, Preacher, 98.

\textsuperscript{615} Fox, Qoheleth, 299.
of the Hebrew participle, there are two different positions among the modern scholars. The majority of scholars suppose that Hebrew participles have aspect. Waltke and O'Connor argue that the active participle denotes linear or continuous action and that the passive participle describes a situation resulting from some earlier action without implying progressive activity. F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp and Galia Hatav also posit that the predicative participle has the progressive aspect. Since the participle is a verbal adjective, it has both verbal functions and adjectival functions. The aspect of the participle, therefore, is complicated by both its function and its form.

More recently Jason DeRouchie argues that "the aspect of any given Hebrew participle is determined not by the participle's nature but by the context." Following D. Pardee, DeRouchie understands Hebrew participle as a non-aspectual nominal even when it functions as a predicate. Pardee's view is based upon the work by his student Peter Nash. Nash calls the participle a non-finite process indicator. He contends that the participle represents an action with reference only to its continuity and processive nature with no statement concerning completion (i.e., perfective aspect) or non-

---

616 Waltke and O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §37.1.
completion (i.e., imperfective aspect). According to Nash the participle functions as a non-aspectual narrative background element.

While Hebraists have divergent opinions on the matter of the aspect of the Hebrew participle, modern Greek scholars concur that the Greek participles express aspect. Greek participles can express three distinct aspects. The present participle, focusing on the internal make-up of the occurrence, views the action in progress and denotes imperfective aspect. The aorist participle presents the occurrence as a whole from beginning to end and thus is labeled perfective aspect. Lastly, the perfect participle emphasizes the resulting state or condition from the anterior activity, and its aspect can be called stative.

Methodologically inductive studies may be more suitable for the analysis of aspect than deductive studies. This means the primary focus must be on how the Translator understood the aspect of the Hebrew participle in Ecclesiastes not on how modern scholars view the aspect of the Hebrew participle.

\[621\] Ibid., 104-06.

\[622\] As in the title in his dissertation. For the backgrounding construction in Hebrew narrative, see Nash, “The Hebrew Qal Active Participle,” 94-97.


\[624\] Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 413; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 89, 91.

\[625\] The term ‘stative’ for the aspect of the perfect tense is used by Porter. Fanning argues that the term ‘stative’ is the Aktionsart-feature, and the perfect has the perfective aspect. On the other hand, Evans posits that stativity is akin to the meaning of the imperfective aspect. The term ‘stative’ is employed here because the present writer believes that the beginning of the stativity of the perfect tense may be marked (as perfective) but its end may not be (as imperfective), so the aspect of the perfect is
In 62 instances out of 71 the Translator employed a present participle for the Hebrew participles (87 percent). The statistics indicate that the Translator generally understood Hebrew participles as having imperfective aspect and so utilized the Greek present participles for them. More convincingly, the active participle form in Hebrew occurs 54 times in Ecclesiastes, and 50 instances of them are rendered by present participles in Greek (93 percent).626

With respect to function, as being bound in the norm of Greek the Translator had to choose between aorist, present, and perfect participles even when the Hebrew participles are functioning substantively and attributively. Substantival participles are dominant (34 occurrences, 55 percent). Substantival participles sometimes denote professionals (e.g. "singers" in 2:8b) or social classes (e.g. "the oppressed" in 4:1b). This kind of nomen agentis may be better understood in imperfective aspect.627 Nonetheless, the predicate participles may give more direct information on how the Translator understood the aspect of the Hebrew participles.628 The predicate use of the participles is generally found in the instances where the participle follows the existential

---

626 The 54 occurrences also include piel stem and hiphil stem. The percentage is increased to 96 percent when the instances in 4:17b and 9:1b are added, in which the perfect participle forms of ololX render the participle forms of יתכן. See p. 235 of this dissertation.

627 The professionals or social classes denoted in participle forms are in 2:8b, 2:8b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 12:3b, 12:3b, and 12:3a.

628 As for the other functions, the relative or attributive uses of the participle occur 10 times (2:6b, 2:16b, 4:15a, 5:12a, 6:11a, 7:15b, 7:15b, 7:21b, 9:12a, 10:7b), and the circumstantial participle twice (1:5b, 1:6b).
particles יְמָשָׁה or לְשׁוֹן (12 instances, 19 percent). The Translator rendered them by the analytic tenses in Greek (εἰσποι verb + participle). The analytic tenses are used to constitute a single finite verb tense in Hellenistic Greek. The aspect of the analytic tenses is identical with the aspect of the participle, not with the aspect of εἰσποι verb.

Examples:
1:7a ἡ θάλασσα οὖκ ἦσται ἔμπιστλαμένη
5:11b καὶ τὸ ἐμπιστληθεῖται τοῦ πλούτου οὖκ ἦστιν ἀψίων αὐτῶν τοῦ ὑπνώσαι

The future periphrastic participle is used only once (1:7a). In 1:7a, the Translator interpreted the lexically stative ἡ θάλασσα as having a future stative sense in imperfective aspect. The present periphrastic participle is used in 10 instances. The present periphrastic participle in 5:11b expresses the progressive or customary sense, and these

---

629 The 12 instances are 1:7a, 5:11b, 6:2a, 6:11a, 8:7a, 8:11a, 8:13b, 8:16b, 9:2b, 9:5b, 9:16b, 11:5a. However the instance in 9:2b is excluded from the analysis because it is not translated by the predicate participle but by the substantival participle. For the predicate use of Hebrew participles with יְמָשָׁה or לְשׁוֹן, see Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §37.6a. There are 4 other instances where the Hebrew participle is used as predicate. Three of them are rendered by the relative or substantival participles (4:1a, 9:2b, 9:12a). One instance is rendered by the predicate participle (9:16b).

630 The analytic tenses were more widely used in Hellenistic Greek than in Classical Greek. See Robertson, 1119; Conybeare and Stock, Septuagint Greek, §72; Thackeray, Grammar, 24.

631 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 453; Robertson, Grammar, 374-76; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 309-10; Wallace, Greek Grammar, 647.

632 Porter notes that the auxiliary verb is aspectually vague to avoid aspectual conflict with the participle. Porter, Verbal Aspect, 452-53.

are little different from the aspect of the present indicative.\textsuperscript{634} There are 9 instances where the Hebrew participle is not rendered by the present participle but by the other tenses. However, not all of their functions are predicative.\textsuperscript{635} In sum, when the Hebrew participle functions as predicate and is rendered by the predicate participle, the aspect is always understood as imperfective in Greek Ecclesiastes.

In addition to the functional consideration, the contexts in which the Hebrew participles occur need to be examined so that one might know whether the Translator understood the aspect of the Hebrew participles solely by the context or not. The Hebrew participles rendered by the present participles occur predominantly in the sentences denoting gnomic truth (51 occurrences, 82 percent).\textsuperscript{636} This category includes proverbial sayings and general facts.

Examples:

\begin{verbatim}
4:1b כֵּן קֵדֶם חַיָּיו אֲנִי לְאָם נַעַם
4:1b כֵּן אָדָם דָּמוּנִים תּוּנִים אָדָם כֵּן הֲכָן וְלָא יִּשְׁחֵם
5:11b כֵּן לֹּו עֲשָׂר אָנָּה מֵתוּ לְאָת אֵלֶּה
5:11b כֵּן לֹּו אֶלֹהִים תּוּנִים אֲנִי אֲגַר אָמַר אֵלֶּה עַל-יִּשְׁחֵם
\end{verbatim}

The contexts of 14 participles are general facts either of human condition or of nature.\textsuperscript{637}

The sentence in 4:1b describes a general human condition. The sorrow of the oppressed and their inability to find comfort may be a general phenomenon in human society. The

\textsuperscript{634}Fanning, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 312.

\textsuperscript{635}These instances are discussed below.

\textsuperscript{636}Out of 12 Hebrew participles, which function as predicate in Ecclesiastes and rendered by the predicate participles, 10 instances occur in gnomic sentences (83 percent).
context of 5:11b is a proverbial saying, in which the insomnia of the rich is described. Another 36 participles rendered by the present participles occur in such proverbial sayings. The gnomic truth can be expressed not only by the present but also by the aorist, perfect, or future in Greek. In other words, the Translator had four choices among Greek tenses to express the gnomic senses, if he understood the Hebrew participles as purely non-aspectual adjectives. Nonetheless he used only the present tense for the participles in gnomic sentences (91 percent) with five exceptions (9 percent), which are discussed below. The reason why the Translator used present participles more than 82 percent, therefore, may not be only because their contexts demand it but may be also because Hebrew participles were generally understood as having the imperfective aspect.

There is 1 instance where the Hebrew participle is rendered by the aorist participle.

The 14 instances are 1:5b, 1:6b, 1:7a, 2:6b, 2:16b, 2:26b, 4:1a, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 7:15b, 7:15b, 10:7b.

The 36 instances are 3:15b, 5:9a, 5:10a, 6:11a, 7:5b, 7:11b, 7:18b, 7:21b, 7:26b, 8:5a, 8:7a, 8:11a, 8:11a, 8:12b, 8:13b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:5b, 9:11a, 9:12a, 9:12a, 9:16b, 9:16b, 9:17b, 9:18b, 10:4a, 10:8a, 10:8b, 10:9a, 10:9b, 11:4a, 11:4b, 11:5a.


There are 11 instances left. The present aspect is demanded by the context only in 2 instances of the 11 (3:9a, 4:15a). In 6 instances, the nomen agentis denotes the professional (2:8b, 2:8b, 12:3b, 12:3b?, 12:4a, 12:5b).
In 12:1a, the context demands the perfective aspect for the Hebrew participle בורא. The form in question designates God the Creator. The activity of God in creation is regarded as completed. The form is not used as a predicate but as a nomen agentis, and its aspect is theologically not seen as imperfective. In this case the Translator was sensitive to the context, and his rendering is theologically motivated.

There are 8 instances where the Translator used the perfect tense for the Hebrew participle. Two instances are excluded where forms of ὁδος are employed for the participle forms of ἦν (4:17b, 9:1b). The verb ὁδος is always perfect in form but has present semantic value in Hellenistic Greek. Therefore, these 2 instances are to be treated as the present participles. Six instances remain for analysis.

The 5 Hebrew participles rendered by the perfect participles are passive stems. Three of them are used as substantives and 2 as attributives. Two examples are given for illustration.

In 1:15a, מָשְׁרָה is a substantival participle in the Pual stem and denotes something that is in crooked state, which results from the previous action. The Greek perfect participle appropriately expresses the stative aspect of the Hebrew participle in Pual. The other 2 substantival participles in 3:2b and 12:10b can be analyzed in the same way.

641 LSJ, s.v. "εἴδω."
The attributive participle in 12:11 modifies the antecedent. The \textit{Qal} passive participle describes the state of the antecedent. This stative aspect is effectively expressed by the perfect participle. Another attributive participle in 12:14 is construed in the same way.

There are 4 instances in which the Hebrew participles in passive stems are not rendered by the Greek perfect participles but by the present medio-passive participles with the passive function. All of them function as predicates in Hebrew and describe activity rather than stativity. The Translator employed the present tense for them because the predicative participles in these instances denote more the imperfective aspect than the stative aspect.

Example:
9:16b קִבֵּרֵי אֵין יִשְׁפָּעֵי
9:16b καὶ λόγοι αὐτοῦ οὐκ εἶσαι ἀκούμενοι

In sum, the aspect of the participles in passive stems seems to be related to their functions in Hebrew. If the participle is predicating, the present is employed to convey what the Translator construed as imperfective aspect. If the participle is substantive or attributive, the perfect is employed to express their stative aspect.

\begin{itemize}
\item[642] A \textit{Qal} passive form appears in 3:2b, 12:10b, 12:14a; \textit{Pual} stem in 1:15a; \textit{Niphal} stem in 12:14a.
\item[643] The 4 instances are 5:12b, 9:16a, 9:16b, 9:16b.
\item[644] The function is of the Hebrew participle, not of the Greek one.
\end{itemize}
Finally the Hebrew participle in 4:2a is not in a passive stem but rendered by the perfect participle according to the context.

4:2a

The articular participle is used as a substantive. The participle can mean either the dying, or the dead, or the one who will die. The Translator understood as “the dead” and used the perfect participle to express the state resulting from death. In Hebrew the articular form itself usually expresses “the dead.” The context also requires the meaning, “the dead.” The participle is modified by the relative clause, and the adverb (“already”) in the relative clause decides the meaning of the participle. The choice of the perfect tense is, therefore, decided by the grammatical nature of voice or the lexical nature of the word in question.

In conclusion, when Hebrew participles are rendered by Greek participles the Translator normally understood the Hebrew participles as having the progressive or imperfective aspect and employed the present participles for them. There is only 1 exception where he used the aorist for the Qotel form because the context demands the perfective aspect. The passive forms are not simple. The Greek perfect participles are mostly used for the Hebrew passive forms except in 1 instance. When the passive participle functions as non-predicate (i.e., substantive or attributive) in Hebrew the Translator construed the passive forms as having stative or perfective aspect and employed the perfect participle. One the other hand, if the passive participle is used as a

---

645 GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §116d; KB, s.v. "המת".
predicate in Hebrew he employed the present participle emphasizing the on-going activity.

**Voice.** Of the 71 Hebrew participles occurring in Ecclesiastes, 50 are active in form, 15 are in the Niphal stem, and 6 are stative (e.g. _gateway). Among the 50 active participles, 45 Hebrew participles are rendered by the Greek active participles (90 percent). The other 10 Greek equivalents for the Hebrew active participle are all medio-passive forms. The verbs ἔρχομαι in 2:16b, καταράμαι in 7:21b, and πορεύομαι in 10:7b do not have active forms, but only medio-passive forms exist. In 7:15b the Hebrew active participle ἔρχομαι with the meaning of “perishing” is rendered effectively by the Greek ἀπολλύμενος (ἀπόλλυμαι), which is medio-passive in form and middle in meaning. In 12:5b the Translator used the medio-passive form κοπτόμενοι (κόπτομαι)
for the Hebrew active participle לִפְרֹח because only the meaning of middle voice of the Greek verb corresponds to that of לַפְרֹח ("to mourn").

Fourteen out of 15 participles in the Niphal stem are rendered in the medio-passive forms (93 percent). Twelve of the Greek medio-passive forms are used with passive meanings as expected, but 2 participles may be not passive. The Niphal participles in 4:1a and in 8:11a are rendered by the participle forms of γίνομαι, which does not have an active form. The Niphal form of νιστ, whether in participial or finite forms, occurs 13 times in Ecclesiastes. Three of them are rendered by the present medio-passive participles of γίνομαι (1:13a, 4:1a, 8:11a). For the other 10 instances, normally the perfect medio-passive forms of ποιέω are used (1:9a, 1:14a, 2:17a, 4:3b, 8:9a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:3a, 9:6b) except 1 case, where the future passive form of ποιέω renders the prefix form of νιστ (1:9a). It is not evident whether the choice between γίνομαι and ποιέω is arbitrary or based on context. Nonetheless, it may be significant that the Translator used present participle forms of γίνομαι for all the Niphal participles of νιστ (e.g. 4:1a and 8:11a). Even though the perfect medio-passive forms of ποιέω may be more suitable for the Niphal participles of νιστ, the Translator probably wanted to convey the sense of activity in these 2 instances and thus used the present participle forms of γίνομαι.

There is 1 instance where the participle in the Niphal stem is rendered by the

---

651 Cf. LSJ, s.v. "κόπτω." See also the analysis of DeRouchie, “The Translation of Participles,” 19.

652 The 14 instances in medio-passive forms are 1:15a, 3:2b, 3:15b, 4:1a, 4:1b, 5:12b, 8:11a, 9:12a, 9:16a, 9:16b, 12:10b, 12:11a, 12:14a.
active participle form in Greek. In 9:2b the *Niphal* form of ἔφαξ is used as a substantive and rendered by the active participle form ὀμνώτον. The word ἐφαξ has the meaning of “to swear” only in its *Niphal* stem, and the same meaning is given in the active form of ὀμνώτον. In this case, the lexical nature of the word ἐφαξ was considered in determining the voice.

The participle forms of stative verbs occur 6 times in Ecclesiastes. The verbs are ἔστη in 1:7a, ἐπίθεε in 6:2a, and ἐλεήσε in 7:18b, 8:12b, 8:13b, 9:2b. Although the stative verb has the identical forms in the prefix 3 m.s., participle m.s., and adjective m.s., these instances are construed as participles based on syntax and on the pattern of the Greek translation. The forms ἐστή, ἐπιθέε, and ἐλεήσε in 8:13b come after ἡ τιμή (τιμ + 3 m.s. pronominal suffix). ἔστη with pronominal suffixes occurs 9 times in Ecclesiastes besides these 3 instances. In all 9 instances the form is followed by the participle, never by the adjective. The 3 stative verbs in question, therefore, can be analyzed as participles. Furthermore, the Translator rendered all 3 instances by participles. The other 3 instances of ἐλεήσε in 7:18b, 8:12b, 9:2b can be either adjectives or participles. Since all of them

---

653 KB, s.v. “ἔφαξ I”; Bauer, s.v. “ὀμνώτον.”


655 The 6 instances are 1:7a, 6:2a, 7:18b, 8:12b, 8:13b, 9:2b.

656 The 9 instances are in 4:17b, 5:11b, 8:7a, 8:16b, 9:2a, 9:5b, 9:16b, 11:5a, 11:6b.

657 In 9:2b ἐλεήσε functions as the predicate in the ἔθνος-clause. If ἐλεήσε is the suffix 3 m.s. form, the Translator would have translated the form by the finite verb as he did elsewhere (3:14b, 5:6b, 8:12b, 12:5a). The participle form can function as the predicate in the ἔθνος-clause in Ecclesiastes. See 4:1a, where the participle ἔφαξ is predicate in the ἔθνος-clause.
are rendered by the substantival participles, they are treated here as participles for convenience.

The participle שָׁלְחָן in 1:7a is translated by ἔμπορον παραμένει, and the meaning in a medio-passive form is comparable to the Hebrew. The equivalents of the 4 instances of the participle שָׁלְחָן are participles of φοβοματι, and a medio-passive form was only available to the Translator. Finally, קדש (hāsēr) in 6:2a is translated by ἵστατον, which is the active participle both in form and in function, and the Greek form is semantically corresponding to the Hebrew. Once again, the Greek voice for the stative verbs in Hebrew is decided by the lexical nature of the Greek words.

**Articulation.** An analysis of the translator’s approach to the articulation of participles will complete the study of participles rendered by participles. A total of 71 Hebrew participles are rendered by the Greek participles. As the nouns are categorized for the analysis of articulation, all the participles in Hebrew are to be classified into 4 categories: (1) free forms, in which the article is visible in a consonantal text (2) indeterminate forms with inseparable prepositions, in which the article is not visible in a consonantal text, (3) bound forms, which are forms with pronominal suffixes, and (4) bound forms functioning as nomen regens (hereafter NR).658

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Forms</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Arthrous &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Arthrous &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Anarthrous &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

658 This categorization is indebted to Gentry, Greek Job, 250-251.

659 The 12 occurrences are: 2:16b, 3:9a, 4:1b, 4:2a, 4:15a, 9:2b, 9:12a, 10:4a, 12:3b, 12:3b, 12:4a, 12:5b.
(4) Anarthrous > Anarthrous

2. Indeterminate Forms
   Total
   (1) Arthrous in MT > Arthrous
       4
   (2) Arthrous in MT > Anarthrous
       0
   (3) Anarthrous in MT > Arthrous
       2
   (4) Anarthrous in MT > Anarthrous
       0

3. Bound Forms with Pronominal Suffixes
   Total
   (1) > Arthrous
       1 (12:1a)
   (2) > Anarthrous
       3

4. Bound Forms Functioning as nomen regens
   Total
   (1) Anarthrous > Arthrous
       2
   (2) Anarthrous > Anarthrous
       1 (7:18b)

The articulation of participles in Greek Ecclesiastes formally agrees with Hebrew 60 times out of 71 (85 percent). The figure 85 percent may be enough to indicate the literal characteristic of the translation with respect to the articulation. Nonetheless, the 11 cases in which the articulation disagrees need to be discussed.

Seven Hebrew anarthrous participles (free forms) are rendered by Greek arthrous participles. The 4 anarthrous participles in 3:15a, 8:5a, 8:11a, and 10:8a

---

660 The 7 occurrences are 3:15b, 4:1a, 8:5a, 8:11a, 9:2b, 9:12a, 10:8a.

661 The 41 occurrences are 1:5b, 1:6b, 1:7a, 1:15a, 2:6b, 2:8b, 3:2b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:17b, 5:9a, 5:11b, 5:12b, 6:2a, 6:11a, 7:5b, 7:15b, 7:15b, 7:26b, 7:7a, 8:11a, 8:13b, 8:16b, 9:1b, 9:2b, 9:5b, 9:16b, 9:16b, 9:17b, 9:18b, 10:7b, 10:8b, 10:9a, 10:9b, 11:4a, 11:4b, 11:5a, 12:10b, 12:11a, 12:14a.

662 The 4 occurrences are 2:26b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:11a.

663 The 2 occurrences are 7:11b, 8:12b.

664 The 3 occurrences are 4:1b, 5:10a, 7:21b.
function as substantives. In 3:15b the definiteness of the participle is marked by the so-called *nota accusativi* ἐν, for which the Greek article is employed in the accusative case.

In the other 3 instances the substantival participles have their own objects. The anarthrous participle functioning as substantive occurs 9 times elsewhere in Ecclesiastes, but the 9 participles do not have the object and are rendered by anarthrous participles in Greek. The presence of an object, therefore, may have been understood to imply the definiteness of the substantival participle. Compare 7:26b and 8:5a.

Example:

7:26b καὶ ἀμαρτάνων συλλημφήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ
8:5a ὅ φυλάσσων ἐντολήν οὐ γνώσεται ῥῆμα πονηρόν

The 3 anarthrous participles in 4:1a, 9:2b, and 9:12a follow relative particles in Hebrew, which are rendered by the article in Greek. The arthrous participle in Greek is a good functional equivalent for the relative particle and the participle.

Example:

9:2b καὶ τῷ θυσιάζοντι καὶ τῷ μὴ θυσιάζοντι

In 9:2b the relative particle is prefixed by the preposition ὅ. The preposition ὅ is regarded as the dative marker, so the relative particle and the ὅ are rendered together by the dative article.

---

665 The 3 occurrences are 7:11b, 8:12b. The forms in 7:11b and 8:12b are indeterminate forms at the same time.

666 The 9 instances are 1:15a, 2:8b, 2:8b, 3:2b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 7:26b, 9:17b, 9:18b.

Two indeterminate forms in 7:11b and 8:12b are anarthrous and prefixed by the б of the benefactive dative. This б is a dative marker and is frequently rendered by the dative article in Greek. Additionally, both of them function as *nomen regens* governed by a definite *nomen rectum*, and, so may have been understood as definite.

Example:

7:11b Λείδει του θεού τῶν ἠλικών
7:11b καὶ περισσεία τοῖς θεωροῦσιν τὸν ἡλίου

Pronominal suffixes attached to participles in Ecclesiastes are all functioning as the objects of the participles. In such cases, the Translator generally employed the anarthrous participles. Hebrew bound participles with pronominal suffixes were understood as indefinite, and the Greek anarthrous participles were used as their formal equivalents. The exception is in 12:1a, where the arthrous participle is employed for דא. Since the form in question designates the one God and also follows the so-called *nota accusativi*, it is understood as definite.

In sum, the Translator never employed the anarthrous participle in Greek for the arthrous participle in Hebrew. On the other hand, when the arthrous participle in Greek is utilized for the anarthrous participle in Hebrew, other components such as relative particles, the preposition б, or the so-called *nota accusativi* in Hebrew are rendered by the article in Greek. Substantival participles with their own objects are regarded as definite. Thus, arthrous participles are used for them.669 The Translator's

---

668 The б is called a benefactive dative. Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §11.2.10d.

669 Pronominal suffixes functioning as object are not included.
renderings of the participles are either formally or functionally literal with respect to articulation.

**Participle > Indicative (47)**

Evidence:
1:4a, 1:4b, 1:5b, 1:6a, 1:6b, 1:6b, 1:6b, 1:6b, 1:7a, 1:7b, 1:7b, 2:2b, 2:3b, 2:14a, 2:19a, 2:22a, 3:20a, 3:21a, 3:21b, 4:5a, 4:5b, 4:8b, 5:9b, 5:19b, 6:6b, 6:8b, 6:10a, 6:12a, 7:26a, 8:1a, 8:12a, 8:12b, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:5a, 9:10b, 9:12b, 9:17a, 10:3a, 10:3a, 10:5b, 10:19a, 11:6b, 12:5b.

There are 47 instances (35 percent) where the participles in Hebrew are rendered by indicatives in Greek. All of the 47 participles function as predicates in verbless clauses. For these predicate participles, the Translator employed present indicatives 29 times (62 percent), aorist indicatives 9 times (19 percent), perfect indicatives 6 times (13 percent), future indicatives 2 times (4 percent), and the present subjunctive once (2 percent). Each case requires discussion with respect to tense and aspect.

**Participle > present indicative (29).** The evidence, in which the Hebrew participles are rendered by the Greek participles in Ecclesiastes, has demonstrated that the Hebrew participle normally denotes imperfective aspect and is mostly rendered by the present tense in Ecclesiastes. According to Segal, the participle becomes equivalent to the finite verb in Mishnaic Hebrew. In Mishnaic Hebrew, the participle describes an

---

670 The 29 occurrences are 1:4a, 1:4a, 1:5b, 1:6a, 1:6a, 1:6b, 1:6b, 1:7a, 1:7b, 1:7b, 2:2b, 2:14a, 2:22a, 3:20a, 3:21a, 3:21b, 4:8b, 4:19b, 6:6b, 7:26a, 8:12b, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:10b, 9:12b, 9:17a, 10:19a, 11:6b.

671 See p. 237 of this dissertation.

act in the process of being performed and, therefore, indicates the present tense.  
Both the evidence in Greek Ecclesiastes and the perspective of Mishnaic Hebrew are consistent with the fact that the Translator utilized the present indicative in Greek for the Hebrew predicate participles in 29 instances. Two examples are given for illustration.

Examples:
1:7a πάντες οἱ χείμαρροι πορεύονται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν
1:7a νυκτὶ καὶ χείμαρροι θὰ πορεύονται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν

2:2b καὶ τῇ εὐφροσύνῃ τὴ τούτο ποιεῖς

The participle in 1:7a depicts the constant nature of the activity. Most of the participles rendered by the present indicatives occur in gnomic statements. They describe either recurring phenomena or general human condition. In 2:2b the participle is used in an indirect question and denotes present progressive action: “Why are you doing this?”

**Participle > aorist indicative (9).** A total of 6 predicate participles occurs in proverbial sayings or universal truths (4:5a, 4:5b, 5:9a, 8:12a, 8:12b, 12:5b). The aorist indicatives employed for those 6 participles must be gnomic.

4:5a ένοβάνειν δέματα
4:5b ἄρξεται ἀναθήματα
4:5a ἀφένων περείλαβεν τὰς χείρας αὐτοῦ
4:5b καὶ ἐφαγεν τὰς σάρκας αὐτοῦ

---

673 Ibid., 156.
675 The 26 instances occur in the gnomic sentences, and the other 3 instances are closely connected to the gnomic sentences (4:8b, 7:26a, 8:12b).
676 Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 2.
This proverbial saying depicts how the foolish acts. Folding of the hands can be understood in perfective aspect but may be better understood as imperfective aspect because it probably implies continuous laziness. "Consuming flesh" is also best understood with the imperfective aspect because it seems to be a progressive activity. Therefore, it is not likely that the context forced the Translator to render both participles with aorist indicatives. The Translator possibly read אֶלְכָּל בֶּךָ and כֵּן as suffixed forms.

One could argue that the subject אֶלְכָּל is followed by the form בֶּךָ, and thus, the word order seems to indicate that בֶּךָ is a participle. However, the word order is not decisive in distinguishing the participle from the suffixed form in Ecclesiastes. The subject frequently precedes the finite verb in Ecclesiastes when the subject is emphasized. The fronting of the subject mostly marks a change of the subject (e.g., אֶלְכָּל בֶּךָ in 1:12a, וַיִּהְנוּ in 2:24b).

Conversely, the participle sometimes precedes the subject in Ecclesiastes as the suffix form normally does in biblical Hebrew. The participles in 7:26a and in 12:5b are also good examples of unusual word order. Thus, word order cannot be a criterion for deciding the identity of a form.

7:26a וַיִּהְנוּ אֶלְכָּל אַל פָּקַח אַל הָאָדָם
7:26a כִּי יָרְשָׁא אֵלָּל עֵיקַרְתֵּבָו עַל בָּאָדָם אָלֶּֽהָ נִמְנֵֽה

12:5b כִּי לֻאֵלָּל אֶלְכָּל אַל בָּרֵא שֶׁלֶם
12:5b וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָּל אִמְרָה אָלֶּֽהָ נִמְנֵֽה אֲשֶׁר אָדָם אַל בָּרֵא

677 The 9 instances are 2:3b, 4:5a, 4:5b, 4:9b, 6:10a, 8:12a, 8:12a, 10:5b, 12:5b.

678 Cf. Gordis, Koheleth, 231; Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 38; Fox, Qoheleth, 202.
In both instances the participles precede the subjects. The form מָאָבָה לִדְוָא in 7:26a is clearly marked as a participle in a consonantal text, but the form נֵבֵל in 12:5b can be either a participle or suffix form. The context of 12:5b does not demand the perfective aspect, and the imperfective aspect is suitable because דָּאָרֵם indicates not a specific man but implies human beings in general. The Translator, therefore, did not likely render the participle by the aorist indicative according to the context but rather construed the verb נֵבֵל as a suffix form.

The other 3 instances, in which the aorist indicatives render the participles, are likely cases where the Translator construed the verb as a suffix form.

5:9a נְמוֹרַהְוַה יֵבָאָה לָא נְבוֹאַה 5:9a καὶ τίς ἤγαπησεν ἐν πλῆθει αὐτῶν γένημα
8:12a ἀκριβώς ἡμεῖς τὴν μέσαν τοσαῦτα διὰ τοῦτο 8:12a δὲ ἠμαρτεν ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν ἀπὸ τότε καὶ ἀπὸ μακρότητος αὐτῶ

The rhetorical question in 5:9a is used to relate the gnomic truth that the one loving wealth would never be satisfied with the abundance of produce. Even though one can depict the activity of loving wealth as a whole, the context does not require the perfective aspect. The depiction may be smoother in the imperfective aspect. In 8:12a, two

679 Not only the subject but also the object (e.g., 3:11a) or adverb (e.g., 3:16a) often comes at the beginning of the sentence. Plenty of fronting may be a characteristic of Ecclesiastes.

680 The modern commentators translated 12:5 by the present tense or even present progressive in English. Fox, Qoheleth, 280; Gordis, Koheleth, 188; Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 112.

681 DeRouchie pointed out that the suffix form never occurs after ב. However, it does not undermine the possibility of the suffix form for three reasons. First, another finite verbal form, the prefix form frequently follows ב in Ecclesiastes (2:25, 3:22, 6:12,
forms, “sinning” and “doing (evil),” may also be better understood in imperfective aspect. The adverbial phrase (ἐπὶ τῷ καὶ ἐπὶ μακρῷ θρύσκω) probably supports the sense of continuity, i.e., the continuous evil activity of the sinner. Once again, the contexts do not clearly provide the reason why the Translator employed aorist indicatives in these instances. The forms בָּשָׁם in 5:9a and נָשָׁה in 8:12a, therefore, were possibly construed as suffix forms not as participles.

In sum, the Translator portrayed the events in complete pictures by employing aorist indicatives in 4:5a, 4:5b, 5:9a, 8:12a (x2), and 12:5b. His decisions may have been motivated not by the context, but by their forms.

The other 3 participles rendered by aorist indicatives do not occur in gnomic sentences. They may be analyzed in a different way. Two instances in 2:3b and 6:10a follow suffix forms in a sequence. The Translator recognized this sequence in which the participle functions as a suffix form, and so properly employed the aorist indicative for the participles.

Example:

2:3a דָּעַת בָּלְבָּלָה לְמַשָּׂה בֵּית אָדָם דָּעַת
2:3b בָּלְבָּלָה בֵּית בּוּקֶפֶד
2:3a כַּטַּבְּשֶׁנָּה עַל קָרְדָּא מְנָיָּה עָלֶיהָ עָלֶיהָ לִבְנָיוֹ תַּחַת שָׁדָא מְנָיָּה
2:3b כָּלָה קָרְדָּא מְנָיָּה שָׁדָא שָׁדָא עָלֶיהָ עָלֶיהָ עָלֶיהָ עָלֶיהָ עָלֶיהָ עָלֶיהָ עָלֶיהָ עָלֶיהָ

In 2:3b נֵכֵה follows the suffix form מָעַרְיָא in 2:3a, so the functional value of נֵכֵה is determined by that of מָעַרְיָא. 682 It is also possible that the form נֵכֵה in 2:3b and

6:10a are read as suffix forms.

Finally, the equivalent of the form \( \text{זע} \) in 10:5b may be decided by the context.

\[ 10:5a \text{ יש רעה רוחית חיה הפשמה} \]
\[ 10:5b \text{ בלעך י größer הפליג הבלתי} \]
\[ 10:5a \text{ ותנינא ידוב וינד תונ הפליג} \]
\[ 10:5b \text{ וע ידוב וינד תונ הפרנסות תונ הפליג} \]

The relative clause in 10:5b modifies \( \text{שַׁה} \) ("involuntary offense"). By employing the aorist indicative for the predicate participle \( \text{שַׁה} \), the Translator understood the "involuntary offense" as a whole and seems to stress the occurrence, not the process, of the activity. ⁶⁸³ The Translator’s rendering in this case is contextually motivated. ⁶⁸⁴

In conclusion, all 9 instances where an aorist indicative renders the participle in Ecclesiastes are identical with suffixed forms in a consonantal text. To decide the form, the context and the sequence are examined. If the context does not definitely demand the perfective aspect, the Translator may have construed the form as a suffixed form and used the aorist indicative for the presumed suffixed form. On the other hand, if the context or sequence clearly demands the perfect aspect, his using the aorist indicative can be justified by the context or sequence.

**Participle > perfect indicative (6).** ⁶⁸⁵ There are six instances where the Translator employed the perfect indicative for the Hebrew participle.

\[ 1:4b \text{ רָאָרָר לְלָלָלָלָל נְמִיָּה} \]

---


⁶⁸⁴ Since „שַׁה“ is a feminine noun, it is not likely that \( \text{זע} \) is construed as a suffix form.

⁶⁸⁵ The 6 instances are 1:4b, 2:19a, 3:21a, 6:8b, 6:12a, 8:1a.
1:4b καὶ ἔγνοι ἔστηκεν

In 1:4b, the predicate participle τῷ ἀκρωτᾷ clearly denotes a state of “standing” in the context. The “land” does not move, so the continuous activity or process is not involved. The adverbial phrase ἀρχεῖά elucidates the picture “how long the land has been in the state of standing.” The perfect indicative, therefore, would be an excellent equivalent to the participle denoting the stative aspect. In the other 5 instances, ὑπάρχει is rendered by οἶδεν, which is always perfect in form, but is present in function.

Participle > future indicative (2) / present subjunctive (1). 686 In 2 instances, the Hebrew participle is rendered by the future indicative in Greek. Both instances occur in proverbial sayings. The Greek future can convey a gnomic sense. 687

9:5a εἰς τὸν ἀκρωτὴν ἔστηκεν

9:5a δι' ἐκείνης γινόμεναι δι' ἀποθανοῦνται καὶ ἐκείνης οὐκ εἰσίν γινώσκοντες οὐδεν

10:3a καὶ γε ἐν ὀδὸν ἄφοβον πορεύεται καρδία αὐτοῦ ὑπερῆσαι

The aspect of the Greek future is still debated. 688 Some argue that the future is strictly tense and non-aspectual (e.g. Fanning), while others contend that it has aspect (e.g., McKay, “expressing intention”). 689 In 9:5a and 10:3a γινόμεναι and ὑπερῆσαι are used

---

686 The 2 instances of the future indicative are 9:5a, 10:3a. The 1 instance of the present subjunctive is 10:3a.

687 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 411; Wallace, Greek Grammar, 571.

688 See p. 138 of this dissertation.
in distinctly non-future contexts. They seem to be modal and express “expectation.” In 9:5a the future tense may imply probability that the living knows their death in future. One may be living in recognition of his death in future. The statement can be legitimately expressed with a modal verb. The future indicative is an excellent choice for both the gnomic and modal statement.

In 10:3a the subordinate clause is introduced by ὅταν, which denotes an indefinite temporal idea. When the ὅταν is used as a temporal particle, the verb in the subordinate clause conveys a repeated or conditional action. The main verb (ὑπερήφανον) must be correlated with the indefinite temporal clause, so the future indicative in the modal use is an appropriate choice. In sum, both future indicatives for the Hebrew participles are decided by the demands of the target language.

In 1 instance the Translator rendered the participle by the present subjunctive. In 10:3a the subjunctive πορεύσαι renders ἧκεν. The subjunctive is employed because of ὅταν. When ὅταν is used as temporal conjunction, it approaches the meaning of εἶναι, so the subjunctive normally follows. The present tense is used because not only is the action progressive, it is also contemporaneous with that of the main clause. Whenever the fool walks on the road, others observe the state of his heart simultaneously. Using the

689 Porter summarized the different positions on the aspect of the future. He concluded that the future is aspectually vague. See Porter, Verbal Aspect, 407-16.

690 Cf. Porter, Idioms, 44.

691 Bauer, s.v. “ὅταν.”

692 Ibid.

693 Ibid.; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 391.
present subjunctive in 10:3a, therefore, not only maintains the literalness of the translation but also conforms to good Greek style. Thus, the Translator was concerned about the demands of the target language.

**Participle > Noun (8)**

Evidence:
2:2a, 4:1a, 5:11a, 5:12a, 5:15a, 10:1a, 12:3a, 12:11b.

**Function.** There are 8 participles in Hebrew (6 percent), which are rendered by nouns in Greek. Functionally, all of them are substantival participles. The noun is a good functional equivalent to the substantival participle.\(^{694}\) An example is given for illustration.

Example: מַחְזַקְתּ שֵׁם הַנֶּבעַר אֲדֹנָי אֶל הָאָדָם אֶל עַל אֶל כָּל
5:11א γλυκὸς ὑπνός τοῦ δούλου εἰ ὀλίγον καὶ εἰ πολὺ φάγεται

In addition to the functional comparison, number and articulation are to be considered for the formal comparison between participles in Hebrew and their equivalents rendered by nouns in Greek.

**Number.** Six participles have singular forms in Hebrew, and 2 are plural forms.\(^{695}\) In all 8 instances the number of the Greek noun matches the number of the Hebrew participle (100 percent).

---

\(^{694}\) The 8 instances are 2:2a, 4:1a, 5:11a, 5:12a, 5:15a, 10:1a, 12:3a, 12:11b.

\(^{695}\) The singular forms are in 2:2a, 5:11a, 5:12a, 5:15a, 10:1a, 12:11b. The plural forms are in 4:1a, 12:3a.
**Articulation.** The way to analyze the articulation of participles in Hebrew rendered by nouns in Greek will be the same as that used to analyze the articulation of participles in Hebrew rendered by participles in Greek.

1. Free Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Instances</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthrous &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4:1a, 5:11a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthrous &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarthrous &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarthrous &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2:2a, 5:12a, 5:15a, 10:1a, 12:11b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Indeterminate Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Instances</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthrous in MT &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthrous in MT &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarthrous in MT &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarthrous in MT &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Bound Forms with Pronominal Suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Instances</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Bound Forms Functioning as *nomen regens*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Instances</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anarthrous &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarthrous &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12:3a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence shows that the articulation of participles in Hebrew perfectly matches the articulation of their corresponding nouns in Greek (100 percent). This demonstrates the literalness of the Translator with respect to articulation.

In sum, the Translator's rendering of the participles by nouns is functionally literal as well as formally literal with respect to number and articulation.

---

696 The 2 instances are 4:1a, 5:11a.

697 The 7 instances are 2:2a, 5:12a, 5:15a, 10:1a, 12:11b.
Participle > Adjective (8)

Evidence:

Function. There are 8 Hebrew participles rendered by Greek adjectives in Ecclesiastes (6 percent). Six of the Hebrew participles function as substantives and are all rendered by substantival adjectives. The other 2 Hebrew participles function as attributives modifying their antecedents and are rendered by attributive adjectives in Greek. The 8 Greek adjectives rendering the Hebrew participles, therefore, are functional equivalents.

Examples:
(substantive: רְפָאִים > τοὺς νεκρούς)
9:3b נַעֲשֵׂה רְפָאִים
9:3b καὶ ὀπίσω αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς νεκρούς

(attributive: רְפָאִים > τῶν νεκρῶν)
9:4b πειραλέκτων καὶ οὓς προκεκρίσατο πάρα
9:4b διότι ο ζῶν αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὸς ἐπέρ τῶν λέοντα τῶν νεκρῶν

Number. As for the number, 4 participles in Hebrew are singular forms, and 4 are plurals. All numbers of the Hebrew participles in Hebrew match the numbers of the Greek adjectives (100 percent).

698 The 6 instances are 4:14a, 4:14b, 5:7a, 9:3b, 9:5b, 9:11a. The participle указ in 4:14b could be analyzed not only as a substantive, “(born as) a poor,” but also as a subjective complement “(born) poor.”

699 The 2 instances are 4:12b, 9:4b.

700 The singular forms are in 4:12b, 4:14b, 5:7a, 9:4b. The plural forms are in 4:14a, 9:3b, 9:5b, 9:11a.
Articulation. Articulation for these 8 instances is analyzed in the same way as the Hebrew participles rendered by the Greek participles.\textsuperscript{701}

1. Free Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Arthrous &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{702}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Arthrous &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Anarthrous &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Anarthrous &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{703}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Indeterminate Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Arthrous in MT &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>1 (9:11a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Arthrous in MT &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Anarthrous in MT &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Anarthrous in MT &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Bound Forms with Pronominal Suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Bound Forms Functioning as \textit{nomen regens}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Anarthrous &gt; Arthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Anarthrous &gt; Anarthrous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 6 arthrous participles are rendered by arthrous adjectives in Greek. Two anarthrous forms are rendered by anarthrous adjectives. The articulation matches between the target language and the target language in all instances.

In sum, the Greek adjectives, which render the Hebrew participles, are functional equivalents, and their number and articulation always agree.

\textsuperscript{701}For the analytic frame, see Gentry, \textit{Greek Job}, 258-259.

\textsuperscript{702}The 5 instances are 4:12b, 4:14a, 9:3b, 9:4b, 9:5b.

\textsuperscript{703}The 2 instances are 4:14b, 5:7a.
Participle > Infinitive (1)

The participle functions as a predicate in 5:7b. The Translator uncharacteristically employed the aorist infinitive for the participle. The participle is syntactically vague. It can be either predicative or attributive modifying the second הבדל. The Translator likely construed the form as an attributive and removed the ambiguity by using the infinitive in an attributive fashion. Since using the infinitive for the participle deviates from his normal approach, it is also possible that the Translator construed the form as an infinitive construct (š'mōr). With respect to aspect, the sentence denotes a universal truth, so the aorist must be gnomic. The Translator perceived the action ("looking out") to be repeated or generalized and summarized its occurrence in the aorist tense.

Summary

With respect to function, predicate participles occur in 59 instances out of 135 (44 percent) in Ecclesiastes. Greek indicatives render 47 instances of the 59 (80 percent), and the analytic tense form is used for the other 12 instances (20 percent). Substantival participles occur 48 times (35 percent). They are rendered by substantival participles 34 times (71 percent), nouns 8 times (17 percent), and substantival adjectives 6 times (12 percent). Finally, attributive participles occur 28 times (21 percent). Greek attributive

704 Murphy takes the participle as a predicate (Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 44), while Fox interprets it as an attributive (Fox, Qoheleth, 212).

participles render 25 instances (89 percent); attributive adjectives render 2 instances (7 percent); and infinitives render 1 instance (4 percent). All the Greek renderings are functionally equivalent to the Hebrew participles.

In the terms of number and articulation, the source and target languages agree in more than 90 percent of the instances. Number is adjusted by the context (3 percent). The Greek arthrous participles render the Hebrew anarthrous participles (15 percent) because other lexemes such as a relative particle, preposition *lamed*, and so-called *nota accusativi* are represented by the articles. The voice is identical in more than 90 percent of the instances. Any discrepancy of voice is due to the lexical nature either of the target language or of the source language.

As for the aspect of the participle, two equations, Hebrew Participle > Greek Participle and Hebrew Participle > Greek Indicative, are considered. In 91 out of 118 occurrences, the Translator used the present participle or the present indicative for Hebrew participles (77 percent). One can, therefore, posit that the aspect of the Hebrew participle was normally understood as imperfective or progressive. He employed the aorist tense when he construed a Hebrew form as a suffixed form (6 instances) or gave *qtl* value to the Hebrew participle according to a sequence (2 instances). Context is taken into account only in 2 cases in using the aorist tense. The perfect aspect is employed for Hebrew passive stems denoting a stative condition or for the verb *וַיָּלֶד* (> * telegram*).

**Infinitives**

There is a total of 104 infinitive forms in Ecclesiastes. In 2 instances, the Translator did not construe the forms as infinitives. The first instance is the form *ךְרָם* in
The form בָּרָה (qârôb) can be analyzed either as a free infinitive or as an adjective.\footnote{Gordis, \textit{Koheleth}, 237.}

The Translator probably construed the form as an adjective and used the Greek adjective ἐγγύς for its equivalent. The form in question must, therefore, be treated as an adjective.

Another instance involves a textual problem. In 9:1a the Translator read the bound infinitive form as a noun and as part of the verb.

The form לָבָר (lâbûr) in MT is analyzed as the preposition ל plus a bound infinitive from the root בָּרָה or בָּרָה.\footnote{Cf. T. Muraoka, \textit{“Aramaic Index to the Septuagint,”} 233, 238.} The Translator added a subject קַרְדִּיא μου, which is missing in MT, and uses an aorist indicative εἶδεν rather than an infinitive. Neither בָּרָה nor בָּרָה are rendered by εἶδεν in LXX.\footnote{Some scholars explain the root בָּרָה as the by-form of בָּרָה (KB, s.v. “בָּרָה”). Others analyze לָבָר as a bound infinitive from a geminate root but as the analogy with II-waw verb (GKC, \textit{Hebrew Grammar}, §67r).} The Translator likely had a different consonantal text from MT in 9:1a. A reason that the LXX does not literally correspond to MT in 9:1a may be because of wrong word division and dittography. First, the graphical confusion between ל and ב might occur, and לָבָר becomes לָבָר. The ל is

\footnote{NKJV, NIV, and NASB read בָּרָה as infinitive, which functions as imperative. NRSV also takes the form in question as infinitive but functioning as substantive.}
separated from הָלְבִּי, and is joined to the next word. The next two consonants כ are read twice with another confusion between כ and כ. Consequently, the Translator’s parent text might read רָאָה אַרְכָּלִי הָלְבִּי. 710 If the textual problem is resolved in this way, the Translator’s rendering is a formally literal translation, and this case is excluded from the evidence of bound infinitives.

On the other hand, there are 3 instances where the Translator construed the noun forms in MT as bound infinitive forms. The 3 forms are: (1) רָאָה in 5:10b, which is vocalized as the noun (רֶעַת) in MT but must have been construed as the bound infinitive form (רֶעַת), 711 (2) הָלְבִּי הַלַּעַד in 5:11b, which is a noun prefixed by a preposition (לֵאָשִׁיר) in MT but must have been understood as the a Hiphil infinitive with a syncopated כ (לֵאָשִׁיר); 712 and finally (3) לַעַד in 8:9b, which is read as the preposition plus noun (לָרָא) in MT but is probably interpreted as Hiphil infinitive with a syncopated כ (לָרָא). 713 These 3 instances are included in the total number of bound infinitives.

**Free Infinitive**

Free infinitive forms occur 18 times in Ecclesiastes. They are rendered by adjectives, adverbs, or aorist indicatives.

710 The Peshitta supports this reading. Cf. BHS-Horst; Gordis, Koheleth, 289; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 297.

711 See p. 20 of this dissertation.

712 An intervocalic כ is often syncopated in the late Hebrew (Segal, Mishnaic Herbew, §143). See p. 20 of this dissertation.

713 See p. 21 of this dissertation.
Free Infinitive > adjective / adverbs (15). The equivalent occurs in 1:16b, 2:7b, 5:6a, 5:11a, 5:16b, 5:19a, 6:11a, 7:16a, 7:17a, 9:18b, 11:8a, 11:8b, 12:9b, 12:12b, 12:12b. In all instances the hiphil free infinitive form הָרְבָּה (harbēh) is used as an adjective or adverb. The Translator always rendered the form in question by πολύς. In 8 instances he construed הָרְבָּה as an attributive adjective and matched the gender and number of πολύς with those of the noun it modifies.\(^{714}\) In 6 instances he construed הָרְבָּה as an adverb and used the neuter accusative of πολύς for the Hebrew form.\(^{715}\) There is 1 instance where the Translator construed הָרְבָּה as a predicate adjective (11:8b).

Examples:
(attributive adjective)
2:7b כִּי מָכָהּ בְּךָ לֹא אָסַא הָרְבָּה הָיָה כְּיָמִן
2:7b καὶ γε κτήσεις βουκολίου καὶ ποιμνίου πολλή ἐγένετό μοι

(adverb)
5:19α γιὰ τὸ πολλὰ μνησθήσεται τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ

(predicate adjective)
11:8b ἐρήμηθεν ψυχὴ πολλὴ ἐπὶ στῆθος πάν τὸ ἑρχόμενον ματαιότης

Free infinitive > aorist indicative (3). In 4:2a, 8:9a, and 9:11a, the free infinitives with waw follow finite verbs and function as finite verbs.\(^{716}\) In 8:9a and 9:11a

\(^{714}\) The 8 instances are 2:7b, 5:6b, 5:16b, 6:11a, 9:18b, 11:8a, 12:12b, 12:12b.

\(^{715}\) The 6 instances are 1:16b, 5:11a, 5:19a, 7:16a, 7:17a, 12:9b.

\(^{716}\) For the function of free infinitive as finite verb, see A. Rubinstein, “A Finite Verb Continued by an Infinitive Absolute in Biblical Hebrew,” VT 2 (1952): 362-67; Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, §35.5.2; GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §113y-z.
the infinitives with waw immediately follow the qtl forms.

In both instances the qtl forms are rendered by aorist indicative, and the free infinitives following qtl are also rendered by aorist indicative. The Translator must have equated the function of the free infinitive as that of qtl.

In 4:2a the free infinitive follows the wayyqtl form.

The first conjunction withบร is construed as simple waw i.e., waw conjunction, but the second waw withאר is understood as waw consecutive. In other words, the Translator analyzed two verbs in 4:1a as having perfective aspect and employed aorist indicatives for both. He also equated the functional value of the free infinitive with waw in 4:2a in the sequence with the previous verbs, and he used the aorist indicative for the free infinitive.

Bound Infinitive

The bound infinitive occurs 107 times in Ecclesiastes. The forms appear either without a preposition or with the prepositions ב or כ. The Translator employed 12 different equivalents for the forms. All the evidence is arranged and discussed in the categories establish by I. Soisalon-Soininen in his monograph Die Infinitive in der
Bound infinitive without preposition $> \tau o + \text{infinitive}$ (4). The occurrences are 3:4b, 3:4b, 3:5a, and 5:10b. In 3 instances the bound infinitives appear in the genitive case after a noun in the construct state.\(^{718}\)

(bound infinitives in 3:4b and 3:5a)

3:4a $\tau o \text{ לָכַדְתָּ הָעָה לָשְׁרָהְמָן}$
3:4b $\tau o \text{ מְפֹד לָכַדְתָּ}$
3:5a $\text{לָשְׁרָהְמָן אָבְנֵכֵי הָעָה כִּנֹּס אֲבֵכִים}$
3:4a $\text{כַּיְּרֹס} \tau o \text{ קַלַּדָּשָּא} \text{ כַּיְּרֹס} \tau o \text{ נֶלָשָּא}$
3:4b $\text{כַּיְּרֹס} \tau o \text{ נֶלָשָּא} \text{ כַּיְּרֹס} \tau o \text{ מְפֹדָאש}$
3:5a $\text{כַּיְּרֹס} \tau o \text{ בָּלֶא} \text{ לִּיתְוָא} \text{ כַּיְּרֹס} \tau o \text{ מְפֹדָאש}$

The bound infinitives $\tau o$ in 3:4b and $\tau o$ in 3:5a modify the antecedent nouns. The 3 bound infinitives are not prefixed by the preposition $\text{לָכַדְתָּ}$ while other bound infinite forms in 3:2-8 have the preposition $\text{לָכַדְתָּ}$. Nevertheless, the Translator consistently used $\tau o + \text{Infinitive}$ for Hebrew bound infinitives whether or not they are prefixed by $\text{לָכַדְתָּ}$. As in Hebrew, the Greek infinitives in these cases function as substantives, so their genitive relation with the preceding substantives is normal.\(^{719}\) The genitive article in Greek makes this relation clear. The Translator’s rendering bound infinitive in Hebrew by $\tau o + \text{Infinitive}$ in Greek is, therefore, appropriate. This pattern of rendering is also attested in other places of LXX.\(^{720}\)


\(^{718}\)Cf. Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §36.2.1c.

\(^{719}\)Robertson, *Grammar*, 1076.

In 5:10b the Translator probably read ῥα αὐτῷ as the bound infinitive form (ῥ' αὐτ). Its Greek equivalent τοῦ ὀρᾶν functions as a substantive after a conjunction. The substantival use of τοῦ + infinitive is normal in Hellenistic Greek as mentioned above. 721

Bound infinitive without preposition > anarthrous infinitive (2). The equivalent occurs in 7:25a and 12:12b.

7:25a σιφομορ ἄν νολπερ καὶ τριβεται
κατά νομοῦ

7:25b δεικνυόμενον καὶ ἢ καρδία μου τοῦ γνώσωσαι καὶ τοῦ κατασκέψασθαι καὶ ζητήσων σοφίαν καὶ σύννοµον

7:25καὶ τοῦ γνώσωσαι ἁσβούς ἁμφοτέρων καὶ σκληρίαν καὶ περιφορὰν

12:12b ἦσσα λεπτή καινὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας
12:12b ποιήσατε βιβλία πολλὰ οὐκ ἢ ἑστιν περασμός

The infinitive form ἲσβ (baqqēs) in 7:25a must be a bound infinitive even though the free infinitive has the same form. 722 The preposition ἀ is probably gapped, and the infinitive has an adverbial function denoting a final sense as the previous infinitives ὑπὲρ καὶ τῆς κατά νομοῦ in 7:25b do. 723 A bound infinitive ἲσβ in 12:12b functions as a subject of the clause and also takes an object. The

721 See also Robertson, Grammar, 1066-67.

722 If the infinitive is a free form, it continues the preceding finite verb that is a suffix form. For the cases where a free form functions as finite verb, the Translator always employed an aorist indicative (4:2a, 8:9a, 9:11a) rather than an infinitive. Furthermore, the objects καὶ τῆς κατά νομοῦ must fit to ἲσβ as well as to ἲσβ. The form in question is, therefore, not a free infinitive.
Translator utilized the anarthrous infinitives for both Hebrew bound infinitives. His renderings are not only formally literal but are also acceptable Hellenistic Greek.  

**Bound infinitive without preposition > nominals (2).** There are 2 instances in which the bound infinitive without preposition is rendered by a nominal: by a noun in 7:1b, and by substantival adjective in 10:10b.

7:1b

καὶ ἡμέρα τοῦ θανάτου ὑπὲρ ἡμέραν γενέσεως αὐτοῦ

10:10b

καὶ περισσεία τοῦ ἀνδρείου σοφία

In both cases, the Hebrew bound infinitives are in the construct state and have nominal functions. According to Soisalon-Soininen, using nouns in Greek for the Hebrew bound infinitive as genitival attributive is an established approach in other translators of LXX.  

∑ + **bound infinitive > τοῦ + infinitive (87).** There are 87 instances in which the Hebrew bound infinitive prefixed by ∑ is rendered by τοῦ plus an infinitive in Greek.

Evidence:

1:7b, 1:8a, 1:8b, 1:13a, 1:13a, 1:13b, 1:15b, 1:17a, 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:6b, 2:11a, 2:12a, 2:20a, 2:26b, 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:2a, 3:2a, 3:2b, 3:2b, 3:3a, 3:3a, 3:3b, 3:3b, 3:4a, 3:4a, 3:5a, 3:5a, 3:5b, 3:5b, 3:6a, 3:6a, 3:6b, 3:6b, 3:7a, 3:7a, 3:7b, 3:7b, 3:8a, 3:8a, 3:10b, 3:12b, 3:12b, 3:15a, 3:18b, 3:22b, 4:10b, 4:13b, 4:14a, 4:17a, 4:17b, 5:1a, 5:3a, 5:5a, 5:11b, 5:11b, 5:14a, 5:17a, 5:17a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 6:10b, 7:5a, 7:9a, 7:13b, 7:25a, 7:25a,

---

723 In this case, the final infinitive can be also understood as a complementary infinitive. Cf. Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, 607.

724 For the final use of the bound infinitive, see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 24; BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §390; Robertson, *Grammar*, 989ff. For its substantival use functioning as subject, see BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §399; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1058ff.

In all these instances, the genitive article τοῦ is regarded as an equivalent of ἃ. The evidence is categorized into 3 groups according to their function: (1) independent uses, (2) adjectival uses, and (3) adverbial uses.

Adverbial ἃ + bound infinitive (48). In 25 instances out of 48, the form in question denotes purpose; in 20 instances it is used as the complement of a verb; and finally in 3 instances it functions as direct object. Examples are given for illustration.

(.final ἃ + Bound Infinitive)

1:17α καὶ ἔδωκα καρδίαν μου τοῦ γυνώναι σοφίαν καὶ γυνώσων παραβολάς καὶ ἐπιστήμην

(complementary ἃ + Bound Infinitive)

1:8α πάντες οἱ λόγοι ἔγκοποι οὓς διυπήκεται ἀνήρ τοῦ λαλεῖν

( להמשיך + Bound Infinitive as direct object)

4:17β ὡς οὖν εἶοι εἶδότες τοῦ ποιήσαί κακῶν

---

726 Cf. Robertson, Grammar, 1067; Soisalon-Soininen, Infinitive, 50; Gentry, Greek Job, 266.

727 This categorization is indebted to Soisalon-Soininen. In his monograph Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta, Soisalon-Soininen categorizes the bound infinitives into three groups. The first group includes independent uses of ἃ plus bound infinitive that are a subject or predicate. The second group contains adjectival uses, in which ἃ plus bound infinitive modifies preceding nominals. The final group includes adverbial uses, in which Soisalon-Soininen subgroups ἃ plus bound infinitive into a direct object, final, and epexegetical functions. See Soisalon-Soininen, Infinitive, 29-75.

728 (1) Final ἃ + Bound Infinitive: 1:13α, 1:13α, 1:13β, 1:17α, 2:6β, 2:11α, 2:26β, 3:10β, 3:22β, 4:14α, 4:17α, 5:5α (result), 5:18α, 5:18α, 5:18α, 6:2α, 7:25α, 7:25α, 7:25β, 7:27β, 8:9β, 8:16α, 8:16α, 8:17α, 12:10α; (2) Complementary ἃ + Bound Infinitive: 1:7β, 1:8α, 1:8β, 1:15β, 2:3α, 2:3β, 2:12α, 2:20α, 5:1α, 5:3α, 5:11β, 5:11β, 5:14α, 6:10β, 7:9α, 7:13β, 8:11α, 8:17α, 8:17β, 9:10α; (3) As Direct Object: 4:13β, 4:17β, 10:15β.
The ב plus bound infinitive in 1:17a is one of the cases, which is used as final clause. The Greek equivalent τοῦ plus an infinitive can also express purpose in Hellenistic Greek. The ב plus a bound infinitive in 1:8a is used as complement for the verb ראה. The main verbs, after which a complementary infinitive occurs, are mostly: משכ, מנה, מלא, מנה, וה, וה, וה, וה, וה. For these complementary infinitives, the Translator used τοῦ plus an infinitive. As in 4:17b the ב plus a bound infinitive functioning as direct object always occurs after the verb ראה. The Translator utilized τοῦ plus an infinitive for these cases as well. The same approach is already established by the earlier translators of LXX.

Adjectival ב + bound infinitive (28). In 28 instances the ב plus a bound infinitive is used attributively and rendered by τοῦ plus infinitive in Greek.

Example:
3:2a תָּפִלָה תָּפִלָה תָּפִלָה תָּפִלָה תָּפִלָה
3:2a καιρὸς τοῦ τεκέιν και καιρὸς τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν

The bound infinitives with preposition ב modify the preceding nouns as genitival attributive. The Translator employed τοῦ plus infinitive for the form in question. When the bound infinitive functions as adjectival modifier, whether it is with ב or without ב, the Translator consistently used the same approach. This approach is

---

729 Cf. Robertson, Grammar, 990.

730 Soisalon-Soininen, Infinitive, 50-54 (final); 38-48 (complementary); 39-41 (direct object).

731 The 28 instances are 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:2a, 3:2a, 3:2b, 3:2b, 3:3a, 3:3a, 3:3b, 3:3b, 3:4a, 3:4a, 3:5a, 3:5b, 3:5b, 3:6a, 3:6a, 3:6b, 3:6b, 3:7a, 3:7a, 3:7b, 3:7b, 3:8a, 3:8a, 4:10b, 8:8a, 11:7b.
also attested in other books of LXX.\textsuperscript{733}

*Independent ἦ + bound infinitive (11).* In 8 instances, the ἦ plus bound infinitive functions as subject, and in 3 instances as predicate.\textsuperscript{734}

Examples:

3:12a οἶδαί πεῖ μεν \textsuperscript{12} \textsuperscript{15} \\
3:12b οὐκ ἂν λεγομεν ἦν αὐτοῖς \\
3:12a ἦν οίκ ἐστιν ἁγαθὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς \\
3:12b ἦν τού ἐφφανθηκέναι καὶ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἁγαθὸν ἐν ζωῇ αὐτοῦ

3:15a ἡ σέβησθε καὶ οὐκ ἐνῆσήν τε καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ γίνεσθαι ἤκουσεν \\
3:15a το γενόμενον ἤκουσεν καὶ ἑαυτῷ γίνεσθαι ἤκουσεν \\

Two bound infinitives with ἦ follow the particle of exception αν in 3:12b.\textsuperscript{735} The particle αν functions as a conjunction ("unless"), and the forms λέγομαι and λεγεῖ function as subject. The predicate (θὰ) in the clause is gapped. The Translator used τοῦ plus infinitives as the functional equivalent for λέγομαι and λεγεῖ. Use of τοῦ plus infinitive as subject is frequently attested elsewhere in LXX.\textsuperscript{736}

In 3:15a the bound infinitive prefixed by ἦ is used as predicate in the headless relative clause introduced by ἐν. Some modern scholars describe ἐν as the

\textsuperscript{732}Most instances are focused on 3:2-8 (85 percent).


\textsuperscript{734}The 9 instances used as subject are 3:12b, 3:12b, 5:17a, 5:17a, 5:17a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:15a. Three instances in 5:17a are appositions to the subject, and the other instances are nominals following ἦν. The instances of direct objective are excluded since Soisalon-Soininen analyzes the instances as adverbial. The 3 instances used as predicate are 3:15a, 3:18b, 8:17b.

\textsuperscript{735}Cf. KB, s.v. "ἀν ἢ." 

\textsuperscript{736}Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 30; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1067.
periphrastic future. The Translator utilized plus infinitive, and its function in the clause is exactly the same as that of לֶךֶת. The same approach is observed in the renderings of other LXX translators.

\[
\text{ל + bound infinitive > anarthrous infinitive (4).} \quad \text{The equivalent occurs in 3:14a, 3:14a, 6:8b, and 7:2a.}
\]

\[\text{Independent } \text{ל + bound infinitive (3).} \quad \text{There are 3 instances where } \text{ל plus bound infinitive} \text{ are used as subjects in a clause and are rendered by the anarthrous infinitive in Greek (3:14a, 3:14a, 7:2a).}
\]

Example:

\[3:14a \text{לֶךֶת אֶל לֶךֶת וְהָלְכוּ אֶל לֶךֶת.}
\]

In 3:14a the bound infinitives with a preposition לֶךֶת and follow. The לֶךֶת-clause probably means here “it is impossible, it is not allowed” and must have a nominal subject. The Translator understood the forms לֶךֶת and as subject in the clause and employed an anarthrous infinitive in Greek for the Hebrew forms. One may expect an article for the formal equivalent of ל, but the anarthrous infinitive is also

---

\[737\text{Whitely, }\text{Koheleth, }114; \text{ M. Dahood, “Canaanite-Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth,” }\text{Biblica} 33 (1952): 51.\]

\[738\text{Soisalon-Soininen, }\text{Infinitive, }30-31.\]

\[739\text{Schoors, }\text{Preacher, }183.\]

\[740\text{In Ecclesiastes 3:14a is the only place where the }\text{ל plus infinitive follows לֶךֶת and functions as subject.}\]
used as subject in Hellenistic Greek.\textsuperscript{741}

\( \text{ב} + \text{bound infinitive as direct object (1).} \) In 1 instance \( \text{ב} \) plus bound infinitive functions as direct object and is rendered by the anarthrous infinitive in Greek.

6:8b יְהִי חֵן לְךָ לְכָּל הָעָקָדִים נֶר כְּלָלִים
6:8b διὸ ἐπὶ τῆς οἴνος πορεύουσα κατέναντι τῆς ζωῆς

In 6:8b, \( \text{לְכָּל} \) (\( \text{ב} \) plus \( Qal \) bound infinitive) is used as the object of \( 

\text{The Translator rendered it by the anarthrous infinitive. The article may be expected for the equivalent of } \text{ב} \text{ as in the other 3 instances, where the arthrous infinitive renders } \text{ב} \text{ plus bound infinitive functioning an object.\textsuperscript{742} Although there are numerous instances in Hellenistic Greek where the anarthrous infinitive functions as object, the Greek translators do not seem to prefer the anarthrous infinitive over the arthrous infinitive.\textsuperscript{743}}

In sum, the anarthrous infinitive for \( \text{ב} \) plus a bound infinitive is limited to the substantival uses of a bound infinitive, in which the form functions as subject or as object.

\( \text{ב} + \text{bound infinitive} > \text{τῷ} + \text{infinitive (1).} \) The equivalent occurs in 1:16a.

1:16a ἐξαποθείη ἐγὼ ἐν καρδίᾳ μου τῷ λέγειν ἐγὼ ἰδοὺ ἐμεγαλύνθην
1:16a יָאַפְתִּי הַיְהִי אֵמֶר אֶל הַיּוֹם הָעָדִים

The frozen expression \( לְאַרְאֵה \) introduces direct speech and is described as

\textsuperscript{741}See. Robertson, \textit{Grammar}, 1058; Soisalon-Soininen, \textit{Infinitive}, 29. In 8 instances, the article \( τῷ \) is used for the equivalent of \( \text{ב} \) which is conjoined to the bound infinitive functioning as subject.

\textsuperscript{742}The 3 instances are: 4:13b, 4:17b, 10:15b. Interestingly, all these infinitives including one of 7:2a are the objects of the verb \( \text{רָאָי} \).
The form in question is normally rendered by a participle form of ἔγερνυ in LXX. However, the Translator employed τυ plus an infinitive for ἀλλη, not a participle nor το plus an infinitive as one expects. This is the only place in Ecclesiastes where τυ is employed for the equivalent of ἐ with bound infinitive.

绑定不定式 + ἐ + 空格 + 不定式 (1)。在7:5a，绑定不定式用于主体。译者将形式翻译为τυ加上不定式在希腊。

7:5a ἐγένετο το ἀκούσα ἐπιτίμησε σοφοῖ

绑定不定式 > τυ + 空格 + 不定式 (1)。7:5a绑定不定式用于主体。虽然7:5a是唯一一个例子，在希腊Ecclesiastes中，使用绑定不定式，该方式通常被早期的LXX译者使用。

绑定不定式 + 空格 + ἐ + 空格 + 空格 + 显示性 (1)。在3:18a，绑定不定式用于直接对象，被一个显示性的空格 ἐ。
The form לַברָם (l'barām) is analyzed as bound infinitive prefixed by a preposition א and suffixed by the 3 m.p. pronominal suffix. The word לָברָם is the subject of the bound phrase, and the whole phrase לָברָם לָברָם functions as the object of the main verb. The Translator employed the ὅστε-clause for לָברָם לָברָם. The ὅστε-clause also functions as object, so its function matches that of the Hebrew infinitive phrase. If he used the Greek infinitive for the Hebrew infinitive, its subject and its object may have been confused because both of them would be accusative. Therefore the Translator intentionally used the ὅστε-clause to avoid the confusion. The approach is already established in other translators in LXX.747

In sum, formally, א plus a bound infinitive occurs 94 times. The bound infinitives in Hebrew are all rendered by an infinitive in Greek except in 1 case (99 percent). The preposition א is rendered by τοῦ 87 times (93 percent). In 4 instances, there is no equivalent for א, and the anarthrous infinitives are employed (4 percent). Both τῶ and τό are employed once each for א. An indicative with ὅστε is used for א plus a bound infinitive once.

When א plus a bound infinitive functions as a subject, τοῦ plus an infinitive renders it 9 times out of 13 (69 percent), anarthrous infinitive 3 times (23 percent), and τό plus infinitive once (8 percent). The approaches vary when the form in question is used as direct object. The τοῦ plus an infinitive is employed 3 times out of 5 (60 percent), anarthrous infinitive once (20 percent), and an indicative with ὅστε once (20 percent). However, for the cases in which the form in question functions as predicate, attributive, etc.,
complement, or final clause, τὸ plus an infinitive is utilized in all occurrences (100 percent). Finally, the epexegetical ἐ plus a bound infinitive is rendered by τὸ plus an infinitive.


$\text{ἵνα} + \text{bound infinitive} > \text{ἀπὸ} + \text{noun}$ (2). The equivalent occurs in 1:8b and 3:5b.

1:8b οὐκ ἐμπληκαίοντάς τοῦ οὐ καὶ οὐ πληρωθέντας οὐς ἀπὸ ἀκροάσεως

3:5b καιρὸς τοῦ περιλαβέντα καὶ καιρός τοῦ μακρυνθήναι ἀπὸ περιλήψεως

The form μεσίζα in 1:8b is analyzed as the Qal bound infinitive prefixed by the preposition $\text{ἵνα}$, and the form μεθήματι in 3:5b as the Piel bound infinitive prefixed by $\text{ἵνα}$. The translator rendered both forms by ἀπὸ plus nouns. The nouns in -σις are described as deverbative nouns expressing action and semantically correspond to -ing in English.\(^{748}\)

Since the bound infinitive is a verbal noun, the nouns in -σις are excellent functional equivalents for the Hebrew bound infinitive. The preposition $\text{ἵνα}$ may denote means or agent in 1:8b, and separation in 3:5b.\(^ {749}\) Its equivalent ἀπὸ conveys the same meanings in Hellenistic Greek.\(^ {750}\) This approach is well established in earlier LXX books.\(^ {751}\)


\(^{750}\) LSJ, s.v. “ἀπὸ”; BDF, §210-11; Robertson, *Grammar*, 574-80.

\(^{751}\) See Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 104-05.
The form ראה is analyzed as the bound infinitive with the preposition ב. The Translator rendered the form by ופי וplus the noun דמעא. The preposition ל here denotes comparison, and the Greek comparative ופי is an excellent equivalent to the ב. As for the noun דמעא for the bound infinitive, some modern scholars suggest that the Translator might have had a text that read מיממט (mimmattat, ב plus the noun). However, employing a noun for a bound infinitive prefixed by ב is the Translator’s standard equivalent as well as that of the earlier translators. Furthermore, the noun דמעא is deverbal and can be labeled a result noun. In other words, the noun belongs to the semantic category of action. Therefore, the deverbal noun is an appropriate equivalent to the bound infinitive. It is not necessary to presume that the Translator had a consonantal text different from MT.

In 6:9a, the Translator utilizes ופי plus the participle for המצ. The comparative ופי is an expected equivalent to the comparative ב. The bound infinitive
in Hebrew functions as an object of the preposition ן. The Greek participle πορευόμενον renders the form ן. One cannot decide whether the Translator read ן as the bound infinitive or as the participle. In either case, the Greek participle, which is used as substantive, functionally matches the form.

ן + **bound infinitive** > ה + **anarthrous infinitive** (1). The equivalent occurs in 7:2a.

7:2a מִלֵּכַת אֲלֵי בָּיְתָאֶכְל מִלְכָּת אֲלֵי בָּיְתָאֶכְל מִלְכָּת אֲלֵי בָּיְתָאֶכְל
7:2a ἀγαθῶν πορευόμεναι εἰς οἶκον πένθους ἕν ὅτι πορευόμεναι εἰς οἶκον πότου

The form מִלֵּכַת is analyzed as the prepositionן plus the bound infinitive, and the Translator rendered the form by ה + the infinitive. The Greek infinitive is a formal equivalent to the Hebrew bound infinitive, and the comparative ה is a functional equivalent to the comparativeן. The conjunction ה may be pleonastic. Soisalon-Soininen presented this as the only instance where ה renders the comparativeן in all the LXX, so the approach is unprecedented in LXX.

In sum, when a bound infinitive is used withן, the bound infinitive is rendered by the noun 3 times, and by a substantival participle or infinitive twice. Therefore, all 5 bound infinitives withן are rendered by substantives in Greek (100 percent). As the equivalent ofן, ἄντω is used for separative or means, and ἐπέρ or ה ὅτι

---

755 Ibid.

756 The particle ה can be used with infinitive. See BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §185 (2).

is employed for the comparative sense of מְנַקַּח.

ב + bound infinitive > ἐν + noun (2). In 5:10a and 12:4a, the preposition ב is prefixed to the bound infinitive in Ecclesiastes. The Translator employed ἐν plus anarthrous nouns in both instances.

5:10a מְנַקַּח תָּם הַנִּיר אִישׁ אֶלֶךָ
5:10a ἐν πλῆθεὶ τῆς ἀγαθωσύνης ἐπληθύνθησαν οἴς οὕτως αὐτήν
12:4a καὶ κλείσσοντον θύρας ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἐν ἀσθενεῖᾳ φωνῇ τῆς ἀληθοῦσης
12:4a καὶ κλείσσοντον θύρας ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἐν ἀσθενεῖᾳ φωνῇ τῆς ἀληθοῦσης

The preposition ב is temporal in 5:10a and either a temporal or causal idea in 12:4a.759 When ב expresses these ideas the preposition ἐν is an excellent formal and functional equivalent.760 The nouns πλῆθος and ἀσθενεία, the equivalents for רָצוֹן and בּשָׂל respectively, are action nouns.761 The action nouns are good equivalents for the Hebrew bound infinitives, which function as substantives and objects of the preposition ב. According to Soisalon-Soininen, the approach is already established by the earlier translators of LXX.762

In sum, for the preposition ב prefixed to a bound infinitive, mostly the article τοῦ is employed, and no Greek preposition ever renders ב. On the other hand, for מ or ב,

758 Soisalon-Soininen, Infinitive, 109.

759 Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 44, 112; Lohfink, Qoheleth, 78, 136; Gordis, Koheleth, 188; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 201, 347. Some scholars interpret in 5:10a as comparative, but it does not seem to be the way, in which the Translator understood it. Cf. Gordis, Koheleth, 158; Fox, Qoheleth, 214.

760 LSJ, s.v. “ἐν”, Bauer, s.v. “ἐν”

the proper Greek corresponding prepositions are employed in all but 1 case. Arthrous infinitives in Greek render bound infinitives in Hebrew 90 times, and anarthrous infinitives render them 7 times. The translation of infinitive is literal throughout the Greek Ecclesiastes, and the Translator’s approach is attested in earlier LXX books.

**Pseudo-Verbs**

The positive pseudo-verb ϭ occurs 16 times in Ecclesiastes and its negative counterpart ḫ 44 times. In 31 out of 44 instances the form ḫ is vocalized as 'ēn, the bound form without a pronominal suffix. With a pronominal suffix, it occurs 12 times. There is 1 instance in Ecclesiastes where the form is vocalized as the free form 'ayin. Although the bound form and its free form are not distinguishable in a consonantal text, the Greek equivalents correspond to the vocalization in MT. Its bound form without pronoun is analyzed first followed by its bound form with pronoun and the free form. The evidence is presented under each subheading, and the commentary follows.

**موافقة (44)**

**Bound form ḫ without pronoun (31).** They are normally rendered by οὐκ ἔστιν.

موافقة > οὐκ ἔστιν (30). The occurrences are 1:9b, 1:11a, 2:11b, 2:16a, 2:24a, 3:12a, 3:14a, 3:14a, 3:22a, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:16a, 5:3a, 5:13b, 7:20a, 8:8a, 8:8a, 8:11a, 8:15a, 9:1b, 9:5b, 9:6b, 9:10b, 10:11b, 12:1b, and 12:12b.

In 30 instances out of 31 (97 percent), the negative plus copula verb οὐκ ἔστιν

---

762 Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 82-83.
translates the bound form γρ, and this constitutes the normal pattern. The approach is functionally literal. Two examples are presented for illustration.

Examples:
1:9b καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν πᾶν πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἕλληνων
1:9b καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν πᾶν πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἕλληνων

8:11a ὅτε οὐκ ἔστιν γινομένη ἀντίρρησις ἀπὸ τῶν ποιοῦντων τὸ ποιητὴν ταχύ
8:11a ὅτε οὐκ ἔστιν γινομένη ἀντίρρησις ἀπὸ τῶν ποιοῦντων τὸ ποιητήν ταχύ

The bound form γρ rendered by οὐκ ἔστιν is normally followed by substantives as in 1:9b.764 When a participle follows γρ as in 8:11a, the Greek equivalent becomes a periphrastic construction.765

γρ > μὴ γε (I). In 4:10b, the bound form γρ is rendered by the negative μὴ plus the subjunctive γε.

4:10b καὶ οὐκαὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἐνὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πέσῃ καὶ μὴ γε δεύτερος τοῦ ἐγείρας αὐτῶν
4:10b καὶ οὐκαὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἐνὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πέσῃ καὶ μὴ γε δεύτερος τοῦ ἐγείρας αὐτῶν

The Translator construed the ὃ-clause as a temporal clause and rendered it by ὃκατ. When it is used for a conditional sense, the ὃκατ normally takes μὴ for a negative and the subjunctive for a verb as ἦλθ.766 Therefore, μὴ γε can be understood simply as a grammatical variation of οὐκ ἔστιν according to the norms of Greek and is a functional equivalent to the γρ in the temporal ὃ-clause.

763 The exceptional case is 7:2a where the comparative γε ὃτι is used.
764 There is one exception. In 7:20a a predicate adjective follows γρ.
765 Another periphrastic construction is attested in 9:1b.
766 Bauer, s.v. "ὁκατ"; LSJ, s.v. "ὁκατ."
Bound form יְחַלְיָה with pronouns (12). The equivalent occurs in 1:7a, 4:17b, 5:11b, 6:2a, 8:7a, 8:13b, 8:16b, 9:2a, 9:5b, 9:16b, 11:5a, and 11:6b.

For the cases where the bound form יְחַלְיָה has a pronominal suffix, the Translator employed various approaches. The form יְחַלְיָה with 3 m.s. suffix occurs 7 times.767 In 5 of them יְחַלְיָה is rendered by oυκ εστίν.768 5:11b is given for an example.

ברַבַּשּׁנָה לֵשְׁרְיָה נֵינֶהֹּו לַּלִּשְׁרָּא הָאָדָם ngoạiו אֱלֹהֵי יְחַלְיָה
5:11b καὶ τῷ ἐμπληθέντι τοῦ πλοῦτῷ ὠκ ἔστιν ἀφίων αὐτῶν τοῦ ὑποῦσαι

As discussed above, the Translator used the same oυκ εστίν as equivalent to the bound form יְחַלְיָה without a pronoun.769 In other words, he did not distinguish between the 5 instances of יְחַלְיָה with 3 m.s. suffix and יְחַלְיָה without a pronoun because the form εστίν is marked for person.

In 1:7a, the Translator used a future indicative form (ἔσται) instead of a present form (ἔστιν).

כְּלָהֵלֵלָיִם הַלוֹכְסָם בְּהַיָּהָם לְפָלוֹ
1:7a πάντες οἱ χεὶμαρροὶ πορεύονται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν
καὶ ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔσται ἐμπληθείη

The first line ("all the streams go to the sea") describes a present event, and the following line ("and the sea will not be full") is a temporal sequence of the previous line.770 The Translator’s use of oυκ εσται for יְחַלְיָה is, therefore, contextually motivated.

767 The 7 occurrences are: 1:7a, 5:11b, 6:2a, 8:7a, 8:13b, 8:16b, 9:2a.
768 The 5 occurrences are: 5:11b, 6:2a, 8:7a, 8:13b, and 8:16b.
769 See p. 277 of this dissertation.
770 English translation is from Gentry, "Ekklesiastes, 1."
In 9:2a, the Translator employed a functional equivalent to יאש. The 3 m.s. pronominal suffix in יאש is resumptive according to the rules of a relative clause in Hebrew but is not rendered in Greek. This is an example of a freer non-mechanical translation.

There are 3 instances, in which יאש has a 3 m.p. personal suffix—i.e., יאש. In all 3 instances, oυκ εἰσιν is used for יאש. The form εἰσιν already implies the third person plural subject in itself, so oυκ εἰσιν is a functional equivalent to יאש.

Example:
4:17b ἐσθήσατε τοὺς ποιήσατε κακῶν

Finally, יאש with a 2m.s. suffix occurs twice (11:5a, 11:6b). Each case deserves full presentation.

(יאש in 11:5a)
11:5a ἐστίν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τῶν σκοτών
11:5b ἀνθρώποι οὐκ εἰσέβαλεν
11:6a καὶ ἐξορυσσεῖ ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν μυστηρίων
11:6b καὶ ἐξορύσσει τὸν ἄνθρωπον στὸν θεὸν

In 11:5a, ἀνατρέπεται introduces an adverbial clause and denotes comparison (“Just as you do not know...”). Its main clause is 11:5b (“so you will not know...”). The

771 The 3 instances are: 4:17b, 9:5b, 9:16b.
Translator probably read בְּכָלְכָּא as בִּכְלַכָּא due to the confusion between ב and ב, and the clause becomes a temporal one, and not a comparative one. The Translator seems to have construed the בִּכְלַכָּא-clause in 11:5b to modify the clause in 11:4. The clause in 11:4 now becomes the main clause: “One who watches the wind will not sow... when he does not know...” Consequently, the subject of the relative clause in 11:5a is understood as the third person singular in light of 11:4. The new sentence in Greek begins with ὡς ὀστὰ ἐν γαστρὶ τῆς κυοφορούσης: “As bones in the belly of the pregnant woman...” The Translator’s rendering ἀναίρεσις by οὐκ ἔσται is, therefore, due to the different syntactical reading from MT. It is also possible that the Translator interpreted the clause introduced by ἀναίρεσις as a gnomical truth. In this case, the change from the second person to the third person may be because the object of the statement is not limited to “you” but is applied to the people in general.

In 11:6b the Translator used οὐ γινώσκεις (negative plus a present indicative in the second person singular) for ἀναίρεσις.

11:6b οὐ γινώσκεις ποιον στοιχήσει ἢ τούτο ἢ τούτο

One may expect a Greek periphrastic construction for ἀναίρεσις as the Translator did in other instances. Although 11:6b deviates from the normal pattern, οὐ γινώσκεις is a good functional equivalent to ἀναίρεσις.

The Translator’s renderings for the bound form ἀναίρεσις with or without a pronoun

772 Rahlfis’ punctuation in 11:4-5 follows this analysis.

773 One cannot know whether the Translator deliberately changed the person or his parent text already had ἀναίρεσις.
are either formally or functionally literal in all instances.

**Free form תָּנָא (1).** In 3:19b, תָּנָא is vocalized as a free form.

3:19b 

The form תָּנָא is used as a nominal predicate in MT: “and the advantage of the man over the beast is nothing.” On the other hand, the Translator understood תָּנָא as an interrogative plus verb and תָּנָא as the answer to the question: “and in what way did humans excel above cattle? Nothing.” Even though the Translator interpreted the syntax of תָּנָא differently from MT, he agreed with MT in construing the form in question as a free form with the meaning of “nothing” as a substantive. Therefore, תָּנָא is a formal equivalent to תָּנָא.

774 English translation is from Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 4. For the rendering for the form תָּנָא see p. 18 of this dissertation.
Examples:
2:13a καὶ εἰδόν ἐγὼ ὅτι ἐστίν περισσεία τῇ σοφίᾳ ύπερ τὴν ἀφροσύνην

6:11a δοῖ εἰσὶν λόγοι πολλοὶ πληθύνοντες ματαιότητα

יש > δς (1). The equivalent occurs in 1:10a.

1:10a יש לך פיוסי יראתי התש הוה איה קרב תני לוכלפם אבר חוה קלחנה
1:10b דס לאלשא כאל רפיו ידטו קאינוון יסטינ

Formally, 1:10a and 1:10b have 2 independent clauses that are asyndetically connected. From a functional perspective, modern commentators are apt to construe 1:10a as a protasis and 1:10b as an apodosis in a conditional sentence: “If there is a thing about which one might say... , it already existed... .” The Translator rendered 1:10a by a relative clause functioning as the subject of 1:10b. Seow suggests that the form יש ברב (יש + noun) is read as יש ברב (יש + verb) with metathesis of ר and יש. His proposal is insightful but not necessary to understand the approach of the Translator. A relative clause can also function as a conditional sentence in Greek. It is, therefore, possible that the Translator interpreted 1:10a in a conditional sense, as modern scholars do, and expressed the conditional sense with a relative clause. If this is the case, he is sensitive

---

775εστίν is employed in 2:13a, 2:21a, 4:8a, 4:9b, 5:12a, 6:1a, 6:11a, 7:15b, 8:6a, 8:14a, 9:4a, 10:5a; εἰσι(ν) in 6:11a, 8:14a, 8:14a.

776See Fox, Qoheleth, 169; Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 6; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 110. Cf. GKC, Hebrew Grammar, §159dd.

777Seow, Ecclesiastes, 110.

not only to the context but also to Greek.

The Translator's renderings of ו and ו are formally consistent with very few exceptions. The latter arises from either a stylistic variation (e.g. 11:6b) or contextual interpretation (e.g. 1:10a).

**Lexical Analysis of Verbs**

Turning from the syntactical viewpoint, we shall now analyze the patterns of the Translator on the basis of lexical equivalency. The analysis comprises finite verbs, infinitives, and participles occurring more than 3 times in MT. One is not apt to posit any significant pattern with verbs occurring less than 3 times.779 Pseudoverbs are not included because they have already been extensively analyzed in the previous section. Glosses, which the Translator added, are also excluded since they do not have a corresponding Hebrew text. For example, διότι ἀφρων ἐκ περισσεύματος λαλεί in 2:15 may be regarded as gloss, so the λαλεί is not listed in any entry.

All occurrences are grouped into three categories according to the level of variety. Category 1 consists of one-to-one or many-to-one Hebrew-Greek equivalencies. They are normally stereotypical renderings. Category 2 is called regular equivalents, which are one-to-many equivalencies. Finally, category 3 comprises many-to-many Hebrew Greek equivalencies. The motivation for the variations in categories 2 and 3 may be more complicated than that for the variations in category 1. The evidence is presented in the format: X > Y, which signifies “X is rendered by Y.” The number

779 The parameters for the analysis and the method to analyze are adopted from Gentry, *Greek Job*, 293-304.
following indicates the frequency, and the reference is given in the parenthesis following the frequency.

**Category 1 – Stereotype Equivalents**

*One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered by One Greek Lexeme*

1. רָאָשׁ > ἀπόλλυμι 6 (3:6a, 5:13a, 7:7b, 7:15b, 9:6b, 9:18b)

2. ἑλεόν > ἐσθίω 14 (2:24a, 2:25a, 3:13a, 4:5b, 5:10a, 5:11a, 5:17a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 8:15a, 9:7a, 10:16b, 10:17b)

3a. בַּל (Piel) > σπεύδω 2 (5:1a, 7:9a);

3b. בַּל (Niphal) > σπουδάζω 1 (8:3a)

4. נִנֵּה > οἰκοδομέω 3 (2:4b, 3:3b, 9:14b)

5. σέβομαι (Piel) > ζητέω 7 (3:6a, 3:15b, 7:25a, 7:28a, 7:29b, 8:17b, 12:10a)

6. נָסָל (Hiphil, Qal) > μεγαλύνω 3 (1:16a, 2:4a, 2:9a)

7. יָרָה > λαλέω 5 (1:8a, 1:10a, 1:16a, 2:15b, 3:7b, 7:21a, 8:4a)\(^{780}\)

8. עָרָה > μιμήροικω 4 (5:19a, 9:15b, 11:8b, 12:1a)

9a. עָבִיק (Qal) > περιλαμβάνω 2 (3:5b, 4:5a);

9. עָבִיק (Piel Inf.cs.) > περιλαμβάνεις 1 (3:5b)

10a. עָבִיק (Qal) > ἀμαρτάνω 6 (2:26b, 7:20b, 7:26b, 8:12a, 9:2b, 9:18b);

10b. עָבִיק (Hiphil) > ἀμαρτάναι 1 (5:5a)

11a. עָבְדָה (Qal) > κόμω 3 (6:3a, 6:6a, 7:14a,\(^{781}\) 11:8a)

---

\(^{780}\) דָּבָר in 1:10a and 8:4a, which are nouns (*dābār*) in MT, are construed as verbs.

\(^{781}\) The form דָּבָר in MT may have been read as דָּבָד.
11b. הָדַּר (Piel) > זָוַפְּנוֹאֵו 1 (7:12b)

12. סְכָמ > סְפִּיר 4 (2:15a, 2:19a, 7:16a, 7:23b)

13. בֵּית > דֹּֽנְאַמְא 7 (1:8a, 1:15a, 1:15b, 6:10b, 7:13b, 8:17a, 8:17b)

14a. אֵלַי (Qal) > אֶֽזְרָךְמַמ 4 (4:14a, 5:14a, 7:18b, 10:5b);

14b. אֵלַי (Hiphil) > אֶֽזְרַקְו 1 (5:1a)

15. אָרֵי > פָּבַּא 8 (3:14b, 5:6b, 7:18b, 8:12b, 8:13b, 9:2b, 12:13b)\footnote{The form אָרֵי is vocalized as yira'Î in MT (prefix defective form 3 m.p. from אָרֵי), but its Greek equivalent reflects yir'Î (prefix form 3 m.p. from אָרֵי).}

16. נַשְׁנ > סְעַנְּנָא 3 (2:8a, 2:26b, 3:5a)

17a. מָלַל (Niphal) > פָּלַרְו 4 (1:8b, 6:7b, 9:3b, 11:3a);

17b. מָלַל (Qal) > פָּלַרְו 17 (3:11b, 7:14b, 7:24b, 7:26a, 7:27a, 7:27b, 7:28a, 7:28b, 7:28b, 7:29a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 8:17b, 9:10a, 9:15a, 11:1b, 12:10a)

18a. מָלַל (Piel) > דֶּלַקְו 2 (8:8b, 9:15a);

18b. מָלַל (Niphal) > דֶּלַקְו 1 (7:26b)

19. אֵלַי > יָרִ֑יָּסֵ֔ו 17 (3:11b, 7:14b, 7:24b, 7:26a, 7:27a, 7:27b, 7:28a, 7:28b, 7:28b, 7:29a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 8:17b, 9:10a, 9:15a, 11:1b, 12:10a)

20. נֵד > אֵנַֽאֶ֑גֶ֖לְלָא 2 (8:7b, 10:14b);
> אֵנַֽאֶ֑גֶ֖לְלָא 2 (6:12b, 10:20b)

21. נֵנ > פָּבָֽו 3 (8:14a, 8:14a, 12:1b)

22. נֵד > אֵוַֽחַ֚מֶ֑ו 4 (5:3a, 5:3b, 5:4a, 5:4b)

23. נֵנ > פָּטְלָא 5 (2:4b, 2:5b, 3:2b, 3:2b, 12:11a)

24. בָּע > פָּטְלָא 4 (4:10a, 4:10b, 11:3a, 11:3b);
> אֵמָֽטְלָא 1 (10:8a);
> אֵמָֽטְלָא 1 (9:12b)

25. חָס > דָּיָֽשְּסֵ֑פָּא 3 (1:15a, 7:13b, 12:3a)
26. נָבָה > אֹסְטַה 5 (1:4b, 2:9b, 4:12a, 4:15b, 8:3a)

27. נָבָה > מֹכְחֵהוֹ 13 (1:3a, 2:11a, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:20b, 2:21b, 2:22b, 3:9b, 4:8b, 5:15b, 5:17a, 8:17a, 9:9b)

28. הָעַנ > פְּרֵיתוֹ 3 (1:13b, 3:10b, 5:19b)

29a. נָב (Hiphil) > הָגָקָר 2 (4:10a, 4:10b);

29b. נָב (Qal) > אָנִיסֶתִּהוֹ 1 (12:4b)

30a. נָב (Piel) > קָטַבָּרָא 4 (7:21b, 7:22b, 10:20a, 10:20a);

30b. נָב (Pilpel) > תָּרָכָשׁ 1 (10:10a)

31. נָב > סְעָנָה 3 (2:14b, 2:15a, 9:11b)

32. נָב > הָקָדָמְשׁ 2 (4:2a, 8:10a, 83 8:15a)

33. נָב > בַּפּוֹמֶל 1 (5:9a);
> אָנְפִּילֶמָל 3 (1:8b, 4:8a, 6:3a)

34. נָב > אְפֻדָּדוּ 3 (5:3a, 5:3b, 5:4b)

35. נָב > אֲפָרָאֵנְו 9 (2:10b, 3:12b, 3:22b, 4:16a, 5:18a, 8:15a, 10:19a, 11:8a, 11:9a)

36. נָב > הָקָוָו 7 (4:17a, 7:5a, 7:5b, 7:21b, 9:16b, 9:17a, 12:13a);
> אָקְרָא 1 (1:8b)

37. נָב > מְסֶלֶה 4 (2:17a, 2:18a, 3:8a, 8:1b 785)

38. נָב > הָעָר 5 (2:24a, 3:13a, 5:17a, 8:15a, 9:7a)

39. נָב > קְתָבָאָטֶסְיָם 3 (1:13a, 2:3a, 7:25a)

---

783 The form נָב in MT is read as נָבָה.

784 The form is vocalized as ša'mēah in MT.

785 šnḥ ("to change") in MT is construed as šn'.
More Than One Hebrew Lexeme
Rendered by One Greek Lexeme

40. בְּשֵׁם > προστίθημι 5 (1:16a, 1:18b, 1:18b, 2:9a, 3:14a) [בְּשֵׁם > προστίθημι 1 (2:26b)]

41. יְהוָה > πληθύνω 2 (6:11a, 10:14a) [יְהוָה > πληθύνω 1 (5:10a)];
   > πλήθος 1 (5:10a)
   יְהוָה > πολύς 15 (1:16b, 2:7b, 5:6a, 5:11a, 5:16b, 5:19a, 6:11a, 7:16a, 7:17a, 9:18b, 11:8a, 11:8b, 12:9b, 12:12b, 12:12b)

42. בִּשָּׁל > ἐπιστρέφω 10 (1:6b, 1:7b, 3:20b, 4:1a, 4:7a, 5:14a, 9:11a, 12:2b, 12:7a, 12:7b)
   [בִּשָּׁל > ἐπιστρέφω 1 (2:20a)]

43. שְׁלֵש > ἔξουσίας 4 (2:19a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 8:9b) [שְׁלֵש > ἔξουσίας 2 (9:17b, 10:4a)]

Category 2 – Regular Equivalents

One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered by
More Than One Greek Lexeme

44. בּוּז > ἁγαπάω 3 (5:9a, 5:9a, 9:9a);
   > φιλέω 1 (3:8a)

45. נָש > θηρεύω 2 (9:12a, 9:12a);
   > ἀντέχω 1 (7:18a);
   > κρατέω 1 (2:3b)

46. נָו > λέγω 19 (1:2a, 1:10a, 1:16a, 2:1a, 2:2a, 2:15a, 3:17a, 3:18a, 5:5a, 6:3b, 7:10a, 7:23b, 7:27a, 8:4b, 8:14b, 8:17b, 9:16a, 12:1b, 12:8b);
   > λογίζομαι 1 (10:3b)

47. נָב > ἔρχομαι 6 (1:4a, 2:16b, 6:4a, 9:14a, 11:8b, 12:1b);
   > ἀγω 3 (3:22b, 11:9b, 12:14a);
   > παραγινόμαι 2 (5:2a, 5:15a);
   > δύω 1 (1:5a);
   > εἰσάγω 1 (8:10a);
   > ἐπέρχομαι 1 (2:12b);
   > ἥκω 1 (5:14a)

48. נָב > πορεύομαι 24 (1:4a, 1:6a, 1:6b, 1:7a, 1:7b, 1:7b, 2:14a, 3:20a, 4:17a, 5:14a, 5:14b, 6:4a, 6:6b, 6:8b, 6:9a, 7:2a, 8:3a, 8:10a, 9:10b, 10:3a, 10:7b, 10:15b, 12:5b);
   > δεύτερο 2 (2:1a, 9:7a);
   > περιπατέω 2 (4:15a, 11:9a);
49. יד > γιγνώσκω 27 (1:17a, 1:17b, 2:14b, 3:12a, 3:14a, 4:13b, 6:5a, 6:10a, 7:25a, 7:25b, 8:5a, 8:7a, 8:12b, 8:16a, 8:17b, 9:5a, 9:5b, 9:11a, 9:12a, 10:14b, 10:15b, 11:2b, 11:5a, 11:5b, 11:6b, 11:9b);
> οἶδα 7 (2:19a, 3:21a, 4:17b, 6:8b, 6:12a, 8:1a, 9:1b) 786 [Ο > οἶδα 1]

50. ייתי > γεννάω 3 (4:14b, 5:13b, 6:3a);
> γένεσις 1 (7:1b);
> τίκτω 1 (3:2a)

51. ἡμήν > ἀποθνῄσκω 5 (2:16b, 3:2a, 4:2a, 7:17b, 9:5a);
> νεκρός 3 (9:3b, 9:4b, 9:5b);
> θνησκω 1 (4:2a)

52. ἦν > ἀπήλθω 4 (2:18b, 5:11b, 10:4a, 11:6a);
> ἤνίθμητα 1 (7:18a);
> ἤναπαύω 1 (7:9b);
> καταπευόμαι 1 (10:4b)

53. ἐν > διδώμαι 23 (1:13a, 1:13b, 1:17a, 2:21b, 2:26a, 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:10a, 3:11b, 5:5a, 5:17b, 5:18a, 6:2a, 7:2b, 8:9a, 8:15b, 8:16a, 9:1a, 9:9a, 10:6a, 11:2a, 12:7b, 12:11b);
> δῶμαι 1 (4:17a);
> τίθημι 1 (7:21a)

54. ἐρέω > ὅρκω 43 (1:8b, 1:10a, 1:14a, 1:16b, 2:1a, 2:3b, 2:12a, 2:13a, 2:24b, 3:10a, 3:13a, 3:16a, 3:22a, 3:22b, 4:1a, 4:3b, 4:14, 4:7a, 4:15a, 5:7a, 5:10b, 5:12a, 5:17a, 5:17a, 6:1a, 6:5a, 6:6b, 7:13a, 7:14a, 7:15a, 7:27a, 7:29a, 8:9a, 8:10a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:9a, 9:11a, 9:13a, 10:5a, 10:7a, 12:5a 785);
> βλέπω 4 (8:16a, 11:4b, 11:7b, 12:3b);
> δείκνυμι 2 (2:24b, 3:18b 790);

786 In 7:22a, ידיע in MT is read as ידעם with the confusion between יד and יד.

787 The Keilb form ἐρέω is vocalized as a noun in MT, but the Translator seems to have construed it as an infinitive from ἐρέω.

788 MT has יבלי ראה אָלַל יהוּדָא לִבְרָבָר אַף אַל, but the Translator seems to have read אָלַל יהוּדָא לִבְרָבָר אַף אַל. The verb יבלי ראה is created by the wrong word division, dittography of ראה, and the confusion between אָל and אָל.

789 See above entry 15.
Category 3 – Non-Standard Equivalents

55. הוש > γνώσω 28 (1:9a, 1:9a, 1:10b, 1:10b, 1:11b, 1:11b, 1:12a, 1:16a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:10b, 2:18b, 3:15a, 3:15a, 3:15a, 3:20b, 3:22b, 4:3a, 4:16a, 6:3a, 6:10a, 7:10a, 7:16a, 7:17a, 10:14a, 12.9a) [הוש > γνώσω 3 (1:13a, 4:1a, 8:11a); הוש > γνώσω 1 (2:22a)];
> είμι 18 (1:11b, 2:19a, 3:14a, 5:1b, 6:3a, 6:12b, 7:10a, 7:19b, 7:24a, 8:7a, 8:7b, 8:12b, 8:13a, 9:8a, 10:14b, 11:2b, 11:8b, 12.7a) [אֶל > είμι 9 (1:10a, 1:17b, 2:23b, 3:15a, 4:8b, 5:8a (Qere), 6:2b, 6:10a, 10:3b); אֶל > είμι 8 (2:24b, 3:13b, 5:5a, 5:8a Ketib, 5:18b, 6:1b, 7:26a, 9:13b); הוש > είμι 1 (11:3b); הוש > είμι 1 (3:18b)]

56. בֵּשָׁ > ἑτερογέφω 1 (2:20a) [בֵּשָׁ > ἑτερογέφω 10 (1:6b, 1:7b, 3:20b, 4:1b, 4:7a, 5:14a, 9:11a, 12:2b, 12:7a, 12:7b)];
> κυκλώ 6 (1:6a, 1:6b, 1:6b, 7:25a, 9:14b, 12:5b)

57. בֵּשָׁ > γνώσω 3 (1:13a, 4:1a, 8:11a) [יָד > γνώσω 28 (1:9a, 1:9a, 1:10b, 1:10b, 1:11b, 1:12a, 1:16a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:10b, 2:18b, 3:15a, 3:15a, 3:15a, 3:20b, 3:22b, 4:3a, 4:16a, 6:3a, 6:10a, 7:10a, 7:16a, 7:17a, 10:14a, 12:9a); הוש > γνώσω 1 (2:22a)];
> ποιέω 40 (1:9a, 1:9a, 1:14a, 2:2b, 2:3b, 2:5a, 2:6a, 2:8b, 2:11a, 2:11a, 2:12b, 2:17a, 3:9a, 3:11a, 3:11b, 3:12b, 3:14a, 3:14b, 4:3b, 4:17b, 6:12a, 7:14b, 7:20b, 7:29a, 8:3b, 8:4b, 8:9a, 8:10a, 8:11a, 8:12a, 8:14a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:3a, 9:6b, 9:10a, 10:19a, 11:5b, 12:12b)

58. בֵּשָׁ > φυλάσσω 7 (3:6b, 4:17a, 5:7b, 5:12b, 8:2a, 8:5a, 12:13b) [יָד > φυλάσσω 1 ( )];
> πρέπω 1 (11:4a);
> φύλαξ 1 (12:3a)

Commentary

According to category 1, one-to-one equivalency is applied to 39 verbs out of 58 (67 percent), and a many to one Greek-Hebrew equation is used for 4 verbs (7 percent). Thus the evidence in category 1 demonstrates a strong tendency towards

---

790 The form is Qal in MT but is construed as Hiphil.

791 For the form in 7:14a, see above entry 11a.
stereotypical renderings (total of 74 percent). The percentage of verbs in the category 1 is the same as that of nouns in category 1. Some brief comment is necessary for the apparent variations that appear in several entries of category 1.

No Significant or Minor Variation.

One of the distinctive features in category 1 is that the Translator used different Greek verbs for different stems of the same Hebrew verbs. They include entries 3, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 29, and 30. In entry 3, σπεύδω is used for the occurrences in the Piel stem of בָּדַי, but σποουάζω is used for its Niphal stem. The Translator employed ἀμαρτάνω for the Qal stem of άνυ and ἰσαμαρτάνω for the Hiphil stem in entry 10. In entry 11, he used ζάω for the Qal stem of άνυ and ζωοποιέω for the Piel stem. In the same way, ἦξηρχομαι renders the Qal stem of άνυ, and ἐκφέρω renders the Hiphil in entry 14. In entry 17, the Translator used πληρόω for the Niphal stem of άνυ, while he used πληροφορέω for the Qal stem. Similarly, he employed διασοφόω for the Niphal stem of άνυ, and διεισδέω for the Piel in entry 18. In entry 29, for the Hiphil stem of ἀναφέρω, he used ἐγείρω, but for the Qal stem, he used ἀνίστημι. The last example in category 1 is found in entry 30 where the Translator rendered the Piel stem of ἀπάνω by καταράομαι, while he rendered the Pilpel stem by παράόω in entry 30. Examples are also found in categories 2 and 3. In entry 45, θηρεύω is probably employed for passive meanings of άνυ. In entry 47, the Translator employed ἐρχομαι as a default rendering for the Qal stem of άνυ, while he used ἀγω for the Hiphil stem. In entry 52, ἀνύ in the Qal stem is rendered by ἀναπαύω, while the Hiphil stem is rendered by ἄφιημι, ἀνίημι, or καταπαύω (10:4b). The Translator employed περιπατέω for the Piel stem of ἀπάνω, ἀποφέρω for the Hiphil stem, and usually πορεύομαι.
for the Qal stem in entry 48. In entry 54, he used δείκνυμι for the Hiphil stem of παρέστησαν, while he used ὅραω, βλέπω, or θεωρέω for the Qal. Since different stems in these verbs represent different meanings, change of verb for change of stem is still recognized as stereotypical rendering in nature.792

The Translator often used simplex and compound forms of verbs without semantic distinction. Some grammatical circumstances may be related to the choice of compound forms. In entry 20, he employed ἀναγγέλλω when the direct object precedes τοῦ, while he used ἀπαγγέλλω when the direct object follows the verb. The compound forms ἐμπιέπτω and ἐπιπίπτω are employed along with the simplex form πίπτω in entry 24. The compound forms are decided by their governing prepositions: ἐν and ἐπὶ. There is no evident semantic difference between πίμπλημι and ἐμπιέπλημι in entry 33. Examples are also observed in categories 2 and 3. In entry 51, θυσία is used in perfect, while the compound form ἀποθυσία is used for future and aorist.793 Two Greek equivalents ἄφημι and ἄνημι for νῦν in entry 52 are also employed with no discernable distinction.

According to entries 9, 36, and 41, the Translator employed cognate nouns instead of verbs for stylistic purposes or smoothness of expression. The Hebrew verbs, for which he used cognate nouns, are all prefixed by prepositions: ἐπί (entries 9, 36) or ἐπὶ (entry 41). In entry 9, he used περιέπλησις for an infinitive form of παρέστησαν, and it may be

792 Cf. Gentry, Greek Job, 298.

793 LSJ, s.v. “ἀποθυσία.” According to LSJ, the practice, in which θυσία is used for perfect and pluperfect while ἀποθυσία is used for present, future, and aorist, has its
understood as a stylistic variation since another בַּבְרִי in the same line is rendered by the cognate verb περιλαμβάνω. In entry 41, the noun πληθος is used for בַּבְרִי once. The Greek equivalent is a stylistic variation of πληθονος, which is used for בַּבְרִי in the same line. Examples are found also in categories 2 and 3: entries 50, 53, and 58. In entry 50, γεννησις, the cognate noun of γεννάω, is used for בַּבְרִי. Similarly, the Translator probably employed δόμα for נַע in entry 53 and φύλαξ for שֶׁר in entry 58. Two common features are observed: (1) the Translator never used these cognate nouns more than once for each entry; (2) the cognate nouns are all employed for non-finite verbs (i.e., infinitive or participle).

Categories 2 and 3 represent one-to-many Hebrew-Greek equation and many-to-many equivalency. Most variations in these categories, which are not explained above, seem to be motivated by three factors: (1) contextual interpretation, (2) grammatical circumstance, and (3) stylistic variation.

**Contextual Interpretation**

In several entries, Hebrew verbs are contextually interpreted within the range of the usage of the target language. In entry 45, the Translator employed three different lexemes (θηρεύω, “hunt,” ἀντέχω, “hold on,” and κρατέω, “hold fast”) for בַּבְרִי according to context. The two equivalents ἀντέχω and κρατέω may be motivated by context.

origin in early prose. Thus the use of the compound form in this case is by the demand of the target language.

794 בַּבְרִי in 5:10a is a bi-form of בַּבְרִי.

795 The passive voice of the Hebrew word may also affect the choice of θηρεύω.
In entry 47, the default rendering for אָדָם with the meaning of “to go” is אֶרֶךְכֹּל. On the other hand, παράγνυμαι (“to arrive”), δύο (“to sink”), επέρχομαι (metaphorically “to follow”), and ἔκο (with perfect sense “to have come”) are chosen by the contextual sensitivity of the Translator.

In entry 48, אָדָם in 5:15 contextually denotes “to go away,” in contrast to אָדָם (contextually “to arrive”), so the Translator used ἐπέρχομαι for אָדָם rather than the default rendering πορεύματι.

In entry 55, the Translator seems to have been very sensitive to the contextual meaning of אָדָם. If אָדָם has inchoative sense with the meanings of “to happen,” “to come (into existence),” “to be born,” “to become,” or “to possess,” with אָדָם, he always employed γίγνομαι. On the contrary, for the instances where אָדָם simply functions as copula, he used εἰμί as an equivalent to אָדָם.

In entry 56, the Translator generally rendered אָדָם by κυκλώ (“to circle”) but used ἐπιστρέφω for אָדָם in 2:20a because he contextually interpreted אָדָם with the meaning of “to turn.”

In entry 57, a Niphal form of אָדָם is rendered by a present medio-passive form of γίγνομαι 3 times and by perfect medio-passive form of ποτέω 10 times. The Translator probably employed a medio-passive form of γίγνομαι for a middle sense and a medio-passive form of ποτέω for a passive sense.

Finally, in entry 58, the Translator used τηρέω for אָדָם in 11:4a where אָדָם contextually denotes “to watch” or “to observe,” while he employed φυλάσσω for the meaning of “to keep.” All these variations are within the range of usage of the target language.
**Grammatical Circumstances**

Some variations are employed based upon certain grammatical conditions. For example, in entry 46, the Translator used λέγω for ῥῆμα when ῥῆμα is followed by either direct or indirect speech. For ῥῆμα in 10:3b, which is not followed by direct speech nor by indirect speech, he employed λογιζομαι. In entry 48, δεῦρο is used for an imperative form of ἐν. In entry 50, ἱλίῳ has an object or occurs in the Niphal stem with passive meaning, the Translator rendered it by γεννάω. On the other hand, for the verb ἱλίῳ in 3:2a, which does not have an object in 3:2a, he used τίκτω. In entry 49, while the default rendering for ῥῆμα is γεννάσκω, the Translator always employed οἶδα for ῥῆμα when ῥῆμα occurred after an interrogative. Finally, according to entry 54, participle forms of ἁρὰ are always rendered either by βλέπω or θεωρέω, not by ὄρω. The verb θεωρέω is used for the bound form of the participle.

**Stylistic Variation**

In categories 2 and 3, a few variations are stylistic. In entry 47, παραγινομαῖ in 5:15a may be used as a stylistic variation to ἰκώ in 5:14a without any significant distinction. According to entry 53, τίθημι is used once for ἔγγυτο (7:21a). The verb ἔγγυτο takes ἂν as its object in 7:21a. The same grammatical construction (ἐγγυτόν ἂν) is observed in

---

796 There is only 1 instance where an indirect speech (infinitive) follows ῥῆμα (8:17b).
798 An exception is 11:7b, which is not a participle but an infinitive.
1:13a, 1:17a, 8:9a, and 8:16a. In all 4 instances, the Translator employed מָזַל for מָזַל. Since no different contextual meaning or grammatical condition is found in 7:21a from other 4 instances above, מָזַל is better understood as stylistic variation to מָזַל.

Summary

This analysis demonstrates that the approach of the Translator is highly literal and that he employed few free renderings. The variations are usually due to different stems of the Hebrew verb, stylistic variations, including cognate nouns, grammatical conditions involved, or his contextual interpretations. There are also cases where the Translator followed the demand of the target language to avoid a wooden expression. Contextual or stylistic variations compensate for the monotony of the stereotypical renderings.

Particles

The final part of speech for analysis is particles. Waltke and O’Connor define particles as “a class of words that connects and subjoins nouns and verbs” or that “exists on the margins of utterances.” They include prepositions, conjunctions, adverbs, articles, interjections, and exclamations. Some nouns are used as adverbs (e.g. הָרוֹם in 8:11a) or with the force of prepositions (e.g. נַחֲטָב with ב in 7:14b); and certain conjunctions are occasionally followed, not by clauses, but by nouns or nominal phrases (e.g. יִשָּׁמָע in 5:11a). Formally, the particles can overlap each other or overlap with nouns. They are, therefore, to be understood on a functional rather than formal ground.

799 Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, 692.
The data are categorized into 2 groups: (1) prepositions, and (2) conjunctions and other particles. The latter category includes adverbs, negatives, emphatics as well as conjunctions.

**Prepositions**

The Hebrew prepositions in Ecclesiastes may be categorized according to morphology. The inseparable prepositions, which occur only as prefixes, include ב, ו, and ס. As the preposition י can be both preposed and separate, it is labelled as separable. All other prepositions occur only as independent words and are called separate prepositions. Compound prepositions and semiprepositions are seen in Ecclesiastes. The compound preposition is a combination of one or more prepositions. The semipreposition is a combination of a preposition and a noun whose function is prepositional. The evidence is presented based upon these categories. Some prepositions overlap because they appear in some instances as components of compound prepositions or of semiprepositions. There are also prepositions that always occur as components of compound prepositions. They are not presented here independently.

---

800 Ibid.

801 The categories for analysis are borrowed from Gentry, *Greek Job*, 314-55.

802 For example, the form מִלָּהוֹן is presented under the preposition י, under ב, and under semiprepositions.

803 For example, מִלָּהוֹן is always associated with the preposition ב and never appears alone as a preposition. Therefore, מִלָּהוֹן is not presented as an independent subcategory of prepositions.
Inseparable Prepositions

The inseparable preposition ב occurs 159 times in Ecclesiastes. In 4 instances, the Translator seems to have construed the form differently from MT (7:12a, 8:4a, 9:10a, 10:17b). In 7:12a and 9:10a, ב is rendered by ו, and in 8:4a, the compound form חוֹזָר is rendered by כָּאָפּוֹ. The Greek equivalents may reflect ב rather than ב in all the 3 instances. In 10:17b, the form חוֹזָר, which is analyzed as ב plus noun כותָר ("drinking") in MT, is rendered by the verb αἰσχρόν (fut. medio-passive from αἰσχύνον "to be ashamed" in passive). The Translator probably construed חוֹזָר as a suffix verb form from ב ("to be ashamed"). These 4 instances are excluded from analysis because they are not construed as ב.

On the contrary, there are 6 instances where the form in MT is not ב but is construed as such by the Translator (4:17a, 6:12a, 8:13a, 8:16a, 9:2a, 11:5a). All 6 instances are the preposition ב in MT and are rendered by εν. Four of them are compound forms with חוֹזָר (4:17a, 8:16a, 9:2a, 11:5a). Since εν is a normal equivalent to ב rather than ב, the 6 instances are regarded as the instances of ב.

Consequently, the legitimate forms for the analysis of ב total 161.

804 For ב rendered by ו, see below the analysis of ב; for חוֹזָר rendered by כָּאָפּוֹ, see p. 105 of this dissertation.
805 KB, s.v. "כָּאָפּוֹ"; BDB, s.v. "כָּאָפּוֹ"; LSJ, s.v. "αἰσχύνον.
806 See p. 22 of this dissertation.
ב > ἐν (153). The Greek preposition ἐν renders ב in 153 instances (95 percent).

It is an expected literal approach, so no further discussion is necessary.

Evidence:
1:1b, 1:3b, 1:12b, 1:13a, 1:13b, 1:18a, 2:1a, 2:1a, 2:1a, 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:5b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:11a, 2:11a, 2:14a, 2:14a, 2:15b, 2:19a, 2:21a, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:22a, 2:22a, 2:23a, 2:24a, 2:24a, 3:9b, 3:10b, 3:11a, 3:11b, 3:12a, 3:12b, 3:13a, 3:17a, 3:18a, 3:22a, 3:22b, 4:9b, 4:14b, 4:16a, 5:1b, 5:2a, 5:2b, 5:3a, 5:6a, 5:7a, 5:8a, 5:9a, 5:10a, 5:13a, 5:13b, 5:14b, 5:14b, 5:16a, 5:17a, 5:18a, 5:19b, 6:4a, 6:4a, 6:4b, 6:12a, 7:3b, 7:4a, 7:4b, 7:9a, 7:12a, 7:14a, 7:14a, 7:15a, 7:15b, 7:15b, 7:17b, 7:18a, 7:19b, 7:20a, 7:23a, 7:26a, 7:28b, 8:3a, 8:8a, 8:8a, 8:8a, 8:9b, 8:10a, 8:11b, 8:15b, 8:16b, 8:16b, 8:16b, 9:1a, 9:3a, 9:3b, 9:6b, 9:7a, 9:7a, 9:8a, 9:9b, 9:9b, 9:10b, 9:12a, 9:12a, 9:14a, 9:15a, 9:15a, 9:17a, 9:17b, 10:3a, 10:6a, 10:6b, 10:8a, 10:9a, 10:9b, 10:11a, 10:16b, 10:17b, 10:18a, 10:18b, 10:20a, 10:20a, 11:1b, 11:3a, 11:3a, 11:4b, 11:5a, 11:6a, 11:8a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9b, 12:1a, 12:1b, 12:3a, 12:3b, 12:4a, 12:4a, 12:5a, 12:5b, 12:14a.

Examples:
1:18a
1:18a ὃς ἐν πληθείᾳ σοφίας πλῆθος γνώσεως

2:1a
2:1a δεῦρο δὴ πειράσω σε ἐν εὐφροσύνη καὶ ίδὲ ἐν ἄγαθῳ

7:9a
7:9α μὴ σπεύσῃς ἐν πνεύματί σου τοῦ θυμοῦσθαι

ב > different Greek syntagmeme (8). In the other 8 instances the Translator employed a different syntagmeme in Greek to comply with the demands of the target language or to convey the function of the ב. All the evidence is presented for discussion.

2:3a
2:3a κατεσκεψάμην ἐν καρδίᾳ μου τοῦ ἐλκύσας εἰς οἶνον τὴν σάρκα μου

In Hellenistic Greek the preposition εἰς is often used in the place of ἐν with

807 In 9:2a וְכָלָה is rendered by ἐν. It is somewhat dubious whether ἐν renders ב only or וְכָלָה as a whole.
various nuances. In 2:3a, εἰς (“into”) may fit better in the context than ἐν (“in”) because εἰς not only denotes location but also explicitly implies direction or motion.

In addition to that, יָשָׁה frequently takes ב unless the subject is Yahweh, but ἔλκω is more common with εἰς than ἐν. Therefore, εἰς is a good equivalent to ב according to the demands of the target language as well as the context, and it demonstrates that the translation is not at all mechanical.

In 2:3b, the second ב is rendered by ἐπί. The verb ἀπέκτω normally occurs with ב when it is used with a preposition. On the other hand, the Greek verb κράτεω is mainly used with the accusative or genitive case without a preposition. If ἐν is used for ב, it would be interpreted as an instrumental notion (“with”) with κράτεω. The preposition ἐπί may be used to avoid the semantic confusion and at the same time to carry a close function to ב.

10:17b כִּי בְּעָרְכוֹ תִּשְׁתַּחֵץ
10:17b כִּי אוֹאָוֶתֶּשׁ סַוֶּאֶרֶךְ קַרְדוֹן פַּגְוַונֵתָא

---


809 Cf. Conybeare and Stock, Septuagint Greek, §90.

810 If the subject is Yahweh, the preposition used is ב. See BDB, s.v. ב; cf. KB, s.v. ב. For the prepositions following ἔλκω, see Bauer, s.v. ἔλκω.

811 BDB, s.v. ב; KB, s.v. ב.
The Translator used πρός rather than ἐν for ἰ in 10:17b. The preposition πρός may denote towards a certain time ("at," "about") or duration of a period of time ("for," "in").812 On the other hand, ἐν denotes either a time period of time covered by an occurrence ("within") or the point of time when something occurs ("at"). While ἐν seems to designate precise temporal deixis, πρός reflects somewhat approximate temporal notion. The Translator would have construed ἰ as having the sense of approximate temporal boundary for the "proper time (objPHPExcel)."

In the 2 instances above, ἰ is prefixed to the noun ἰ ("haste") or adverb ἰ ("thus").813 The compound forms, ἰ ἰ in 4:12b and ἰ ἰ in 8:10a, function as adverbs: "quickly" and "thereupon" respectively. The Translator did not mechanically translate the Hebrew forms but interpreted the forms by their function. The Greek adverbs ταχέως and τότε are excellent functional equivalents to ἰ ἰ and ἰ ἰ respectively.

812 LSJ, s.v. "πρός"; Bauer, s.v. "ἐν."

813 BDB, s.v. "המיחה" and s.v. "מק"; KB, s.v. "מהרה" and s.v. "כן."
In the above 3 instances, א is associated with relatives: ר in 2:16b, ר in 7:2a, and ר in 8:17a. Construing ר and ר as having the identical value in 2:16b and 7:2a, the Translator used קד for both ר and ר. He probably interpreted the Hebrew compound relatives with a causal notion (“because”). For ר ר in 8:17a, the indefinite relative pronoun ו and ו are used. The Translator may have understood the Hebrew phrase as an indefinite relative (“whatever”).

The preposition א occurs 32 times in Ecclesiastes, but the Translator probably confused 6 of them with the preposition א (4:17a, 6:12a, 8:13a, 8:16a, 9:2a, 11:5a). Thus, 6 forms are to be regarded as א. On the contrary, in 3 instances the preposition א is construed as א (7:12a, 8:4a, 9:10a). These 3 instances are counted as א. A total of 29 occurrences, therefore, are legitimate for the analysis of the preposition א. The preposition א is categorized according to its function whether the prepositional phrase modifies a nominal or a verb or introduces a dependent clause. Its functions are decided in the perspective of the Translator.

814 There are 4 instances where the Translator construed ר ר as ר (4:17a, 8:16a, 9:2a, and 11:5a). He rendered א of the forms by ו following his normal pattern.

815 See pp. 106 and 114 of this dissertation.

816 See p. 99 of this dissertation.

817 See p. 298 of this dissertation.

818 Ibid.

819 The syntactical categorization for the analysis is indebted to Gentry, Greek Job, 322-24.
Nominal modifier (1). The prepositional phrase $\text{ἐν χώρᾳ}$ in 10:5b modifies the noun χώρα in 10:5a. The preposition $\epsilon$ is rendered by ως.

Verbal modifiers (19). When $\epsilon$ functions as a verbal modifier, it is normally rendered by ως.

$\epsilon > \omegaς$ (17). The equivalent occurs in 2:13b, 2:15a, 3:19a, 7:6a, 7:12a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:10a, 9:12a, 9:12a, 9:12b, 10:7b, 11:5a, 12:11a, and 12:11a.

Examples:

9:12b κάθε μνήμεως γενέας κλάματα
9:12b ως αὐτὰ παγιδεύονται οἱ νεοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

12:11a τὰς ἀθώτατα σοφωνίμους πόλεις τὰ βουκεντρα

The prepositional phrase $\text{ἐν χώρᾳ}$ is understood to modify the participle functioning as a predicate in 9:12b. In 12:11a, the prepositional phrase $\text{ἐν χώρᾳ}$ is construed as a predicate.

$\epsilon > \text{different Greek syntagmeme (2).}$ The occurrences are 8:1a and 11:6b.

8:1a τοις καθήκοντες φοίνικες αἰεὶ δύναται τῇ 
8:1a τοις οἴκῳ σοφών καὶ τοις οἴκῳ λύσον ρήματος

11:6b οἵ ἀμφιθυμῶν παραδόθησαν ἐπάλληλον

---

820 The Greek equivalent is used with an accent (ως) and functions as a demonstrative (“so,” “thus”). See LSJ, s.v. “ως.”

821 There are 2 other instances where the prepositional phrase functions as predicate (12:11a, 7:12a).
In 8:1a, ὁ ὡτὸ ἀγαθόν functions as a predicate: “Who is like the wise?” Aquila reads ἡ ὢτὸ ἀγαθόν and it seems to reflect אֶל הַבְּשָׁם with different word division from the MT. Is oǐδεν in Greek Ecclesiastes possibly a corruption of oǐδε in Aquila? The plural οὐφοῦς may be due to the dittography of the next μ with the confusion of ν and ρ. There may have been a Hebrew text, which had a different word division from MT and the dittography: אֶל הַבְּשָׁם. With the different Hebrew text, Aquila’s translation (τίς οὐδεὶς οὐφοῦς) was probably corrupted into τίς οǐδεν οὐφοῦς. The corruption may have also been an attempt to parallel with the next μ clause. Another possible explanation for 8:1a may be that the Translator himself interpreted the clause contextually. Without departing from the original Hebrew meaning, he made the two questions parallel, so the first question “Who is like the wise?” becomes “Who knows wise things?” This explains both the verb (oǐδεν) and the plural noun (οὐφοῦς). The latter explanation may be preferable because the former has to postulate a text which is not attested.

In 11:6b, the preposition ἐπὶ is rendered by the preposition εἰς. The Greek expression εἰς τὸ ἀντίστοιο signifies “together” as is וּלָכַּב in Hebrew. The εἰς is, therefore

---

822Fields, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, 2: 395; Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 80.

823Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 80; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 277. The relationship between the Translator and Aquila will be discussed in chap. 3.

824Seow, Ecclesiastes, 277.

825I.e., τίς οὐδεὶς οὐφοῦς, or τίς οǐδεν οὐφοῦς, or their corresponding Hebrew texts.

826BDB, s.v. "וּלָכַּב"; Bauer, s.v. "εἰς."
used because of Greek convention.

**Dependent clause marker (9).** In 9 instances, ἃ fuctions as a dependent clause marker together with other conjunctions.

> καθὼς (4) / καθὼς ἀν (1). For ἃ, the Translator employed καθὼς in 5:14a, 8:4a, 8:7b, 9:2b and καθὼς ἀν in 5:3a.

Examples:
5:3a καθὼς ἀν εὐθὺς εὐχὴν τῷ θεῷ
5:14a καθὼς ἐξῆλθεν ἀπὸ γαστρὸς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ γαμῆς

> ὥς (2) / ὅταν (2). For ὥς, ὥς is used in 5:14a and 12:7a, and ὅταν is used in 9:12b and 10:3a.

Evidence:

> ὥς: 5:14a, 12:7a.

> ὅταν: 9:12b, 10:3a.

Examples:
5:14a ἀπὸ τῆς γένεσεως αὐτοῦ ὥς ἦκει
9:12b ὅταν ἐπιτέτησε ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ἀφίω

**Summary.** The patterns betray the literal characteristics of the translation.

For ἃ, the Translator employed ὥς in 20 instances and its related form καθὼς in 5 instances (86 percent). Nevertheless, his rendering is not stereotyped. He was sensitive to the context and the meaning of the words, which is evident in his choice of conjunctions. This sensitivity demonstrates his ability to adapt his translation to the nuances of the text.

---

827 See p. 105 of this dissertation.
828 See p. 113 of this dissertation.
to the poetic parallel in 8:1a and to the context in 9:12b and 10:3a. In 11:6b, he used a 
Greek idiom as a functional equivalent to the Hebrew idiomatic phrase.

The preposition לָכַה occurs 234 times in Ecclesiastes. The form לָכַה in 9:1a is 
analyzed as the preposition plus a bound infinitive ("to examine") in MT, but the 
Translator construed it as the noun with 1 c.s. pronoun לָכַה ("my heart"). The 
compound form לָכַה לָכַה occurs in 4 instances (2:15a, 5:5b, 7:16b, 7:17b) and functions as 
interrogative. These 4 instances of לָכַה are not considered for this analysis.

On the other hand, there are 3 forms, which do not follow the preposition לָכַה, but the Translator construed as such. In 4:10b, the Translator probably understood the 
form לָכַה לָכַה ("if") as לָכַה ("woe to him!"), so it is treated under the preposition לָכַה. As for לָכַה (kol- 'ummat) in 5:15a, he may have construed it as לָכַה + לָכַה + defective לָכַה. 
Finally, αὐτῶν is the corresponding Greek equivalent for לָכַה in 5:9a. The Translator 
probably construed the form as לָכַה (לָכַה + personal pronoun 3 m.s.). In sum, a total of 232 
instances are considered for the analysis of the preposition לָכַה in Ecclesiastes.

Nominal modifiers (76). When לָכַה functions as a nominal modifier, it is 
rendered either an article in genitive or the dative of respect.

Rendered by article in genitive (29). The occurrences are 2:16a, 3:2a, 3:2a,

829 See p. 16 of this dissertation.
830 Gordis, Koheleth, 241; Whitley, Koheleth, 51; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 205.
3.2b, 3.2b, 3.3a, 3.3a, 3.3b, 3.3b, 3.4a, 3.4a, 3.5a, 3.5b, 3.5b, 3.6a, 3.6a, 3.6b, 3.6b, 3.7a, 3.7a, 3.7b, 3.7b, 3.8a, 3.8a, 4.10b, 5.8b, 5.9a, 8.8a, and 11.7b.

Examples:
2:16α οὐκ ἔστιν μνήμη τοῦ σοφοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ἥφθων καὶ ἀλώνα

3:2α ηῆ ηῆ ηῆ ηῆ
3:2α καίρος τοῦ τεκείν καὶ καίρος τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν

In 2 instances (2:16α, 5:8b), ἀ is prefixed to a noun and modifies a previous noun in a bound phrase. For the other 26 instances, ἀ is prefixed to the bound infinitive and functions attributively to modify a noun as is the example in 3:2α.

Rendered by dative of respect (47). In 35 instances, ἀ is rendered by the article in dative.

Evidence:
1:3α, 1:11α, 1:11α, 2:3β, 2:13α, 3:1α, 3:1β, 3:17β, 3:19α, 4:8α, 4:16α, 5:10β, 6:8α, 6:11β, 6:12α, 7:11β, 8:12β, 8:13α, 8:15α, 9:2α, 9:2α, 9:2α, 9:2α, 9:2α, 9:2α, 9:2α, 8:31 9:3α, 9:11α, 9:11α, 10:11β, 11:7β.

Example:
1:3α ηῆ ηῆ ηῆ ηῆ ηῆ
1:3α τίς περισσεία τῷ ᾑθρώνῳ ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ

In 12 instances, ἀ is just marked by the dative case of the following word:

1:11β, 3:19α, 4:9β, 4:10β, 4:11α, 5:15β, 6:5β, 8:6α, 8:12α, 9:5β, 9:6β, 10:16α.

Example:
8:6α ἡ ἐν παντὶ πράσματι ἄφθων καὶ κρίσις
8:6α ἡ ἐν παντὶ πράσματι ἄφθων καὶ κρίσις

Verbal modifiers (156). When functions as a verbal modifier, the Translator normally utilizes nominals in dative or τοῦ + Infinitive (61).
In 5 instances, the phrase functions as a subject, and is rendered by the article in nominative. In 4:11b, 6:8b, 9:4b, and 10:3b, a noun follows, and in 7:5a, an infinitive follows.

Examples:
6:8b διότι ὁ πέντες οίδεν πορευθήμας κατέναντι τῆς ζωῆς
7:5a ἐγαθοῦ τὸ ἀκοίσα ἐπιτίμης οὑ οὐ

In 27 instances, the preposition has a pronominal suffix and is rendered by the dative case of the Greek pronoun.

Evidence:
2:4b, 2:4b, 2:5a, 2:6a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:9b, 3:18b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:8a, 4:8b, 5:12b, 5:17b, 5:18a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:3a, 8:4b, 8:7b, 8:9b, 8:15b, 9:9a, 10:14b, 12:1b.

Example:
2:4b καθεὶς
2:4b ὡς δινήσα, ἠ οὐκους

In 16 instances, for the suffixed to the noun the Translator rendered the article in the dative.

Evidence:
1:13b, 2:2a, 2:2b, 2:18b, 2:22a, 2:26a, 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:10b, 5:3a, 6:12b, 7:19a, 7:27b, 9:2a, 11:2a, 11:2a.

Example:
2:2a ἀναφέρεται ἐν ἁγιασμῷ
2:2a τῷ γέλωται εἴπα περιφορᾶν

831 All are personal pronouns except 4:8b, which is an interrogative.
The phrase > nominal in accusative (1). In 5:11b, the Translator understood יִשְׁמַע as the object of the verb and so used the pronoun in accusative according to the norm of the target language.

5:11b יִשְׁמַע מִן לִשְׁמַא יִשְׁמַע
5:11b οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀφίων αὐτὸν τοῦ ὑπηρέτου

The phrase > eἰς + nominal in accusative (18) / ἐν + nominal in dative (1). The occurrences are 1:4b, 1:11b, 2:16a, 3:14a, 3:21a, 5:12b, 5:15b, 6:7a, 7:21a, 8:9a, 9:6b, 9:12b, 10:2a, 10:2b, 10:19a, 11:6a, 12:4b, and 1:10b (ἐν).

In 18 instances, the Translator interpreted the י phrases with adverbial functions and employed εἰς for י. Three times, he construed the י phrase as articular form (1:4b, 1:11b, 3:14a) but for all the other instances, as anarthrous forms.

Example:
1:4b ἦν ἀρχὴ ἡ ἐν ἐν τῶν αἰῶνα ἐστηκεν
1:4b καὶ ἥ γε ἐν τῶν αἰῶνα ἐστηκεν

2:16a ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶν μνημή τοῦ οσφοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ἀφρονος εἰς αἰῶνα
2:16a οὐκ ἐστὶν μνημή τοῦ οσφοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ἀφρονος εἰς αἰῶνα

In 1:10b, the Translator rendered לְעַלְמָה by ἐν τοῖς αἰῶναν not by εἰς τοῖς αἰῶναν.

1:10b καὶ πάλιν ἐν τοῖς αἰῶναν
1:10b καὶ πάλιν ἐν τοῖς αἰῶναν

When לְעַל suffixed by י is a singular, he used εἰς for י (1:4b, 2:16a, 3:14a, 9:6b). On the other hand, the form לְעַל in 1:10b is plural and by the context, has a different temporal nuance from its singular form. The Translator was sensitive to this different nuance and used a different preposition.
$ + \text{bound infinitive} > \tau\nu + \text{infinitive (61)}. \text{ The occurrences are } 1:7b, 1:8a, 1:8b, 1:13a, 1:13a, 1:13b, 1:15a, 1:15b, 1:17a, 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:6b, 2:11a, 2:12a, 2:20a, 2:26b, 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:10b, 3:12b, 3:12b, 3:18b, 3:22b, 4:13a, 4:14a, 4:17a, 4:17b, 5:1a, 5:3a, 5:5a, 5:11b, 5:11b, 5:14a, 5:17a, 5:17a, 5:17a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 6:10b, 7:9a, 7:13b, 7:25a, 7:25b, 7:27b, 8:9b, 8:11b, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:16a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 8:17b, 9:10a, 10:15b, \text{ and } 12:10a.

Example:
(Final $^833$

$\text{το υπόλοιπον κατάληκτον όνομα}$

1:13a καὶ ἔδωκα τὴν καρδίαν μου τῷ ἐκζητήσαν

(Nominal $^834$

$\text{οὐ εὖ έγένετο τοῦ προσέχειν ἔτι}$

4:13a ὃς οὖν ἔγνω τοῦ προσέχειν ἔτι

(Complementary $^835$

$\text{καὶ εἰς τὸν λαλεῖν}$

1:8a οὐ δυνῆσεται ἄνηρ τοῦ λαλεῖν

Predicate $ + \text{bound infinitive} > \tau\nu + \text{infinitive (1)}. \text{ The equivalent occurs in } 3:15a.$

3:15a καὶ δέον τῷ γίνεσθαι θῇ τῇ γέγονεν

$^833$ The final $ is seen in 32 instances: 1:7b, 1:13a, 1:13a, 1:13b, 1:15a, 1:15b, 1:17a, 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:6b, 2:11a, 2:12a, 2:20a, 2:26b, 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:10b, 3:12b, 3:12b, 3:18b, 3:22b, 4:13a, 4:14a, 4:17a, 4:17b, 5:1a, 5:3a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 7:25a, 7:25a, 7:25b, 7:27b, 8:9b, 8:11a, 8:16a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 12:10a.

$^834$ The nominal $ is seen in 15 instances: 2:3a, 2:3b, 3:12b, 3:12b, 4:13b, 4:17b, 5:17a, 5:17a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:17b, 9:10a, 10:15b.

$^835$ The complementary $ is seen in 14 instances: 1:8a, 1:8b, 1:15a, 1:15b, 5:1a, 5:3a, 5:11b, 5:14a, 6:10b, 7:9a, 7:13b, 8:11b, 8:17a, 8:17b.
$ + \text{bound infinitive} > \text{different Greek syntagmeme}$ (2). The occurrences are 1:16a and 3:18a.

1:16a

3:18a

In 1:16a 'לאמר' is a marker to signal the beginning of quoted speech.\textsuperscript{836} The Translator rendered it by the article in dative followed by the infinitive. The $'$ phrase in 3:18a functions as an objective clause and is properly rendered by the $\delta \tau \iota$-clause.

$\delta\phi\tau\rho\omega\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota > \text{adverb}$ (2). The equivalent occurs in 3:21b and 7:29a.

3:21b

7:29a

The form $\lambda\mu\varepsilon\iota\varsigma$ in 3:21b is analyzed as $\delta$ plus adverb, and $\lambda\mu\varepsilon\iota\varsigma$ in 7:29a is $\delta$ plus noun. The Translator interpreted both forms as having adverbial functions and used Greek adverbs for their equivalents.

$\delta > \text{zero}$ (5). The occurrences are 2:21b, 3:14a, 3:14a, 6:8b, and 7:2a.

Examples:

2:21b

7:2a

All 5 instances where ἐ is rendered by zero are to be construed either as subject or as object. The form ἐπεμεθε in 2:21b is grammatically casus pendens and may function as an indirect object in a deep structure. The Translator used an anarthrous noun in the nominative for the form. In 7:2a, the ἐ plus a bound infinitive functions as the subject, and is rendered by the anarthrous infinitive.

ἐ in compound preposition ἐπεμεθε < ὀπεπ (1) / ἐπεμεθε > σύμφωνος (1). The occurrences are 5:15a and 7:14b.

5:15a ἐπεμεθε σύμφωνος καὶ ἀπελεύσατο
5:15a ὀπεπ γὰρ παρεγένητο οὕτως καὶ ἀπελεύσατο
7:14b καὶ γε σὺν τούτῳ σύμφωνον τούτῳ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς περὶ λαλίας
7:14b καὶ γε σὺν τούτῳ σύμφωνον τούτῳ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς περὶ λαλίας

The rendering is not mechanical for the same form as the Translator was sensitive to the context and employed appropriate Greek equivalents.

ἐ in semipreposition ἐπεμεθε > πρὸ προσώπου (6) / ἐμπροσθεν (5) / πρόσωπον (4). The Translator employed πρὸ προσώπου in 2:26a, 2:26b, 5:1a, 5:5a, 7:26b, and 9:1b,

ἐμπροσθεν in 1:10b, 1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a, and 4:16a, and πρόσωπον in 3:14b, 8:12b, 8:13b, and 10:5b.

Examples:
5:5a ἐ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ
5:5a καὶ μὴ εἴπης πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ

2:7b ἐ πρὸ προσώπου πολλῆ ἐγένετο μοι ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς γενομένους ἐμπροσθέν μοι

3:14b ἐ πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
3:14b ἐ πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
Summary. The Translator employed the dative for 91 instances of the nominal prefixed by י (39 percent) and genitive for 90 instances of the bound infinitive prefixed by י (39 percent). For the other instances, he used nominative and accusative following the demands of the target language. As a whole, the case is decided by the Greek syntax.

In 149 instances, the Translator rendered י by the article (65 percent). If we lay aside cases of י + pronouns (38), adverbial phrases (21), and compound or semiprepositions (15), the percentage of the instances of י rendered by the article increases to 95 percent. The evidence strongly suggests that the Translator intended the Greek article as an equivalent for the preposition י.

Separable Preposition יָּן

The preposition יָּן occurs in 75 instances in Ecclesiastes. In 3 instances, the form is not a יָּן prepositional phrase in MT, but the Translator construed it as such (7:24a, 8:11a, 8:12a). The Translator rendered the form יָּן יָּן יָּן (interrogative + verb) in 7:24a by יָּן יָּן יָּן. The Greek equivalent reflects יָּן יָּן (miššehāyā) or as יָּן יָּן יָּן (mihahōyeh). In 8:11a and 8:12a, the nouns beginning with יָּן are misconstrued as a יָּן preposition plus nominal: יָּן יָּן יָּן in 8:11a as יָּן יָּן יָּן (meʾōṣay) and יָּן יָּן יָּן in 8:12a as יָּן יָּן יָּן (meʾāz). These 3 instances are to be included in the analysis. The total of instances of the preposition יָּן is 78.

837 The Translator probably read יָּן יָּן יָּן as kilʿummat.

838 See p. 93 of this dissertation.
The ἀπό prepositional phrases normally function as verbal modifiers. Apart from 9 instances, all cases of ἀπό are prefixed with assimilation of nun to the first letter of the following word. The evidence is presented according to frequency.


\( \eta > \alpha \pi \omega + \) Genitive (33)

Evidence:
1:8b, 1:10b, 2:6b, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:24b, 3:5b, 3:11b, 3:14a, 3:14b, 3:20b, 4:1b, 4:4a, 4:8b, 5:14a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:3a, 7:18a, 7:23b, 7:26b, 7:28b, 8:3a, 8:11a, 8:12a, 8:12b, 8:13b, 10:5b, 11:10a, 11:10a, 12:5a.

Examples:
2:6b τοῦ ποτίσαι ἀπ’ αὐτῶν δριμὸν βλαστῶντα ξύλα
5:18a καὶ ἔξουσισαν αὐτῶν τοῦ φαγεῖν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ
6:3a ἐξετασάμενοι σωτὴρν ὑποθήκην ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγαθωσύνης
8:12a δὲ ἤματεν ἐποίησεν τὸ ποιητῆν ἀπὸ τότε

The Translator employed ἀπό for ἦν in 33 instances out of 78 (43 percent). In 26 instances, the ἀπό may be used in a locative sense (79 percent), e.g., 2:6b. The Translator interpreted ἦν in 4 instances as partitive (5:18a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 10:1b). In another

---

839 See p. 22 of this dissertation.
840 The 9 instances where nun is not assimilated to the first letter of the following word are: 2:13a, 2:13b, 3:19b, 3:20b, 4:2b, 4:9a, 6:3a, 6:8a, and 9:4b.
841 The locative may denote source or origin: 2:6b, 2:10b, 3:20b, 4:1b, 5:14a, and 7:28b. It can be separation, i.e., ablative: 2:10a, 2:10b, 3:5b, 3:11b, 3:14a, 4:8b, 7:18a, 7:23b, 11:10a, and 11:10a. The semiprepositions μετά and μετατίθεν are also understood as locative. Other miscellaneous locatives are 4:4a, 8:11a, and 12:5a.
3 instances, the מ was probably understood as מ of agency (1:8b, 2:24b, 6:3a). Finally, the instance in 8:12a is the only place where the Translator construed the מ as temporal.

מ > ὑπέρ + Accusative (29)

Evidence:
2:7b 2:13a, 2:13b, 4:2b, 4:3a, 4:6b, 4:9a, 4:13b, 4:17a, 6:3b, 6:5b, 6:8a, 6:9a, 6:10b, 7:1a, 7:1b, 7:3a, 7:5b, 7:8a, 7:8b, 7:10a, 7:19b, 7:24a, 7:26a, 9:4b, 9:16a, 9:17b, 9:18a, 10:1b.

In 29 instances, the Translator rendered מ by ὑπέρ (38 percent), and all are comparative.

Example:
2:13a ἐστιν περισσεῖα τῇ σοφίᾳ ὑπέρ τῆς ἀφροσύνης

מ > ἐκ + Genitive (4)

Evidence:
4:14a, 8:10a, 12:11b, 12:12a.

The preposition ἐκ is employed when מ is construed as locative denoting origin (4:14a, 8:10a, 12:12a) or as agency (12:11b).

Examples:
4:14a ἐξ οἰκου τῶν δεσμίων ἐξελέυσεται τοῦ βασιλέας

12:11b ὁ παρὰ τῶν συναγμάτων ἔδοθησαν ἐκ ποιμένος ἐνός

מ > ἐν + Dative (2)

2:10b ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐπιφώτισεν μου
2:10b ὁτί καρδία μου ἐυφρανθη ἐν παντὶ μόχῳ μου

7:10b ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐπιφώτισεν περὶ τούτων
The εν in 2:10b may be used to render the locative sense of ἕν. On the other hand, the instance in 7:10b is probably interpreted as means or instrumental ἕν.

**衹 > ἀπά + Accusative (2)**

In both instances, the Translator used ἀπά with accusative to render the comparative ἕν.

**衹 > Different Greek Syntagmeme (3)**

In 3:22a, ἕν is interpreted as restrictive—probably ablative mixed with comparative—and is rendered by ει μη. The next 2 instances of ἕν are understood as comparatives and are rendered by ἦ in 5:4b and ἦ ὡτι in 7:2a. In 10:1b, ἕν is perhaps construed as a partitive genitive.
**Compound Forms (4)**

2:25b

2:25b καὶ τίς φείσεται πάρεξ αὐτοῦ

3:11b ἡ ἀπὸς μὴ εὐθὺς ὃ ἀνθρώπος το ποίημα

5:7b ἐντὸς ὑψηλὸς ἐπάνω ὑψηλῶς φυλάξαι

10:14b καὶ τὸ ἐσόμενον ὑπίσω αὑτοῦ τὶς ἀναγγελεῖ αὐτῷ

In 2:25b, the Translator may have interpreted ἰν (noun + preposition) in the ablative or restrictive sense (“apart from,” “without”). The Greek preposition πάρεξ (“except”) is a good functional equivalent to the Hebrew. In 3:11b, the compound form, μᾶλλον, followed by ἀπὸ, is construed as a conjunction, which introduces a result/purpose clause. The Translator employed ὑπὸς for it. The Translator construed two compound prepositions, μᾶλλον in 5:7b and ἀπὸ ἀπὸ in 10:14b in the locative and temporal sense respectively. He used a proper Greek preposition for each case.

The Translator construed ἰν as locative in 34 instances out of 77 (44 percent), and generally employed ἀπὸ for the locative ἰν (26 instances, 76 percent). He treated 33 instances of ἰν as comparative (43 percent) and used ἀπὸ for 29 instances (88 percent). For the partitive ἰν or ἰν of agency, he mainly employed ἀπὸ. In translating the preposition ἰν, the Translator was not mechanical, but was sensitive to the semantics of the preposition and utilized various approaches.

**Separate and Compound Prepositions.**
The Translator rendered ידוע by μετά in 2 instances and ὑπὸ in 5 instances. They are all interpreted as temporal except for 1 instance (2:12b), which has spatial sense. The μετά and ὑπὸ may be stylistic variations.

יראה > μετά + accusative (2) The equivalent occurs in 2:18b and 3:22b.

Example:
2:18b ὁ ἀφίων αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ γυμνόμενῳ μετ' ἑμὲν

יראה (4) / מראות (1) > ὑπὸ. The occurrences are 2:12b, 6:12b, 7:14b, 9:3b, and 10:14b (הוא).

Example:
6:12b τῷ ἔσται ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τὸν Ἰλιον

ירא (23)

The Translator employed three different Greek prepositions for יא: εἰς (13), πρὸς (8), and ἐπὶ (2). He may have used εἰς for the terminative sense of יא (“into”). In all the instances where εἰς renders יא, the objectives of יא are specific places such as

842 Even though εἰς can denote the directive sense (“toward”), the directive יא seems to be reserved for πρὸς.
On the other hand, the Translator probably employed ἐπὶ to represent the directive sense of אֵל (“toward”). Its objects are either direction (רָאָשׁ, נְפָשׁ) or person (אֲנָשִׁים, חָיוֹת, personal pronouns). Finally, for the contingent locative senses of אֵל such as “near” or “at,” the Translator used ἐπὶ.

אֵל > ἐπὶ + accusative (13). The occurrences are 1:5b, 1:7a, 1:7b, 3:20a, 3:20b, 4:17a, 6:6b, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:2b, 9:1a, 10:15b, and 12:5b.

Example:
1:6a

אֵל > πρός + accusative (8). The occurrences are 1:6a, 1:6a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:3b, 9:4a, 9:13b, and 12:7b.

Example:
1:6a

אֵל > ἐπὶ + accusative (2). The equivalent occurs in 9:14b and 12:6b.

Example:
12:6b

The compound preposition יְבַל with ὀπὸς and the pleonastic יְבַל is rendered by the conjunction ὀπὸς with the negative μη.
When רע functions as a conjunction, the Translator employed ἐως. On the other hand, when רע functions as a preposition, he used μέχρι. The conjunction ἐως introduces indefinite temporal clauses in Greek Ecclesiastes while μέχρι is followed by a definite time.

Example: 2:3b ἐως οὖν ἔδωκεν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

The form רע > ἐως (4). The equivalent occurs in 2:3b, 12:1b, 12:2a, and 12:6a.

3:11b ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ μέχρι τέλους

The form occurs twice in Ecclesiastes and is analyzed as רע + ἐως (3). The Translator rendered the form רע + ἐως by ἐως τοῦ νῦν (“until now”) in 4:2b and the form with καλ together by οὐπώ (“not yet”) in 4:3a. The 2 instances are in close proximity, so the different renderings indicate that the translation is contextual rather than accidental. The Translator was sensitive to the context and also to the demands of the target language.

4:2b ὑπὲρ τοὺς ζῶντας ὅσοι αὐτοῖς ζῶσιν ἐως τοῦ νῦν

The form רע > ἐως τοῦ νῦν (1). The equivalent occurs in 4:2b.

843 KB, s.v. “רע”; BDB, s.v. “<$\text{ם}^n$" .
The preposition "לע" occurs in 38 instances. The Translator employed "ἐπὶ" for most of the locative uses of "לע." When "לע" denotes reference, he used "περί".

**Locative "לע" > ἐπὶ + accusative (16).** The equivalent occurs in 1:6b, 1:12b, 2:17a, 5:7b, 6:1b, 8:6b, 9:8b, 9:12b, 9:14b, 10:4a, 10:7a, 11:1a, 11:2b, 11:3a, 12:6b, and 12:7a.

Example:
1:6b קכָּךְ הַקְּדוֹשִׁים שִׁבְּתַן לְעֵבְרֵי הָנָּה
1:6b καὶ ἐπὶ κύκλους αὐτοῦ ἐπιστρέφει τῷ πνεύμα

**Locative "לע" > ἐπὶ + dative (9).** The equivalent occurs in 1:16a, 2:20b, 3:14a, 3:17b, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:5b, 5:7a, and 11:9a.

Example:
3:14a "עִלְיוּן אֵל לְעֵבְרֵי הָנָּה"
3:14a ἐπὶ αὐτῷ οὐκ ὡστὶν προσθείναι

**Locative "לע" > ἐπὶ + genitive (4).** The equivalent occurs in 5:1b, 8:14a, 8:16a, and 10:7b.

Example:
5:1b "ἐν τῇ θεότητῃ καὶ συνάντησάν με ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς θεότητος"
5:1b ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ σὺ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

**לע of reference > περί + genitive (5).** The equivalent occurs in 1:13a, 3:18a,
Example:

7:14b ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς περὶ λαλίας

7:14b שֽׁהָה הַאֲלָלִים עַל-רְבִיָּה

 seri 7:10b, 7:14b, and 8:2b.

ב > ἐν + dative (2). The occurrences include 1:16a and 12:14a.

1:16a καὶ προσέθηκα σοφίαν ἐπὶ πάσιν οἱ ἐγένοντο ἡμιρροσθέν μου ἐν Ἱεροσολυμ

12:14a οὐκ οὖν πᾶν τὸ ποιήμα ὅ θεὸς ἄξει ἐν κρίσει ἐν παντὶ παρεώρισμένῳ

The Translator construed the second ב in 1:16a as locative and employed the locative ἐν for it. The word יִרְשָׁלֶם normally takes the preposition ב, and the ב is rendered by ἐν. 844 The rendering ב in 1:16a may be influenced by the other instances where יִרְשָׁלֶם is rendered by ἐν Ἱεροσολυμ. The ἐν for ב in 12:14a seems to have been used for reference.

ב > διὰ + accusative (1). The single example occurs in 8:11b.

8:11b διὰ τούτο ἐπληροφόρηθη καρδία αὐτῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

The phrase ב is rendered by διὰ τούτο in 8:11b. It is compared with ב in 5:1b where it is rendered by ἐπὶ τούτῳ.

Compound preposition ב > ἐπάνω + genitive (1). 845 The single example

844 The word יִרְשָׁלֶם occurs 5 times in Ecclesiastes, and 4 of them are prefixed by the preposition ב, for which the Translator used ἐν.

845 See p. 317 of this dissertation.
occurs in 5:7b.

5:7b יִהְיֶה מַעֲלֶה בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה
5:7b ὁτι ψηφιλος ἐπάνω ψηφιλοῦ φυλάξει

In sum, the Translator was sensitive to the context in rendering בְּשֵׁם and chose proper equivalents according to the norm of Greek.

ם (8)

The Translator employed the μετὰ of accompaniment ("with") for 7 instances of בְּשֵׁם. There is 1 instance where he construed בְּשֵׁם as locative ("in") and used ἐν for it.

The Translator was not mechanical in rendering בְּשֵׁם.

ם > μετὰ (7). The equivalent occurs in 1:11b, 2:16a, 2:16b, 4:15b, 6:10b, 7:11a, and 9:9a.

Example:
2:16a כָּרְךָ אֶת מִשְׁכָּב לְהָעָפָה יִשְׂרָאֵל
2:16b δέ τι οὐκ ξετείν μυθιμή τοῦ σωφοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ἀκρονος

ם > ἐν (1). The single example occurs in 1:16a.

1:16a δεσπότης άν υπελέβει
1:16a ἐλάλησεν ἐγώ ἐν καρδίᾳ μου

נהר (34)

The Translator interpreted 33 instances of הנהר as simple locative "under" and employed υπό + accusative for them. The word שָׁם occurs 31 times as an object of the preposition, and הנהר שָׁם and שָׁם הנהר follow הנהר each once.846 In 1 instance, he construed הנהר in

846 In 2:3b, the Translator read שָׁם שָׁם in MT as שָׁם.
the sense of substitution ("in place of") and so, used ἀντὶ for it. The Translator utilized different Greek prepositions as equivalents to ἀντὶ according to the different nuances of each context.

**Spatial ἀντὶ > ὑπὸ + accusative (33).** The equivalent occurs in 1:3b, 1:9b, 1:13a, 1:14a, 2:3b, 2:11b, 2:17a, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:20b, 2:22b, 3:1b, 3:16a, 4:1a, 4:3b, 4:7b, 4:15b, 5:12a, 5:17a, 6:1a, 6:12b, 7:6a, 8:9a, 8:15a, 8:15b, 8:17a, 9:3a, 9:6b, 9:9a, 9:9b, 9:11a, 9:13a, and 10:5a.

Example:

1:9b καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν πάν τρόποι πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἠλέου

**ἀντὶ of substitution > ἀντὶ + genitive (1).** The single example occurs in 4:15b.

4:15b μετὰ τοῦ νεανίσκου τοῦ δεύτερου ὡς στήσεται ἀντὶ αὐτοῦ

In sum, the Translator was not mechanical in rendering separate and compound prepositions but clarified different meanings of the same preposition by employing various Greek equivalents.

**Semiprepositions.**

In studying semiprepositions in LXX, R. Sollamo defines the term semipreposition as a combination of a preposition and a noun, which functions as a preposition.\(^{847}\)

---

Semiprepositions with the Stem יָבָא (17)

In 17 of the 21 occurrences of the word בַּלֶּנֶא in Ecclesiastes, it becomes a component of semiprepositions.

לְבָא > προ γροσσώτοι (6). The equivalent occurs in 2:26a, 2:26b, 5:1a, 5:5a, 7:26b, and 9:1b.

In 6 instances, the semipreposition לְבָא is rendered by προ γροσσώτοι. The לְבָא may be used either as denoting pure location (“in front of”) or as denoting value judgment (“in view of”) in metaphorical sense.\(^{848}\)

Examples:

\begin{verbatim}
2:26a λεγεται λεπτερον τοις ουκ οικηθεν
2:26a οτι τω ανθρωπω τοις αγαθω προ προσωπου αυτου εδωκεν σοφιαν
5:1a και καρδια σου μη ταχυνατω τοι εξενεγκαι λογον προ προσωπου του θεου
5:1a και καρδια σου μη ταχυνατω τοι εξενεγκαι λογον προ προσωπου του θεου
\end{verbatim}

According to Sollamo, the approach is already established by other translators of LXX while προ προσώπου is not attested outside the LXX and NT.\(^{849}\)

לְבָא > ξυμπροσθεν (4). The equivalent occurs in 1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a, and 4:16a.

When the semipreposition לְבָא is temporal, the Translator always rendered it by ξυμπροσθεν.

Example:

\begin{verbatim}
2:9a και προσέθηκα παρα παντας τους γενομενους ξυμπροσθεν μου εν Ιερουσαλημ
2:9a και προσέθηκα παρα παντας τους γενομενους ξυμπροσθεν μου εν Ιερουσαλημ
\end{verbatim}

\(^{848}\)The locative sense is found in 2:26a, 2:26b, and 7:26b. The use of value judgment is in 5:1a, 5:5a and 9:1b. Cf. KB, s.v. “לְבָא.”

\(^{849}\)Sollamo, Hebrew Semiprepositions, 30-31.
In 2:9a, the Qoheleth compares himself with those who existed in the past before his time. The temporal ולֵנים is always followed by human beings as objects.\textsuperscript{850}

The approach is attested in the antecedent translators of LXX, and ξυμπροσθεν with temporal force is also attested in Hellenistic Greek literature outside the LXX and NT.\textsuperscript{851}

םלֵנים > אתְנַי propósito (4). The equivalent occurs in 3:14b, 8:12b, 8:13b, and 10:5b.

Example:
8:13b אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי וְרָאָתי וְלִבְמוֹ בְּבֵית
8:13b וְיָכְזוּ הֶבְדוּ מְפַלְפַל מִי אֲנִי propósito וַשָּׁם הָאָדָם

םלֵנים > אתְנַי ξυμπροσθεν (1). The single example occurs in 1:10b.

1:10b עַכְּרֵךְ אֲנִי לִבְמָה אַשְּרַי לִבְמָה מַלְפַל
1:10b וְיָכְזוּ γέונָהוּוֹ אַלִּים אוֹתֶק הֶבְדוּ מְפַלְפַל וַשָּׁם אֲנִי propósito וַשָּׁם

There are 5 instances where a semipreposition ולֵנים is prefixed by מ. Just as πρὸ propósito is employed for the spatial force of ולֵנים and ξυμπροσθεν for the temporal force, so אתְנַי propósito is utilized for ולֵנים with a spatial notion and אתְנַי ξυμπροσθεν for וַשָּׁם with a temporal notion.\textsuperscript{852} The case in 1:10b, in which ולֵנים is rendered by אתְנַי ξυμπροσθהеУ, is unique in LXX.\textsuperscript{853} Sollamo concludes that Eccl 1:10 is a curious case.\textsuperscript{854}

\textsuperscript{850}The Qoheleth comes after ולֵנים in 1:16a, 2:7b, and 2:9a; and the human beings in 4:16a.

\textsuperscript{851}Sollamo, Hebrew Semiprepositions, 34-35, 320-21.

\textsuperscript{852}In 1:10b, the antecedent of אֲשֶׁר is ולֵנים, so the temporal force of וַשָּׁם is evident in the context.

\textsuperscript{853}See the table in Sollamo, Hebrew Semiprepositions, 96.

\textsuperscript{854}Ibid., 101.
Nevertheless, the Translator consistently employed ξυμπροσθεν for the temporal force whether it was for לולמי or לולמי. On the other hand, as in 8:13b, the Translator always used ἀπὸ προσώπου for לולמי in a locative sense. The object of לולמי rendered by ἀπὸ προσώπου is always God or someone in power as it is when the spatial לולמי is rendered by πρὸ προσώπου. While Sollamo argues that the Greek equivalent ἀπὸ προσώπου is not sound Greek usage, consistent patterns are found in the translation. The Translator used two different approaches to render לולמי based upon the two different meanings (i.e., whether spatial or temporal) or upon the objects of the prepositions (i.e., whether human beings or God).

ינני > ἀπὸ προσώπου (1). The single example occurs in 8:3a.

8:3a ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ πορεία

ינני > עלימני (1). The single example occurs in 11:1a.

11:1a ἀπόστειλον τῶν ἀρτοὺν σου ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ ἵδατος

The semipreposition יָמי in 8:3a denotes local direction. The Translator employed ἀπὸ προσώπου for the form and did not distinguish יָמי from לולמי in translation. The rendering is formally and functionally literal, and also good Hellenistic

855 The לולמי in 10:5b denotes the sense of origin, and it is a subcategory of the locative.

856 Sollamo, Hebrew Semiprepositions, 95.
Greek. 11:1a is not likely prepositional because the form bears its literal meaning "surface." 

**Semiprepositions with the Stem ו (5)**

**ב > בּ (3).** The occurrences are 5:13b, 5:14b, and 9:1a.

Example:

5:13b קָלָה מִנָּה כְּבֵדָה מִמְּאֹמְרָה
5:13b קָלָה אֶפְּנַת וּניֵר קָלָה עָשָׂה בּ אֵשׁ עַד עָשָׂה אֵשׁ

Sollamo lists two categories in which ב is regarded as prepositional. The first category is ב loci, having the meaning of "in the power of," or "in the possession of." The second category is ב instrumenti which means "by the action of," "by," or "through." All instances of ב in Ecclesiastes belong to the first category. The example in 5:13b illustrates the usage. The approach is already established by other translators of LXX.

**ב > מ (2).** The occurrences are 2:24b and 4:1b.

Example:

2:24b קָדָם לֶאָ רֶבֶנָה מַעְצָבָה הִזָּה
2:24b קָדָם לֶאָ רֶבֶנָה מַעְצָבָה הִזָּה לֵלֶבֶנָה מַעְצָבָה הִזָּה

The Greek equivalent מ for ב is not only a literal rendering but also

---


858 Sollamo notes that the meaning "on the surface of" can be prepositional when relevant. See Sollamo, *Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 102-04.

859 Ibid., 156-57, 160-61.

860 Ibid., 157.

a normal Greek expression.\textsuperscript{862} In both 2:24b and 4:1b, the semipreposition ἐνι may denote origin (“to come from”).

\textit{With Prepositions (2)}

8:16b ἐν δόξῃ ἀνέστη ἡ ἀρχή
8:16b ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν βλέπων

11:7b καὶ ἀγαθὸν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῦ βλέπειν σὺν τοῦ κόσμου

When the form ἐνι has a prepositional function, it means either “in the judgement of” or “in the presence of.”\textsuperscript{863} However, exegesis eliminates the possibility of there being a semipreposition for ἐνι in 8:16b, because ἐνι literally designates physical human eyes. For the case of 11:7b, even though ἐνι is prefixed by ἐκ, it is a free form and does not function as a preposition.

\textit{With Prepositions (2)}

5:1a ἐπὶ στάματι σου

6:7a πᾶς μόσχος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς στόμα αὐτοῦ

The form ἐπι can be functionally prepositional only when it means “according to” or “according to word or command.”\textsuperscript{864} ἐπι in 5:1a is used metaphorically and implies “utterance.” The form may be regarded as an ordinary noun.

\textsuperscript{862} Ibid., 197.

\textsuperscript{863} Ibid., 123.

\textsuperscript{864} KB, s.v. “הו”; Sollamo, Hebrew Semiprepositions, 224.
with a preposition עַל rather than a semipreposition.

Another related form, לֵפֶס, can be prepositional with the meaning of “according to.” In 6:7a, the meaning of לֵפֶס is literally “for mouth” by the context and may metaphorically imply “greed.” Therefore, לֵפֶס in 6:7a is not prepositional in function.

In sum, the semiprepositional forms are found in 26 instances, but only 21 instances are functionally prepositional. The Translator is always sensitive to the meaning of the semiprepositions in context. His approach to render the semiprepositions is literal and is also found in other translators of LXX.

Conjunctions and Other Particles

The analysis includes not only conjunctions but also adverbs and nouns functioning as adverbs. Several particles are excluded in the analysis because they have already been discussed. The so-called nota accusatīvi is completely analyzed in the noun section and is not dealt with here. The other six particles to be excluded are: ב (7:29a), ב (3:11b), ו (2:25b), מ (3:21b), י (5:15a, 7:14b), and הנה (8:17a). They occur only once or twice in Ecclesiastes and are all combined with prepositions. These have already been discussed under the prepositions. 865

865 See ב for ב, מ and מ; see ה for ה; and finally for הנה, see ב and מ.
\textit{tote} (2)

2:15a ἐγώ \\ 2:15a ἐγώ τότε περισσῶν ἑλάλησα εν καρδίᾳ μου

8:12a δέ ἤμαρτεν ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν ἀπὸ τότε.\textsuperscript{866}

\textit{ouai} (2)

4:10b καὶ οὐαὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἑνὶ ὅταν πέσῃ\textsuperscript{867}

10:16a οὐαὶ σοι πόλις ἢς ὁ βασιλεὺς σου νεώτερος

\textit{poios} (2)

2:3b οὐ οἱ ποίοι τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

11:6b οὗ γινώσκεις ποίον στοιχήσει ἢ τοῦτο ἢ τούτο

\textit{poas} (2)

2:16b ὁ σοφὸς μετὰ τοῦ ἀφρονος

4:11b καὶ ὁ ἐξ ποικιλίας θερμανθηθη
Where אָ֫נִּי introduces a protasis in a conditional sentence, the Translator mainly used הֲּאָנָּה as equivalent for the אָ֫נִּי, but his rendering is not perfunctory. In 1 instance, he employed an indefinite relative clause for a protasis (8:17b). The relative clause could imply a conditional sense in Hellenistic Greek and may be more effective in emphasizing
the human inability to understand God’s works.\textsuperscript{868}

\textbf{α} > \textit{ει} (2)

Example:
5:11a γλυκὸς ὑπνός τοῦ δούλου \textit{ει} ἄλλιγον καὶ \textit{ει} πολὺ φάγεται

When \textit{α} is used in double indirect question (5:11a and 12:4b), the Translator employed \textit{ει} for 5:11a and \textit{εάν} for 12:4b. The example of 5:11a may be a stylistic variation for 12:4b.

\textbf{α} > \textit{ει} \textit{μη} (2)

3:12a κύριος εἰς ἀληθείαν εἰς
3:12b κύριος εἰς ἀληθείαν εἰς αὐτοῖς
3:12b εἰ μὴ τοῦ εὐφρανθῆναι καὶ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἁγάθον ἐν ζωῇ αὐτοῦ\textsuperscript{869}

8:15a οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον ὅτι εἰ μὴ τοῦ φαγεῖν

\textbf{α} > \textit{ἀλλὰ} \textit{η} (1)

5:10b καὶ τι ἀνάρεια τῷ παρ’ αὐτῆς ὅτι \textit{ἀλλὰ} \textit{η} τοῦ ὀρῶν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ

\textit{α} is used in the restrictive sense “except” with \textit{ο} in 3 instances (3:12b, 5:10b, 8:15a). Two follow the negative \textit{ο} (3:12b, 8:15a), and one is preceded by a rhetorical question (5:10b). The Translator differentiated two cases by employing \textit{ει} \textit{μη} for the

\textsuperscript{868} The approach should be considered together with the preceding sentence where \textit{ο} is rendered also by \textit{δο} εἰν. For the use of the indefinite relative with a conditional sense, see Wallace, Greek Grammar, 688; Robertson, Grammar, 961-62.
former case and ἀλλὰ ἂ for the latter case. His rendering is elaborate. Additionally, he
did not interpret ἀλλὰ ἂ in 4:10a and 11:8a as restrictive but construed them as normal
conditional clauses. It demonstrates that he was not mechanical but was sensitive to the
context.

ἀλλὰ > καὶ γέ (1)

ἐν τῇ καθότι ἢ ἂ
2:9b καὶ γέ σοφία μου ἡτάθη μοι

ἐν (58)

ἐν > καὶ γέ (43)

Evidence:
1:17b, 2:1b, 2:7b, 2:8a, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:15b, 2:19b, 2:21b, 2:23a, 2:23b, 2:24b, 2:26b,
3:11b, 4:4b, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8b, 4:11a, 4:14b, 4:16a, 4:16b, 5:9b, 5:16a, 5:18a, 6:5a, 6:9b,
7:14b, 7:21a, 7:22a, 8:10b, 8:12b, 8:14b, 8:16b, 9:1b, 9:6a, 9:6a, 9:6a, 9:12a, 9:13a,
10:20a, 12:5a.

Example:
2:23a καὶ γέ ἐν νυκτί οἴκο κοιμᾶται ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ

ἐν > γέ (14)

Evidence:
1:11b, 3:13a, 5:15a, 6:3a, 6:7b, 7:6b, 7:18a, 8:17b, 9:3b, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:12a, 10:3a, 11:2a

Example:
6:3a καὶ γέ ταφ ὀφὲ ἐγένετο αὐτῷ

869 The particle ἂ may be rendered by zero because ἂ is always rendered by ὁτι when it is followed by ἀλλὰ (cf. 4:10a, 5:10b, 8:15a, 11:8a).
In 14 instances where יְהַלְוֵה follows the conjunction כָּל, the Translator always rendered יְהַלְוֵה by יְהֵן (100 percent). On the other hand, if יְהַלְוֵה does not follow כָּל, he used כָּל יְהֵן for יְהַלְוֵה in 43 instances out of 44 (98 percent). The יְהַלְוֵה has two functions in Ecclesiastes. In most cases, it has an emphatic function—i.e., emphasizing the following substantive or clause. It may also be a clause marker. In 27 instances out of 43, יְהַלְוֵה introduces asyndeton clauses (63 percent). Finally, there is 1 instance where יְהַלְוֵה is rendered by כָּל (7:22a). In 7:22a, the Translator duplicated the Hebrew in two synonymous clauses. The first Greek clause is introduced by δὲ, which reflects יְהַלְוֵה. The second clause is connected to the first one by כָּל. כָּל could correspond to יְהַלְוֵה, but it is more likely that the Translator has rendered the emphatic יְהַלְוֵה in an indirect way by duplication. In sum, the Translator’s rendering יְהַלְוֵה was motivated by the grammatical circumstances, and the pattern is stereotypical for most cases but shows liberty in 7:22a.

ה (Question Marker) (5)

ה > את (3)

Evidence:
2:19a, 3:21a, 3:21b.

870 Gentry uses English “indeed” for both כָּל יְהֵן and יְהֵן. His translation clearly reflects the emphatic use of יְהַלְוֵה. See Gentry, “Ekklesiastes,” 1-11.

871 The MT pointed ע as an article in 3:21a and 3:21b, but the Translator construed the form as a question marker in both instances.
In 3:21a and 3:21b where ἢ is construed as a question marker (“whether”) to introduce a dependent interrogative clause, the Translator used εἰ for ἢ. In 2:19a and 11:6b, ἢ is correlated with ἢ (“whether...or...”), and the Translator employed εἰ...هة for 2:19a and ἢ...هة for 11:6b. When ἢ is followed by the negative ἄλλα, he used the negative combination μὴ οὐκ, which strengthens the negation (6:6a). Overall, one could notice the stylistic variations and contextual interpretation from the Translator’s approach in treating ἢ.

νάν > ἵδοι (6)

Evidence:
1:14b, 1:16a, 2:1b, 2:11b, 4:1b, 5:17a.

Example:

νάνα τὰ πάντα ματαιότητι καὶ προαίρεσις πνεύματος

872 Bauer, s.v. “μὴ”; BDF, Greek Grammar, §365.
1 > καὶ (356)

Evidence:

1:4a, 1:4b, 1:5a, 1:5b, 1:6a, 1:6b, 1:7a, 1:8b, 1:9a, 1:9b, 1:11b, 1:13a, 1:13a, 1:14b, 1:14b, 1:15b, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:16b, 1:17a, 1:17a, 1:17a, 1:18b, 2:1a, 2:1b, 2:2b, 2:3b, 2:5a, 2:5b, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:8a, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:9a, 2:9a, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:12a, 2:12a, 2:12a, 2:14a, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:15a, 2:16b, 2:17a, 2:17b, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:19a, 2:20a, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:22a, 2:23a, 2:24a, 2:24a, 2:25a, 2:26a, 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:1b, 3:2a, 3:2b, 3:3a, 3:3b, 3:4a, 3:4b, 3:5a, 3:5b, 3:6a, 3:6b, 3:7a, 3:7b, 3:8b, 3:8b, 3:11b, 3:12b, 4:1a, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:2a, 4:3a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:4b, 4:5b, 4:6b, 4:7a, 4:7a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:10a, 4:10b, 4:11a, 4:11b, 4:12a, 4:12b, 4:13a, 4:13b, 4:16b, 4:17a, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:2b, 5:5a, 5:6a, 5:6a, 5:7a, 5:7b, 5:8a, 5:9a, 5:10b, 5:11a, 5:11b, 5:13a, 5:13b, 5:13b, 5:14b, 5:15a, 5:15b, 5:16b, 5:16b, 5:16b, 5:17a, 5:17a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 6:1b, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:4a, 6:4b, 6:5a, 6:6a, 6:7b, 6:9b, 6:10a, 6:10b, 6:12a, 7:1b, 7:2b, 7:4b, 7:6b, 7:7b, 7:11b, 7:12b, 7:14a, 7:15b, 7:16a, 7:17a, 7:18a, 7:20b, 7:23b, 7:24b, 7:25a, 7:25a, 7:25a, 7:25b, 7:25b, 7:26a, 7:26a, 7:26b, 7:27b, 7:27b, 7:29b, 8:1a, 8:1b, 8:2b, 8:4b, 8:5b, 8:6a, 8:8a, 8:8a, 8:8b, 8:9a, 8:10a, 8:10b, 8:12a, 8:13a, 8:13a, 8:14a, 8:15a, 8:18a, 8:15b, 8:16a, 8:16b, 8:17a, 8:17b, 8:17b, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:3b, 9:3b, 9:3b, 9:5b, 9:5b, 9:5b, 9:7a, 9:8b, 9:9b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11b, 9:12a, 9:13b, 9:14a, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:15a, 9:15a, 9:15a, 9:15b, 9:16a, 9:16b, 9:16b, 9:16b, 9:18b, 10:2a, 10:3a, 10:3b, 10:6b, 10:7b, 10:8b, 10:10a, 10:10a, 10:10b, 10:12b, 10:13b, 10:14a, 10:14b, 10:16b, 10:17b, 10:17b, 10:18b, 10:19a, 10:19b, 10:20a, 10:20b, 11:2a, 11:3a, 11:3a, 11:4b, 11:6a, 11:6b, 11:7a, 11:7b, 11:8b, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9b, 11:10a, 11:10a, 11:10b, 12:1a, 12:1a, 12:2a, 12:2a, 12:2c, 12:3a, 12:3b, 12:4a, 12:4b, 12:5a, 12:5a, 12:5a, 12:5b, 12:6a, 12:6b, 12:6b, 12:7a, 12:7b, 12:9a, 12:9b, 12:10b, 12:11a, 12:12a, 12:12b, 12:13b, 12:14b.

Example:

1:4a καὶ ἠρods
1:4a γενεὰ πορεύεται καὶ γενεὰ ἐρχεται

1 > Zero (5)

Evidence:

2:15b, 3:19a, 8:5b, 8:10a, 12:9b.

Example:

2:15 καὶ ἐνα τι ἐσοφοισάμην ἐγώ τότε περισσόν ἐλάφησα ἐν καρδίᾳ μου
According to Rahlfs’ editorial decision, a new sentence begins at ἔγρα, while in MT, וַיֹּאמֶר starts the new sentence. The ἓν clause seems to be treated as the object of ἐλάλησα. The conjunction ἤ may have been lacking in the parent text of the Translator.

MT vocalizes all 3 occurrences of μιᾷ as free forms, and consequently, 3:19a is read as three independent clauses connected by ἤ. On the other hand, the Greek translation suggests that the first two μιᾷ are construed as bound forms. The two bound phrases are subjects, and the final μιᾷ is a subject complement in function. The second ἤ is probably lacking in the parent text of the Translator as many Hebrew manuscripts and other ancient versions attest to it. 873

8:5b καὶ καὶ χρίσεως γινώσκει καρδία σοφοῦ

The hendiadys ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ὅτι in 8:5b is rendered by the genitive phrase καὶ κρίσεως. The same ἐν τούτῳ τῷ occurs in 8:6a, but its rendering is formally literal: καὶ κρίσεις καὶ κρίσεις. One cannot be sure whether the Vorlage in 8:5b did not have ἤ or the Translator deliberately employed a stylistic variation in 8:6a for the same Hebrew phrase.

8:10a καὶ τότε ἔδωκεν ἁμαρτίαν ἐνακείμενον καὶ ἔκ τοῦ πνεύματός ἐπορεύθησαν

12:9b καὶ οὕς ἐξεισινάσεται κόσμων παραβολῶν

873 BHS-Horst; Murphy, Ecclesiastes, 30; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 168. Gordis argues that the vocalization for μιᾷ designates an abnormal bound form and the second ἤ has a function to emphasize the predicate. See Gordis, Koheleth, 227-28.
The Greek equivalent \( \epsilonioschatēntas \) for בֵּן יָוָן in 8:10a probably reflects the participle form בֵּן יָוָן. The form בֵּן יָוָן in 12:9b, which is a suffix form with waw in MT, may have been read as the prefix בֵּן יָוָן, but neither case is the ב construed as a conjunction.

In sum, the Translator may have not had a conjunction ב in his parent text for 2:15b and 3:19a and did not read the form in question as a conjunction in another 2 instances (8:10a, 12:9b). For 1 instance (8:5b), the evidence is too scanty to reach a conclusion.

(9)

(cb) > הָּנָּה (8)

Evidence:
1:10b, 2:16b, 3:15a, 3:15a, 4:2a, 6:10a, 9:6a, 9:7b.

Example:
3:15a תַּהֲפַסְתָּה הָּנָּה הָּנָּה
3:15a תַּהֲפַסְתָּה הָּנָּה הָּנָּה

(cb) > Zero (1)

2:12b הָּה הָּה הָּה הָּה
2:12b תִּכְּכָה בָּה בָּה בָּה בָּה

The absence of הָּנָּה for בֵּן יָוָן in 2:12b is unusual. The evidence is insufficient to establish any pattern for the case.

(88)

(88) > גָּדִים (86)

Evidence:
Examples:
2:10b ὅτι καρδία μου εὐφράσθη ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ μου

8:15a ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶν ἁγαθὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἥλιων ὅτι εἶ μή τοῦ φαγεῖν

יכ > Zero (I)

3:12a כָּפָר לַאֲדֹם הַשָּׁמֶשׁ כְּפָר לַאֲדֹמֵל כָּפָר לַאֲדֹם
3:12a כָּפָר לַאֲדֹם הַשָּׁמֶשׁ כְּפָר לַאֲדֹמֵל כָּפָר לַאֲדֹם

The combination כו ינ occurs 5 times in Ecclesiastes (3:12a, 4:10a, 5:10b, 8:15a, 11:8a). In 4 instances, ינ is rendered by ὅτι, and in 1 instance (3:12a), it is rendered by zero. Functionally, כו ינ introduces a conditional clause in 2 instances (4:10a, 11:8a) and introduces an exceptive clause followed by an infinitive in 3 instances (3:12a, 5:10b, 8:15a). In any case, ὅτι rendering ינ would be pleonastic in the Greek syntax. Although 3:12a deviates from the formally literal pattern, it may be a better Greek expression.

יכ > γάρ (I)

5:15א γαρ παρεγένετο οὕτως καὶ ἀπελεύθεται
5:15א καὶ γε τούτῳ ποιητὰ ἀρρωστία ὡσπερ γάρ παρεγένετο οὕτως καὶ ἀπελεύθεται

874 Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ὅτι," II.2.
The Greek translation ὠσπερ γὰρ may reflect λέει μιὰ λογικὴ διαλεκτικὴ. The substantive λέει is always used with ἀλήθεια, and the combination λέει may be rendered by ὠσπερ. Employing γὰρ for ἀλήθεια is already an established pattern by other translators. 876

> οὕτως (1)

καθὼς λέει ἀληθινὴ ἀλήθεια

καθὼς οὕτως οὐ γνώση τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ θεοῦ

> οὕτως (4)

Evidence:
3:19a, 5:15a, 7:6a, 8:10a.

Examples:
3:19a καθὼς οὐ λέει θάνατος τούτου οὕτως ο θάνατος τούτου

8:10a κατ' ἐπιμέλειαν ἐν τῇ πόλει ὡς οὕτως ἐποίησαν

> οὕτως (2)

ἐπὶ γὰρ τούτῳ ἔστωσαν οἱ λόγοι σου ὁλίγοι

8:11b διὰ τούτῳ ἐπληρωφόρηθη καρδία ὑπὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν αὐτοῖς

> τότε (1)

οὐκ ἑαυτὴν ἤξυνεν ἀλάμεν οἷον

875 See p. 306 of this dissertation.
876 Gentry, Greek Job, 371.
8:10a καὶ τότε εἶδον ἀσβεῖς εἰς τάφους εἰσαχθέντας

In 3 instances, the Translator construed ὁ as a correlative conjunction with ἢ (3:19a, 7:6a) or with ἐλήματι (5:15a). He employed Greek correlatives denoting comparison: ὁς…οὕτως for ὁ, καὶ, and ὁσπερ…οὕτως for ἢ…ἐλήματι. In 8:10a, ὁ is used as a simple adverb to modify the verb, and the Translator rendered it by οὐτως. When ὁ is combined with the preposition ἐν (5:1b, 8:11b), the Translator employed for ὁ neuter forms of οὕτως. The ἐπὶ τούτῳ in 5:1b may denote ground, and διὰ τοῦτο in 8:11b may be understood as causal. Finally, another combination form ἐπὶ ἢ in 8:10a is rendered by τότε. The ὅ is used here with the temporal meaning “then” or “thereupon,” so τότε is a good functional equivalent for it. In sum, the different renderings for ὁ are due to its different functions.

(64)

The negation ἀλλὰ occurs in 65 instances. In 1 instance, the Translator may not have construed the form as negative.

5:9a υρίσαι ἄλλες ἄλλης ἀλλὰ ἑταίρα
5:9a καὶ τίς ἥγαμπησεν ἐν πλήθει αὐτῶν γένημα

In 5:9a, αὐτῶν may reflect ἀλλά (lō), which is a homonym with ἀλλὰ (lō•). This case is not included in the analysis.

877 For ἢ in 5:15a, see p. 306 of this dissertation.
878 See p. 322 of this dissertation.
879 Gordis, Koheleth, 241; Whitley, Koheleth, 51; Seow, Ecclesiastes, 205. See p. 306 of this dissertation.
Evidence:
1:8a, 1:8b, 1:11b, 1:15a, 1:15b, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:21b, 2:23a, 4:3a, 4:8a, 4:12b, 4:13b, 4:16a, 5:9a, 5:14b, 5:19a, 6:2a, 6:3a, 6:5a, 6:5a, 6:6a, 6:6b, 6:7b, 6:10b, 7:10b, 7:17b, 7:20b, 7:28a, 7:28b, 8:5a, 8:8b, 8:13a, 8:13a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 8:17b, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:12a, 9:15b, 10:11a, 10:14b, 10:15b, 10:17b, 11:2b, 11:4a, 11:4b, 11:5b.

Examples:
1:8b ἐπεί δὲ ἐντολήν
1:8b καὶ οὐκ ἐμπλησθήσεται ὀφθαλμὸς τοῦ ὀρέων
9:11a γίνεται οὐ τοῖς κοῦφοις ὁ δρόμος

The Translator used οὐ for ἢ when the indicative verb or nominal is negated in Greek. 880

Evidence:

Examples:
5:4a ἐγερθοῦ τῷ μὴ εἰσέσθαι σε ἢ τῷ εἰσέσθαι σε
7:14b ἵνα μὴ εὑρήσῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁπίσω αὐτοῦ μηδὲν

When the infinitive is negated, or when the verb is rendered by the subjunctive in the independent clause, the Translator employed μὴ for ἢ according to the norm of the

880 The nominal includes a nominal phrase in 7:17b, prepositional phrases in 9:11a, and a noun in 10:11a.

881 The combination ἢ ὢν μή ἔσται λέγειν ἢ ἐσται λέγειν is rendered by ὡποῖς μὴ. The ἢ may be pleonastic. Cf. BDB, s.v. “יִלָּב.” See p. 317 of this dissertation.
target language.  

**הִלָּה > Different Greek Syntagmeme (I)**

10:10a יְהוָה לְאִישׁ וּלְיָשָׁר קֵרֶב
10:10a εἶναι ἐκπεσθεί τῷ σιδήρῳ καὶ αὐτὸς πρόσωπον ἐταύραξεν

The Oriental Manuscripts attest יְהוָה for הִלָּה. Gordis suggests that the Translator probably rendered יְהוָה by αὐτῶ, and it is omitted after αὐτὸς in the present text. However, the reason for omitting αὐτῶ, which Gordis proposes, does not seem plausible. The absence of negation in LXX may rather be semantic. The Translator seems to have interpreted בָּא בִּנֵיה with the meaning of “human face,” not “edge” of instrument such as a sword. The form קַלֵּךְ (Piel form from קָלֵל) occurs only twice in the Hebrew Bible. While modern lexicographers propose the meaning “to sharpen” for קַלֵּךְ, the meaning for ταράσσω, “to trouble,” does not match that of קַלֵּךְ. A possible proposal may be that the Translator semantically combined הִלָּה and קַלֵּךְ into ταράσσω. In other words, the negative sense of הִלָּה may be included in the lexical equivalent he selected, i.e., ταράσσω.

**הִלָּה > ὁσὺν (I)**

4:3a δὲν ὁσὺν הִלָּה ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων
4:3a καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο τούτους ὡστὶς ὁσὺν ἐγένετο

With the meaning of “not yet,” ὁσὺν is a good functional equivalent for הִלָּה.

---

882 The infinitive is negated in 5:4a and 5:4b; the negation for the subjunctive is in 3:11b, 7:14b, 7:21b, 12:1b, 12:2a, and 12:6a.

883 Gordis, Koheleth, 311.
Both forms מָהָרָה and מָהָרָה are used adverbially with the same meaning ("quickly"). For מָהָרָה, the Translator used ταχύ an adjective in neuter accusative functioning as adverb, and for מָהָרָה, he employed the adverb ταχέως. The Greek equivalents for the Hebrew are not only functionally matched but also are finely chosen according to the Hebrew forms.
Summary

The data are sufficient for 13 particles out of 24 to uncover the approach of the Translator in rendering particles: נ, ב, ג, ה, ו, ז, ח, ט, י, ק, ל, ר, ס, ת, על, מ, נ, נא, and י. The correspondence between Hebrew and Greek is generally literal either formally or functionally. The Translator’s approach is not mechanical but complies with the demands of the target language. Stylistic variations betray that the Translator was sensitive to the context.
CHAPTER 3
THE HISTORICAL PLACE OF THE TRANSLATOR

The purpose of the present chapter is to identify the Translator within the history of the transmission of the text. The study begins with a brief survey of the history of research of the issue in question. The translation technique of the Translator, which is described exhaustively in the previous chapter, will then be compared with the translation techniques of others such as Aquila or Theodotion. Finally, the lexical and syntactical comparisons will lead to a conclusion that the Translator may have been inspired in part by other translators but utilized his own distinctive principles in translating Ecclesiastes.

History and Method

The standard view in the last century is that Aquila is the Translator of the Greek Ecclesiastes because some of the patterns of translation technique are considered hallmarks of Aquila. In this point, the evidence is based largely on lexical equivalents. On the other hand, it has also been noticed that Hexaplaric fragments attributed to Aquila contain renderings of the Hebrew text somewhat different from those in the Greek Ecclesiastes. How can one explain the differences between Aquila fragments from the Hexapla and the Greek Ecclesiastes?

From Dillmann to Gentry

In his article “Über die griechische Übersetzung des Qoheleth” published in 1892, August Dillmann posits that the Greek Ecclesiastes is not the work of Aquila but is
a revision of an older Greek translation following Aquilan translation technique. After research on the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever, Dominique Barthélemy argued that the present Greek Text of Ecclesiastes is the work of Aquila, but the fragments surviving from the Hexapla attributed to Aquila are not his work. In contrast to Barthélemy, three scholars—Hyvärinen, Jarick, and Gentry—agree that Greek Ecclesiastes contains certain non-Aquilan traits. Kyösti Hyvärinen points out that the approach found in the Greek Ecclesiastes is often contextually driven while Aquilan translation is slavishly literal. He also presents different lexical choices made by the Translator and by Aquila, and shows that the LXX version contains non-Aquilan features. Finally, he concludes that the hexaplaric fragments attributed to Aquila are actually by him, but the LXX version may have been done by a different person. John Jarick also rejects Barthélemy’s view. By comparing Aquilan fragments for Ecclesiastes and the Greek Ecclesiastes with other Aquilan sources, he demonstrates that Hexaplaric fragments attributed to Aquila are far closer to the characteristics of Aquila than the Greek Ecclesiastes. Jarick takes a skeptical view of the possibility of identifying the

1 August Dillmann, “Über die griechische Übersetzung des Qoheleth,” SAW (1892): 3-16.


4 Hyvärinen, Aquila, 88-93, 96-98.

5 Hyvärinen, Aquila, 98-99.

Translator of the Greek Ecclesiastes. Recently, by studying the marginal notes of the Syro-Hexapla, Peter Gentry affirmed that the Greek Ecclesiastes is closer to Theodotion than to Aquila in certain places. In conclusion, he calls for a comprehensive study of the translation technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes to identify its Translator. Gentry’s suggestion opens the door to a new possibility of solving the issue in question.

**Methodology**

How one explains the non-Aquilan evidence found in the Greek Ecclesiastes may be a key to the identity of the Translator within the history of the transmission of the text. As mentioned above, the purpose of this chapter is to identify the Translator based upon the translation technique. This may be best demonstrated by a quantitative comparison between the Greek Ecclesiastes and selected congeners. The comparison should be as comprehensive as possible, not only on a lexical level, but also on a syntactical level.

**Translator and His Congeners**

The congeners chosen for lexical comparison are the Three (i.e., α', θ', and σ'), the Theodotionic portion of the Greek Job, and the Kaige tradition revealed in the Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever. For syntactical comparison, three congeners are selected: Aquila, Theodotion in the Greek Job, and the Kaige tradition in the Minor Prophet Scroll from Nahal Hever. Field’s *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, the

---

7 Jarick, “Aquila’s Koheleth,” 139.


second apparatus in the Göttingen Critical Editions, and Reider’s *Index to Aquila* were consulted for the lexical level-comparison between the Translator and the Three.\(^{10}\)

Hyvärinen provides syntactical characteristics of Aquila from selected Aquilan texts, and thus, his studies are utilized for syntactical comparison with Aquila.\(^{11}\) Gentry identifies Theodotion’s lexical and syntactical features in the Greek Job. Therefore, his work, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*, is a good reference for a comparison with Theodotion. Finally, the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever is taken for the *Kaige* tradition. Even though the material is fragmentary, the editor E. Tov provides a good deal of syntactical analysis on the Scroll, which is regarded as authentic data on the *Kaige* tradition. Since no one has arranged lexical equivalencies on the Scroll, all lexical data are checked in every case and are given in the following Table 3.

**Lexical Comparison**

A careful comparison between the Translator and selected congeners will be helpful to find the place of the Translator in the early history of the Greek Old Testament.

---

The first comparison is on a lexical level. All equivalences employed by the Translator for nouns and verbs occurring 3 times or more are listed and compared with equivalences for the same Hebrew words chosen by γ′, Theodotion in the Greek Job, and the Minor Prophets Scroll. After Table 3, commentary and analysis follow.

**Lexical Comparison: Data**

Key To Table 3 to Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>Hebrew (i.e., Masoretic Text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Translator (i.e., Greek Ecclesiastes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ′</td>
<td>The Three (including all α′, σ′, and θ′)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>Theodotion in Greek Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Kaige Tradition in Greek Minor Prophets from Nahal Hever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>γ′ / GJ / MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Same Equivalent in X as in Tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−</td>
<td>Same Equivalent Not in X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Equivalent Extant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Evidence Questionable / Equivalent Not Characteristic in X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| σ′...   | Same Equivalent Only Attested Uniquely By Symmachus

| Act     | Active |
| Impv    | Imperative |
| M-P     | Medio-Passive |

---

Table 3
Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1 – Stereotype Equivalents</th>
<th>One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By One Greek Lexeme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>בַל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>אָבִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>אֲר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>א</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>אָשֶׁר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>שֵׁמ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>בֵּית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>שֵׁמ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>דַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>דַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>הָבֵל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12I.e., not attested in both α and θ.


14GJ has παθείμι for בַל (29:25).

15In Hab 3:11, φέγγος seems to reflect הָנָה and not דַע. See Gentry, *Greek Job*, 420 n. 131.

16τέκνον is used twice (39:4, 39:16), and κόμη once (38:32).

17The instances in 1:18a and 8:6b are included where both יְתַת הַכָּךְ and יְתַת הַכָּךְ in MT are rendered by γνώσις.

18GJ has ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ for בֵּל in 35:16. For Alpha privative, see BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §117.

19A. has μάταιος in Isa 30:7 and Jer 10:8. In Greek Ecclesiastes, α and θ normally have ἄτμος for בֵּל.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ'</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>תיב</td>
<td>לְחֵם 8</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>תֵרֵם</td>
<td>לְחֵם 13</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>חָסִים</td>
<td>סֹפָה 21</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>חָסִים</td>
<td>סֹפָה 28</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>מִרְבָּה</td>
<td>סֹפָה 6</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>מֶרֶב</td>
<td>אָגָבָה 45</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>מֶרֶב</td>
<td>אָגָבָה 7</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>נֵבֶן</td>
<td>חָרִים 13</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>הָדִיר</td>
<td>תַּמְרוֹד 26</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>יִנְשֶׂה</td>
<td>סִינָס 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23a</td>
<td>כֹּל</td>
<td>נַעַס 87</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+12/13</td>
<td>+18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23b</td>
<td>+ לָל</td>
<td>נַעַס 2</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>בָּטָם</td>
<td>בּוֹמֹס 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>בָּשָׂר</td>
<td>אָנָדְרֵי 3</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>לֶחֶם</td>
<td>אָלָרְט 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>מְלַק</td>
<td>בְּאוֹלִילֵוָה 11</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>מִטֶּפֶת</td>
<td>אָלָלִוָס 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>מֶשֶׁה</td>
<td>פֹּעְלָה 20</td>
<td>α'</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>מִכֹּס</td>
<td>תֹּפָה 9</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>מָכָר</td>
<td>סָעָלִים 7</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>נְזֶר</td>
<td>אֵלָתָס 3</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>נֵס</td>
<td>יָשֵׁחַ 7</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 GJ has μεταλος for תֵרֵם (35:16).

21 GJ has καλὸς for מֵרֶב in 34:4.

22 GJ has ὅλος for כֹּל in 21:23.

23 Eccl 4:4. γ' has ἀνδρεία for כְּשִׁיר (e.g., Prov 31:19).

24 The instance in 2:12b is excluded where מִלַּק is construed as homonym.

25 For α', see Ps 44(45):2. α' generally has ἐργὸν for מֵנְשָה.

26 MP has ἐργὸν for מֵנְשָה in Jonah 3:10 (= LXX).

27 Sam 6:9.

28 Eccl 6:5.

29 GJ has καταβάλων for רַעֲמַי in 36:16, and the Greek equivalent seems to reflect a verb rather than a noun. See Gentry, Greek Job, 513.
Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ'</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>נער</td>
<td>δούλος</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+1 (42:8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>לך</td>
<td>αἰών</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>יעקב</td>
<td>ὀφθαλμός</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>תמך</td>
<td>μόχθος</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>עִין</td>
<td>περιστασιαμός</td>
<td>α' θ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>נער</td>
<td>χοῦς</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+1/8</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>צע</td>
<td>ξύλον</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>נשא</td>
<td>πλούτος</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>עשה</td>
<td>καιρός</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+3/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>פס</td>
<td>στόμα</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+6/8</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44a</td>
<td>סנזור</td>
<td>πρόσωπον</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44b</td>
<td>+ ל</td>
<td>πρό προσώπου</td>
<td>α' σ</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44c</td>
<td>ט</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44d</td>
<td>+ ל</td>
<td>ἀπὸ προσώπου</td>
<td>α' θ</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 GJ has κόπος for נעָר in 16:2.
31 Eccl 1:13 and 5:13. σ' consistently has ἄσχολία for נעָר.
33 MP also has χώμα for נעָר once.
34 GJ has ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ κυρίου for בִּלְבָּל in 37:2.
35 MP has καιρός for נעָר in Hab 2:3.
36 GJ has περιστάμενον for מָה in 15:27 and 30:18.
37 When לְבָּל is spatial.
38 E.g., Ps 116(114):9. In α', εἰς πρόσωπον is dominant (Isa 8:4, 40:10, etc.), and in σ', ἐμπροσθεν is general (Isa 36:7, 41:2, etc.). θ' normally has ἐνῷποιον for spatial לְבָּל (Isa 53:2, Prov 8:30, 25:26).
39 MP has ἐνωπίων in Zech 3:4. Cf. πρό προσώπου in LXX.
40 When לְבָּל is temporal.
41 E.g., Jer 34(41):5 (α') and Prov 15:33 (σ' θ'). For the temporal לְבָּל, there are various approaches found in α' and σ', but they still prefer εἰς πρόσωπον (Prov 16:18, 1 Kgs 14:9) and ἐμπροσθεν (Prov 15:33, 18:12, etc.) respectively as in the cases of spatial לְבָּל. ἐμπροσθεν is exclusive in θ'.
When מַלְאַךְ is spatial.

E.g., Ps 114(113):7 (‘א’), Jer 33:18 (θ’). ο’ has ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου in Ps 17(16):2

When מַלְאַךְ is temporal.

‘ο’ has πρό in Eccl 1:10, which is the only evidence of γ’ for the temporal מַלְאַךְ extant in Field’s Origenis Hexapla.

The evidence is from σκιά θανάτου for מַלְאַךְ.

γ’ has πέρας for γ in Job 16:3.

GJ often has πέρας for γ.

θ’ has γέλως for בַּשְׁכִּים in Ezek 23:32. בַּשְׁכִּים may be a by-form of בַּשְׁכִּים. Two sibilants ש and פ are interchanged. See C. Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen (New York: Lemcke & Buechner, 1908-13), §55d; KB, s.v. “בַּשְׁכִּים.”

Eccl 10:5. ‘א’ also has ἀξονισάω for μῆλος in most cases as α’ and θ’. Cf. 9:17b, 10:4a.

In 2:3b, LXX reflects שָׁפָט rather than שָׁפָט of the MT, so the instance is regarded as the rendering of שָׁפָט.
### More Than One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By One Greek Lexeme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>אָרָרִין</td>
<td>ἐσχατος 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>דִּלי</td>
<td>μέγας 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 8/9^52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>ידוה</td>
<td>περισσεία 10</td>
<td>-^53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>לָב</td>
<td>καρδία 42</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>מָאָרָה</td>
<td>οὐδείς 3</td>
<td>θ^54</td>
<td>+ 1^55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>מַלְמָה</td>
<td>πόλεμος 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>מַסָכֶל</td>
<td>πένης 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>מְר</td>
<td>πόλις 5</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>רָב (rōb)</td>
<td>πλήθος 6</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 2^57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>דּֿעַת</td>
<td>προαίρεσις 7</td>
<td>-^58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>רְעָע</td>
<td>προαίρεσις 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>נִמְרִים</td>
<td>δύο 5</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category 2 – Regular Equivalents

One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By More Than One Greek Lexeme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72a</td>
<td>אָדוֹת</td>
<td>εἰς 18</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 2 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72b</td>
<td>αὕτος 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73a</td>
<td>בִּינֵה</td>
<td>οίκος 8</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 2 + 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^52 In Nah 3:10, MP has μεγιστάν as in LXX.

^53 The word ידוה only occurs in Ecclesiastes where α' has πλέον in 1:3, and σ' has also πλέον in 1:3, περισσόν in 5:15, πρόεξει in 10:10, and δφέλος in 10:11. There is no extant evidence in θ'.

^54 Jer 39(46):10, 12 (μηδείς after subjunctive). α' has ὁτιοῦν τι and ὡστιοῦν for ἡμείς in 1 Sam 29:3 and 1 King 10:21 respectively; σ' has μέμψιν in Eccl 7:15(14).

^55 Jonah 3:7 has μηδείς as an object of an imperative.

^56 מפרֹק only occurs in Ecclesiastes. For the occurrence in Eccl 4:13, Field provides Jerome's citing σ' in Latin and also its Greek retroversion which is presumed as πένης. γ' often has πένης for both רָע and מפרֹק; α' and θ' sometimes have πένης for לָב.

^57 According to Qere in 33:19.

^58 רַע ("longing," "striving") only occurs in Ecclesiastes. γ' attests different renderings from Tr: νομή in α' and in θ', and βόσκησις and κακώσις in σ'.

^59 רַע only occurs in Ecclesiastes. σ' has νομή in Eccl 1:17 and βόσκησις in Eccl 4:16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ'</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73b</td>
<td>/sweetalert 2</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73c</td>
<td>/sweetalert 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74a</td>
<td>παρά 3</td>
<td>α' σ'</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74b</td>
<td>παρά 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74c</td>
<td>παρά 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74d</td>
<td>εχον 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74e</td>
<td>επέδω 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75a</td>
<td>ὕψηλος 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75b</td>
<td>ὑψος 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76a</td>
<td>μερίς 7</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76b</td>
<td>μέρος 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77a</td>
<td>πράγμα 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77b</td>
<td>θέλημα 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78a</td>
<td>θάνατος 5</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78b</td>
<td>θάνατος 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79a</td>
<td>κρίσις 5</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79b</td>
<td>κρίμα 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

60 I.e., Ecc 12:11 (also see Prov 1:19 for σ'). θ' has δ' εχον (see also 1 Sam 23:12).

61 The proper noun ἐστιν is rendered by Βασιλ in Zeph 1:4.

62 Cf. σ' has one word, το πέρωτον, for the bound phrase βιβλίον Κερεφίμ in Eccl 10:20 while α' has δ' κυριεύων πέρων and θ' has δ' εχον πέρων for the same phrase. The tendency of σ' to use one word for a bound phrase beginning βιβλίον is seen also in Isa 41:15 where ἐστιν is rendered by the participle, ἐστομαμένον, in σ', but θ' also has one word, ἄμφικη, in the same reference.

63 GJ has ὑπερήφανος for ἔστιν in 41:26.

64 σ' has ὑψος for gōbah in Jer 48:29 (LXX 39:29).

65 GJ has μερίζω for πλήρε in 31:2. The Greek equivalent reflects a verb rather than a noun. See Gentry, Greek Job, 502, 511.

66 MP has ἃρτος in Hab 1:16 where LXX has μερίζει.

67 E.g. Ps 17(16):14 (α') and Job 32:17 (σ').

68 E.g. Ecc 12:1. α' and σ' have χρεία in Eccl 3:1 (σ'), 3:17 (σ'), 5:3 (σ'), 12:10 (α'); θ' has θέλημα in Eccl 12:1. θ' and σ' normally have πράγμα for ἔστιν (e.g. Judg 6:29 and Eccl 6:5).
### Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>( \gamma )</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80a</td>
<td>(sākāl)</td>
<td>ἀφρων 3</td>
<td>( \sigma' (\alpha') )</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80b</td>
<td>ἀφροσύνη 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80c</td>
<td>σκληρός 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81a</td>
<td>νέφος 2</td>
<td>( \theta )</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81b</td>
<td>νεφέλη 1</td>
<td>( \sigma' \theta )</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82a</td>
<td>κάθοδος 2</td>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82b</td>
<td>πλειστάκις 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83a</td>
<td>κεφαλή 2</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td>+ 2/4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83b</td>
<td>ἀρχη 1</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84a</td>
<td>πινεύμα 21</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84b</td>
<td>νεμος 2</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84c</td>
<td>μακρόθυμος 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85a</td>
<td>הער</td>
<td>γη 12</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
<td>+ 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85b</td>
<td>πόλις 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86a</td>
<td>הוה</td>
<td>λόγος 19</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>+ 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86b</td>
<td>ῥήμα 3</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 1/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87a</td>
<td>דיבר</td>
<td>λαλιά 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Category 3 – Non-Standard Equivalents

**More Than One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By More Than One Greek Lexeme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>( \gamma )</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85a</td>
<td>הער</td>
<td>γη 12</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
<td>+ 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85b</td>
<td>πόλις 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86a</td>
<td>הוה</td>
<td>λόγος 19</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>+ 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86b</td>
<td>ῥήμα 3</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 1/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87a</td>
<td>דיבר</td>
<td>λαλιά 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

69 Hab 1:7.

70 \( \alpha' \) in Eccl 10:3 and Jer 5:21. \( \alpha' \) has ἀφρων for בשל לא in Eccl 10:6, which is vocalized as sekel in MT not as sākāl. ἀφρων is normally for בשל לא in \( \alpha' \).

71 \( \gamma' \) usually has ἀφροσύνη for בצל לא.

72 Isa 25:5. \( \alpha' \) has πάχος for בצל. (e.g. Exod 19:9)

73 For \( \sigma' \), Job 36:29, 37:11, Eccl 12:2; for \( \theta' \), Job 36:29. \( \alpha' \) has νεφέλη for \( \mu \) in most cases.

74 E.g., Exod 34:24, Deut 9:19, Isa 41:7, etc.

75 GJ has ὀδός for סעפ in 33:29.

76 \( \sigma' \) has πλειστάκις for רוחה סעפ in Eccl 7:22.

77 GJ has ἄρχων for ברא in 29:25 and τάγμα in 1:17.

78 The phrase only occurs in Eccl 7:8.

79 In Jonah 4:2, בראל א is rendered by μακρόθυμος.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ'</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87b</td>
<td>λόγος 1</td>
<td>α' (380)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88a</td>
<td>תהלת� (peripore') 2</td>
<td>θ' (81)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88b</td>
<td>περιφέρεια 2 (82)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88c</td>
<td>παραβολή 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89a</td>
<td>לוגיאמוצס 3 (83)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89b</td>
<td>ψήφος 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90a</td>
<td>περισσός 5</td>
<td>γ' (84)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90b</td>
<td>περισσεία 2</td>
<td>α' (85)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91a</td>
<td>יפרוט 17</td>
<td>γ' (86)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91b</td>
<td>αφροσύνη 1</td>
<td>γ' (87)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92a</td>
<td>סקלת� 5</td>
<td>α' (88)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92b</td>
<td>סקלפליא 1</td>
<td>γ' (89)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93a</td>
<td>זכר 2</td>
<td>γ' (90)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93b</td>
<td>זכראס 1</td>
<td>γ' (91)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94a</td>
<td>ר (rab)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 4 (91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80Ps 110(109):4. ο' also has ἀνάλογον for דבורה in Eccl 7:14(15) and παραβήματι in Eccl 8:2.

81θ' has παραφορά (according to MSS 161, 248) or περιφορά (according to Syh) in Eccl 1:17 but πλάνη in Eccl 2:12. α' consistently has πλάνη for תהלת� (Eccl 1:17, 2:12, 7:25(26), 9:3); ο' shows various approaches (πλάνη in 2:12, ἐννοεῖ θεοῦμαι in 7:25(26), αὐθάδεια in 9:3, and θόρυβος in 10:13). תהלת� only occurs in Ecclesiastes.

82In MT, תהלת� (holēlūr) in 10:13b is vocalized differently from תהלת� (holēlōr) in 9:3b. The Translator may not have vocalized them differently and thus employed περιφέρεια for both instances.

83hisābōn in 7:29 is included.

84E.g., Eccl 6:8. α' and θ' have περισσός for תורת.

85E.g., Eccl 6:8.

86E.g., Eccl 4:5, 4:17, 5:3, 7:6(7).

87γ' normally has ἀφροσύνη for אָלָל (e.g. Prov 13:16).

88I.e., Eccl 2:13 where ο' has ἀμαθία. סקלפת only occurs in Ecclesiastes.

89In 17:9 and 36:7, ר is rendered by δικαίος.

90In 35:8, ר is rendered by δικαίος.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94b</td>
<td>μέγας 2</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94c</td>
<td>πλήθος 1</td>
<td>α'</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94d</td>
<td>πλευστάκις 1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95a</td>
<td>ποιητός 13</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 1/93</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95b</td>
<td>κακός 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>— (κακία)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95c</td>
<td>ποιητίκη 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>+ 1/94</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95d</td>
<td>ἀφοσία 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbs**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>אב (Pi., Qal)</td>
<td>ἀπολλύμι (Act, M-P) 6</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>בֵּל (Pi.)</td>
<td>ἐσθίω 14</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>—95</td>
<td>+ 6/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99a</td>
<td>בֵּל (Pi.)</td>
<td>σπειδώ 2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>—98</td>
<td>—99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99b</td>
<td>בֵּל (Pi.)</td>
<td>σπουδάζω (Act) 1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>—99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

91In Jonah 4:2, MP has πολυέλεος (= LXX) for βρα.

92E.g., Ps 89(88):8. γ' has πλήθος normally for ῥόβ. It is also possible that the Translator may have vocalized βρα in 6:3 as ῥόβ differently from the MT since he consistently used πλήθος for ῥόβ in 6 instances. Furthermore, a noun is syntactically preferred to an adjective in the clause.

93κακία renders βρα in 17:5 where the MT vocalizes βρα as ῥεά' ("friend"). See Gentry, Greek Job, 429 n. 194.

94MP has λύπη in Jonah 4:1.

95GJ has κατεσθίω for λῆμα in 22:20. Another form in 34:3 seems to be construed as a noun. See Gentry, Greek Job, 510.

96In Nah 2:14, κατεσθίω is reconstructed.

97σ' And θ' have M-P forms of σπουδάζω for ἀφέλεις in Pual stem (e.g. Prov 20:21).
Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ'</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>בְּרִית</td>
<td>οἴκοδομέω 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>שְׁפֵךְ</td>
<td>ζητέω 7</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>הָלַי (Hi., Qal)</td>
<td>μεγαλάνω 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>דָּבָר</td>
<td>λαλέω 5</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>מַעְרָה</td>
<td>μιμητικόω 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105a</td>
<td>בָּטַק (Qal)</td>
<td>περιλαμβάνω 2</td>
<td>α' ?101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105b</td>
<td>בָּטַק (Pi. Ptc)</td>
<td>περιλαμβάνεις 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106a</td>
<td>אָמַה (Qal)</td>
<td>διαμαρτάνω 6</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>-102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106b</td>
<td>אָמַה (Hi.)</td>
<td>εξομαρτάνω 1</td>
<td>α' σ'103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107a</td>
<td>הָזַת (Qal)</td>
<td>μάω 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107b</td>
<td>הָזַת (Pl.)</td>
<td>ζωοποιεώ 1</td>
<td>α' θ'104</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>עָטָה (Qal, Hith.)</td>
<td>σωφίζω (M-P) 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>רְפָא</td>
<td>δύναμαι 7</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110a</td>
<td>נְבָע (Qal)</td>
<td>εξέρχομαι 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+3/6106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110b</td>
<td>נְבָע (Hi.)</td>
<td>ἐκφέρω 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>-107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>נְשָׂי</td>
<td>φοβέω 8</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>σ108</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

98α' has M-P forms of σπεύδω for לְבָנָה in Niphal stem; σ' has either Act or M-P forms of σπεύδω. See Ps 90(89):7; Ecc1 8:3.

99GJ has κατασπουδάζω for לְבָנָה in 23:15.

100GJ has ἐκτρέφω for לָבָנָה (Qal) in 31:18.

101α' has περιλαμβάνω for the derivative noun ἁββούκ in Prov 6:10 and 24:33.

102ἐξομαρτάνω in Zeph 1:17.

103No extant evidence exists in θ'.


105GJ has ὑποθέρμω for לְבָנָה in 31:23.

106MP always has ἐκπορεύομαι for Qal participles of נְבָע. (Mic 1:3, Zech 2:7, 2:7).

107GJ has διανοίγω for נְבָע (Hi.) in 38:32.

108GJ has μεγάλης for נְשָׂי in 37:22. Since the Greek equivalent does not correspond with Hebrew in any way, Gentry argues that μεγάλης is not a part of Theodotion materials. See Gentry, *Greek Job*, 261-262.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ'</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>נבט</td>
<td>σωνάγω 3</td>
<td>α' σ' (θ')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113a</td>
<td>נלב (Ni.)</td>
<td>πληρόω (M-P) 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113b</td>
<td>נלב (Qal)</td>
<td>πληροφορέω (M-P) 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114a</td>
<td>מינל (Pi.)</td>
<td>διασφάςω 2</td>
<td>σ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114b</td>
<td>מינל (Ni.)</td>
<td>εξαπατέω (M-P) 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>מאמ</td>
<td>εὑρίσκω 17</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116a</td>
<td>ונב (Hi.)</td>
<td>αναγέλλω 2</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116b</td>
<td>ונב (Hi.)</td>
<td>επαγέλλω 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>נתנ</td>
<td>φθάνω 3</td>
<td>θ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>נזר</td>
<td>ευ'χομαι 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>נתנ</td>
<td>φυτεύω 5</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120a</td>
<td>נצל</td>
<td>πιπτω 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120b</td>
<td>נצל</td>
<td>ἐμπίπτω 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120c</td>
<td>נצל</td>
<td>ἐπιπίπτω 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

109θ' has σωναχθήμα for נבט in Hithpael stem (Isa 28:20).

110πληρόω renders נלב (Pi.).

111πύμπλημι (M-P) in Hab 2:14.

112γ' has πληρόω (Act) for נלב in Qal stem.

113GJ has ἐμπύμπλημι for נלב (Qal) in 20:11.

114I.e., Ps 33(32):17 (cf. Isa 49:24). γ' commonly has σφάς or περισφάς for σφάς (Pi.). σφάς is also seen in α'.

115In GJ, נלב (Pi.) is rendered by σφάς (20:20) or ρύσμαι (22:30).

116γ' has M-P forms of σφάς or περισφάς for נלב (Ni.). In Dan 11:41, M-P form of διασφάς is found in θ'.

117διασφάς is used for נלב (Ni.) in 22:30.

118ἀπασφάς is used for נלב (Ni.) in Zech 2:11.

119E.g. Eccl 8:14 and Ezek 7:12. α' normally has either ἄπτω or ἐγγύζω for ἄπτω (Hi.).

120καταφυτεύω is used in Zeph 1:13.

121GJ has ἐποπίπτω for נצל in 29:24.
### Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ'</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>דָּעַת (Pi., Pu., Hith.)</td>
<td>διαστρέφω (Act, M-P)</td>
<td>ο’ See 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>יְשִׁים</td>
<td>יְשִׁים 5</td>
<td>γ' + 2</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>מחָל</td>
<td>μοχθέω 13</td>
<td>γ’223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>רָע</td>
<td>περισσάω 3</td>
<td>θ’124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125a</td>
<td>בָּר (Hi.)</td>
<td>εγείρω 2</td>
<td>-125</td>
<td>+ ½126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125b</td>
<td>בָּר (Qal)</td>
<td>ανίστημι 1</td>
<td>γ' + 2/4127</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126a</td>
<td>כָּלָל (Pi.)</td>
<td>καταράζωμαι 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126b</td>
<td>כָּלָל (Pilpel)</td>
<td>ταράζω 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>רָו</td>
<td>שְׁצָנָה 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>שֶׁבַי</td>
<td>ἐπαυνέω 3</td>
<td>σ’229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129a</td>
<td>ἀμφώ</td>
<td>πίμπλημι (M-P) 1</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129b</td>
<td>ἀμφώ (Pi.)</td>
<td>ἀποπιθέμεναι (M-P) 3</td>
<td>γ’ + ½130</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>מֹר</td>
<td>ἀποπιθέμεναι 3</td>
<td>α’ σ’131 -132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>מֶשֶׁם (Qal, Pi.)</td>
<td>εὐφραῖνω (M-P) 9</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132a</td>
<td>מֶשֶׁה</td>
<td>ἀκούω 7</td>
<td>γ’ + 8/10133</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132b</td>
<td>מֶשֶׁה (Qal Inf.cs.)</td>
<td>ἀκρόασις 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>מֶשֶׁה</td>
<td>μισέω 4</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

122 See Eccl 7:13(14) in Field. In Job 8:3, ο’ has μεταστρέφω, and α’ has σκέλιζω for דעַת (Pi.).

123, E.g., Eccl 2:19 (ο’), 2:21 (α’ and θ’).

124 E.g., Eccl 1:13. רָע (“to be troubled about”) only occurs in Ecclesiastes.

125 α’ And θ’ have ἐξεγείρω for בָּר (Hi.); σ’ has ἐπεγείρω or ἀνεγείρω.

126 In Mic 5:4, MP has ἐπεγείρω.

127 GJ has ἐπανίστημι for בָּר (Qal) in 30:12 and ἱστημι in 22:28.

128 σ’ has ἀπαντᾶω for בָּר in Eccl 3:14.

129 Eccl 8:10.

130 GJ has χορτάζω for מֶשֶׁה in 38:27.

131 θ’ always has either ἀναποπιθέμεναι or ἀποτίνω for מָלַש (Pi.).

132 GJ has ἀναποπιθέμεναι (21:19, 21:31) or ἀποτίνω (34:33) for מָלַש (Pi.).

133 GJ has εἰσακούω (34:28) or ἀκοή (37:2) for מֶשֶׁה.
Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ’</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>שלוח</td>
<td>πίνω 5</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>רוח</td>
<td>κατασκέπτομαι 3</td>
<td>θ’ 134</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More Than One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By One Greek Lexeme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hebrew (Hi.)</th>
<th>proostíthmi 5</th>
<th>γ’</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137a</td>
<td>דבה</td>
<td>πληθύνω 2</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137b</td>
<td>הֶרְבַּה</td>
<td>πλήθος 1</td>
<td>α’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137c</td>
<td>דֶרֶב</td>
<td>πολύς 15</td>
<td>γ’ 135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>שֶבֶר</td>
<td>ἐπιστρέφω 10</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>שֶלֶל</td>
<td>ἡδονιστάζω 4</td>
<td>σ’ θ’ 137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category 2 – Regular Equivalents

One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By More Than One Greek Lexeme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>ἀγαπάω 3</th>
<th>γ’</th>
<th>+1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140a</td>
<td>爱你</td>
<td>φιλέω 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140b</td>
<td>爱你 (Ni., Qal Pass. Ptc)</td>
<td>θηρεῦω (M-P) 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141a</td>
<td>爱你 (Qal)</td>
<td>ἀντέχω (M-P) 1</td>
<td>θ’ 140</td>
<td>+1/4 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141b</td>
<td>爱你</td>
<td>κρατέω 1</td>
<td>α’ θ’ 142</td>
<td>+2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142a</td>
<td>爱你</td>
<td>λέγω 19</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142b</td>
<td>爱你</td>
<td>λογίζομαι 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

134 In Job 39:8, the form רוח in MT is vocalized as a noun, but θ’ probably read the form as a verb and rendered it by κατασκέπτομαι (= LXX). See BDB, s.v. "רוח"; KB, s.v. "רוחך." α’ has ἔξερευναν in Ecc1 1:13 and νοέω in Eccl 2:3 where θ’ has διανοεῖμαι for רוח.

135 E.g., σ’ in Eccl 5:16; α’ and θ’ in Eccl 5:19.

136 GJ has ἀνακάμπτω for בָשׁ (Qal) and ἀποκρίνομαι for בָשׁ (Hi.).

137 E.g., Ecc1 2:19, 8:9. α’ has κυριεῦω for σάλα.

138 γ’ has φιλός for ὀἰχέμβ.

139 α’ has κατέχω (M-P), and σ’ has κρατέω (M-P) for מַמָּח in Niphal stem (e.g. Gen 22:13, Gen 47:27).

140 Job 17:9.

141 GJ has κατέχω for מַמָּח in 23:9.

142 E.g., Ps 56(55):1 (α’) and Ps 77(76):5 (θ’). σ’ normally has κατέχω for מַמָּח.
Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ'</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143a</td>
<td>יִצְוָא (Qal)</td>
<td>€&quot;ρροχματι 6</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 1/2 143</td>
<td>+ 5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143b</td>
<td>נַחַנְיָמ (1)</td>
<td>€πέρσοματε 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143c</td>
<td>פָּרָגְנֵו (2)</td>
<td>α’ θ’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143d</td>
<td>דָּשָׁה 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143e</td>
<td>הָעַי 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144a</td>
<td>יַגַּה (Hi.)</td>
<td>אֵגוֹג 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>-144</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144b</td>
<td>יְלָדָה (Ho.)</td>
<td>εἰσάγαγο (M-P) 1</td>
<td>σ’ (γ’?) 145</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145a</td>
<td>יַלֹּל (Qal, Pi) 146</td>
<td>πορεύομαι 24</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 13147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145b</td>
<td>אֶתְּפֹרְמָה 1</td>
<td>α’ σ’</td>
<td>+ 1/2 148</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145c</td>
<td>זָלָה (Qal Impv)</td>
<td>δεύρο 2</td>
<td>ε’ 149</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145d</td>
<td>זָלָה (Pi.)</td>
<td>περιπατέω 2</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145e</td>
<td>זָלָה (Hi.)</td>
<td>ἀποφέρω 1</td>
<td>-151</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146a</td>
<td>יָשָׁר</td>
<td>γιγνώσκω 27</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>+ 10/11 152</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146b</td>
<td>יִזְדָא 7</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 1153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147a</td>
<td>יִלֵי (Hi., Ni.)</td>
<td>γενέω (Act, M-P) 3</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147b</td>
<td>יִלֵי (Ni.)</td>
<td>γένεσις 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147c</td>
<td>יִלֵי (Qal)</td>
<td>τίκτω 1</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>-154</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148a</td>
<td>יְרָמ</td>
<td>ἀποθητήσω 5</td>
<td>γ’</td>
<td>+ 1/2 155</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

143GJ has δεύτε for יִצְוָא (Qal Impv).
144GJ has ετάγω for יַגַּה (Hi.) in 34:28.
145σ’ in Ezek 40:4. γ’ has εἰσάγαγο (Act) for יַגַּה (Hi.).
146Piel in 8:10.
147Piel in Hab 3:11. Two instances of a Qal form in Mic 1:8 and Nah 3:10 are reconstructed.
148GJ has προάγω for יַלֹּל (Qal Inf cs) in 34:23.
149E.g., 2 Kgs 8:1, Dan 12:13. α’ normally has πορεύομαι for יַלֹּל (Qal Impv), and σ’ has ἀπερχομαι.
150Hab 3:11 in entry 145a is only occurrence of Piel in MP.
151γ’ normally has ἀπάγω for יַלֹּל (Hi.).
152GJ has εἴπαγωσκο for ἄναμ in 24:16c. See Gentry, Greek Job, 295.
154GJ has τοκτός for יַלֵי (Qal Inf cs) in 39:1.
### Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ'</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>148b</td>
<td>νεκρός 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148c</td>
<td>θησικών 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149a</td>
<td>ἀφίημι 4</td>
<td>α' σ'</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149b</td>
<td>ἀνίημι 4</td>
<td>θ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149c</td>
<td>καταπαύω 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149d</td>
<td>ἀναπαύω 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150a</td>
<td>δίδωμι (Act, M-P) 23</td>
<td>γ' + 7</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150b</td>
<td>δόμα 1</td>
<td>α' σ'</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150c</td>
<td>τίθημι 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151a</td>
<td>ὑπάρχει 43</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 9/11</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151b</td>
<td>βλέπω 4</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 1/11</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151c</td>
<td>θεωρέω 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151d</td>
<td>δείκνυμι 2</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category 3 – Non-Standard Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>γ'</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152a</td>
<td>γίγνομαι 28</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152b</td>
<td>εἰμί 18</td>
<td>ε'</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153a</td>
<td>κυκλώ 6</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153b</td>
<td>ἐπιστρέφω 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154a</td>
<td>ποιέω (Act, M-P)</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154b</td>
<td>γίγνομαι (M-P) 3</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155a</td>
<td>φιλάσσω 7</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td>+2/3</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155b</td>
<td>τηρεώ 1</td>
<td>σ' θ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155c</td>
<td>φύλαξ 1</td>
<td>γ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

155 GJ has ἀποθνήσκω for ὁμιλέω in 42:17.

156 In 36:16, καταβαίνω reflects the verb Ἒρε not ἦν.

157 E.g., Eccl 4:17.

158 GJ has ἐμβλέπω for ἐμπέπατο in 41:26.

159 Other LXX translators often rendered ἐπιστρέφω by ἐπιστρέφω (e.g., 1 Sam 22:18; 2 Sam 18:30).

160 E.g., Judg 16:11(α'), Eccl 2:17(σ''), and Dan 11:36(θ').

161 GJ has οὐχ ἔπεμψει for ἐπέμψει in 2:6.
Lexical Comparison: Commentary and Analysis

The data given in Table 3 are categorized in four groups based upon agreement or disagreement between the Translator and his congeneres. The values of each group may differ in deciding the historical place of the Translator.

1. \( Tr = y' = GJ = MP \)
2. \( Tr = y' = GJ / Tr = y' = MP / Tr = y' \)
3. Only attested in \( Tr \)—i.e., no extant datum exists in congeners
4. Variations, for which the symbol \( - \) is seen in any column, or \( \alpha', \sigma', \) or \( \delta' \) in \( y' \) column

\( Tr = y' = GJ = MP (58 \text{ Entries}) \)

If all congeners agree with the Translator for a certain rendering, the rendering is regarded as common. For example, \( \lambda \bar{ion} \) in entry 2 is found in all three columns—\( y' \), GJ, and MP. This means that \( \lambda \bar{ion} \) is a common translation for \( \mathcal{m} \). Such information has little significance in identifying the Translator. In a total of 58 entries, all congeners share identical renderings with the Translator. The 58 entries are: 2, 3, 5, 8a, 9a, 11a, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23a, 27, 30, 33, 36, 39, 43, 44a, 45, 47, 49, 54, 55, 58, 63, 68, 72a, 73a, 78a, 79b, 83a, 84a, 85a, 86a, 94a, 95a, 96a, 97, 103, 104, 110a, 120a, 122, 125b, 129b, 132a, 134, 136, 138, 142a, 143a, 150a, 151a, 152a, 152b, 154a, 155a.

\( Tr = y' = GJ (15 \text{ Entries}) / Tr = y' = MP \)
\( (19 \text{ Entries}) / Tr = y' (30 \text{ Entries}) \)

The next examples may also imply common renderings. In these equivalences, no different rendering is attested by any other translator. Additionally, these equivalences are frequently seen in other LXX translators. If a certain equivalence in \( Tr \) is seen in \( y' \), and the marker ‘\( - \)’ does not appear in both GJ and MP (i.e., \( Tr = y' = GJ or \)
$\text{Tr} = \gamma' = \text{MP}$, it may be regarded as a common equivalence. An example is entry 6 where $\gamma'$ and MP have $\gamma\nu\nu\eta$ for $\pi\varsigma\kappa$, thus agreeing with the Translator, but GJ does not have any evidence extant. Another common rendering is entry 15 which shows that $\gamma'$ has $\delta\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\varsigma$ for $\zeta\tau\nu$ as does the Translator, but there is no evidence for the Hebrew lexeme available in both GJ and MP (i.e., $\text{Tr} = \gamma'$). This second type of common rendering consists of 64 examples. A total of 15 occurrences of $\text{Tr} = \gamma' = \text{GJ}$ are found in entries 4, 10, 16, 26, 34, 42, 46, 60, 71, 77b, 115, 116a, 116b, 137a, and 148a. The case of $\text{Tr} = \gamma' = \text{MP}$ occurs in 19 entries: 6, 7, 22, 35, 40, 51, 57, 61, 65, 67, 100, 101, 107a, 111, 118, 131, 140a, 151d, and 153a. Finally, $\text{Tr} = \gamma'$ is seen in 30 entries: 14, 15, 19, 23b, 24, 28, 32, 41, 44c, 50, 52, 56, 59, 74d, 89a, 91a, 93a, 93b, 108, 112, 123, 126a, 126b, 133, 137c, 147a, 149c, 149d, 154b, and 155c. Since these 64 equivalences are commonly shared with other translators or revisors, they have little value in finding the place of the Translator within the history of the transmission of the text.

*Equivalences Only Attested in Tr (13 Entries)*

In 13 entries which are 8b, 44e, 66, 70, 73c, 74e, 84c, 87a, 94d, 96d, 99a, 105b, and 132b, no object in congeners to compare with Tr exists—i.e., no extant datum for the Hebrew word in question exists in congeners. Thus, it is not possible to judge the characteristic of Tr using these data. Some of the Hebrew words occur only in Ecclesiastes.

*Different Equivalences Found Among the Congeners (109 Entries)*

In 109 entries, different equivalences from Tr are found among the congeners.
They are marked by α', σ', or θ' in the γ' column or by the symbol '-' in other columns. These equivalences may reveal the distinctive characteristic of Tr and may be a guide to the historical place of Tr in the transmission history of the Greek Ecclesiastes. Thus, it is necessary to analyze and discuss in detail all of these 109 entries. For proper analysis, the entries are arranged in three groups according to the relationship between Tr and each congener: Tr and MP, Tr and GJ, and Tr and γ'. Each group is examined individually in the order of agreement followed by disagreement.

Tr and MP (46 entries). The relationship between Tr and MP is seen in a total of 46 entries. In 11 entries, they agree, and in 35 entries, they disagree.

![Table 4. Agreement between Tr and MP.](image)

According to Table 4, when Tr agrees with MP, it never agrees with GJ. In 6 out of 9 instances, the disagreement between Tr/MP and GJ has little value in establishing the relationship between Tr and MP. In entry 75a, GJ has ὑπερήφανος for πᾶσιν while Tr, MP, and γ' have ὑψηλὸς. Since the GJ rendering represents θ', ὑπερήφανος must be a variant used by θ'. In entries 143d and 143e, Tr and MP employed δύο and ἐκτρέφω once respectively for κυν (Qal) based upon contextual interpretation. No context in GJ requires the renderings used by Tr and MP. On the contrary, ἐκτρέφω by GJ for ὄν
(Qal) in entry 102 is motivated by contextual meaning in 31:18 while Tr and MP have no such context and normally have μεγαλύνω in different contexts. Disagreement in entries 98 and 147c between GJ and Tr / MP is not lexically irrelevant. In entry 98, κατεσθίω by GJ is a compound form of ἐσθίω used by Tr and MP. GJ utilized the deverbal noun, τοκετός, for יָלִי (Qal Inf. cs.) in entry 147c where Tr and MP rendered יָלִי (Qal) by יִקְטָו.

The case of entry 86b may imply a lexical connection between Tr and MP against GJ, but the connection is not significant. Tr used δῆμα when דֱִבָּר designated a whole discourse or matter while he utilized λόγος for individual or specific utterance. Even though MP has δῆμα once in Zech 1:13, it is used as a stylistic variant of λόγος rather than as an attempt to distinguished lexical meaning.

Significant agreements of Tr and MP against GJ are seen in entries 145a, and 146b. In entry 145a, πορεύομαι is used as a default rendering for יָלִי both in Tr and MP, but GJ never employs πορεύομαι. In entry 146b, both Tr and MP have οἶδα for יִכְכַּה if יִכְכַּת follows the interrogative יו. On the contrary, GJ has γνωρίσκω in the same grammatical circumstance.

Although MP agrees with Tr and never agrees with GJ, there is one instance where MP agreeing with Tr agrees with θ' (entry 64). In entry 64, Tr, MP and θ' all have οὐδὲς for διαίραμα. This approach is already established in the Greek Pentateuch, but α' and σ' do not attest to it in the extant evidence. This instance may imply a relationship between Theodotion and the Kaige revision, but the evidence is too scanty to judge the

162 For MP, see Jonah 3:9.
relationship.

Beyond $\gamma'$, both Tr and MP agree with $\gamma'$ on the same 8 entries out of 10. Nine instances have been discussed above, and the disagreement in entry 125a will now be explained. The disagreement in entry 125a is trivial because $\gamma'$ has compound forms such as $\epsilon\varepsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\omega$, $\epsilon\pi\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\omega$, or $\dot{\alpha}v\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\omega$, for $\Delta\nu$ (Hi.) while Tr and MP have the simplex form $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\omega$. As a whole, Tr, agreeing with MP, is much closer to $\gamma'$ than to GJ.

### Table 5. Disagreement between Tr and MP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \gamma'$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106a, 113a, 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \alpha'\sigma'$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \alpha'\iota$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \neq \text{OJ} = \gamma'$</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75b, 83b, 94b, 95b, 96b, 96c, 120b, 120c, 129a, 143b, 150c, 151c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \neq \text{OJ} = \alpha'$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \neq \text{OJ} = \alpha'\sigma'$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \neq \text{OJ} = \alpha'\iota$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \neq \text{OJ} = \sigma'\iota$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>155b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \neq \text{OJ} = \gamma'$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73b, 76a, 79a, 146a, 151b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \neq \text{OJ} = \alpha'\sigma'$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \neq \text{OJ} = \gamma'$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140b, 153b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} = \neq \text{MP} = \neq \text{OJ} = \gamma'$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48, 72b, 78b, 85b, 114b, 142b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that Tr generally disagrees with GJ when Tr disagrees with MP (22 entries out of 28). Eight entries are categorized as contextual rendering: 75a, 83b, 94b, 95b, 96b, 96c, 143c, and 155b. Significant disagreement between Tr and MP are seen only in entries 75b and 95b because, in these 2 entries, similar contexts

\[\alpha'\text{ has } \dot{\alpha}v\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\omega \text{ and } \sigma'\text{ has } \mu\varepsilon\mu\iota\nu.\]
distinguished by Tr are also seen in both MP and GJ, and thus, one can compare Tr with MP/GJ. In entry 75b, Tr used ὑψός for ἡλίος to designate place, but MP employed υψηλός (Zeph 1:16). When υψηλός is used for ἡλίος in Tr, it always denotes human beings. GJ has ὑπερήφανος implying something proud (1:26). The rendering, ἤρ > κακός, in entry 95b is already established in the Greek Pentateuch.\(^{164}\) Tr seems to have utilized κακός and πονηρός with different nuances according to context: κακός for “evil,” and πονηρός for “grievous.”\(^{165}\) MP and GJ have πονηρός for the meaning of “evil.” These 2 entries demonstrate unique patterns found in Tr as compared to MP or GJ.

In the other entries, even though different Greek lexemes used according to context are highly systematized in Tr, MP and GJ do not have sufficient contexts for comparison. Thus, the evidence has little value for this comparison. In entry 83b, Tr used ἄρχη for ἀρχή in the temporal sense of “beginning” while using κεφαλή for the meaning of “head.” Any context, in which ἀρχή denotes a temporal idea, is not extant in either MP or GJ. In entry 94b, Tr twice uses μέγας for ὁ μεγάς implying size (“great”). On the other hand, he has πολύς 5 times if ὁ μεγάς refers to quantity (“many,” “much”). The evidence extant in MP and GJ is all related to quantity, so comparison for ὁ μεγάς implying size (“great”) is not possible. In entries 96b and 96c, Tr has πονηρός and πονηρία for ἡ μέγα 4 times respectively. MP and GJ have κακία as Tr has in another 4 instances. Rendering ἡ μέγα by πονηρός or by πονηρία is already established in LXX even though there are

\(^{164}\) Six instances out of a total of 21 in LXX: Gen 24:50, 44:34, 50:15, Exod 5:19, Deut 1:39, 30:15. See Gentry, Greek Job, 450.

relatively few examples. Tr may have applied the approach established by other LXX translators or may have intended to correlate the common equation בְּנֵי > πατὴρ. In 143c, נָשָׁה is twice contextually rendered by παραγίνομαι by Tr, while MP and GJ have only the common rendering ἔρχομαι. In 155b, Tr employs τηρέω based upon context, but MP and GJ have only the default rendering φυλάσσω. The equation ἔστιν > αὐτός in entry 72b is not only contextual but is also required by the target language for good idiomatic Greek. No corresponding context is found in GJ, MP, and γ'. The equation ἐστὶν > πάλιν in entry 85b is also highly contextual, and even a different Vorlage is suspected.

In 4 entries, the difference between Tr and MP/GJ involves only simplex or compound forms: 120b, 120c, 129a, and 143b. The difference in entry 94c may be due to different vocalization. These 5 cases are not significant.

Stylistic variations are involved in entries 76b and 150c. In 76b, Tr utilized μέρις, the default rendering for בָּנֵי, in 5:17, but used μέρος in 5:18 for stylistic variation. MP has ἔρτος in Hab 1:16 where LXX has μέρις; GJ has μερίς. Another stylistic variation may be seen in entry 150c where Tr rendered לֹא by τίθημι once, but normally rendered it by διδόμην. Both MP and GJ have διδόμην. These stylistic variations have little significance in establishing a relationship between Tr and MP/GJ.

In 3 entries (78b, 142b, 151c), grammatical circumstances govern the renderings in Tr. In 78b, the free form of the noun נָשָׁה in a bound construction is rendered by an adjectival infinitive form of θανατάω. Neither MP nor GJ has this syntactical condition, and thus, the case is not significant. In entry 142b, Tr has the

166 Gentry, Greek Job, 450.
equation רמא > λογίζομαι. In Tr, when רמא is followed by a direct or indirect speech, λέγω is always used as its equivalent. If רמא is not followed by either a direct or indirect speech, λογίζομαι is employed. While no extant evidence is seen in MP for the same grammatical condition, GJ has one instance (33:8) in which λογίζομαι is expected according to Tr, but λέγω is used for it. Furthermore, none of the other translators of the LXX ever used the equivalence in question. Thus, the equation רמא > λογίζομαι in Tr may be unique. On the other hand, entry 151c is noteworthy. Tr has θεωρεῖν for a participle bound form of ἱερα, while having ὁρᾶω for non-participle forms of ἱερα. The identical syntax (i.e., participle bound form of ἱερα) is found once in MP (Nah 3:7) and is rendered by ὁρᾶω.

Unique renderings in Tr against MP/GJ are seen in entries 48 and 114b. In entry 48, Tr consistently has περασμός for ἐγεῖ in 3 occurrences while MP/ GJ and γ’ have πέρας. περασμός never occurs in LXX except in Tr. In entry 114b, מילך in Niphal stem is rendered by ἐξαίρετο in Tr, but this never occurs in MP, GJ, or γ’, where σώζω or its compound forms are attested. ἐξαίρετο for מילך (Ni.) is also not seen elsewhere in the LXX. The two Greek lexemes, περασμός for ἐγεῖ and ἐξαίρετο for מילך (Ni.), reveal the independent character of Tr.

On the contrary, when Tr disagrees with MP, Tr generally agrees with more than one member of γ’. Differences between Tr/γ’ and MP in entries 106a and 119

167 rāb may have been construed as rāb in Tr.
168 In 27 entries out of 34, Tr against MP agrees with more than one of γ’ (80 percent). α’ rendering is seen in 26 entries; σ’ in 24; and θ’ in 23.
involves simplex forms vs. compound forms, and so, they are not significant. In entry 44b, MP has ἑυκοπίον for the spatial ἀπέλθη in Zech 3:4. Since the LXX has πρὸ τοῦ πρόσωπου in the same reference, MP shows a revision of the LXX. Tr agrees with α and σ having πρὸ τοῦ πρόσωπου, but θ agrees with MP.

In entry 113a, Tr has πληρῶ for ἀπέλθη (Ni.) in all 4 occurrences. MP has πιμπλήμι in Hab 2:14 following the LXX. Although γ' attests πληρῶ in Exod 1:7, πιμπλήμι is also seen in σ' and θ' outside of the Pentateuch. Other translators in the LXX prefer πιμπλήμι (13 occurrences) to πληρῶ (4 occurrences). The choice of Tr was possibly made based upon an established approach by earlier translator(s), but the consistent use of πληρῶ in Tr is noteworthy.

In entry 29, מְשֶׁה is rendered by ποίημα in Tr, α and θ' but by έργον in MP and σ'. The noun מְשֶׁה occurs 234 times in MT, and έργον is used as its equivalent 161 times in the LXX (69 percent). ποίημα is mainly focused on the Greek Ecclesiastes (20 occurrences out of 29), and έργον is never used by Tr. ποίημα may have been employed with relation to the equation מְשֶׁה > ποιέω etymologically. Nevertheless, one cannot confirm that ποίημα is an Aquilan reading or Aquilan influence because α' has not

---

169 In entry 106a, Tr and γ have ἀμαρτάνω for עתי (Qal), and MP has ἐξαμαρτάνω. In entry 119, Tr and γ have φυτεύω for מְשֶׁה, and MP has καταφυτεύω.

170 E.g., Ezek 10:4; 23:34; Ps 71(70):8. Cf. θ' has χορτάζω (M-P) in Eccl 6:7.

171 See Hatch and Redpath, Concordance, s.v. "πιμπλήμι and πληρῶ."

172 Nine occurrences where מְשֶׁה is rendered by ποίημα outside Greek Ecclesiastes are Judg 13:12, 1 Sam 8:8, 19:4, 1 Kgs 7:31, Ezra 9:13, Neh 6:14, Pss 64(63):9, 143(142):5.
only ποίημα but also ἔργον, δικαίωμα, and ποιήσις for פְּנֵיהַו. It is significant that Tr consistently and exclusively has ποίημα for פְּנֵיהַו, and that this exclusivity is not found in any other translator.

In 6 entries, Tr, GJ, and γ’ share the same Greek equivalent for a certain Hebrew lexeme. Only MP does not have it. Four cases (73b, 76a, 145b, 151b) may imply a peculiarity of MP or may indicate standardized renderings in other translators. In entry 73b, Tr, GJ, and γ’ have οἰκία for מִשְׁמָר as well as οἰκός (entry 73a), but MP has only οἰκός. Tr and GJ distinctively used οἰκία and οἰκός according to context, and both Greek equivalents are commonly used in γ’. Revision by MP is seen in Hab 3:13 where ἄνυφμων in the LXX for מִשְׁמָר is replaced by εξ οἰκου in MP towards the Hebrew text. In entry 76a, פְּרִתָה is rendered by μερίς in Tr, GJ, and γ’, but by ἄρτος in MP (Hab 1:16). The LXX attests μερίς in Hab 1:16, and MP revised it. In entry 145b, the equivalence מְלֹא > ἀπερχομαι is definitely contextual in Tr. The rendering pattern is already established in the Greek Pentateuch. GJ, α’, and ι’ also attest ἀπερχομαι. Thus, ἀπερχομαι must have been normal rendering for מְלֹא. MP has only πορεύομαι in all 12 extant occurrences following the LXX. Since MP did not revise the LXX, no peculiarity is seen in MP. In entry 151b, the rendering of מְלֹא by βλέπω is motivated by a certain grammatical condition in Tr—i.e., always the participle of מְלֹא in free form. In GJ, βλέπω is used as a...
stylistic variation for ὀπέω (10:4).\textsuperscript{176} γʹ also allows βλέπω as an alternative rendering. MP follows LXX and stereotypically sticks to ὀπέω.\textsuperscript{177}

The other 2 entries (79a, 146a) have less significance due to scanty evidence. In entry 79a, Tr and GJ utilize κρίσις for ἐπιστρέφω distinguishing it from κρίμα probably based upon contextual distinction, and γʹ attests both κρίσις and κρίμα. The only extant evidence in MP is κρίμα in Hab 1:7. Since the evidence is limited, no comparison can be made between Tr and MP. In entry 146a, the equivalence ἀπερατόν > γινώσκω is already established in the Greek Pentateuch. MP has only οἶδα in 1 extant instance. Even though it could be motivated by a certain grammatical condition as in Tr, no definite conclusion can be reached.

There are 2 entries (140b, 153b) where the rendering of Tr is against MP and γʹ, and GJ does not have any extant evidence. In entry 140b, the equation ἅμα > φιλέω is seen in Tr, but MP and γʹ have only ἀγαπάω, which is a default rendering of Tr. In 3:8, φιλέω is chosen as an antonym for μισέω in context. This approach is seen in the Greek Genesis, and the Translator probably adopted it. In entry 153b, ἐπιστρέφω is chosen once for ἐπιστρέφω in Tr for contextual reasons while κυκλόω is a normal rendering. Neither MP nor γʹ attests to ἐπιστρέφω. However, other translators of the LXX used it in 12 occurrences, and these are mainly found in the Historical books.\textsuperscript{178} (e.g. 1 Sam 15:12, 2 Kgs 9:18). The Translator may have extended the equivalence ἀμα > ἐπιστρέφω which was already

\textsuperscript{176}Gentry, Greek Job, 302.

\textsuperscript{177} Only instance where MP revised LXX is Hab 3:10 (δύναται is revised by εἴδοσαν).
established in Historical books.

In summary, Tr against MP is close to \( \gamma' \) and distant from GJ. In other words, Tr shows a stronger relationship with \( \gamma' \) than MP or GJ in the cases above.

**Tr and GJ (57).** The relationship between Tr and GJ is seen in 57 entries. Tr and GJ agree in 10 entries and disagree in 47 entries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr = GJ ≠ MP = ( \gamma' )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73b, 76a, 79a, 146a, 151b</td>
<td>10/57 (17.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = GJ = ( \alpha' \theta' )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = GJ = ( \alpha' )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107b, 141c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = GJ = ( \theta' )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135, 141b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon Table 6, when Tr agrees with GJ, they never agree with MP (73b, 76a, 79a, 146a, 151b). As discussed above, Tr agreeing with MP also never agrees with GJ. These 2 facts indicate the great distance between GJ and MP with respect to Tr.

On the other hand, GJ agreeing with Tr agrees with \( \theta' \) in all 10 occurrences, \( \alpha' \) in 7, and \( \sigma' \) in 6. This shows more affinity of \( \theta' \) to GJ than affinity of \( \alpha' \) or \( \sigma' \) to GJ.

Since Theodotion is regarded as the translator or revisor of GJ, the close affinity of \( \theta' \) to GJ is expected.\(^{179}\) Five cases have been discussed above (entries 73b, 76a, 79a, 146a, 151b), but the other 5 entries require explanation.

\(^{178}\) The 12 instances are 1 Sam 15:12, 27, 17:30, 22:18 bis, 2 Sam 14:24, 18:30, 31, 2 Kgs 9:18, 19, 1 Chr 16:43, and Ezek 42:18 (19).

\(^{179}\) Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 494.
In entry 81b, Tr, GJ, σ', and θ' have \( \nu \varepsilon \phi \ell \eta \) for \( \pi \nu \), but the Greek equivalent is normally used for \( \pi \nu \) in \( \sigma' \). In entry 107b, \( \tau \nu \) (Pi.) is rendered by \( \zeta \omega \pi \varepsilon \nu \omega \) in Tr along with GJ, \( \sigma' \), and \( \theta' \) while \( \sigma' \) has \( \delta \iota \alpha \omega \omega \zeta \omega \) in Eccl 7:10.\(^{180}\) A non-\( \sigma' \) reading is also seen in entry 141c where \( \kappa \rho \tau \varepsilon \omega \) is used for \( \tau \nu \) in Tr, GJ, \( \sigma' \), and \( \theta' \). For the Hebrew lexeme, \( \sigma' \) normally uses \( \kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \chi \omega \). There are 2 entries (135, 141b) where the Tr shares equivalences with GJ and \( \theta' \). The equivalence \( \tau \nu \rightarrow \kappa \alpha \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \pi \tau \omega \mu \alpha \iota \) in entry 135 is already established in the Greek Pentateuch.\(^{181}\) Tr may have employed the approach as Theodotion did. The \( \theta' \) rendering \( \tau \nu \rightarrow \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \chi \omega \) in entry 141b is the same evidence which is presented in GJ by Gentry. The LXX has 1 instance outside the Greek Ecclesiastes where \( \tau \nu \) is rendered by \( \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \chi \omega \): Deut 32:41. One cannot be sure whether Tr was influenced by the translator of the Greek Deuteronomy or by Theodotion because the extant evidence is only one example for each translator.

In conclusion, GJ agrees with Tr only in 10 entries out of 55 (18.2 percent), and the shared renderings between Tr and GJ are identical to renderings in \( \theta' \). The meager percentage of agreement between Tr and GJ/\( \theta' \) does not seem to suggest \( \theta' \) as the Translator of the Greek Ecclesiastes. Non-\( \sigma' \) renderings are found in entry 81b, 135, and 141b, and non-\( \sigma' \) renderings are seen in entries 107b and 141c.

According to Table 7 below, Tr against GJ disagrees with MP in 23 entries but agrees in 9. Significant disagreements between Tr and GJ are seen in entries 48, 75b, 95b, 114b, and 151c; noteworthy disagreements are in entries 145a and 146b. These

---

\(^{180}\) For \( \delta \iota \alpha \omega \omega \zeta \omega \) in \( \sigma' \), see also Jer 49:11 (29:13), Ps 33(32):19. \( \sigma' \) has various other equivalents for \( \tau \nu \) (Pi.) such as \( \zeta \alpha \omega \), \( \zeta \omega \omega \), etc.

\(^{181}\) See Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. "\( \kappa \alpha \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \pi \tau \omega \mu \alpha \iota \)."
cases have been discussed above.\textsuperscript{182}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} = \alpha' \sigma' )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12, 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} = \alpha' )</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77a, 82a, 137b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} = \sigma' )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} = \gamma' )</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1, 37, 109, 110b, 144a, 148b, 148c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} = \text{MP} = \gamma' )</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75a, 86b, 98, 102, 143e, 145a, 146b, 147c</td>
<td>47/57 (82.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} \neq \text{MP} = \gamma' )</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75b, 83b, 94b, 95b, 96b, 96c, 120b, 120c, 129a, 143b, 150c, 151c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} \neq \text{MP} = \alpha' \sigma' )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76b, 150b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} \neq \text{MP} = \alpha' \theta' )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} \neq \text{MP} = \sigma' \theta' )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>155b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} \neq \text{MP} = \alpha' )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} \neq \text{MP} \neq \gamma' )</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48, 72b, 78b, 85b, 114b, 142b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} = \text{MP} \neq \gamma' )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Tr} \neq \text{GJ} \neq \gamma' )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99b, 113b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\text{Tr} against GJ agrees with \( \alpha' \) in 36 entries out of 46, with \( \sigma' \) in 33, and with \( \theta' \) in 29. \text{Tr} shows least affinity to \( \theta' \) among the Three, and it is expected since GJ disagrees with \text{Tr} in these entries.

In 7 entries, \text{Tr} against GJ shares renderings with either \( \alpha' \) or \( \sigma' \) (12, 77a, 82a, 114a, 130, 137b, 150b). These 7 cases may confirm the Theodotionic characteristic of GJ and may imply a non-Theodotionic characteristic for \text{Tr}.

The equation \( \text{ἵλαρος} > \muαταιότης \) in entry 12 is shared by \text{Tr}, \( \alpha' \), and \( \sigma' \).

\textsuperscript{182}See p. 370 of this dissertation.
Nevertheless, Tr is not Aquilan in this case because $\alpha'$ has $\acute{a}\tau\mu\omicron\omicron\varsigma$ or $\acute{a}\tau\mu\imath\omicron\imath\omicron\varsigma$ for ἀποδίδωμι in the Greek Ecclesiastes (e.g. 1:14).\textsuperscript{183} Tr is definitely connected to $\sigma'$ since $\sigma'$ has μάταιοτης in Eccl 5:6 and 6:12 (7:1). $\theta'$ has μάταιος in Isa 30:7 and Jer 10:8, and GJ attests a similar form μάταιως in 35:16. Another lexical connection between Tr and $\sigma'$ is possible in entry 114a where $\varsigma\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ (Pi.) is rendered by διωσκξ\omega. διωσκξ\omega is never attested in $\alpha'$ and $\theta'$.

They have rather a simplex form: σοφία, περισσότερον, or ρόφαμα. Only 2 instances of $\varsigma\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ (Pi.) > διωσκξ\omega are seen elsewhere in the LXX (Job 29:12, Amos 2:15). It is not evident whether Tr is oriented by other LXX translators or by $\sigma'$, but the possibility of Symmachian influence still exists.

In entry 130, Tr has ἀποδίδωμι for ἀποδοτά for $\varsigma\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ (Pi.), and the same rendering is seen in $\alpha'$ and $\sigma'$. $\theta'$ always attests to either ἀνταποδίδωμι or ἀποτίνως as does GJ (21:19, 21:31, 34:33). Neither ἀνταποδίδωμι nor ἀποτίνως may be regarded as Theodotionic because they are also attested to in $\alpha'$.\textsuperscript{184} The consistent use of ἀποδίδωμι in Tr is evidently non-Theodotionic. Previous LXX translators utilized ἀποδίδωμι for ἀποδοτά for $\varsigma\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ (Pi.), and Tr seems to have adopted this approach.\textsuperscript{185} Another non-Theodotionic rendering may be in entry 150b where a Qal infinitive bound form of πράγμα is rendered by the noun δόμα. The equivalence is never attested to in $\theta'$, but is in $\alpha'$ and $\sigma'$.

There are 3 entries (77a, 82a, 137b), in which the Greek renderings may be Aquilan. According to entry 77a, Tr has the equivalence ἀποδίδωμι > πράγμα, and only $\alpha'$

\textsuperscript{183}$\theta'$ also has ἀτμος or ἀτμις for ἀποδίδωμι.

\textsuperscript{184} Cf. Reider, Index to Aquila, 315.

\textsuperscript{185} Cf. Deut 23:21(22), 2 Sam 33:9, etc. See Hatch and Redpath, Concordance, s.v. ἀποδίδωμι.
shares it.\(^\text{186}\) This approach never occurs elsewhere in the LXX. Even though, α' has θέλημα in Eccl 12:10, πρέπει seems to be Aquilan. GJ and θ' have θέλημα. The equation καθοδος in entry 82a is also Aquilan. Outside the Greek Ecclesiastes in the LXX, this same Greek equivalent is found in 1 Kgs 9:25, but it is regarded as Aquilan according to Hatch and Redpath. Theodotionic rendering is δός as attested to in Job 33:29. The equation רְבִּי > πληθος in entry 137b is used once as a stylistic variation of πληθύνω in Tr. Since the approach is never attested to elsewhere in the LXX, and only α' has πληθος for רְבִּי, the rendering in question is likely Aquilan.

In 7 entries, Tr against GJ agrees with γ' (1, 37, 109, 110b, 144a, 148b, 148c). The 7 equivalences are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Equivalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>הָלַךְ &gt; πένθος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>נָע &gt; מָחְצָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>מָלְא &gt; דִּינָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110b</td>
<td>צֶּדֶק &gt; εκφέρω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144a</td>
<td>מָר &gt; νεκρός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148b</td>
<td>מָר &gt; θνήσκω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148c</td>
<td>מָר &gt; θνήσκω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since these are all attested to in each of the Three, the uniqueness of Tr or his affinity to a particular translator is not found in these 7 cases. The different renderings in GJ from those in Tr/γ' may be nothing but variations by Theodotion.

There are 7 entries where Tr does not share his renderings with any other translator (48, 78b, 85b, 99b, 113b, 114b, 142b). Five of them have been dealt with above.\(^\text{187}\) The remaining 2 cases (99b, 113b) require examination.

In entry 99b, Tr has στουάδζω for בֵּל (Ni.) against GJ and γ'. α' and σ' have either Active or M-P form of σπεόδωμα, which Tr has for בֵּל (Pi.). Although there is no extant θ' fragment for the case in question, GJ attests a compound form, καταστουάδζω in

\(^{186}\) α' in Eccl 12:1.
23:15\textsuperscript{a}. καταστοιδάζω never occurs for ἕβα (Ni.) in the LXX except in Job 23:15\textsuperscript{a}, but σπουδάζω is used in the non-Theodotion portion of Job (4:5, 21:6, 23:15) and Isa 21:3. Thus, σπουδάζω is already established by former translators, and Tr may have adopted the rendering. Nevertheless, it is noticeable that Tr uses σπουδάζω and σπεύδω distinctively according to different stems while any other translator in the LXX does not utilize them in the same way.

In entry 113b, Tr has πληροφορῶ for Χλέ (Qal). γ\textsuperscript{'} normally has πληρόω, and OJ attests ἐμπιστεύμη in 20:11. πληροφορῶ never occurs elsewhere in the LXX. Thus, it is a distinctive rendering by Tr.

In conclusion, the whole picture demonstrates that Tr has a more intimate relationship with γ\textsuperscript{'} (or some of its members) than MP. However, the uniqueness of Tr is revealed in entries 48, 113b, 114b, and perhaps in 99b.

**Tr and γ\textsuperscript{'} (106).** Tr shares equivalences with γ\textsuperscript{'} or its member(s) in 80 entries. On the other hand, disagreement between Tr and γ\textsuperscript{'} is seen in 26 entries.

In 80 entries, γ\textsuperscript{'} or its one or two members agree with Tr. When Tr agrees with γ\textsuperscript{'} member(s), their relationship with GJ can be described in terms of affinity. Affinity is produced in percentage by number of agreement/total occurrences×100. Common renderings are excluded from the analysis, and the total cases of agreement are reduced. Thus, the figure of affinity should be regarded relatively, not absolutely.

\textsuperscript{187} Only entries 48 and 114b out of the 5 are found to be important cases.
Table 8. Agreement between Tr and the Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' = GJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107b, 141c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' = GJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = θ' = GJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135, 141b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = θ' = MP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = γ' = GJ ≠ MP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73b, 76a, 79a, 145b, 146a, 151b</td>
<td>80/106 (75.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = γ' ≠ GJ = MP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75a, 86b, 98, 102, 143e, 145a, 146b, 147c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = γ' ≠ GJ ≠ MP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75b, 83b, 94b, 95b, 96b, 96c, 120b, 120c, 129a, 143b, 150c, 151c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' ≠ GJ ≠ MP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76b, 150b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' ≠ GJ ≠ MP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' ≠ GJ ≠ MP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>155b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = γ' ≠ GJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1, 37, 109, 110b, 144a, 148b, 148c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' ≠ GJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12, 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' ≠ GJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77a, 82a, 137b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' ≠ GJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = γ' ≠ MP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>106a, 113a, 119, 145d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' ≠ MP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' ≠ MP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' = GJ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74a, 87b, 106b, 149a, 150b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' = GJ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38, 44d, 90b, 92a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α' θ' = GJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = α'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31, 105a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = θ'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53, 80a, 90a, 121, 128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = θ'</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25, 81a, 88a, 117, 124, 145c, 149b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 below demonstrates that when agreeing with Tr, θ' is closer to GJ than the other two. Σ' agreeing with Tr is most distant from GJ. Individual instances have been discussed.
Table 9: Tr/\gamma' and GJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Disagreement</th>
<th>Affinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = \gamma' = GJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tr = \gamma' \neq GJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = \alpha' = GJ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tr = \alpha' \neq GJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = \sigma' = GJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tr = \sigma' \neq GJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = \theta' = GJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tr = \theta' \neq GJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the same way, when Tr shares the renderings with \gamma' member(s), their relationship with MP can be described in terms of affinity. Common renderings are not included among the number of agreement.

Table 10: Tr/\gamma' and MP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Disagreement</th>
<th>Affinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = \gamma' = MP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tr = \gamma' \neq MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = \alpha' = MP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tr = \alpha' \neq MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = \sigma' = MP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tr = \sigma' \neq MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr = \theta' = MP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tr = \theta' \neq MP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 10, when agreeing with Tr, \theta' is closer to MP than the other two. \alpha' agreeing with Tr is far distant from MP. As a whole, \theta' agreeing with Tr is slightly closer to GJ than to MP, and \alpha' and \sigma' are much closer to MP than to GJ.

There are 24 entries where GJ and MP do not have any extant evidence, and Tr shares renderings with one or two members of \gamma'. In 5 entries, Tr shares renderings with \alpha' and \sigma' (74a, 87b, 106b, 149a, 150b). In 3 of them (74a, 149a, 150b), the shared renderings are non-Theodotionic—i.e., \theta' attests a different approach: נֵצָע > παρά in entry
74a, נט (Hi.) > αφίημι in entry 149a, and נט (Qal Inf.cs.) > δόμα in entry 150b. In 2 entries (87b, 106b), θ' does not have any extant evidence: רבדא > λόγος in entry 87b and ἔξωματάνω (Hi.) > ἔξωματάνω in entry 106b.

In 4 entries, Tr agrees with α' and θ' not with σ' (38, 44d, 90b, 92a). These are regarded as non-Symmachian because σ' has different renderings. The four equations are 

ען > περισσαμοῦς in entry 38, spatial κλῆσις > ἀπό προσώπου in entry 44d, ἔτερος > 

περισσεία in entry 90b, and κατάθηκα > ἀφροζη in entry 92a.

In entry 139, Tr has a rendering agreeing only with α' and θ': καθ' > ἐξουσιάζω.

Since α' normally has κυρεύω, the equation in question is likely non-Aquilan.

In 2 entries, Tr and α' agree, and no extant evidence is found in GJ and MP:

ט' > συνάντημα in entry 31 and עם > περιλαμβάνω in entry 105a. θ' has different renderings for these cases, and θ' has no extant evidence. These equivalences may be considered as Aquilan.

In 5 entries, Tr and σ' agree, and no extant evidence is found in GJ and MP:

ט' > ἐξουσιάζω in entry 53, חל > ἐξφων in entry 80a, רבר > περισσοῦς in entry 90a, ת' > διαστέρεω in entry 121, and נב > επανέω in entry 128. Three of these equations may be Symmachian since α' or θ' attest different renderings from σ' for the 3 cases (90a, 121, 128). α' or θ' have περισσεία for רבר, καυχάομαι for נב, and α' has οκελίζω for נב with no extant evidence in θ'. For the other 2 cases, Symmachian influence is not obvious

188 Somehow, α' seems to have construed היבוע in Prov 6:10 and 24:33 as verbal forms.

189 σ' has ὑμβηκα (Eccl 3:19) or συγκυρία (1 Sam 6:9) for פך and περιπλέκω (Eccl 4:5, Cant 2:6) for פך.
because no extant evidence exists in α’ or θ’.

In 7 entries, only θ’ has identical renderings with Tr, and GJ and MP do not have any extant evidence: ἀναστήνα in entry 25, ὑπὲρ > νέφος in entry 81a, λαλῶν > περιφορᾶ in entry 88a, ἀναστήνα > δεύσκε in entry 145c, and ὁμοί (Hi.) > ἀνήμα in entry 149b. These are probably all Theodotionic since α’ or θ’ attest to different approaches for them. For ὁμοί, α’ has γοργότης (Eccl 2:21, 4:4) or ἀναστήνα θάμμα (Eccl 5:10), and no extant evidence is in α’; for ὑπὲρ, α’ has πάχος (Exod 19:9), and α’ has νεφέλη (Eccl 12:2); for ὑπὲρ, α’ and θ’ have πλάνη (Eccl 2:12); for νέφος (Hi.), α’ and θ’ usually have either ἐπτω (Isa 6:7, Ps 88:4) or εὐγγέλιο (1 Sam 14:9, Za 14:5); for ἀναστήνα, α’ has ἀσχολέω (Eccl 1:13), and no extant evidence of α’ exists; for ἀνήμα (Qal Impv.), α’ normally has πορεύματι, and α’ has ἀπέρχομαι; and for ἀνήμα (Hi.), α’ and θ’ have ἀφήμα.

As a whole, Aquilan renderings are attested in 5 entries, and non-Aquilan renderings in 18 entries. Symmachian renderings are seen in 5 entries, and non-Symmachian renderings in 23 entries. Finally, Theodotionic renderings are found in

---

190 The 5 Aquilan renderings are: ἀπόκρυφος > συμάντημα in entry 31, ἡγεῖται > πάργαμα in entry 77a, ὑπὲρ > κτισθῆναι in entry 82a, ὑπέρ > περιελλαφάνωσις in entry 105a, and ἀναστήνα > πλῆθος in entry 137b; and the 18 non-Aquilan renderings consist of 5 Symmachian renderings, 10 Theodotionic renderings, and 3 other non-Aquilan renderings such as Tr = α’ θ’: ὑπέρ > νεφέλη in entry 81b, ἄνω > ἐξοσκάλος in entry 139, and ἀπό > τεμένω in entry 155b.

191 The 5 Symmachian renderings are: ἤλειμι > μετακινήτης in entry 12, ὑπέρ > περιελλαφάνωσις in entry 90a, ἀναστήνα > διασκόριζος in entry 114, ἀναστήνα > διασκεδάζοντα in entry 121, and τιμῆ > ἐπανεισάγω in entry 128; and the 23 non-Symmachian renderings are composed of 5 Aquilan renderings, 10 Theodotionic renderings, and 8 other non-Symmachian renderings such as Tr = α’ θ’: ἀναστήνα > πολλά in entry 29, ἄνω > περιελλαφάνωσις in entry 38, spatial ἀπό > προσώπου in entry 44d, ἀναστήνα > περιελλαφάνωσις in entry 90b, and
10 entries, and non-Theodotionic renderings in 16 entries.\textsuperscript{192}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Tr = γ'</th>
<th>Tr = α'</th>
<th>Tr = σ'</th>
<th>Tr = θ'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity</td>
<td>37/63 \textsuperscript{193}</td>
<td>61/105 \textsuperscript{194}</td>
<td>55/104 \textsuperscript{195}</td>
<td>58/100 \textsuperscript{196}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive Agreement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11: Tr and γ'**

\textsuperscript{192}The 10 Theodotionic renderings are: אָדוֹן in entry 25, אָדוֹן > אָדוֹן בּוֹ in entry 64, בּו > νέφος in entry 81a, νέφος (Ni.) > περιφορά in entry 88a, περιφορά > φθάνω in entry 117, φθάνω > περιστάτω in entry 124, περιστάτω > κατακόπτωμα in entry 135, κατακόπτωμα > ακτέχω in entry 141b, ακτέχω (Qal Impv.) > δεύο in entry 145c, and δεύο (Hi.) > άνάημα in entry 149b; and the 16 non-Theodotionic renderings consist of 5 Aquilan renderings, 5 Symmachian renderings, and 6 other non-Theodotionic renderings such as the cases of Tr = α' σ': spatial > πρό προσώπου in entry 44b, πρό > παρά in entry 74a, παρά > μέρος in entry 76b, μέρος (Pi.) > αναδόθωμα in entry 130, αναδόθωμα > αναδόθωμα in entry 149a, and αναδόθωμα (Qal Inf. cs.) > δόμα in entry 150b.

\textsuperscript{193}63 = (37 occurrences of Tr = γ') + (26 occurrences of Tr ≠ γ')

\textsuperscript{194}105 = (61 occurrences of Tr = α') + (44 occurrences of Tr ≠ α'). The 44 occurrence of Tr ≠ α' is calculated by (26 occurrences of Tr ≠ γ') + (18 occurrences of additional non-Aquilan renderings).

\textsuperscript{195}The exclusive agreement between Tr and α' occurs 5 times. The 61 is the total occurrence of Tr = α'.

\textsuperscript{196}104 = (55 occurrences of Tr = σ') + (49 occurrences of Tr ≠ σ'). The 49 occurrence of Tr ≠ σ' is calculated by (26 occurrences of Tr ≠ γ') + (23 occurrences of additional non-Symmachian renderings).

\textsuperscript{197}The exclusive agreement between Tr and σ' occurs 6 times. The 55 is the total occurrence of Tr = σ'.

\textsuperscript{198}100 = (58 occurrences of Tr = θ') + (42 occurrences of Tr ≠ θ'). The 42 occurrence of Tr ≠ θ' is calculated by (26 occurrences of Tr ≠ γ') + (16 occurrences of additional non-Theodotionic renderings).
In Table 11 above, affinity and exclusivity are calculated. Affinity indicates the closeness of γ' or its individual member to Tr. Affinity is produced in percentage by a number of agreement/total occurrences of agreement and disagreement × 100.

Exclusivity may describe a more reliable relationship between Tr and a member of γ' since it only counts exclusive agreement between two. Exclusivity is produced in percentage by a number of exclusive agreement/total occurrences of agreement between the member and Tr × 100.

Affinity of γ' to Tr (58.7 percent) is much higher than of GJ (18.2 percent) or of MP (26.7 percent). Among members of γ', α' shows closest affinity to Tr (58.1 percent), and θ' is the second close member to Tr (58 percent) with respect to total occurrence of agreement. On the other hand, the most exclusivity is seen in θ' (17.2 percent), and the lowest degree of exclusivity is in α' (9.8 percent). In other words, Tr agrees most with α' but exclusively shares his renderings most often with θ'. Affinity and exclusivity point in different directions. The discrepancy between affinity and exclusivity may be explained in terms of dependency. When a member of γ' shares a certain rendering with one of the other two, the rendering is designated as a dependent rendering. For example, according to the chart below, α' shows a dependent rendering in 18 entries. When agreeing with Tr, α' shares 10 equivalents with σ' and 8 with θ'. Dependency is produced in percentage by a number of dependent equivalents of a member of γ'/total occurrences of all dependent equivalents

199 The exclusive agreement between Tr and θ' occurs 10 times. The 58 is the total occurrence of Tr = θ'.

200
In Table 12, the highest dependency is seen in $\alpha'$ (85.7 percent), and the lowest dependency is in $\theta'$ (52.4 percent). This means, even though $\alpha'$ has the most equivalents agreeing with Tr, many of those equivalents are shared with another member of $\gamma'$. Consequently, the dependency of $\alpha'$ is highest among the Three, and so, its exclusivity is lowest. On the other hand, $\theta'$ and Tr agree less often than the occurrences of $\alpha'$ and Tr but share the most exclusive renderings because the dependency of $\theta'$ is the lowest. $\sigma'$ stands between $\alpha'$ and $\theta'$ with respect to exclusivity and dependency.

In conclusion, the reason why scholars have traditionally regarded the Greek Ecclesiastes as Aquilan is because they only consider affinity of $\alpha'$ or total occurrences of agreement between $\alpha'$ and Tr. Although affinity of $\alpha'$ to Tr is slightly higher than $\sigma'$ or $\theta'$, the affinity itself is not at all significant because $\alpha'$ has the highest dependency and the lowest exclusivity. The highest exclusivity of $\theta'$ may be more important in establishing

---

200 The cases where all Three and Tr agree are categorized as common renderings.
the historical place of the Translator. The highest exclusivity of $\theta'$ indicates that, with respect to the Translator's unique renderings, the Translator is closest to $\theta'$ among $\gamma'$. This fact may support Gentry's claim that the Translator might have been $\theta'$. Another significant fact is the Symmachian influence on Tr. The exclusivity of $\sigma'$ is striking because it is higher than $\alpha'$.

Table 13. Disagreement between Tr and $\gamma'$ (26).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} \neq \gamma' \neq \text{GJ} = \text{MP}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} \neq \gamma' \neq \text{GJ} \neq \text{MP}$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48, 72b, 78b, 85b, 114b, 142b</td>
<td>26/106 (24.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} \neq \gamma' \neq \text{GJ}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99b, 113b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} \neq \gamma' = \text{MP}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} \neq \gamma' \neq \text{MP}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140b, 153b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Tr} \neq \gamma'$</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62, 69, 74b, 74c, 80b, 80c, 88b, 88c, 89b, 91b, 92b, 141a, 145e, 147b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tr against $\gamma'$ generally disagrees with GJ (100 percent) or MP (80 percent). Discussion for the 12 entries related to either GJ or MP has been covered. The remaining 14 entries of $\text{Tr} \neq \gamma'$ are now examined.

In 10 entries, equivalences in Tr are regarded as unique: 62, 69, 80b, 80c, 88b, 89b, 91b, 92b, 141a, and 145e. $\gamma'$ has different renderings for those cases, and GJ and MP do not attest any evidence. Brief commentary is given for an individual equivalence.

The equation $\piεροςέξια in entry 62 is unique to Tr. The word $\piεροςέξια
occurs only in Ecclesiastes. \( \alpha' \) has \( \tau \lambda \ell \rho \omicron \nu \) in Eccl 1:3; and \( \sigma' \) attests various equivalents.\(^{201}\) \( \alpha' \) normally has \( \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \alpha \) for \( \tau \rho \nu \rho \eta \tau \eta \) (e.g. Lev 8:25); \( \theta' \) has \( \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \alpha \) for \( \tau \rho \nu \rho \eta \tau \eta \) (e.g. Prov 21:5, Eccl 3:19); and \( \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \alpha \) is not attested in \( \sigma' \). If the Translator was \( \theta' \) and used the same consonantal text as MT, he would have rendered \( \tau \rho \nu \rho \eta \tau \eta \) in Eccl 3:19 by \( \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \alpha \) rather than \( \tau \epsilon \pi \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \alpha \nu \).

The equation \( \tau \rho \nu \rho \eta \tau \eta > \pi \rho \alpha \iota \pi \rho \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \iota \zeta \) in entry 69 is unique for Tr. \( \tau \rho \nu \rho \eta \) only occurs in Ecclesiastes. \( \alpha' \) and \( \theta' \) have \( \nu \omicron \mu \eta \) for \( \tau \rho \nu \rho \eta \) in Eccl 1:14, 2:11, 6:9. \( \sigma' \) has \( \beta \omicron \sigma \kappa \sigma \pi \sigma \sigma \varsigma \) in 1:14 and \( \kappa \alpha \kappa \omega \omicron \sigma \omicron \varsigma \) in 4:6 and 6:9 where \( \sigma' \) presumably understood \( \tau \rho \nu \rho \eta \) from the root \( \nu \omicron \mu \eta \) ("evil").

The equations \( \beta \omicron \sigma \pi \pi \iota \omicron \omicron \nu \eta > \alpha \pi \rho \omicron \sigma \iota \omicron \nu \eta \) in entry 80b and \( \beta \omicron \sigma \pi \pi \iota \omicron \omicron \nu \eta > \sigma \kappa \lambda \nu \rho \omicron \varsigma \) in entry 80c are also regarded as unique choices of Tr. The equivalences are never found in other LXX translators as well as \( \gamma' \). In \( \gamma' \), \( \alpha \pi \rho \omicron \sigma \iota \omicron \nu \eta \) is normally used for \( \tau \rho \nu \rho \eta \) (e.g. Prov 9:6) and \( \sigma \kappa \lambda \nu \rho \omicron \varsigma \) for \( \nu \omicron \mu \eta \) (e.g. Exod 18:26, Isa 27:8).

In entry 88b, \( \tau \rho \nu \rho \eta \) is rendered by \( \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \phi \epsilon \epsilon \iota \alpha \) in Tr, and the equivalence is considered as unique for him. \( \nu \omicron \mu \eta \) only occurs in Ecclesiastes. \( \gamma' \) normally has \( \pi \lambda \alpha \eta \nu \) (Eccl 2:12); \( \theta' \) witnesses \( \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \omicron \phi \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \) or \( \pi \rho \iota \phi \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \); and \( \sigma' \) attests various approaches. \( \alpha' \) and \( \sigma' \) have \( \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \phi \epsilon \epsilon \iota \alpha \) for \( \tau \rho \nu \rho \eta \) in Ps 91(90):4.\(^{202}\)

The equivalence \( \pi \sigma \pi \omicron \epsilon \iota \zeta \nu > \psi \gamma \phi \omicron \omicron \varsigma \) in entry 89b is distinctive for Tr. \( \pi \sigma \pi \omicron \epsilon \iota \zeta \nu \) occurs in Ecclesiastes and 2 Chr 26:15. \( \gamma' \) has \( \lambda \omicron \gamma \iota \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \varsigma \) for \( \pi \sigma \pi \omicron \epsilon \iota \zeta \nu \) in Ecclesiastes and attests

\(^{201}\) \( \tau \lambda \ell \rho \omicron \nu \) in Eccl 1:3, \( \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \alpha \) in Eccl 5:15, \( \pi \rho \omicron \chi \omicron \omicron \) in Eccl 10:10, and \( \omicron \phi \epsilon \epsilon \lambda \omicron \varsigma \) in Eccl 10:11.

\(^{202}\) Reider, Index to Aquila, 191.
The equation אִישׁ > אָפְרֹוֹעַ in entry 91b is attested in Tr but not in γ'. In γ', אָפְרֹוֹעַ appears normally for אַלְמָה (e.g. Prov 13:16) while in Tr, it is more contextually and more flexibly used not only for המֶלֶךְ but also for המֶלֶךְ, or מֶלֶךְ.

Entry 92b shows that the word מֶלֶךְ occurring only in Ecclesiastes is rendered by אָפְרֹוָּה in Tr. α' and θ' have אָפְרֹוָּה for מֶלֶךְ, and σ' has אָמָה. The equivalence is likely a unique approach of Tr and may be correlated to the equation מֶלֶךְ > אָפְרֹוָּה in entry 80c.

In entry 141a, נַח (Ni., Qal Pass. Ptc.) > θηρέου (M-P) is only seen in Tr. α' has κατέχω (M-P) for a Niphal form of נַח in Gen 47:27, and σ' has κρατέω (M-P) in Gen 22:13. For its Qal Pass. Ptc. form, only σ' attests ἐπιλαμβάνω (M-P) and ἀποτομά in Ezek 41:6.

The equivalence ἡλί (Hi.) > ἀποφέρω in entry 145e is distinctive in Tr since γ' normally has ἀπέσω for the form in question.

On the other hand, in 4 entries, the equivalences do not seem to be unique for Tr: 74b, 74c, 88c, and 147b. Various factors motivate these non-unique equivalences.

In entries 74b and 74c, בֻלַּע is rendered by ὁ παρά or ὡς παρά. The equations seem to be variations of בֻלַּע > παρά, which is attested in Tr, α', and σ'. Thus, it is not a unique rendering by Tr.

The equation תִּדְרָע > παραβολή in entry 88c may involve a textual problem. παραβολή may have been παραφορά originally and corrupted at a very early stage of

---

203 Ibid., 259.
transmission. 204

According to entry 147b, the equivalence ר' (Ni. Inf. cs.) > γένεσις only occurs in Tr. The Hebrew form functions substantively in the clause, so the Greek noun is properly chosen for it. Normally γ' has γένναω for ר' in Niphal stem, but any evidence of γ' does not remain for a Niphal bound infinite form functioning substantively.

As a whole, unique renderings only seen in Tr are summed up in 16 equations. The 16 equations are: ר > περασμός in entry 48, כל in (Ni.) > έξαρεω in entry 114b, and מ in (Qal) > πλησιόνω in entry 128b, ב in (Ni.) > σπουδαζω in entry 99b and מ in (Qal) > πλησιόνω in entry 113b for Tr ≠ γ ≠ GJ; ע in (Ni.) > φιλέω in entry 140b and מ in (Qal) > πιστεύω in entry 153b for Tr ≠ γ ≠ MP; and ר > προσέρχομη in entry 69, מ > ἀφροσύνη in entry 80b, כ in entry 80c, πρ in entry 81b > ἡπροσύνη in entry 88b, ו in entry 89b > ἀφροσύνη in entry 91b, מ in entry 92b, ו in (Ni., Qal Pass. Ptc.) > θερεύω in entry 141a, and ה in (Hi.) > ἀποφέρω in entry 145c for Tr ≠ γ'.

Lexical Comparison: Conclusion

Tr is slightly closer to MP (23.9 percent) than GJ (17.5 percent) but has much affinity to γ' (58.7 percent). Aquila evidently is not the Translator because Aquila is found to be the least influential on the Translator among the Three. The closest lexical relationship with Tr is seen in Theodotion. Nevertheless, the Translator is probably not Theodotion either, for three reasons. First, there are non-Theodotion renderings in the

See Gentry, “Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three,” 160-61, and also his
Greek Ecclesiastes. Second, Symmachian equivalences are evident and even more dominant on the Translator than Aquila. Finally, there are a good number of unique equivalences, which the Translator employed without his depending on any congener. Based upon the comprehensive lexical comparison, one may posit that the Translator was not one of the Three even though he was closest to Theodotion. The Symmachian traces in the translation provide a clue about the date of the translation. The Translator may have translated Ecclesiastes right before Symmachus or right after Symmachus.

**Syntactical Comparison**

Turning from a lexical comparison, syntactical features between the Translator, Aquila, Theodotion in the Greek Job, and the Kaige tradition in the Minor Prophets Scroll will now be compared. All extant and available data are listed in Table 14. One should be reminded that the data on the syntax of Aquila provided by Hyvärinen are from selected texts and thus, are not comprehensive but limited. Hyvärinen’s presentation is somewhat brief. The translation technique of the Minor Prophets Scroll as studied by Tov also has limitations because it is based upon fragmentary texts and, in parts, reconstructed texts. Tov’s aim in analyzing the syntax is to compare the Scroll with the LXX, and so, the data is arranged from a different perspective than from other congener.

**Syntactical Comparison: Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Ekklesiastes,” 1.
Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>CN (964)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adj (148)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adv (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Pte</td>
<td>Pte (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vb 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prep 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adj (166)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Pte</td>
<td>Pte (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>Vb (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>ProN</td>
<td>ProN (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adv (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>Sg (759)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Pl (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Pl (138)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>Sg (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bound Phrases

| 5a | NR | Gen (147) |     | + 92 |
|    |    | Compound N (1) |     | – |
| 5c | Dat | Dat (1) |     | – |
| 5d | Acc | Acc (1) |     | – |
| 5e | Pte | Pte (1) |     | – |

Attributive Phrase

| 6a | Att Adj | Att Adj (45) |     | + 5 |
|    | Att Pte | Att Pte (2) |     | – |

Articulation (Common Nouns)

Free Form

| 7a | A  | A (206) |     | + 8 | + 63 |
| 7b | AN | AN (2)  |     | + 1 |
| 8a | AN | A (5)   |     | + 13 | + 22 |
| 8b | AN | AN (419)|     | + 283 | + 8 |

Indeterminate

| 9a | A  | A (27) |     | + 5 |
| 9b | AN | AN (31)|     | + 25 |
| 10a| AN | A (17) |     | + 2 | + 16 |
| 10b| AN | AN (62)|     | + 24 | + 11 |

nomen regens

| 11a| AN | A (15) |     | + 7 | + 5 |
Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>AN (150)</td>
<td>+97</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bound Form with Pronouns

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td>A (44)</td>
<td>+97</td>
<td>+54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>+79</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nota accusativi

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>+ Bound Form</td>
<td>Art for ליע</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b</td>
<td>+ Art</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>א for ליע</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13c</td>
<td>+ אר</td>
<td>Various (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pronouns

Personal Pronouns: Free Forms

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>צ</td>
<td>ה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16c</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>צ</td>
<td>ה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>ע</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal Pronouns: Bound Forms

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>Personal Pron</td>
<td>Matching GNP</td>
<td>+290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b</td>
<td>Non-Matching G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19c</td>
<td>Non-Matching N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19d</td>
<td>Non-Matching P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19e</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref. ProN 8

205 Either NR or Pron.

206 ליע followed by כ is rendered by zero in J41:26.

207 ליע is rendered by an article.

208 For ג in 1 Sam 12:21, Jer 4:22, and 10:5. See Hyvärinen, Aquila, 84.

209 For ג in 32:4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>Pseudo-Vb</td>
<td>οὐκ εἰμί 10</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20b</td>
<td>Variations 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demonstratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>מ (zeh)</td>
<td>οὗτος 35</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>מ (zô)</td>
<td>οὗτος 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>אלֶל</td>
<td>οὗτος 3</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a</td>
<td>קֶה</td>
<td>οὗτος 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24b</td>
<td>εκέινος 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interrogatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>Τίς 17</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26a</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>Τί 16</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26b</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>Τίς 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Πληθυσμός 2</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>οὐτίς 1, οὐ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27a</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>Τί τό 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27b</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>Τό 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Εν υ ἐάν 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Εἰ τίς 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28a</td>
<td>לָלֶד</td>
<td>Ινα μή 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Μήποτε 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>Ποίον 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>Πῶς 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31a</td>
<td>אֵצָר</td>
<td>ος 36</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31b</td>
<td>οςος 8</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31c</td>
<td>οςτίς 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31d</td>
<td>ος εἰμί 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31e</td>
<td>ος ἐάν 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31f</td>
<td>ος ἐάν 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31g</td>
<td>οςος ἐάν 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31h</td>
<td>οςος ἐάν 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31i</td>
<td>ά 13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31j</td>
<td>άττι 7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31k</td>
<td>άς 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31l</td>
<td>ὁπως 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31m</td>
<td>ὁπου 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31n</td>
<td>Zero 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>οὐ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>בָּשָל אָשָר</td>
<td>οςος ἐάν 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32a</td>
<td>קֶה</td>
<td>καθώς 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32b</td>
<td>καθός ἄν 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33a</td>
<td>καθότι 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33b</td>
<td>ἐν 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34a</td>
<td>ὃς 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34b</td>
<td>ὃς ἐὰν 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34c</td>
<td>ὅστις 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34d</td>
<td>ὁ 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34e</td>
<td>ὅτι 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34f</td>
<td>Χτησινα 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34g</td>
<td>καὶ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34h</td>
<td>ὅταν 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35a</td>
<td>ἔσταν 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35b</td>
<td>ὥς 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ἐς</td>
<td>Καθότι 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37a</td>
<td>ἐς τις 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37b</td>
<td>ὃς ἐὰν 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37c</td>
<td>ὁ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>ὄσπερ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Finite Verbs

**Tense / Aspect / Modality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39a</td>
<td>yqtl</td>
<td>Fut Ind 114</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ 160</td>
<td>+ 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39b</td>
<td>Aor Subj 32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 8</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39c</td>
<td>Pres Ind 12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39d</td>
<td>Ptc 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39e</td>
<td>Aor Ind 4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ 17</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39f</td>
<td>Pres Subj 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39g</td>
<td>Inf 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39h</td>
<td>Pres Impv 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40a</td>
<td>w'qtl</td>
<td>Aor Subj 5</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40b</td>
<td>Fut Ind 3</td>
<td>+ 16</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40c</td>
<td>Pres Ind 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40d</td>
<td>Aor Ind 2</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40e</td>
<td>Aor Impv 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40f</td>
<td>Ptc 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>wayqtl</td>
<td>Aor Ind 3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ 16</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impf, Fut, Pres, Ptc</td>
<td>Fut Ind 5, Ptc 2</td>
<td>Fut Ind 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Aq</td>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42a</td>
<td>qtl</td>
<td>Aor Ind 121</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+87</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42b</td>
<td>Ptc 18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42c</td>
<td>Pres Ind 6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42d</td>
<td>Pf Ind 5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42e</td>
<td>Impf Ind 3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42f</td>
<td>Aor Subj 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42g</td>
<td>Fut Ind 2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43a</td>
<td>wqtl</td>
<td>Aor Ind 25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43b</td>
<td>Aor Subj 9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43c</td>
<td>Fut Ind 7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43d</td>
<td>Pres Ind 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43e</td>
<td>Pres Subj 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43f</td>
<td>N 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44a</td>
<td>waw + Impv</td>
<td>Aor Impv 7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44b</td>
<td>Pres Impv 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45a</td>
<td>Impv</td>
<td>Aor Impv 14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45b</td>
<td>Pres Impv 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45c</td>
<td>Adv 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46a</td>
<td>waw + Short yqtl</td>
<td>Aor Ind 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46b</td>
<td>Aor Subj 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46c</td>
<td>Fut Ind 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47a</td>
<td>Short yqtl / yqtl + á suffix</td>
<td>Aor Subj 15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47b</td>
<td>Pres Impv 5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47c</td>
<td>Aor Impv 3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47d</td>
<td>Fut Ind 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>Pl 8</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Sg 1</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51a</td>
<td>Qal</td>
<td>Act 191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51b</td>
<td>M-P 151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52a</td>
<td>Niph</td>
<td>M-P 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52b</td>
<td>Act 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53a</td>
<td>Pi</td>
<td>Act 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53b</td>
<td>M-P 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pilpel</td>
<td>Act 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Poel</td>
<td>Act 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56a</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td>M-P 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Act 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57a</td>
<td>Hith</td>
<td>Act 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57b</td>
<td></td>
<td>M-P 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Hithpolel</td>
<td>M-P 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59a</td>
<td>Hiph</td>
<td>Act 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59b</td>
<td></td>
<td>M-P 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>M-P 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Finite Verbs

#### Participles

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61a</td>
<td>Ptc</td>
<td>Pres Ptc 62</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pf Ptc 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aor Ptc 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pres Ind 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61e</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aor Ind 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61f</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pf Ind 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61g</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fut Ind 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61h</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pres Subj 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61i</td>
<td></td>
<td>N 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>+9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61j</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adj 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>+6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61k</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inf 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Infinitive

**Free Infinitive**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62a</td>
<td>Free Inf</td>
<td>Adj / Adv 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aor Ind 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ptc, N</th>
<th>N 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Bound Infinitive**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63a</td>
<td>w/o Prep</td>
<td>tōu + Inf 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63b</td>
<td></td>
<td>AN Inf 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nominals 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63d</td>
<td></td>
<td>tō + Inf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>tōu + Inf 87</td>
<td></td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64b</td>
<td></td>
<td>AN Inf 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64c</td>
<td></td>
<td>tōū + Inf 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64d</td>
<td></td>
<td>tō + Inf 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64e</td>
<td></td>
<td>ḏtī + Ind 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Tr 210</td>
<td>Aq</td>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65a</td>
<td>ת +</td>
<td>אַנּו + N 2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65b</td>
<td>† +</td>
<td>אַנּו + N / Ptc 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65c</td>
<td>† +</td>
<td>אַנּו + AN Inf 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>ב +</td>
<td>אַנ + N 2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>68</th>
<th>Compound Form</th>
<th>Various 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>69a</th>
<th>Nominal Modifier</th>
<th>א</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>+ 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70a</td>
<td>Verbal Modifier</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70b</td>
<td>Others 2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>71</th>
<th>Compound Form</th>
<th>Various 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>72a</th>
<th>Nominal Modifier</th>
<th>Art in Gen 29</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72b</td>
<td>Art in Dat 47</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73a</td>
<td>Verbal Modifier</td>
<td>Art in Nom 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73b</td>
<td>Dat Nominals 43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 31</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73c</td>
<td>Acc Nominals 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{210}\) א is employed only for ב followed by noun in the Greek Ecclesiastes.

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73d</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>εις + Acc</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73e</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ἐν + Dat Nominals 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73f</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>Adv 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73g</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>Zero 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74a</td>
<td>(+ Inf)</td>
<td>τοῦ + Inf 87</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74b</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>Others 7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>Compound Form Various 17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76a</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ἀπό + Gen 33</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76b</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ὑπέρ + Acc 29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76c</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ἐκ + Gen 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76d</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ἐν + Dat 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76e</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>παρά + Acc 2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76f</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>Others 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+3&lt;sup&gt;212&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>Compound Form Various 4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78a</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>μετά + Acc 2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78b</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ὑπότα ἄν 5&lt;sup&gt;213&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79a</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>εῖς + Acc 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79b</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>πρὸς + Acc 8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79c</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ἐπὶ + Acc 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80a</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ἐος 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80b</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>μέχρι 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81a</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ἐπὶ + Acc 16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81b</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ἐπὶ + Dat 9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81c</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ἐπὶ + Gen 4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81d</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>περί + Gen 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81e</td>
<td>/*</td>
<td>ἐν + Dat 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>212</sup>κατέανυτι, ἀπένανυτι, and -θεν.

<sup>213</sup>τιμή in 10:14.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Aq</th>
<th>GJ</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81f</td>
<td></td>
<td>διά + Acc 1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>üπέρ</td>
<td>Gen 1, Acc 2, κατά +</td>
<td>Gen 2, είς 1, ἐνατίον 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>(ἐπάνω)</td>
<td>ἐπάνω + Gen 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83a</td>
<td>ἐν</td>
<td>μετά 7</td>
<td>+ 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83b</td>
<td>ἐν</td>
<td>εν 1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84a</td>
<td>ὑπό</td>
<td>ὑπό + Acc 33</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84b</td>
<td>ἀντί + Gen 1</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semiprepositions**

| 85a| λέξις | πρὸ Πρωσόπου 6 | + | — |
| 85b| λέξις | εμπροσθεν 4 | + 2 | — |
| 86a| λέξις | ἀπὸ Πρωσόπου 4 | + | — |
| 86b| λέξις | ἀπὸ εμπροσθεν 1 | — | — |
| 87| λέξις | ἀπὸ Πρωσόπου 1 | + 3 | — |
| 88a| βιβλικά | ἐν χηρί 3 | + | + 2 |
| 88b| νομος | ἀπὸ Χειρός 2 | | |

**Conjunctions and Other Particles**

| 89 | λα (‘al) | μὴ 21 | + 1 | — |
| 90a| ἄν | ἐαν 15 | + | + 7 |
| 90b| σσος | ὁ 1 | — | — |
| 90c| ἐι | ἐι 2 | + | + 8 |
| 90d| ἐι | μὴ | + 2 | — |
| 90e| ἄλλα | ἦ 1 | — | — |
| 90f| ἦ | ἦ 3 | — | — |
| 91a| γν | καί γέ 43 | + 4 | + 7 |
| 91b| γέ | γέ 14 | — | + 3 |
| 91c| καί | καί 1 | + 1 | + 1 |

---

214 In 24:25, ἄν follows ἂν and modifies a noun. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 358.

215 ἃν is rendered by καί γέ.

216 For καί in 28:27.
Commentary and Analysis

Five grammatical categories are discussed separately: nouns, pronouns, finite verbs, non-finite verbs, and particles. In each category, the Translator is compared synoptically with three congers, and the focus will be on major discrepancies between

\[\text{où} \chi\] in 31:3 and 31:4.
the Translator and the three congener. The discrepancies may give guidance to discovering the historical place of the Translator.

**Nouns**

In entry 1, the GJ utilizes verbs in 9 instances and a preposition once for Hebrew common nouns while Tr never use either verb or preposition for a Hebrew common noun. However, they are not significant because GJ vocalizes 7 nouns as verbs and the remaining 3 cases cannot be straightforwardly explained.

In entry 5, Aq never employs compound nouns or participles for Hebrew bound phrases. GJ utilizes adjectives and prepositional phrases, which Tr does not use.

It is noteworthy in entry 6 that GJ does not use the attributive participle for a Hebrew attributive adjective but uses a gentilic adjective in 4 instances.

As for articulation, GJ is closer to MT than Tr in the cases of indeterminate forms. MP prefers arthrous nouns for indeterminate forms, bound forms with pronouns, and even free forms, which tendency is contrary to Tr. GJ also shows arthrous preference for bound forms with a pronoun in contrast to Tr.

In rendering *nota accusativi*, the approach of Tr is identical to Aq but not with GJ and MP in entry 13b. When *nota accusativi* precedes the article or א, GJ has nothing for *nota accusativi*, and MP has the article while Tr and Aq have אָֽוָּוָּוָּוָּו.

**Pronouns**

The equation ול > וָ in entry 16c is a unique approach by Tr. GJ has a reflexive pronoun for a Hebrew pronominal suffix in 8 occurrences, which is not attested

---

218 אָֽוָּו is rendered by א or אָֽוָּו.
in Tr. A peculiarity of GJ is also seen in rendering the interrogative ἃν. GJ has ὅστις and ὀὖ in entry 26, which are not found in Tr.

The various syntactical approaches to the relative ἃν by Tr in entry 31 are significant since they show how delicately Tr deals with ἃν while Aq and GJ show simple and general approaches. Tr uses fourteen different Greek relatives or conjunctions. Aq shares 5 of the 14 and, additionally, has ὀὖ, which is not seen in Tr. GJ agrees in only four approaches.

**Finite Verbs**

For יָקַטַל, none of the three congeners have present subjunctive, infinitive, and present imperative (see entry 39). The aorist indicative is much weightier in GJ (8.1 percent) and MP (10.7 percent) than in Tr (2.2 percent). The aorist imperative and imperfect indicative are attested in GJ but not in Tr.

In entry 40, יָקַטַל is rendered mainly by the future indicative in GJ and exclusively in MP while Tr employs more aorist subjunctive than future indicative. GJ and MP commonly lack the present indicative, aorist imperative, and participle. Tr does not have the imperfect indicative, which GJ has.

The treatment of יָקַטַל in entry 41 is different in Tr and the congeners. Tr has only the aorist indicative, but all three congeners use the future indicative for יָקַטַל as well as the aorist indicative. It may be because the congeners vocalize the forms in question as יָקַטַל in most cases.

---

219 The 5 approaches of Aq with Tr are ὅς, ὅςος, ὅ, ὅτι clauses, and zero equivalence.

220 The 4 approaches of GJ with Tr are ὅς, ὅςος, ὅτις, and zero equivalence.
As for qtl, a uniqueness of Tr may be seen in his use of the aorist subjunctive in entry 42f, which is not attested in any of the three congeners. The participle for qtl in entry 42b is also alien to Aq and MP. GJ employs an aorist imperative, which Tr does not.

In analyzing data on wqtl in entry 43, one should consider that waw consecutive is broken in the Greek Ecclesiastes. Thus, the default rendering in Tr is aorist indicative shown in 25 occurrences, and future indicative is used only in 7 occurrences. MP reflects typical waw consecutive sequence in rendering wqtl and generally employs the future indicative. According to context, Tr utilizes aorist subjunctive, present indicative, present subjunctive, and noun, which are not seen in all three congeners. Aq and GJ have the imperative for wqtl, but Tr does not.

A significant difference between Tr and GJ in rendering modals is seen in entry 46 where Tr has an aorist indicative and an aorist subjunctive for waw + short yqtl / yqtl + å suffix while GJ only has the future indicative.

GJ seems to have preference in choosing Greek tense and modality. For example, GJ has the aorist imperative for most finite verbal forms—yqtl, w'yqtl, qtl, and wqtl. Similarly, the future indicative is used for all modal forms in GJ, but Tr has it only for short yqtl / yqtl + å suffix in entry 47d. On the other hand, Tr often attests the subjunctive for Hebrew finite verbs—present subjunctive for yqtl, aorist subjunctive for qtl, aorist subjunctive and present subjunctive for wqtl, which are not seen in any congener.

Non-Finite Verbs

In rendering a participle, Tr with Aq and GJ generally employs the participle
and the indicative as seen in entry 61. The present subjunctive and infinitive for the
participle are not found in either Aq or GJ, and the aorist indicative is also not in GJ.

Tr shows distinctiveness in translating the Hebrew free infinitive. In entry 62,
while Tr has adjective, adverb, and aorist indicative, Aq and GJ employ a noun or
participle.

When a bound infinitive occurs without a preposition, Tr uses το + infinitive
as major equivalence (entry 63a), but Aq and GJ never do. Instead, Aq has τό +
infinitive, which is not seen in Tr.

For the bound infinitive following ὅ, Tr has five different approaches, but each
congener shares only two of them (entry 64). τό + infinitive and ὁτό + indicative are not
attested in the three congeners. Aq and GJ have a noun for the bound infinitive following
ὅ, but Tr does not. While Aq uses εἰς for ὅ followed by infinitive, Tr employs εἰς only
for ὅ followed by a noun not by an infinitive.

The approach of Tr in rendering ἃν + infinitive in entry 65 may demonstrate a
peculiarity of Tr. ἀπε + noun / participle and ἢ ὁτό + anarthrous infinitive are unique to
Tr and alien to both Aq and GJ. Both Aq and GJ share το + μή + Inf, which is not attested
in Tr.

According to entry 66, ἐν + το + Infinitive is employed for + infinitive in Aq
and GJ but not in Tr. Tr has ἐν + action noun, which Aq also has, but GJ does not.

As a whole, there is no significant difference between Tr and congeners in
rendering participles. Evident distinction is seen in infinitives. For both the free
infinitive and the bound infinitive, Tr frequently shows his own approaches which differ
from Aq and GJ.
Particles

For the preposition ἐ, Tr has ἐπὶ and ἐπὶ, but Aq and GJ do not have these (entry 67). On the contrary, διά used by Aq and MP and the nominal in the dative by GJ are not seen in Tr.

In entry 72, ἐ as a nominal modifier is rendered by the article in either the dative or the genitive in Tr. This approach is shared with Aq, but GJ never employs an article for ἐ. For ἐ functioning as a verbal modifier (entry 73), it is noteworthy that Aq does not use the nominal in the dative, which is a major choice of Tr, and employs κατά + Acc, which Tr never does. In each of 6 occurrences, GJ has a nominal in the genitive, and MP has pronouns. These are not seen in Tr.

In entry 76, the equation ἓν > ἐν + dative is absent in all three congers. Additionally, παρά + accusative is lacking in GJ and MP. Their rendering is διά + accusative.

Among separate prepositions, the renderings for ἐν, ἐπὶ, and ἐπὶ are noteworthy. In entry 79a, Aq and MP do not have ἐπὶ + accusative for ἐν. Since it is a major approach by Tr, the absence of this approach in Aq and MP may be significant. For ὧν in entry 80, ἐπὶ is not seen in GJ, and ἐπὶ is not in MP. In entry 81, more varied approaches for ὧν are seen in GJ than in Tr.

Finally, ὧν, ἐκ, ἐκ, ἐπὶ, and ἐπὶ are important conjunctions or particles for a comparison between Tr and the congers. According to entry 91, Tr’s rendering pattern for ἔν generally follows that of MP. It may be significant that GJ never has γε. The equation ἐκ > μην οὐκ in entry 93 shows uniqueness of Tr since GJ and MP have οὐ or οὐχί and never μην οὐκ. Another distinction between Tr and his congers is seen in entry
95 where Aq and GJ utilize δέ for ἤ, but Tr does not. Tr consistently employs καὶ, but Aq and GJ have a variety of approaches. The use of οὕτως for ἤ in entry 98a may differentiate Tr from GJ.

**Syntactical Comparison: Conclusion.**

Agreement between Tr and Aq appears in the rendering of *nota accusativi* and generally in the renderings of personal pronouns, participles, the prepositions ב and י, and the conjunctions ב and י. Crucial differences between Tr and Aq are seen in the renderings of רנא, finite verbs *y ql* and *w qtl*, free and bound infinitives, prepositions ל as verbal modifier and ל, and the conjunction י.

Tr normally agrees with GJ in approaches for nouns with respect to rendering patterns, number, articulation of free forms and of *nomen regens*, for personal pronouns in free form, for finite verbs *q l* and short *y qtl* / *y qtl* + å suffix, for participles, for prepositions ב and י and י, and for the conjunction י. However, the divergence between Tr and GJ is more evident as shown in the renderings of bound phrases, attributive phrases, articulation of bound form with pronouns, *nota accusativi*, the interrogative יב, the relative רנא, imperatives with waw or without waw, short *y qtl* / *y qtl* + å suffix with waw, free and bound infinitives, prepositions ל as nominal modifier and ל, and other particles such as ס, י, י, and י.

With MP, Tr shares renderings of *y qtl*, *q l*, the preposition ל, and the particle ס in general ways. Differences are seen in his approaches to articulation of free forms, indeterminate forms, and bound forms with pronouns, for *nota accusativi*, for *w qtl*, and the particle י.
Syntactical agreement between each congener and the Translator may
demonstrate that the Translator was somehow influenced by all three congeners: Aquila,
Theodotion, and the Kaige tradition. For example, the rendering of *nota accusativi* by
the Translator seems to be from Aquila. His general rendering patterns for nouns may be
from Theodotion. The rendering of ז is clearly from the Kaige tradition. Nevertheless,
such agreement reveals not only that the Translator is inspired by each congener but also
that the Translator is not one of the congeners. The latter point is strengthened by
discrepancies between the Translator and the congeners. The various approaches for י are unique to the Translator. This shows how broadly the Translator understands the
syntax of י differently from the congeners. The Translator and the congeners have
different variations for most finite verbal forms. For example, the Translator has
different preference from Theodotion in choosing tense and modality. While Theodotion
uses the aorist imperative for all prefix and suffix forms except ז, and employs the
future indicative for all modal forms, the Translator employs the subjunctive for all prefix
and suffix forms except ז in the Greek Ecclesiastes, which is a distinctive feature
of the Translator from other Congeners. In rendering both free and bound infinitives, the
Translator clearly departs from the other congeners.

Who was the Translator? He was not Aquila, or Theodotion, or anyone
involved in the Kaige tradition. He must have known their translation techniques but
only adopted them partially. According to lexical comparison, the Translator also seems
to have utilized Symmachian language—whether he was influenced by Symmachus or
had influence upon Symmachus. He is a distinctive translator, and his approaches are
more cultivated and systematized than other congeners. His date is proposed as late as
Symmachus based upon the lexical and syntactical data.
The Characterization of the Translator of the Greek Ecclesiastes

The translation is generally characterized as literal, but is not mechanical. The Translator employed not only formal equivalences but also functional equivalences. Variations often break otherwise consistent patterns. Most deviations or variations are due to contextual interpretation, stylistic change, or the demands of the target language. A different consonantal text from MT is suggested in only a handful of occasions.

As for the Hebrew nouns, the formal equivalency is higher than 86 percent. The rest of the instances correspond functionally. For example, a common noun in Hebrew is sometimes translated by a substantival adjective or substantival participle. Agreement in number between Hebrew nouns and Greek equivalents is 93 percent. The disagreement in number is mainly due to different grammatical demands between the source language and the target language. Hebrew bound phrases are rendered by the Greek genitive 97 percent of the time, and Hebrew attributive phrases are translated by Greek attributives 100 percent of the time—either by attributive adjectives or by attributive participles. There is a different understanding on definiteness between modern grammarians and the Translator. When the article is explicit as in free forms, the formal correspondence of articulation is more than 92 percent. On the other hand, for bound forms with pronominal suffixes, the Translator rendered the article in only 35 percent of
the cases. In rendering pronouns such as personal pronouns, demonstratives, interrogatives, and relatives, the Translator carefully considered their functions and grammatical relationships. Stylistic variations often betray his highly sophisticated translation technique. For example, לַמֵּד in 7:16b is rendered by μή in the next verse 7:17b is translated by ηδευμενη without any functional difference. The reverse case is also found—i.e., Hebrew lexemes are different, but their Greek equivalents are identical. An example is 8:17 where ṣου is used for יָשָׂר in 8:17a and also for דַּתֶּל in the following line 8:17b.

The rendering patterns for finite verbs are examined in three categories: (1) aspects and tenses, (2) number and person, and (3) voices. The Translator considered both aspect and relative temporal references at the same time for his choice of tenses. The present tense is used to highlight the imperfective aspect while the aorist signifies the perfective aspect. The future indicative is often employed to denote a relative future time, and the aorist subjunctive is frequently used as an alternative for the future indicative. יָגַל is generally rendered by the future indicative (64 percent), but other tenses / aspects or moods are also used according to context and grammatical situations. Eccl 8:5 is an example demonstrating that the Translator was not mechanical but was sensitive to the context. The יָגַל form וְיָגוֹל is rendered by the future indicative (יוֹלַד תַּדָּמ) in 8:5a but by the present indicative (יוֹלַד תַּדָּמ) in the next line, 8:5b. wqtl is treated as qtl, and wayyqtl as qtl. The default tense for qtl is the aorist indicative (77 percent), and wqtl is valued as qtl. Formal equivalency in 100 percent is seen in rendering imperatives. For the other modal forms, they are construed by the context, not by forms.
Number and person in finite verbs agree in 98 percent. The difference in number is due to a more strict demand of the target language than that of the source language for the agreement in number between the subject and the verb. This demonstrates that the Translator was not slavish but adjusted number and person according to the target language. In treating voice, the formal equivalency comprises 95 percent. The 5 percent of disagreement may be explained with semantic or functional correspondence.

The rendering patterns for the participle are closely related to its function. For example, the Greek indicative is employed for the participle functioning as predicate in 80 percent, and the Greek adjective or infinitive is utilized for the participle functioning attributively in 11 percent. As for the aspect of the participle, the Translator may have understood the Hebrew participle as having the imperfective aspect and employed the present participle in 70 percent. Other tenses or aspects are decided by context or the demand of the target language.

Far more formal correspondence is seen in the renderings of infinitives than in the renderings of participles. The Translator generally used arthrous infinitives for Hebrew bound infinitives (93 percent). He rendered prefixed to the infinitive by the article and never used a Greek preposition for . His approach to the infinitive is attested by earlier LXX translators.

Systematic consistency may be a hallmark for the rendering patterns of particles. The Translator employed consistent patterns or sometimes various approaches for particles, and they were applied in systematic ways. In considering context and following the grammatical demand of the target language, the Translator often chose the
equivalents based upon his own principles. An example is found in his distinction
between spatial לְחַדֵּשׁ and temporal לְחַדֵּשׁ.

According to lexical analysis of nouns, stereotypical renderings are utilized in
72 percent. The variations (one-to-many or many-to-many equivalences) in the
remaining 28 percent are employed for idiomatic Greek, for different contextual nuance,
or for stylistic change. In the cases of verbs, the tendency towards stereotypical
renderings is slightly higher (74 percent) than that of nouns. Different Hebrew stems,
certain grammatical conditions, contextual interpretation, and stylistic change account for
the remaining 26 percent.

The Place of the Greek Ecclesiastes
in the Text History

The comprehensive analysis of the translation technique provides a solid basis
on which one may conjecture the place of the Translator in the history of the text
transmission. According to the lexical comparison between the Translator and the
congeners, the Translator shared more Greek equivalences with the Three in the
Hexaplaric materials than with the Kaige tradition in the Minor Prophets Scroll or with
Theodotion in the Greek Job. Among the Three, the Translator was farthest from Aquila
and closest to Theodotion. Nevertheless, Theodotion may not have been the Translator
since there are non-Theodotionic renderings and renderings unique to the Translator.
Strong Symmachian influence on the Translator may be significant in identifying the
Translator even though the Translator was not Symmachus.

The comparison on the syntactical level between the Translator and the
congeners supports the conclusion from the lexical comparison that the Translator was
none of the congener but a distinctive translator. He knew Aquilan, Theodotionic, and * Kaige* approaches and applied only some of them in his translation. Having his own principles for translation, he maintained close alignment between the Greek and Hebrew with his systematized and sophisticated approaches.

**Suggestions for Further Study**

Lexical and syntactical discrepancies exist between Theodotion in the Hexaplaric materials and Theodotion in the Greek Job. Their relationship needs to be clarified along with characteristics of other Theodotionic texts in LXX.

If a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments and a concordance of the Three in a synoptic format were published, they would be consulted as useful references for the studies on the translation technique of each individual translator in the LXX and also would enhance the studies on the interrelationship of the Three. Gentry has already appealed for critical texts of the Three, and now, the present writer calls for a concordance of the Three.¹

---
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ABSTRACT

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE OF THE GREEK ECCLESIASTES
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This dissertation investigates the translation technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes and proposes the place of the Translator in the history of the transmission of the Greek text. Chapter 1 defines a text of the Greek Ecclesiastes. Since a Göttingen critical edition of the Greek Ecclesiastes has not been completed yet, Rahlfs’ text is adopted as the basis for the analysis.

Chapter 2 compares and analyzes the Hebrew text of Ecclesiastes and its Greek translation on syntactical and lexical levels. The result of the study reveals that the Translator is not mechanical but is sensitive to context and to the demands of the target language although his translation is labeled as literal.

Chapter 3 deals with the issue of the identity of the Translator. A comparison with the translation techniques of Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and the Kaige tradition betrays that the Translator is none of these. His translation is influenced by them in part but also contains his own distinctive patterns.

Finally, chapter 4 concludes that the Translator has most affinity to Theodotion and least affinity to Aquila. A distinctive Symmachian approach suggests the date of the translation as late as the second century.
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