Copyright © 2005 Yun Yeong Yi

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to Reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purpose chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation, or instruction

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE OF THE GREEK ECCLESIASTES

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Yun Yeong Yi

May 2005

UMI Number: 3173118

Copyright 2005 by
Yi, Yun Yeong

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform 3173118
Copyright 2005 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

APPROVAL SHEET

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE OF

THE GREEK ECCLESIASTES

Yun Yeong Yi

Read and Approved by:

Peter J. Gentry (Chairperson)

Daniel I. Block

John B. Polhill

Date MAY 5, 2005

THESES Ph.D. .Y5t
0199701934978

To my heavenly Father

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS vi

LIST OF TABLES x

PREFACE xi

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

Aim of the Research 1

Text 2

Research History 3

Methodology 6

Contribution 8

2. THE CHARACTERIZATION OF THE TRANSLATION 10

Nouns 10

Structural Analysis of Nouns 13

Structural Analysis of Pronouns 73

Lexical Analysis of Nouns 116

Verbs 133

Structural Analysis of Finite Verbs 133

Structural Analysis of Non-Finite Verbs 225

Chapter Page

Lexical Analysis of Verbs 284

Particles 296

Prepositions 297

Conjunctions and Other Particles 330

3. THE HISTORICAL PLACE OF THE TRANSLATOR 347

History and Method 347

Translator and His Congeners 349

Lexical Comparison 350

Syntactical Comparison 395

4. CONCLUSION 414

The Characterization of the Translator of the Greek Ecclesiastes 414

The Place of the Greek Ecclesiastes in the Text History 417

Suggestion for Further Study 418

BIBLIOGRAPHY 419

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A	Arthrous
Abs	Absolute
Acc	Accusative
Adj	Adjective
Adv	Adverb
AN	Anarthrous
Aor	Aorist
AS	*Aramaic Studies*
Att	Attributive
Bauer	Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*
BDF	F. Blass, A. Debruner, R. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Ecclesiastes was edited by F. Horst. Proposals made by the editor in the apparatus are designated by BHS-Horst.)
BHS-Horst	See BHS supra
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
CN	Common Noun

Cs	Construct
Dat	Dative
Fut	Future
G	Gender
Gen	Genitive
Gent	Gentilic
GKC	W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*
HAR	*Hebrew Annual Review*
HS	*Hebrew Studies*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
Impf	Imperfect
Ind	Indicative
Inf	Infinitive
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBQ	*Jewish Bible Quarterly*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament—Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
KB	Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*
LSJ	Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed.)
Mid	Middle
N	Number
Nom	Nominative

NR	*nomen regens*
NT	*Novum Testamentum*
P	Person
Pass	Passive
Ph	Phrase
Pl	Plural
PN	Proper Noun
Pres	Present
Pron	Pronoun
Ptc	Participle
RB	*Revue biblique*
Refl	Reflexive
SAW	*Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
SBLSCS	SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Sg	Singular
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
Subj	Subjunctive
TASJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum
Translator, the	the translator of the Greek Ecclesiastes
TRev	*Theologische Revue*
Vb	Verb
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
ZAH	*Zeitschrift für Althebraistik*

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Combination of אמר and קהלת 60

2. Rendering of Articulation of מעשה 62

3. Lexical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners. 352

4. Agreement between Tr and MP 369

5. Disagreement between Tr and MP. 371

6. Agreement between Tr and GJ. 378

7. Disagreement between Tr and GJ 380

8. Agreement between Tr and the Three. 384

9. Tr/γ′ and GJ 385

10. Tr/γ′ and MP. 385

11. Tr and γ′ 388

12. Dependency of the Three 390

13. Disagreement between Tr and γ′ 391

14. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners 395

PREFACE

To my Lord only be the glory. During my study, He has sustained me all the time with energy, courage, wisdom, and finances. His gracious provision includes a great family to love me, great scholars to teach me, and great colleagues and friends to encourage me. Without His mercy and love, joy and happiness would never be found in my life. It has been my prayer from the beginning of the task that He might receive glory through my dissertation.

Only two people on earth have thought of me every day and have prayed for me incessantly since I was born. They are my parents, Yun Sang Yi and Young Ja Sung. They wake up before 5 o'clock each morning, kneel down before the Lord, and beseech Him every day on my behalf. How could I return their love and care? My dissertation is made of their tears and prayer.

This dissertation could not have been completed without my professors. Dr. Peter J. Gentry, my supervisor, has motivated me for the subject, has equipped me with proper knowledge on the Septuagint and biblical languages, and has continually encouraged me to finish the task. It has been a truly joyful experience to work with such a great scholar. Dr. Daniel Block and Dr. John Polhill have taught me how to understand Hebrew literature and Greek literature respectively. Their scholarship and instruction have significantly contributed to this work, and their kindness and care have lightened the burden of writing.

I am especially grateful to Mrs. Gentry and Dr. Kevin J. Youngblood, who have carefully proofread my English. Their suggestions and corrections have done much to improve the work. Two colleagues have spiritually encouraged me at the right time—Kuem Ju Lee and Jae Youl Choi. Their prayer and Christian friendship have been comfort in my journey. During my pilgrimage, I have been blessed to be a son-in-law of Haeng Keun Oh and Jung Lan Yoon, who have supported me with prayer and finances. I also want to thank the Youngworl Seogang Church for remembering me in their prayer at every service.

Finally, I extend my heartful gratitude towards my lovely wife, Young Shin Oh. She fully supported me and sacrificed beyond what could rightfully be asked. Her prayer, patience, encouragement, and love are inscribed in every line of my dissertation. In experiencing her love, I experience how Jesus loves me.

Yun Yeong Yi

Louisville, Kentucky

May 2005

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.[3] 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'.[4] 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.[5] 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 σύν," Ziegler investigated all occurrences of *nota accusativi* and categorized them into nine groups according to the manner the Translator used to render them.[6] Providing Text-Groups for each case, Ziegler also classified renderings of the article occurring in the Greek Ecclesiastes in "Der Gebrauch

---

[4]Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta, Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

[5]K. Elliger, W. Rudolph et al., eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983).

[6]J. Ziegler, "Die Wiedergabe der *nota accusativi 'et, 'aet-* mit σύν," in *Lebendige Forschung im Alten Testament*, *ZAW* 100, supp. vol. (1988): 222-33.

des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes," which was published posthumously.[7] These two articles directly inform the rendering patterns of the Translator on *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 *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]

John Jarick has produced a valuable tool for the study of translation technique,

---

[7]J. Ziegler, "Der Gebrauch des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes," in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*, ed. D. Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John Wm Wevers (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 83-120.

[8]Peter J. Gentry, "Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Role of the Syro-Hexapla," *AS* 1.1 (2003): 5-28; idem, "The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes in the Marginal Notes in the Syro-hexapla," *AS* 2.1 (2004): 63-84; idem, "Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three: The Priority of a New Critical Edition of Hexaplaric Fragments," *AS* 2.2 (2004): 145-74.

[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 פה in the Hebrew-Greek Concordance section.[12] איננו in 6:2a is also not included in the personal suffixes.[13] Second, Jarick sometimes failed to identify a verb. Examples are εἰδότες in 4:17 and εἰδώς in 9:1, which are forms of οἶδα but are misconstrued as ὁράω.[14] Finally, some of his judgments are too raw to be reliable. Jarick regarded אשר in 10:14 to be rendered by τί τό.[15] The Translator recognized that there was a gapping of מה in the Hebrew text and rendered the gapped מה by τί. Thus, אשר is not rendered by τί τό but by τό. In 9:2a, באשר seems to be rendered by the preposition ἐν, but Jarick posited that אשר was never

---

[10]John Jarick, ed., *A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance of the Hebrew and Greek Text of Ecclesiastes* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993).

[11]Ibid., iii. The aim of the CATSS project is "creating a comprehensive and flexible computer 'data bank' available for efficient scholarly research on virtually all aspects of Septuagintal studies—text critical, lexical, grammatical, conceptual, translational, bibliographical." See Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov, "Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 14 (1981):22-40.

[12]It should be on p. 259 of the *Concordance*.

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

[14]See Jarick, *Concordance*, 99, 211.

[15]Ibid., 164.

translated.[16] Another example is 3:19b where Jarick suggested that מזותר must have been construed as מה יתר. Since he did not clarify whether יתר 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*.[17] 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.[18]

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.

[17]Cf. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, 65.

[18]Ibid., 83.

two languages, studying lexical equivalence will greatly clarify the translation technique.[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:[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

---

[19]Cf. S. Olofsson, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (Stockholm:Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990), 11-12.

renderings where the translator deliberately aimed at increased regularity in the equivalences chosen. Examples in the Greek Ecclesiastes include רעות, "striving," which is consistently translated by προαίρεσις, "preference"; and יתרון, "advantage" which is rendered by περισσεία, "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) וְאִזֵּן וְחִקֵּר תִּקֵּן מְשָׁלִים הַרְבֵּה
(LXX) καὶ οὗς ἐξιχνιάσεται κόσμιον 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, אזן and תקן are vocalized as Piel suffix forms in MT, but the Translator rendered them by nouns, οὗς 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

---

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

[21]Cf. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, 69.

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]

---

[22]Albert Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues," *VT* 35 (1985): 299; Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, 79-80.

[23]Aejmelaeus, *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

---

[1]The 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.[2] As O'Connor points out, redundancies exist between categories of nouns and verbs and also between categories of nouns and particles.[3] 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 ם suffix), and adverbial accusatives.[4] 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.[5] 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

---

[2]M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 68; Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), §4.2.2e.

[3]O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 300.

[4]Ibid., 300-03. See also P. Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, trans. and rev. T. Muraoka, vol. 2, Subsidia Biblica 14 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1991), §102; Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §4.2.2.

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 טוב.[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] טוב is more difficult than the previous two words. The word טוב occurs 45 times in Ecclesiastes, and the Translator employed ἀγαθός for all the occurrences. According to Bauer, ἀγαθός 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 טוב. According to KB and BDB, רע and רעה can be either nouns or adjectives. As for טוב, while KB simply categorizes טוב as an adjective, BDB discusses the word in two different categories: טוב as a noun and טוב as an adjective.

[8]רעה occurs 16 times in Ecclesiastes, but רעה in 5:12a is not directly rendered by the Translator. See the following footnote.

[9]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 חולה by a single word ἀρρωστία. This case is discussed separately.

adjective.[10] BDB identifies 6 instances of טוב in Ecclesiastes as nouns.[11] Based upon these two guidelines along with consideration of the Translator's perspective, 8 cases of טוב are treated as nouns, and 37 cases as adjectives.[12]

There are 7 instances where nouns syntactically function as adverbs.[13] These cases are formally classified under nouns and discussed here.

Structural Analysis[14]

Introduction

In Ecclesiastes, there are 314 nouns occurring a total of 1363 times.[15] Addtionally, 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.

4:17a וְקָרוֹב לִשְׁמֹעַ מִתֵּת הַכְּסִילִים זָבַח
4:17a καὶ ἐγγὺς τοῦ ἀκούειν ὑπὲρ δόμα τῶν ἀφρόνων θυσία σου

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

---

[10]Bauer, s.v. "ἀγαθός."

[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 מן.[16] Thus, it is not necessary as some modern scholars do to presume a different consonantal text of the Translator from the MT.[17]

5:16a גַּם כָּל־יָמָיו בַּחֹשֶׁךְ יֹאכֵל
5:16b וְכָעַס הַרְבֵּה וְחָלְיוֹ וָקֶצֶף
5:16a καί γε πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτοῦ ἐν σκότει καὶ πένθει
5:16b καὶ θυμῷ πολλῷ καὶ ἀρρωστίᾳ καὶ χόλῳ

In 5:16a the *yqtl* יאכל is rendered by καὶ πένθει–noun with conjunction. The Translator seems to have read יאכל as *wā'ēbel* (i.e., ואבל, a noun with *waw*).[18] The different vocalization is probably due to graphic similarities between י and ו, and also between כ and ב.[19] Not only the *yqtl* but also the *wqtl* (וכעס) in 5:16b was probably construed as a noun with *waw* (*w^e^ka'as*).[20] 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.

8:10a וּבְכֵן רָאִיתִי רְשָׁעִים קְבֻרִים וָבָאוּ
8:10a καὶ τότε εἶδον ἀσεβεῖς εἰς τάφους εἰσαχθέντας

---

[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 ממתת (*mimmattat*) as the *Vorlage* of ὑπὲρ δόμα. 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.

[19]Cf. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible,* 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 244-49.

The form קברים in 8:10a is vocalized as a participle (*q^e^bûrîm*) in MT. The participle functions attributively and modifies the antecedent רשעים. The Translator, however, construed קברים as a plural noun functioning as an adverb modifying the following word, ובאו, which he translated by a participle in the Greek Ecclesiastes. The Translator's parent text probably read רשעים קברים מובאים resulting from the dittography of ם. The participle מובאים is read as a *Hophal* plural participle.[21] In this reading, מובאים becomes an attributive adjectival participle modifying רשעים, and קברים adverbially modifies מובאים. 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.

8:12a אֲשֶׁר חֹטֶא עֹשֶׂה רָע מֵאַת וּמַאֲרִיךְ לוֹ
8:12a ὃς ἥμαρτεν ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν ἀπὸ τότε καὶ ἀπὸ μακρότητος αὐτῷ

In the MT, מאריך is vocalized as a *Hiphil* participle m.s. The participle parallels עשה, which functions as a predicate. The Translator rendered מאריך by ἀπὸ μακρότητος, and the Greek equivalent reflects מארך (preposition *min* plus noun *'ōrek*) which adverbially modifies the predicate עשה. The Translator's understanding of the text is related to the form מאת in MT.[22] The form מאת is rendered by ἀπὸ τότε, and the Greek ἀπὸ τότε indicates that the Translator read the Hebrew as מאז (*mē'āz*) which resulted from

---

[20]Cf. BHS-Horst.

[21]BHS-Horst.

[22]C. L. Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 18c (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 287.

the confusion of ת with ז.[23] Then, the Translator took the presumed מארך as a parallel adverbial phrase to מאז.[24] The Translator's use of a noun for the participle in 8:12a is, thus, due to a different *Vorlage*.

9:1a וְלָבוּר אֶת־כָּל־זֶה
9:1a καὶ καρδία μου σὺν πᾶν εἶδεν τοῦτο

The form לבור in the MT is the preposition ל plus a bound infinitive from the root בור or ברר.[25] The parent text of the Translator probably had לבי instead of לבור, and so the Translator employed a noun and a pronoun, καρδία μου, for the form in question. The discrepancy may be due to incorrect word division and dittography.

10:1a זְבוּבֵי מָוֶת יַבְאִישׁ יַבִּיעַ שֶׁמֶן רוֹקֵחַ
10:1a μυῖαι θανατοῦσαι σαπριοῦσιν σκευασίαν ἐλαίου ἡδύσματος

In 10:1a 2 *yqtl* forms (יבאיש and יביע) are asyndetically joined. The Translator rendered יביע by a noun σκευασίαν. He seems to have construed יביע as a noun גביע

---

[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 ἀπὸ τότε is מעת (*mē 'ēt*) as Gordis proposed. See Robert Gordis, *Koheleth: The Man and His World* (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1955), 287. The form עת (*'ēt*) occurs 40 times in Ecclesiastes. Of these times, 39 are rendered by καιρός, and the last one is construed as the so-called *nota accusativi*. On the other hand, the form אז (*'āz*) occurs once in Ecclesiastes and is rendered by τότε. According to Hatch and Redpath, τότε renders אז (*'āz*) 103 times in the entire LXX but never עת (*'ēt*). 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 בעת ההיא (*bā 'ēt hahî'*) is rendered by τότε (Isa 20:2).

[24]Cf. Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, 894.

[25]Some scholars explain the root בור as a byform of ברר (see KB, s.v. "בור"). Others analyze לבור as a bound infinitive from a geminate root (ברר) and explain the form with an analogy with II-*waw* verb. See W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, trans. A. E. Cowley, 28th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), §67r.

(*gābîa'*) functioning as the object of יבאיש.[26] The difficulty of this conjecture lies in the fact that גביע is never rendered by σκευασία or σκεύασις in the LXX.[27] In spite of this difficulty, it is unlikely that יביע is construed as a verb.

12:9b עוֹד לִמַּד־דַּעַת אֶת־הָעָם וְאִזֵּן וְחִקֵּר תִּקֵּן מְשָׁלִים הַרְבֵּה
12:9b ἔτι ἐδίδαξεν γνῶσιν σὺν τὸν λαόν καὶ οὗς ἐξιχνιάσεται κόσμιον παραβολῶν

Four piel verbs describe Qoheleth's acts in 12:9b. The Translator rendered the second and fourth piel verbs by nouns: אזן by οὗς and תקן by κόσμιον. On his consonantal text, the Translator seems to have read אזן as *'ōzen*,[28] and תקן as *tōqen* or *t^e^qōn*. The former noun οὗς functions as a subject, and the latter noun κόσμιον functions as an object in the Greek text. The Translator's construing of תקן as a noun may have been caused by the asyndeton between וחקר and תקן. The Greek equivalent ἐξιχνιάσεται (fut. ind.) for וחקר suggests that the Translator read וחקר as *yqtl*, i.e., יחקר. Therefore, what the Translator read may have been ואזן יחקר תקן.

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.

[27]Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, 1269; T. Muraoka, "Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint," Appendix 4 of *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, Hatch and Redpath, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998), 240.

[28]Cf. Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, 1034-35.

In conclusion, 8 cases out of 17 must be included in the analysis of nouns because the Translator construed them as nouns.[29] Of the 8 cases, 4 are attested elsewhere in Ecclesiastes.[30] 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.[31]

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 וּמוֹתַר הָאָדָם מִן־הַבְּהֵמָה אָיִן
3:19b καὶ τί ἐπερίσσευσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος παρὰ τὸ κτῆνος οὐδέν

The form מותר in 3:19b is vocalized as a noun (*môtar*) in the MT. The Translator rendered the form by the interrogative τί and the aorist indicative ἐπερίσσευσεν. Modern scholars have suggested that the Translator vocalized מותר as מה יתר *mâ yōtēr* (interrogative plus *Qal* active participle).[32] His reading must have involved the confusion of ו (*waw*) and י (*yod*). Nevertheless, the presumed form יתר 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 יתר (*yōtēr*) or יותר (*yôtēr*) occurs 7 times in

---

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

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

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

[32]Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, 1126. Cf. Jaricks, *Concordance*, 215, 235.

Ecclesiastes, but it is better treated as a noun.[33] All of the instances are rendered by nouns or nouns used adverbially.[34] A Greek indicative never renders the Hebrew participle form *yōtēr* or *yôtēr* whether in Ecclesiastes or in the entire MT. The *Vorlage* of ἐπερίσσευσεν probably was a finite verb—i.e., a suffix form. In the MT, the Hebrew verb יתר 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.[35] The *Hiphil* form can be used intransitively with an elative meaning "to excel or to have priority."[36] The Greek equivalent περισσεύω may also denote an elative meaning in the context: "and in what way did humans excel above cattle?"[37] The form מותר in MT, therefore, may have been construed as an interrogative plus *Hiphil* suffix 3 m.s. form *mâ hôtir* or *mâ ôtir* with a syncopated ה and defective spelling for the theme vowel *hirek yod*.[38]

5:10b וּמַה־כִּשְׁרוֹן לִבְעָלֶיהָ כִּי אִם־רְאוּת עֵינָיו

---

[33]BDB, s.v. "יותר," "יתר"; KB, s.v. "יתר."

[34]In 2 instances, περισσεία is used (6:8, 7:11); and in 5 instances περισσός (2:15, 6:11, 7:16, 12:9, 12:11). The adjective περισσός 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. "יתר"; BDB, s.v. "יתר."

[37]Peter J. Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," in *New English Translation of Septuagint*, Provisional Edition [on-line]; accessed 1 February 2005; available from http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/ekkl.pdf; Internet.

[38]In Ecclesiastes and also in late Hebrew, the preformative ה in *Hiphil* is frequently syncopated. For example, the form לעשיר in 5:11b and the form לרע 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.

5:10b καὶ τί ἀνδρεία τῷ παρ' αὐτῆς ὅτι ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ ὁρᾶν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ

The word ראות in 5:10b is vocalized as a noun in MT.[39] The Translator likely vocalized the form in question as *r^e'ôt*, i.e., an infinitive form.

5:11b וְהַשָּׂבָע לְעָשִׁיר אֵינֶנּוּ מַנִּיחַ לוֹ לִישׁוֹן
5:11b καὶ τῷ ἐμπλησθέντι τοῦ πλουτῆσαι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀφίων αὐτὸν τοῦ ὑπνῶσαι

לעשיר 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 עשיר is rendered by an infinitive in the LXX.[40] The noun עשיר occurs 3 times in Ecclesiastes, and twice it is rendered by the adjective πλούσιος.[41] The Translator may have interpreted לעשיר as a *Hiphil* infinitive with a syncopated ה. The syncopated ה in the infinitive of *Hiphil* is common in DSS.[42]

1:10a יֵשׁ דָּבָר שֶׁיֹּאמַר רְאֵה־זֶה חָדָשׁ הוּא
1:10a ὃς λαλήσει καὶ ἐρεῖ ἰδὲ τοῦτο καινόν ἐστιν

8:4a בַּאֲשֶׁר דְּבַר־מֶלֶךְ שִׁלְטוֹן
8:4a καθὼς λαλεῖ βασιλεὺς ἐξουσιάζων

In both 1:10a and 8:4a, the noun דבר is rendered by the verb λαλέω. The noun דבר occurs 24 times in Ecclesiastes, and in all other instances דבר is rendered by a noun in Greek.[43] 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.

[42]Qimron, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, §310.145; and also see M. H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), §143

reflects metathesis of ש and י.[44] Since this kind of metathesis is a common scribal error, it is possible that the Translator read שידבר.[45] In MT, 8:4a is a verbless clause, and דבר and מלך constitute a bound phrase. The Translator also construed דבר of 8:4a as a verb, not a noun.

(x2)
8:9b עֵת אֲשֶׁר שָׁלַט הָאָדָם בְּאָדָם לְרַע לוֹ
8:9b τὰ ὅσα ἐξουσιάσατο ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ κακῶσαι αὐτόν

There are 2 nouns in 8:9b, which the Translator did not construe as such. The noun עת occurs 40 times in Ecclesiastes and is rendered by καιρός 39 times. The Translator may have understood עת in MT as את due to phonetic confusion between ע and א. This confusion is common in late Hebrew.[46]

Another noun with a preposition (לרע) is rendered by an article plus infinitive τοῦ κακῶσαι. The Translator probably read the form לרע as *Hiphil* infinitive with a syncopated ה.[47]

8:11a אֲשֶׁר אֵין־נַעֲשָׂה פִתְגָם מַעֲשֵׂה הָרָעָה מְהֵרָה
8:11a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν γινομένη ἀντίρρησις ἀπὸ τῶν ποιούντων τὸ πονηρὸν ταχύ

---

[43]By λογός or ῥῆμα. Cf. Jarick, *Concordance*, 178.

[44]Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 110. Metathesis is a common scribal error. See also Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 250-51.

[45]Cf. 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 להרע. Cf. BHS-Horst.

The word מעשה in 8:11a is vocalized as a bound form in MT. The noun מעשה occurs 21 times in Ecclesiastes and is rendered by ποίημα 20 times. According to the pattern, the translation ἀπὸ τῶν ποιούντων in 8:11a does not reflect מעשה but rather reflects מעשי (a preposition plus *Qal* active participle pl).[48]

8:12a אֲשֶׁר חֹטֵא עֹשֶׂה רָע מְאַת וּמַאֲרִיךְ לוֹ
8:12a ὃς ἥμαρτεν ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν ἀπὸ τότε καὶ ἀπὸ μακρότητος αὐτῷ

The noun מאת in 8:12a is translated by ἀπὸ τότε. The Greek equivalent reflects מאז (*mē'ēz*). This conjecture is based upon 2:15 where אז is rendered by τότε.

10:17b וְשָׂרַיִךְ בָּעֵת יֹאכֵלוּ בִּגְבוּרָה וְלֹא בַשְּׁתִי
10:17b καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντές σου πρὸς καιρὸν φάγονται ἐν δυνάμει καὶ οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσονται

בשתי is analyzed as the preposition ב plus the noun שתי ("drinking"). Its Greek equivalent αἰσχυνθήσονται reveals that the Translator may have understood the form as a verb from בוש.

12:4a וְסֻגְּרוּ דְלָתַיִם בַּשּׁוּק בִּשְׁפַל קוֹל הַטַּחֲנָה
12:4a καὶ κλείσουσιν θύρας ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ φωνῆς τῆς ἀληθούσης

The noun הטחנה in 12:4a meaning "mill" is rendered by ἀληθούσης an active participle feminine singular. A participle in the feminine plural form from the same root (הטחנות) appeared in the previous verse 12:3b. The Translator translated הטחנות by αἱ ἀλήθουσαι–an active participle feminine plural. הטחנות in 12:3b likely influenced the Translator's interpretation of the noun הטחנה. Since the noun הטחנה in 12:4a has the feminine ending, the Translator probably read טחנה as an active participle feminine singular (e.g., *ṭōḥănâ*).

---

[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:
דוד > Δαυιδ (1:1a)
ישראל > Ισραηλ (1:12b)[49]
ירושלם > Ιερουσαλημ (1:1b, 1:12b, 1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a)
אלהים > θεός (1:13b, 2:24b, 2:26b, 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 אלהים can carry the character of a proper name, it is discussed under proper nouns.[50] The epithet קהלת should be treated as a common noun. While the article cannot be prefixed to a proper noun, the articular form of קהלת appears in 12:8a.[51] The Translator translated קהלת as ἐκκλησιαστής. Its verbal form ἐκκλησιάζω 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 Ισραηλ is added in Greek Ecclesiastes, which lacks in MT.

[50]Cf. GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §1125f.

[51]Ibid., §125a.

[52]Aeneas Tacticus (4 B.C.) used ἐκκλησιάζω with the meaning of "to convene." See LSJ, s.v. "ἐκκλησιάζω."

There are 4 proper nouns occurring a total of 47 times. The Translator transliterated 3 proper nouns and rendered 1 proper noun (i.e., אלהים) 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 רשע as an adjective *rāšā'* while MT has its substantival form *reša'*.[54]

Example:
3:16b מְקוֹם הַמִּשְׁפָּט שָׁמָּה הָרֶשַׁע וּמְקוֹם הַצֶּדֶק שָׁמָּה הָרָשַׁע
3:16b τόπον τῆς κρίσεως ἐκεῖ ὁ ἀσεβής καὶ τόπον τοῦ δικαίου ἐκεῖ ὁ ἀσεβής

In 3:16b the noun *reša'* occurs twice, and the Translator employed an adjective ἀσεβής for both cases.[55] An expected Greek equivalent for *reša'* is ἀσέβεια as in 8:8b. The adjective ἀσεβής renders all the cases of *rāšā'*.[56] Based on this pattern, one could posit that the Translator read רשע in 3:16b as an adjective (*rāšā'*) rather than a noun (*reša'*).

---

[53]In 1:1b, Ισραηλ, which lacks in MT, is added in Greek Ecclesiastes.

[54]The 3 instances are 3:16b, 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.

5:11b וְהַשָּׂבָע לֶעָשִׁיר אֵינֶנּוּ מַנִּיחַ לוֹ לִישׁוֹן
5:11b καὶ τῷ ἐμπλησθέντι τοῦ πλουτῆσαι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀφίων αὐτὸν τοῦ ὑπνῶσαι

In 5:11b the substantival participle ἐμπλησθέντι is employed for שבע which is vocalized as a noun (*śābā'*) in MT. The noun *śābā'* occurs 8 times in MT, 6 of which occur in Genesis 41. This implies that *śābā'* is uncommon in biblical Hebrew. A common form in MT is *śābē^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 שבע as *śābē^a'* than his reading the form as *śābā'*.

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

6:3a וְרַב שֶׁיִּהְיוּ יְמֵי־שָׁנָיו
6:3a καὶ πλῆθος ὅ τι ἔσονται ἡμέραι ἐτῶν αὐτοῦ

In 6:3a רב, an adjective (*rab*), is rendered by πλῆθος, 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 πλῆθος.[57] The adjective *rab* is normally rendered by adjectives μέγας or πολύς. The noun πλῆθος is used for all 6 occurrences of the common noun *rōb*. According to this pattern, one may posit that the Translator read רב in 6:3a as *rōb* rather than *rab*. This case is considered under common nouns.

---

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

Common Noun > Common Noun (964)

Evidence:
1:1a, 1:1a, 1:1a, 1:1b, 1:2a, 1:2a, 1:2a, 1:2b, 1:2b, 1:2b, 1:3a, 1:3a, 1:3b, 1:3b, 1:4a, 1:4a, 1:4b, 1:4b, 1:5a, 1:5a, 1:5b, 1:6a, 1:6a, 1:6b, 1:6b, 1:6b, 1:7a, 1:7a, 1:7a, 1:7b, 1:7b, 1:8a, 1:8b, 1:8b, 1:8b, 1:9b, 1:10b, 1:11a, 1:11b, 1:12a, 1:12a, 1:13a, 1:13a, 1:13a, 1:13b, 1:13b, 1:13b, 1:14a, 1:14a, 1:14b, 1:14b, 1:14b, 1:15b, 1:16a, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:16b, 1:16b, 1:17a, 1:17a, 1:17a, 1:17a, 1:17a, 1:17b, 1:17b, 1:18a, 1:18a, 1:18a, 1:18a, 1:18b, 1:18b, 2:1a, 2:1a, 2:1a, 2:1b, 2:2a, 2:2b, 2:3a, 2:3a, 2:3a, 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:4a, 2:4b, 2:4b, 2:5a, 2:5a, 2:5b, 2:5b, 2:6a, 2:6a, 2:6b, 2:6b, 2:7a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:8a, 2:8a, 2:8a, 2:8a, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:9b, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:11a, 2:11a, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:12a, 2:12a, 2:12a, 2:12b, 2:12b, 2:13a, 2:13a, 2:13a, 2:13b, 2:13b, 2:13b, 2:14a, 2:14a, 2:14a, 2:14b, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:15a, 2:15b, 2:15b, 2:16a, 2:16a, 2:16b, 2:17a, 2:17a, 2:17a, 2:17b, 2:17b, 2:17b, 2:18a, 2:18a, 2:18b, 2:19a, 2:19b, 2:20a, 2:20a, 2:20b, 2:20b, 2:21a, 2:21a, 2:21a, 2:21a, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:22a, 2:22a, 2:22a, 2:22a, 2:22b, 2:23a, 2:23a, 2:23a, 2:23a, 2:23a, 2:23a, 2:23b, 2:24a, 2:24a, 2:24a, 2:24a, 2:24b, 2:26a, 2:26a, 2:26a, 2:26a, 2:26b, 2:26b, 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:1a, 3:1b, 3:1b, 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, 3:5a, 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, 3:8b, 3:8b, 3:9a, 3:10a, 3:10b, 3:10b, 3:11a, 3:11a, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:12b, 3:12b, 3:13a, 3:13a, 3:13b, 3:14b, 3:16a, 3:16b, 3:16b, 3:16b, 3:16b, 3:17a, 3:17b, 3:17b, 3:17b, 3:18a, 3:18a, 3:18a, 3:18a, 3:18b, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:19b, 3:19b, 3:20a, 3:20b, 3:20b, 3:21a, 3:21a, 3:21b, 3:21b, 3:21b, 3:22a, 3:22a, 3:22a, 4:1a, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:3b, 4:3b, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:4b, 4:4b, 4:4b, 4:5a, 4:5b, 4:6a, 4:6a, 4:6a, 4:6b, 4:6b, 4:6b, 4:6b, 4:6b, 4:7a, 4:7b, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8a, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:9b, 4:9b, 4:10a, 4:11b, 4:12b, 4:13a, 4:13b, 4:14a, 4:14b, 4:15a, 4:15b, 4:16a, 4:16a, 4:16b, 4:16b, 4:16b, 4:17a, 4:17a, 4:17a, 5:1a, 5:1a, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:1b, 5:1b, 5:2a, 5:2a, 5:2a, 5:2b, 5:2b, 5:2b, 5:3a, 5:3b, 5:5a, 5:5a, 5:5a, 5:5b, 5:5b, 5:5b, 5:6a, 5:6a, 5:6a, 5:6a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:8a, 5:8a, 5:8b, 5:8b, 5:9a, 5:9a, 5:9a, 5:9a, 5:9b, 5:10a, 5:10b, 5:10b, 5:11a, 5:12a, 5:12a, 5:12b, 5:12b, 5:12b, 5:13a, 5:13a, 5:13b, 5:13b, 5:14a, 5:14a, 5:14b, 5:14b, 5:15b, 5:15b, 5:16a, 5:16a, 5:16a, 5:16b, 5:16b, 5:16b, 5:17a, 5:17a, 5:17a, 5:17b, 5:17b, 5:17b, 5:17b, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18b, 5:19a, 5:19a, 5:19b, 5:19b, 6:1a, 6:1a, 6:1b, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2b, 6:2b, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3b, 6:4a, 6:4a, 6:4b, 6:4b, 6:5a, 6:5b, 6:6a, 6:6a, 6:6a, 6:6b, 6:7a, 6:7a, 6:7a, 6:7b, 6:8a, 6:8b, 6:9a, 6:9a, 6:9a, 6:9b, 6:9b, 6:9b, 6:10a, 6:10a, 6:11a, 6:11a, 6:11b, 6:12a, 6:12a, 6:12a, 6:12a, 6:12a, 6:12a, 6:12a, 6:12b, 6:12b, 7:1a, 7:1a, 7:1b, 7:1b, 7:1b, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:2b, 7:3a, 7:3a, 7:3b, 7:3b, 7:3b, 7:4a, 7:4a, 7:4a, 7:4b, 7:4b, 7:4b, 7:5a, 7:5b, 7:5b, 7:6a, 7:6a, 7:6a, 7:6a, 7:6b, 7:7a, 7:7b, 7:7b, 7:8a, 7:8a, 7:8b, 7:9a, 7:9b, 7:9b, 7:10a, 7:10b, 7:11a, 7:11a, 7:11b, 7:11b, 7:12a, 7:12a, 7:12a, 7:12a, 7:12b, 7:12b, 7:12b, 7:13a, 7:14a, 7:14a, 7:14a, 7:14a, 7:14a, 7:14b, 7:14b, 7:15a, 7:15a, 7:15b, 7:17b, 7:18a, 7:19a, 7:19b, 7:20a, 7:21a, 7:21b, 7:22a, 7:23a, 7:20a, 7:21a, 7:22a, 7:25a, 7:25a, 7:25a, 7:25b,

---

[57]In other cases, it is rendered by adjectives 7 times and by an adverb once.

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

Common Noun > Adjective (148)

Evidence:
1:2b, 1:3b, 1:7a, 1:8a, 1:9b, 1:13a, 1:14a, 1:14b, 1:16a, 2:3b, 2:5b, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:11b, 2:14b, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:16a, 2:16b, 2:17b, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:19b, 2:20b, 2:22a, 2:23a, 3:1a, 3:1b, 3:11a, 3:13a, 3:13a, 3:13a, 3:14a, 3:17b, 3:17b, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:20a, 3:20b, 3:20b, 4:1a, 4:3a, 4:4a, 4:4a, 4:5a, 4:8a, 4:9a, 4:11a, 4:12a, 4:13b, 4:15a, 4:16a, 4:16a, 4:17a, 4:17b, 5:2b, 5:3a, 5:8a, 5:13b, 5:14b, 5:16a, 5:17a, 5:17a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 6:6a, 6:6b, 6:7a, 6:8a, 6:11b, 7:2a, 7:4b, 7:5b, 7:6a, 7:8a, 7:8b, 7:9b, 7:14b, 7:15a, 7:15b, 7:17a, 7:18b, 7:20b, 7:21a, 7:23a, 7:28b, 7:28b, 8:1b, 8:3b, 8:6a, 8:9a, 8:9a, 8:11b, 8:12a, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:1b, 9:2a, 9:3a, 9:3a, 9:3a, 9:3b, 9:4a, 9:6b, 9:8a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:10a, 9:11a, 9:11b, 10:2a, 10:2b, 10:2b, 10:3b, 10:5b, 10:6a, 10:6b, 10:12b, 10:13b, 10:14a, 10:15a, 10:16a, 10:17a, 10:17a, 10:19b, 10:20a, 11:2a, 11:2a,

11:2b, 11:5b, 11:6b, 11:8a, 11:8b, 11:9b, 12:4b, 12:8b, 12:9a, 12:12b, 12:13a, 12:13b, 12:14a, 12:14a.

The substantive כל is rendered by the adjective πᾶς in 89 instances.[58] When כל stands alone, πᾶς serves as a substantival adjective.[59] On the other hand, when כל appears as the *nomen regens* in a bound phrase, πᾶς is an attributive adjective.[60]

Examples:
1:2b הֲבֵל הֲבָלִים הַכֹּל הָבֶל
1:2b ματαιότης ματαιοτήτων τὰ πάντα ματαιότης

1:3b בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ שֶׁיַּעֲמֹל תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
1:3b ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ ᾧ μοχθεῖ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

Further substantival adjectives, which render substantives in Hebrew, occur in 49 instances. They include ἀγαθόν for טוב,[61] ἀκούσιον for שגגה,[62] ἀναιδής for עז,[63]

---

[58]In 9:2a, הכל is rendered by a noun ματαιότης. The parent text may have had הבל.

[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 כל and Greek substantival πᾶς. Cf. 7:15a.

[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, 2:23a, 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.

[61]2:3b, 3:13a, 5:17a, 7:20b.

[62]10:5b.

[63]8:1b.

ἀριστερόν for שמאל,[64] ἄφρων for כסיל[65] and also for סכל,[66] δεξιόν for ימין,[67] δίκαιος for צדק,[68] δυνατοῖς for גבורים,[69] δύο for שניהם,[70] ἐλευθέρων for חורים,[71] ἐσχάτη for אחרית,[72] κακόν or πονηρόν for רע,[73] μακρόθυμος for ארך־רוח,[74] νεώτερος for נער,[75] οἰκογενεῖς for בני־בית,[76] οὐδέν for מאומה,[77] περισσόν for יותר,[78] πλούσιος for עשיר,[79] and πονηρόν for רעה.[80]

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 σκληρός in 7:17a, which renders סכל, and μακαρία in 10:17a, which renders אשרי.[81]

Examples:
3:13a וְרָאָה טוֹב בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ
3:13a καὶ ἴδῃ ἀγαθὸν ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ

10:17a אַשְׁרֵיךְ אֶרֶץ שֶׁמַּלְכֵּךְ בֶּן־חוֹרִים
10:17a μακαρία σύ γῆ ἧς ὁ βασιλεύς σου υἱὸς ἐλευθέρων

An adjective ἀγαθόν in 3:13a is substantively used. In 10:17a אשרי 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 תֵּן־חֵלֶק לְשִׁבְעָה וְגַם לִשְׁמוֹנָה
11:2a δὸς μερίδα τοῖς ἑπτὰ καί γε τοῖς ὀκτώ

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.[82]

---

[81]Employing σκληρός for סכל deviates from the normal approach. The adjective σκληρός could be substantively used here.

[82]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 אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִתֶּן־לוֹ הָאֱלֹהִים עֹשֶׁר וּנְכָסִים
6:2a ἀνήρ ᾧ δώσει αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς πλοῦτον καὶ ὑπάρχοντα

10:11b וְאֵין יִתְרוֹן לְבַעַל הַלְּשׁוֹן
10:11b καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν περισσεία τῷ ἐπᾴδοντι

The Translator utilized a participle neuter plural accusative ὑπάρχοντα for נכסים in both 5:18a and 6:2a. It is unlikely that the Translator read נכסים as a defective passive participle form meaning of "what is possessed" since no verbal form from the root נכס is attested in MT. The Translator probably construed נכסים 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 בעל הלשון in 10:11b is rendered by ἐπᾴδοντι, and בעל הכנפים in 10:20b by ὁ ἔχων τὰς πτέρυγας.[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 בַּאֲשֶׁר דְּבַר־מֶלֶךְ שִׁלְטוֹן
8:4a καθὼς λαλεῖ βασιλεὺς ἐξουσιάζων

10:1a זְבוּבֵי מָוֶת יַבְאִישׁ יַבִּיעַ שֶׁמֶן רוֹקֵחַ
10:1a μυῖαι θανατοῦσαι σαπριοῦσιν σκευασίαν ἐλαίου ἡδύσματος

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 דבר מלך as

---

[83]Cf. Bauer, s.v. "ὑπάρχω."

subject and the noun שלטון as predicate. By contrast, the Translator vocalized דבר as *dōbēr* (Qal Act. Ptc.) or *dāber* (Qal Pf.) and took מלך שלטון as a bound phrase functioning as subject.

Another free form מות 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 יותר in 2:15a and 7:16a, מעט in 5:11a, קברים in 8:10a, and מהרה 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).

(יותר > περισσόν)[85]
2:15a וְלָמָּה חָכַמְתִּי אֲנִי אָז יוֹתֵר
2:15b וְדִבַּרְתִּי בְלִבִּי
2:15a καὶ ἵνα τί ἐσοφισάμην
2:15b ἐγὼ τότε περισσὸν ἐλάλησα ἐν καρδίᾳ μου

(מעט > ὀλίγον)
5:11a מְתוּקָה שְׁנַת הָעֹבֵד אִם־מְעַט וְאִם־הַרְבֶּה יֹאכֵל
5:11a γλυκὺς ὕπνος τοῦ δούλου εἰ ὀλίγον καὶ εἰ πολὺ φάγεται

(יותר > περισσά)
7:16a וְאַל־תִּתְחַכַּם יוֹתֵר
7:16a καὶ μὴ σοφίζου περισσά

(קברים > εἰς τάφους)[86]

---

[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 יותר belongs to 2:15a or 2:15b, it still functions as an adverb in either case.

8:10a וּבְכֵן רָאִיתִי רְשָׁעִים קְבֻרִים וָבָאוּ
8:10a καὶ τότε εἶδον ἀσεβεῖς εἰς τάφους εἰσαχθέντας

(מהרה > ταχύ)
8:11a אֲשֶׁר אֵין־נַעֲשָׂה פִּתְגָם מַעֲשֵׂה הָרָעָה מְהֵרָה
8:11a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν γινομένη ἀντίρρησις ἀπὸ τῶν ποιούντων τὸ πονηρὸν ταχύ

In 3:21a and 4:12b, nouns מעלה and מהרה, 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.

(למעלה > εἰς ἄνω)
3:21a מִי יוֹדֵעַ רוּחַ בְּנֵי הָאָדָם הָעֹלָה הִיא לְמָעְלָה
3:21a καὶ τίς οἶδεν πνεῦμα υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ ἀναβαίνει αὐτὸ εἰς ἄνω

(במהרה > ταχέως)
4:12b וְהַחוּט הַמְשֻׁלָּשׁ לֹא בִמְהֵרָה יִנָּתֵק
4:12b καὶ τὸ σπαρτίον τὸ ἔντριτον οὐ ταχέως ἀπορραγήσεται

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 בעל has a pronominal suffix or is followed by a *nomen rectum*. These phrases are rendered by ὁ παρα or ὅς παρα τινος.

Example:
5:12b עֹשֶׁר שָׁמוּר לִבְעָלָיו לְרָעָתוֹ
5:12b πλοῦτον φυλασσόμενον τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰς κακίαν αὐτοῦ

---

[86]In 8:10a the Translator must have read קברים 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, 4:13a, 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, 6:3b, 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, 7:8b, 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, 7:28b, 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, 8:15a, 8:17b, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2b, 9:3a, 9:4b, 9:7a, 9:8a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:12a, 9:12b, 9:13b, 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 מִן־הַחַיִּים אֲשֶׁר הֵמָּה חַיִּים עֲדֶנָה
4:2b ὑπὲρ τοὺς ζῶντας ὅσοι αὐτοὶ ζῶσιν ἕως τοῦ νῦν

The adjective חי, 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.

substantival participle ζῶν in 4:2b, 4:15a, 7:2b, 9:4a, 9:5a, and 10:19a. In the same way, שליט is rendered by ἐξουσιάζων in 7:19b and 10:5b, שבע by ἐμπλησθείς in 5:11b,[88] and מלאה by κυοφόρουσα in 11:5a.

There are 2 cases where an attributive adjective in Hebrew is rendered by an attributive participle in Greek.[89]

Example:
9:4b כִּי־לְכֶלֶב חַי הוּא טוֹב מִן־הָאַרְיֵה הַמֵּת
9:4b ὅτι ὁ κύων ὁ ζῶν αὐτὸς ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τὸν λέοντα τὸν νεκρόν

In 9:4b the adjective חי modifies כלב in attributive position. The Translator utilized the attributive participle ὁ ζῶν in Greek for the attributive adjective in Hebrew. Another case is in 8:8a where an attributive adjective שליט is rendered by an attributive participle ἐξουσιάζων.

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: שמח is rendered by εὐφράνθη in 2:10b, and עמל by μοχθέω in 2:18a, 2:22b, 3:9b, 4:8b, and 9:9b.

Example:
2:18a וְשָׂנֵאתִי אֲנִי אֶת־כָּל־עֲמָלִי שֶׁאֲנִי עָמֵל תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
2:18a καὶ ἐμίσησα ἐγὼ σὺν πάντα μόχθον μου ὃν ἐγὼ μοχθῶ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

---

[88]The Translator seems to have read שבע as *śābē*^{a}*'*, a verbal adjective, while MT reads the form in question as *śābā'*, a noun.

[89]The 2 cases are 8:8a and 9:4b.

The adjective חיים functioning as predicate is rendered by the present ζῶσιν in 4:2b, and רחוקה by the aorist ἐμακρύνθη in 7:23b.

7:23b אָמַרְתִּי אֶחְכָּמָה וְהִיא רְחוֹקָה מִמֶּנִּי
7:23b εἶπα σοφισθήσομαι καὶ αὐτὴ ἐμακρύνθη 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 וְעָמֹק עָמֹק מִי יִמְצָאֶנּוּ
7:24b καὶ βαθὺ βάθος τίς εὑρήσει αὐτό

The repetition of the adjective עמק in 7:24b denotes intensification in Hebrew and means "exceedingly deep."[91] This expression is rendered by βαθὺ 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 גַּם מִגָּבֹהַּ יִרָּאוּ וְחַתְּחִתִּים בַּדֶּרֶךְ
12:5a καί γε ἀπὸ ὕψους ὄψονται καὶ θάμβοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ

In 12:5a גבה, which is an adjective and used as a substantive, is rendered by ὕψος a substantive in Greek.

Adjective > Pronoun (1)

In 11:6b, the idiomatic expression כאחד meaning "equally" or "altogether" is rendered also by an idiomatic expression in Greek—ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, which means

---

[90]7:23b and 7:24a in Greek Ecclesiastes.

[91]GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §133k.

"together."[92]

11:6b וְאִם־שְׁנֵיהֶם כְּאֶחָד טוֹבִים
11:6b καὶ ἐὰν τὰ δύο ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀγαθά

Adjective > Adverb (1)

7:23b אָמַרְתִּי אֶחְכָּמָה וְהִיא רְחוֹקָה מִמֶּנִּי
7:24a רָחוֹק מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה

7:23b εἶπα σοφισθήσομαι
7:24a καὶ αὐτὴ ἐμακρύνθη ἀπ' ἐμοῦ μακρὰν ὑπὲρ ὃ ἦν

The adjective רחוק in 7:24a functions as a predicate in MT. The Translator employed the adverb μακράν for רחוק. The discrepancy may be due to different consonantal texts. The parent text of the Translator seems to have been משהיה instead of מה שהיה, and construed the מ as a comparative מן.

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

---

[92]Cf. Bauer, s.v. "αὐτός"; LSJ, s.v. "αὐτός." For the Hebrew meaning of the phrase, see Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 108; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 338; James L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1989), 178.

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.[93] 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 דוד (Δαυιδ), ירושלם (Ιερουσαλημ), and ישראל (Ισραηλ). The form Ιερουσαλημ points to a singular probably vocalized as

---

[93]The categories for description are from Gentry, *Greek Job*, 99-132.

ירושלם (*y^e^rûšālēm*) while the vocalization of MT reflects a dual form.[94] The plural noun אלהים is rendered by the singular of θεός 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 כל.

The numerals שבעה "seven" and שמונה "eight" are singular substantives in Hebrew, both of which occur in 11:2a. Their counterparts in Greek are respectively ἑπτά and ὀκτώ, which are indeclinable nouns. אלף "thousand" is a singular substantive in Hebrew, but its correspondent in Greek χίλιοι is a plural adjective, which is used in 6:6a and 7:28b. The dual form שנים "two" 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.[95] The word δύο is the only dual form that occurs in the LXX.[96]

---

[94]KB, s.v. "ירושלם"; Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §7.3d.

[95]Indeclinable δύο is classical. See A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), 282.

[96]Ibid., 252.

Further 8 nouns occurring a total of 20 instances are dual in Ecclesiastes: דלתים, חפנים, ידים, מים, עינים, עצלתים, פעמים, and שמים. 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, שמים is rendered by the singular noun οὐρανός.[98] The dual form דלתים is also rendered by a singular θύρα in Greek.[99] The singular and plural forms of ὕδωρ in Greek are inconsistently employed for מים in Hebrew.[100] In 4:6b the phrase δύο δρακῶν , which denotes a dual sense, is cleverly used for חפנים. Further there are 12 cases where a dual form in Hebrew is rendered by a plural form in Greek. These include: פעמים by καθόδους in 6:6a;[101] עינים by ὀφθαλμοί in 2:10a, 2:14a, 5:10b, 6:9a, 8:16b, 11:7b, and 11:9a;[102] ידים by χεῖρες in 2:11a, 5:5b, 7:26a, and 10:18b; and עצלתים by ὀκνηρίαι in 10:18a.

The substantive כל 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, שמים is rendered by ἥλιον. The Translator seems to have שמש instead of שמים in a parent text. This case is to be treated as a singlur 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 פעמים 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, כל 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 אַל־תְּהִי צַדִּיק הַרְבֵּה וְאַל־תִּתְחַכַּם יוֹתֵר
7:16a μὴ γίνου δίκαιος πολὺ καὶ μὴ σοφίζου περισσά

In 7:16a the substantive יותר, which functions adverbially, is rendered by περισσά a plural form in Greek. The word περισσόν 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, כל, 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 הכל, functions as a substantive, and its number is taken from its referent.

[104]In 2:15a a singular form περισσόν is used for יותר 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: סגלה in 2:8a is rendered by περιουσιασμοί, בהמה in 3:18b by κτήνη, בשר in 4:5b by σάρκες, כסיל in 7:6a by ἄφρονες, and חכם in 8:1a by σοφοί.

There are 4 instances where a singular form of מעשה is rendered by the plural form ποιήματα.[106] 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 מעשה in a bound phrase is rendered by a singular in Greek.

8:14a יֵשׁ צַדִּיקִים אֲשֶׁר מַגִּיעַ אֲלֵהֶם כְּמַעֲשֵׂה הָרְשָׁעִים
וְיֵשׁ רְשָׁעִים שֶׁמַּגִּיעַ אֲלֵהֶם כְּמַעֲשֵׂה הַצַּדִּיקִים
8:14a εἰσὶ δίκαιοι ὅτι φθάνει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποίημα τῶν ἀσεβῶν
καὶ εἰσὶν ἀσεβεῖς ὅτι φθάνει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποίημα τῶν δικαίων

8:17a וְרָאִיתִי אֶת־כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה הָאֱלֹהִים
8:17a καὶ εἶδον σὺν πάντα τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ θεοῦ

In both 8:14a and 8:17a, מעשה 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 ποίημα for the "work of human beings." An exception is the case in 5:5b where מעשה is rendered by a plural form in Greek even though the *nomen rectum* is not "God."[107]

5:5b וְחִבֵּל אֶת־מַעֲשֵׂה יָדֶיךָ
5:5b καὶ διαφθείρῃ τὰ ποιήματα χειρῶν σου

---

[106]The 4 instances are 5:5b, 7:13a, 8:17a, 11:5b. A singular form of מעשה 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 מעשי is attested in 5:5b instead of מעשה.[108] Except for the 4 cases discussed above the Translator's rendering of the number of מעשה is formally equivalent (94 percent).[109] This means that the Translator normally followed the number of מעשה 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 מעשי 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 וּבְחַדְרֵי מִשְׁכָּבְךָ אַל־תְּקַלֵּל עָשִׁיר
10:20a καὶ ἐν ταμιείοις κοιτώνων σου μὴ καταράσῃ πλούσιον

In 10:20a, משכב is rendered by a plural in Greek. משכב is used as a distributive singular and does not have to agree in number with בחדרי 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]מעשה 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.

[111]F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), §140. For similar Semitic influence upon NT Greek, see Nigel Turner, *Syntax*, ed. J. H. Moulton, vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), 23.

Thus, using the plural κοιτώνων for the singular משכב is due to the norms of the target language.

9:14a עִיר קְטַנָּה וַאֲנָשִׁים בָּהּ מְעָט
9:14a πόλις μικρὰ καὶ ἄνδρες ἐν αὐτῇ ὀλίγοι

The relationship between אנשים and מעט may be construed as appositional.[112] The Translator, however, seems to have reckoned מעט 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 λόγων, is probably due to dittography.

7:8a טוֹב אַחֲרִית דָּבָר מֵרֵאשִׁיתוֹ
7:8a ἀγαθὴ ἐσχάτη 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 λόγων 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 י (*hireq yod*) of the preceeding word אחרית and the following word מראשיתו may create a dittography along with the repetition of מ, which is the beginning letter of the next word. The Translator's consonantal text might have had טוב אחרית דברים מראשיתו.

---

[112]The same appositional use of מעט occurs in Neh 2:12. Cf. KB, s.v. "מעט"; BDB, s.v. "מעט."

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.[113] These abstract nouns, which are rendered by singular nouns in Greek, include בחורות rendered by νεότης in 11:9a and 12:1a, הוללות rendered by περιφορά in 2:12a and 7:25b, מראי rendered by ὁράσει in 11:9a, and finally חיים rendered by ζωή in 12 instances.[114]

In Hebrew the substantive אשר always occurs in the plural construct form אשרי, which is rendered by an adjective feminine singular μακαρία in Greek (10:17a). The word פנה occurs only in the plural form פנים, which 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 חיו, which is also rendered by ζωή in Greek. Based upon the pattern of the Translator, חיו might be construed as חייו, which is an expected form. Two Cairo Geniza Hebrew codex fragments attest חייו. See BHS-Horst.

by the singlar noun πρόσωπον in Greek.[115]

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

2:4a הִגְדַּלְתִּי מַעֲשָׂי
2:4a ἐμεγάλυνα ποίημά μου

As discussed above in the section on the singular, the Translator's rendering the number of מעשה 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 מעשי as *ma'ăśî* instead of *ma'ăśay*. 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.[116] Bound phrases where כל is the *nomen regens* and is rendered by an attributive adjective in Greek cannot be compared and are excluded from the analysis.[117] Cardinal numbers are also excluded because their surface structures are different in Hebrew and Greek (6:6a).[118]

There are 151 bound phrases that qualify for comparison: 137 two-member phrases, 14 three-member phrases, and 1 four-member phrase.[119] The Translator employed nominals in the genitive case in Greek for the free members in Hebrew bound

---

cases where פנים is used as a semipreposition.

[116]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.

[117]If כל 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 כל is one of four members in a bound phrase, the bound phrase is regarded as a three member phrase (9:9a).

[118]Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 110.

[119]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, 3:19a, 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, 2:5b, 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, 7:6a, 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, 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, 12:4b, 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.

8:5b וְעֵת וּמִשְׁפָּט יֵדַע לֵב חָכָם
8:5b καὶ καιρὸν κρίσεως γινώσκει καρδία σοφοῦ

While modern scholars may construe לב חכם as an attributive phrase and translate it as "a wise heart," the Tranlator read חכם 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.

2:7a קָנִיתִי עֲבָדִים וּשְׁפָחוֹת וּבְנֵי־בַיִת הָיָה לִי
2:7a ἐκτησάμην δούλους καὶ παιδίσκας καὶ οἰκογενεῖς ἐγένοντό μοι

In 2:7a the Translator used a compound noun οἰκογενεῖς for a bound phrase בני־בית. The phrase בני־בית, 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 בני־בית.

8:1b וְעֹז פָּנָיו יְשֻׁנֶּא
8:1b καὶ ἀναιδὴς προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ μισηθήσεται

---

[120]For the modern scholars' translation, see Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 281; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 79.

[121]Cf. Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 129.

[122]Cf. LSJ, s.v. "οἰκογενής."

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, "shamless of his face."[123] The dative with adjective are attested in Hellenistic Greek as well as in classical Greek.[124] 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.

10:1a זְבוּבֵי מָוֶת יַבְאִישׁ יַבִּיעַ שֶׁמֶן רוֹקֵחַ
10:1a μυῖαι θανατοῦσαι σαπριοῦσιν σκευασίαν ἐλαίου ἡδύσματος

In 10:1a the free member of the bound phrase is rendered by an attributive participle. The literal meaning of זבובי מות is "flies of death," that is understood as "dead flies" by modern scholars.[125] LXX has a somewhat different rendering: μυῖαι θανατοῦσαι "flies that bring death." The phrase זבובי מות 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 זבובי and מות as a directly causational one, which is called a genitive of effect by modern scholars.[126] The meaning of "flies of death," therefore, becomes "flies that cause death," that is "deadly flies."

10:20b וּבַעַל הַכְּנָפַיִם יַגִּיד דָּבָר
10:20b καὶ ὁ ἔχων τὰς πτέρυγας ἀπαγγελεῖ λόγον

---

[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 בעל הכנפים, 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.[127] 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.[128] Attributive adjectives occur 48 times in Ecclesiastes.[129] In all but 2 cases the Translator employed an attributive adjective in Greek (96 percent).

Example:
4:13a טוֹב יֶלֶד מִסְכֵּן וְחָכָם
4:13a ἀγαθὸς παῖς πένης καὶ σοφὸς

---

[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*.

[128]Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 114.

[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, 9:15a, 9:15b, 9:18a, 10:1b, 10:4b, 10:6a, 10:13b, 12:11b.

An attributive adjective מסכן modifying the noun ילד in Hebrew is rendered also by the attributive adjective πένης modifying the noun παῖς 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 אֵין אָדָם שַׁלִּיט בָּרוּחַ לִכְלוֹא אֶת־הָרוּחַ
8:8a οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος ἐξουσιάζων ἐν πνεύματι τοῦ κωλῦσαι σὺν τὸ πνεῦμα

The adjective שליט 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 שליט the Translator employed the participle form of ἐξουσιάζω in Greek. In 8:8a the attributive adjective שליט modifying אדם is rendered by a participle ἐξουσιάζων, which attributively modifies ἄνθρωπος.

9:4b כִּי־לְכֶלֶב חַי הוּא טוֹב מִן־הָאַרְיֵה הַמֵּת
9:4b ὅτι ὁ κύων ὁ ζῶν αὐτὸς ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τὸν λέοντα τὸν νεκρόν

The adjective חי 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 ζάω in Greek renders חי in Hebrew. The participle forms of ζάω are used for the substantive uses and an attributive use of חי, and its indicative form for the predicative use. In 9:4b an attributive adjective חי is rendered by an attributive participle ὁ ζῶν.[131]

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

---

[130]The 6 cases of the substantival use of חי 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.[132] 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 כָּל־הַנְּחָלִים הֹלְכִים אֶל־הַיָּם
1:7a πάντες οἱ χείμαρροι πορεύονται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν

The translation is evidently literal in 1:7a. The phrase כל־הנחלים 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 πάντες agrees with its modifying noun οἱ χείμαρροι.

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

4:3a וְטוֹב מִשְּׁנֵיהֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־עֵדֶן לֹא הָיָה
4:3a καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο τούτους ὅστις οὔπω ἐγένετο

The form שניהם is analyzed as the construct form of שנים 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 וְאִלּוּ חָיָה אֶלֶף שָׁנִים פַּעֲמַיִם וְטוֹבָה לֹא רָאָה
6:6a καὶ εἰ ἔζησεν χιλίων ἐτῶν καθόδους καὶ ἀγαθωσύνην οὐκ εἶδεν

---

[131]The article seems to be due to the fact that the Translator read an indeterminate form לכלב as an articular form.

[132]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 אלף is also a substantive in Hebrew, but its corresponding Greek word χιλίων 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 כל,[133] 2 instances of substantival cardinal numbers,[134] and 2 instances of other substantives.[135] 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.[136] 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:

דוד > Δαυιδ	anarthrous > anarthrous: 1:1a.
ישראל > Ισραηλ	anarthrous > anarthrous: 1:12b.[137]
ירושלם > Ιερουσαλημ	anarthrous > anarthrous: 1:1b, 1:12b, 1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a.
אלהים > θεός	arthrous > arthrous: 2:24b, 2:26b, 3:11b, 3:14a, 3:14b, 3:15a, 3:17a, 3:18a, 4:17a, 5:1a, 5:1b, 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. anarthrous > arthrous: 1:13b, 3:10b, 5:3a, 7:18b, 8:13b. anarthrous > anarthrous: 3:13b, 5:18b, 8:2b.

Normally proper nouns do not take the article in Hebrew.[138] As expected, the proper nouns דוד, ישראל, and ירושלם 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 אלהים, an appellative which has the sense of a proper name, can take the article.[139] In MT אלהים occurs in 40 instances: 32 instances are arthrous, and 8 instances are anarthrous.[140] The Translator employed arthrous θεός for all the instances of arthrous אלהים, and also for 5 out of 8 instances of anarthrous אלהים. Only in 3 instances anarthrous אלהים corresponds to anarthrous θεός.

---

[137]In 1:1b, Ισραηλ 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 אלהים 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, 12:3b, 12:14a. The 8 instances of anarthrous אלהים are 1:13b, 3:10b, 3:13b, 5:3a, 5:18b, 7:18b, 8:2b, 8:13b.

The 5 instances where anarthrous אלהים is rendered by arthrous θεός need to be explained. In 1:13b and 3:10b, אלהים functions as subject and syntactically related to the words נתן (predicate) and ענין (object). The form לאלהים in 5:3a is not graphemically distinguishable between arthrous and anarthrous form in a consonantal text. In 7:18b and 8:13b, לאלהים functions as object: object of the participle ירא in 7:18b and object of the semipreposition מלפני in 8:13b. Both instances are related to the verb ירא.[141] In other words, for the instances where אלהים functions either as subject or as object, the Translator employed arthrous θεός. In the other 3 instances where the Translator rendered anarthrous אלהים by anarthrous θεός, אלהים 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 אלהים 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 מלפני אלהים adverbially modifies ירא.

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 הכל in MT. The Translator's parent text seems to read הבל, which is an anarthrous form of הבל, instead of הכל. 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 הכנפים, which is arthrous, instead of the *Qere* form כנפים, 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 206[143]

---

[142]The categorization for the analysis is from A. Pietersma, "Articulation in the Greek Psalms: The Evidence of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV," in *Tradition of the Text: Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 109, ed. G. J. Norton and S. Pisano (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 184-202.

[143]The 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, 2:16a, 2:16b, 2:16b, 2:16b, 2:17a, 2:17a, 2:17a, 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, 3:17b, 3:18a, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:19b, 3:19b, 3:20a, 3:20b, 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, 6:7b, 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, 8:8a, 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, 11:1b, 11:2b, 11:3a, 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, 12:2a, 12:2b, 12:2b, 12:3a, 12:3a, 12:4b, 12:4b, 12:5a, 12:5a, 12:5a, 12:5b,

Arthrous in Hebrew > Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes	2[144]
Subtotal	208
Anarthrous in Hebrew > Arthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes	5[145]
Anarthrous in Hebrew > Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes	419[146]
Subtotal	424

12:6a, 12:6a, 12:6b, 12:6b, 12:6b, 12:7a, 12:7a, 12:7b, 12:8a, 12:8b, 12:9b, 12:13a, 12:13b.

[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, 1:2b, 1:3a, 1:4a, 1:4a, 1:6a, 1:6a, 1:7b, 1:8b, 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, 1:17a, 1:17b, 1:18a, 1:18a, 1:18b, 1:18b, 2:1b, 2:3b, 2:4b, 2:4b, 2:5a, 2:5a, 2:5b, 2:6a, 2:6b, 2:6b, 2:7a, 2:7a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:8a, 2:8a, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:9a, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:12a, 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, 2:23a, 2:23b, 2:24a, 2:26a, 2:26a, 2:26a, 2:26b, 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:1a, 3:1b, 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, 3:5a, 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, 4:8a, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:9b, 4:11a, 4:13a, 4:13b, 4:13b, 4:14a, 4:16a, 4:16b, 4:16b, 4:17a, 4:17b, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:2a, 5:2b, 5:2b, 5:3a, 5:3b, 5:5a, 5:6a, 5:6a, 5:6a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:8a, 5:8b, 5:9a, 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, 5:17a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 6:1a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:2b, 6:2b, 6:3a, 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, 7:3b, 7:4a, 7:4b, 7:4b, 7:5b, 7:5b, 7:6b, 7:7b, 7:8a, 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, 7:25a, 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, 8:1a, 8:1b, 8:2a, 8:3b, 8:4a, 8:5a, 8:5a, 8:5b, 8:5b, 8:5b, 8:6a, 8:6a, 8:6a, 8:8a, 8:8a, 8:8a, 8:8b, 8:9a, 8:9a, 8:10a, 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, 9:8b, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:10a, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11b, 9:11b, 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, 10:8b, 10:9a, 10:9b, 10:10a, 10:10b, 10:10b, 10:11a, 10:11b, 10:12a, 10:12b, 10:13a, 10:13b, 10:14a, 10:15b, 10:16a, 10:16a, 10:17a, 10:17a, 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, 12:1b, 12:1b, 12:4a, 12:5a, 12:6a, 12:8a, 12:8b, 12:9a, 12:9a, 12:9b, 12:9b, 12:9b, 12:10a, 12:10a, 12:10b, 12:10b, 12:12a, 12:12b, 12:12b, 12:12b, 12:12b, 12:13a, 12:14a.

Total 632

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 כִּי בָא הַחֲלוֹם בְּרֹב עִנְיָן
5:2a ὅτι παραγίνεται ἐνύπνιον ἐν πλήθει περισπασμοῦ

8:17a וְרָאִיתִי אֶת־כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה הָאֱלֹהִים כִּי לֹא יוּכַל הָאָדָם
לִמְצוֹא אֶת־הַמַּעֲשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר נַעֲשָׂה תַּחַת־הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
8:17a καὶ εἶδον σὺν πάντα τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι οὐ δυνήσεται ἄνθρωπος
τοῦ εὑρεῖν σὺν τὸ ποίημα τὸ πεποιημένον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

Above are 2 cases where arthrous nouns are rendered by anarthrous nouns. The word חלום 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 ἐνύπνιον. The Greek noun ἐνύπνιον is used both with the article and without article in Hellenistic Greek with little difference in meaning.[147] The evidence for חלום in Ecclesiastes is not enough to posit what the consonantal text of the Translator might have been in 5:2a.

In Ecclesiastes the word אדם 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).[148] In 2:24a and 2:26a, אדם is prefixed by

---

[147]Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ἐνύπνιον"; Bauer, s.v. "ἐνύπνιον."

[148]For more discussion on rendering of articulation, see Peter J. Gentry, "The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes in the Marginal Notes in the Syro-hexapla," *AS* 2.1 (2004), 63-83.; J. Ziegler, "Der Gebrauch des Artikels

inseparable prepositions ב and כ repectively. The form באדם in 2:24a is vocalized as arthrous in the MT but is rendered by an anarthrous from. On the contrary, the form כאדם 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 אדם (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 הֲבֵל הֲבָלִים אָמַר קֹהֶלֶת
1:2a ματαιότης ματαιοτήτων εἶπεν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής

7:27a רְאֵה זֶה מָצָאתִי אָמְרָה קֹהֶלֶת
7:27a ἰδὲ τοῦτο εὗρον εἶπεν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής

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

---

in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes," in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*, ed. D. Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John Wm Wevers (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 83-120.

[149]Ziegler does not note the occurrence in 8:17a in "Der Gebrauch des Artikels."

division may be אמר הקהלת, which is reflected in LXX.[150] 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 אמר and קהלת

Evidence	MT	LXX
1:2a	אמר קהלת	εἶπεν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής
7:27a	אמרה קהלת	εἶπεν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής
12:8a	אמר הקהלת	εἶπεν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής

Whenever קהלת followed אמר, the Translator employed an arthrous form ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής.[151] In other places Ἐκκλησιαστής is anarthrous.[152] In a consonantal text, 7:27a and 12:8a could be regarded as the same form, and their Greek equivalents reflect אמר הקהלת. Thus, based upon this pattern one can posit that in the consonantal text the Translator also had הקהלת in 1:2a.

9:2b כַּטּוֹב כַּחֹטֶא הַנִּשְׁבָּע כַּאֲשֶׁר שְׁבוּעָה יָרֵא
9:2b ὡς ὁ ἀγαθός ὡς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων ὡς ὁ ὀμνύων καθὼς ὁ τὸν ὅρκον φοβούμενος

12:11a וּכְמַשְׂמְרוֹת נְטוּעִים בַּעֲלֵי אֲסֻפּוֹת
12:11a καὶ ὡς ἧλοι 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 שבועה occurs twice, both times anarthrous in MT (8:2b, 9:2b).[153] The Translator uses anarthrous ὅρκος for 8:2b but arthrous ὅρκος for 9:2b. It is unclear why the Translator used an arthrous form in 9:2b. In 12:11a the anarthrous אספות is a free member of the בעלי construct and is rendered by arthrous τῶν συναγμάτων. The noun בעל occurs 7 times in Ecclesiastes and functions as *nomen regens* in all instances. A Greek equivalent for בעל is always arthrous, and its free member is also treated as definite all the time. Thus, rendering אספות by τῶν συναγμάτων follows the normal approach.

12:14a כִּי אֶת־כָּל־מַעֲשֶׂה הָאֱלֹהִים יָבִא בְּמִשְׁפָּט
12:14a ὅτι σὺν πᾶν τὸ ποίημα ὁ θεὸς ἄξει ἐν κρίσει

The rendering of articulation of מעשה seems to be related to the rendering of other neighboring words such as את or כל-. 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 את

---

[153]One in 8:2b appears as a bound form of a bound phrase. Another one in

Table 2. Rendering of Articulation of מעשה

	Hebrew					Greek				
	NM/Sf.	מעשה	Art.	כל	את	σύν	πᾶς	Art.	Ποίημα	Gen.
1:14a		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2:4a	X	X							X	X
2:11a	X	X		X			X		X	X
2:17a		X	X					X	X	
*3:11b		X	X		X	?		X	X	
3:17b		X	X	X			X	X	X	
3:22a	X	X							X	X
4:3b		X	X		X	X		X	X	
4:4a		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
*5:5b	X	X			X	?		+	X	X
*7:13a	X	X			X	?		+	X	X
8:9a		X		X			X		X	
8:14a	X	X							X	X
8:14a	X	X							X	X
*8:17a	X	X		X	X	X	X	+	X	X
8:17a		X	X		X	X		X	X	
*9:7b	X	X			X	?		+	X	X
9:10b		X							X	
*11:5b	X	X			X	?		+	X	X
*12:14a		X		X	X	X	X	+	X	
Total	10	21	7	7	11	6	7	13	21	10

and articles.[154] In 4 cases the particle σύν may be expected for את, 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: את + מעשה + NR/Sf. Wherever this arrangement occurs, an article in Greek renders את. If the elements are arranged by את + כל + מעשה + (NR), an article is added (8:17a, 12:14a). There is 1 case where σύν for את is just dropped out (3:11b). This may be abnormal because σύν for את exists in 4:3b and 8:17a which have

9:2b functions as the object of ירא.

the same arrangement of words in Hebrew with 3:11b. σύν is expected in 3:11b based upon the rendering pattern. The evidence indicates that the rendering of the article and את followed by מעשה is motivated by the certain syntagms.[155]

In sum, 625 occurrences of the article attached to free forms out of 631 are rendered by the article in Greek (99 percent).[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.[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.[158]

---

[154]They are 7 instances: 3:11b, 5:5b, 7:13a, 8:17a, 9:7b, 12:14a.

[155]The rendering of the *nota accusativi* את is fully discussed below.

[156]They include the case of 7:27a.

[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.

[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[159]
Arthrous in MT > Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes	31[160]
Subtotal	58
Anarthrous in MT > Arthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes	17[161]
Anarthrous in MT > Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes	62[162]
Subtotal	79
Total	137[163]

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 ל is

---

idiomatic expressions (5:10b, 5:12b, 7:12b, 10:11b, 10:17b). The 2 cases where כל 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, 6:12a, 6:12b, 7:23a, 8:8a, 8:15a, 9:2a, 9:3a, 9:9b, 9:11a, 9:12a, 11:3a, 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, 6:4a, 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, 2:21a, 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, 5:18a, 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.[164] 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.

Anarthrous in Hebrew > Arthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes 15[165]
Anarthrous in Hebrew > Anarthrous in Greek Ecclesiastes 150[166]

---

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.

Total 165

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.[167] 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, 3:19a, 3:21a, 3:21a, 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, 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, 7:12b, 7:14a, 7:14a, 8:1a, 8:1b, 8:1b, 8:2a, 8:2b, 8:2b, 8:6b, 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, 10:1a, 10:2a, 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, 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.

(84 percent).[168] 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* את immediatedly precedes a bound form functioning as NR (7 cases).[169] 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 44[170]

---

[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 σύν," in *Lebendige Forschung im Alten Testament*, *ZAW* 100, supp. vol. (1988): 229, 231-232. To be excluded are the cases of את followed by כל, which is rendered by adjective πᾶς (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	82[171]
Total	126

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* את precedes the forms in question, the Translator always used the article for the particle.[172] The את 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 את.[173] The above analysis on articulation reveals that *nota accusativi* את has a certain effect on articulation in Greek. The *nota accusativi* את occurs 75 times in Ecclesiastes.[174] In his study, "Die Wiedergabe der nota accusativi

---

10:16b, 10:17a, 10:17b, 11:1a, 11:6a, 11:6a, 11:6b, 11:9a, 12:13b. In 7:18b and 11:6b pronominal suffixes are not rendered in Greek Ecclesiastes.

[171]The 82 instances are 1:3b, 1:6b, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:17a, 2:3b, 2:3b, 2:4a, 2:9b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:18a, 2:20a, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:22a, 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, 9:7a, 9:7a, 9:8a, 9:8b, 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, 5:5a, 5:18a, 7:18a, 7:18b, 7:21b, 8:9a, 8:16a, 9:7b, 9:12a, 11:6a, 12:13b. See the discussion on את 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 עת is read as את.

'et, 'aet- mit σύν," Ziegler categorizes the renderings of את in Greek Ecclesiastes into eight groups:[175]

1. את + Art(icle) > + Art.
2. את-הכל > συν τα παντα
3. את-כלם > συν πασιν αυτοις
4. את-כל + Subst(antive) > συν παν + Subst.
5. את אשר > συν τα οσα
6. את > Masked συν
7. את + Art. > συν missing
8. את > Art.

There are 4 Instances which are not included by Ziegler: the 2 instances of את אשר in 4:3a and 7:13b, and 2 instances of את 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 את are categorized into three groups.[176] First, if bound forms functioning as NR or bound forms with pronominal suffixes follow את, the

---

[175]Ziegler, "Die Wiedergabe der nota accusativi" 222-233.

[176]Rahlfs believes that this approach is that of Aquila and comments that Aquila usually renders את by the preposition σύν, but if an article is absent, an article renders את. However, Rahlfs does not correctly and fully present the cases where את occurs. See his note on τὰ ὅσα in 2:12.

Translator employed an article for את.[177] None of the 31 instances in the first group has an article following את in Hebrew.[178]

Examples:
(bound form with a pronominal suffix)
1:13a וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־לִבִּי לִדְרוֹשׁ וְלָתוּר בַּחָכְמָה
1:13a καὶ ἔδωκα τὴν καρδίαν μου τοῦ ἐκζητῆσαι καὶ τοῦ κατασκέψασθαι ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ
(bound form functioning as NR)
5:19a כִּי לֹא הַרְבֵּה יִזְכֹּר אֶת־יְמֵי חַיָּיו
5:19a ὅτι οὐ πολλὰ μνησθήσεται τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ

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

3:15b וְהָאֱלֹהִים יְבַקֵּשׁ אֶת־נִרְדָּף
3:15b καὶ ὁ θεὸς ζητήσει τὸν διωκόμενον

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

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

Examples:
1:14a רָאִיתִי אֶת־כָּל־הַמַּעֲשִׂים שֶׁנַּעֲשׂוּ תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
1:14a εἶδον σὺν πάντα τὰ ποιήματα τὰ πεποιημένα ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

2:17a וְשָׂנֵאתִי אֶת־הַחַיִּים כִּי רַע עָלַי הַמַּעֲשֶׂה
2:17a καὶ ἐμίσησα σὺν τὴν ζωήν ὅτι πονηρὸν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὸ ποίημα

---

[177]The cases include כל plus pronominal suffix (2:14b, 9:11b) and exclude כל functioning as NR.

[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, σύν renders את in all 11 cases where כל follows את.[179] If the noun has an article like 2:17a, the Translator normally translated את by σύν (22 instances).[180]

There are 4 arthrous nouns where σύν is expected for את 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 וּמִלַּט־הוּא אֶת־הָעִיר בְּחָכְמָתוֹ
9:15a καὶ διασώσει αὐτὸς τὴν πόλιν ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ

In 9:15a, one would expect σύν for את because of the presence of the article, but the Translator deviated from the nomal approach.

The final group includes 5 instances where אשר-clauses follow את.[181] According to Rahlfs' text, the Translator always employed τὰ ὅσα for את אשר which adverbially functions in accusative case (2:12b, 8:9b).[182]

2:12b כִּי מֶה הָאָדָם שֶׁיָּבוֹא אַחֲרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־כְּבָר עָשׂוּהוּ
2:12b ὅτι τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐπελεύσεται ὀπίσω τῆς βουλῆς τὰ ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτήν

8:9b עֵת אֲשֶׁר שָׁלַט הָאָדָם בְּאָדָם לְרַע לוֹ
8:9b τὰ ὅσα ἐξουσιάσατο ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ κακῶσαι αὐτόν

---

[179]The 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 כל.

[180]The 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 כל. In 7:14b, a demonstrative pronoun זה follows את, and the demonstrative pronoun is to be treated like an articular noun.

[181]See p. 96 of this dissertation.

[182]In 8:9b, the Translator construed עת as את.

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 את. On the other hand, based upon weight of the witnesses and Ziegler's study, Gentry takes σὺν τὰ ὅσα as original.[183]

When את אשר-clause functions as nominal clause, the approach is more varied. In 5:3b, את אשר introduces an object clause. For its equivalent, Rahlfs follows SC and V† which contain σύν.

5:3b אֵת אֲשֶׁר־תִּדֹּר שַׁלֵּם
5:3b σὺν ὅσα ἐὰν εὔξῃ ἀπόδος

In the other 2 instances (4:3a, 7:13b), the Translator renders את אשר by ὅστις in 4:3a (subject clause) or ὃν ἄν (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 אשר את. For the case of 9:11b, Rahlfs seems to make a sound judgement. When את followed a substantive with a suffix, the article always renders את. Therefore, כלם 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

---

[183]Peter J. Gentry, "Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three: The Priority of a New Critical Edition of Hexaplaric Fragments," *AS* 2.2 (2004), 163-64; Ziegler, "Die Wiedergabe der *nota accusativi*," 229-30.

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* את 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.[184] 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.

in Greek, so they are also discussed here.[185]

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.[186] 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.

אני (1 c.s. Pronoun)

The personal pronoun 1 c.s. אני occurs 29 times in Greek Ecclesiastes, and in 28 instances it is rendered by ἐγώ (97 percent).[187] There is 1 instance where אני is not rendered as such. In 8:2a there is no Greek equivalent for אני at all.

8:2a אֲנִי פִּי־מֶלֶךְ שְׁמוֹר
8:2a στόμα βασιλέως φύλαξον

The pronoun אני does not fit syntactically into the sentence. Some scholars suggest emending אני in MT as את (*'ēt*) based upon the ancient versions which include LXX.[188] The Translator, however, would have used the article for את since the presumed *nota*

---

[185]Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 148 n. 195.

[186]Cf. Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §16.2.

[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, 2:18a, 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.

[188]BHS-Horst; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 80. Cf. Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 279.

accusativi precedes a bound phrase.[189] Therefore, one cannot argue that the parent text of the Translator had את instead of אני. Other suggestions have been made to explain the אני in MT. For example, Gordis suggests that אני is an elliptical form for אמרתי אני,[190] and Whitley proposes that אני פי־מלך must be read as אנפי־מלך ("in the presence of king").[191] Greek Ecclesiastes gives no indication of such changes. Since the translation of the form אני is strictly literal elsewhere, it is likely that the Translator did not have the form אני in his parent text.[192]

אתה (2 m.s. Pronoun)

The personal pronoun 2 m.s. אתה occurs 4 times in Greek Ecclesiastes (5:1b, 7:22b, 9:9b, 9:10b). All of them are rendered by σύ.

הוא (3 m.s. Pronoun)

The form הוא 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 αὐτός: 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.

[190]Gordis, *Koheleth*, 277f. But see 2:1a.

[191]Charles F. Whitley, *Koheleth: His Language and Thought* (New York: de Gruyter, 1979), 71f.

[192]Gentry suggests a haplography (personal conversation). The form אני is preceded by ישנא. The verb ends נא, and the next word begins אנ. Thus אני could have been erroneously omitted.

1:9a מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה הוּא שֶׁיִּהְיֶה
1:9a τί τὸ γεγονός αὐτὸ τὸ γενησόμενον[193]

In 9 instances, הוא is construed as the copula and rendered by a form of εἰμί: 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 הוא by a form of εἰμί. All 7 instances where הוא occurs at the end of the clause are included in this category.[194]

Example:
2:23b גַּם־זֶה הֶבֶל הוּא
2:23b καί γε τοῦτο ματαιότης ἐστίν

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

1:13b הוּא עִנְיַן רָע
נָתַן אֱלֹהִים לִבְנֵי הָאָדָם לַעֲנוֹת בּוֹ
1:13b ὅτι περισπασμὸν πονηρὸν
ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ περισπᾶσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ

Modern scholars analyze the form הוא as demonstrative pronoun and רע ענין as nominative predicate. The following clause is an asyndetic relative clause and modifies רע ענין: "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.

[194]The 7 instances are 1:10a, 2:23b, 3:15a, 4:8b, 5:8a (*Qere*), 6:2b, 10:3b.

[195]Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 1.

[196]For 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 הוא refers to. The ὅτι-clause provides a comment on what Qoheleth has discovered, which is the referent of הוא in the Translator's understanding. Though the conjunction ὅτι is not formally equivalent to הוא, it is functionally equivalent.

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

היא (3 f.s. Pronoun)

The form היא 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 αὐτός (3:21a, 3:21b, 4:4a, 7:23b). In the other 8 instances, the Translator took היא 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 היא is clause initial or follows a participle, the Translator took it as a subject and renders it by the form of αὐτός.

Examples:
(היא in the second position following participle)
3:21b וְרוּחַ הַבְּהֵמָה הַיֹּרֶדֶת הִיא לְמַטָּה לָאָרֶץ
3:21b καὶ πνεῦμα τοῦ κτήνους εἰ καταβαίνει αὐτὸ κάτω εἰς γῆν

(היא in the first position of the clause)
4:4a כִּי הִיא קִנְאַת־אִישׁ מֵרֵעֵהוּ
4:4a ὅτι αὐτὸ ζῆλος ἀνδρὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑταίρου αὐτοῦ

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

9:13b וּגְדוֹלָה הִיא אֵלַי

---

[197]In 5 instances out of 8, the verb היה is located at the end of the clause.

9:13b καὶ μεγάλη ἐστὶν πρός με

In 9:13b, היא neither occurs in initial position nor follows the participle, so the Translator employed the copula rather than αὐτός.

הם (3 m.p. Pronoun)

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

3:18b שְׁהֵם־בְּהֵמָה הֵמָּה לָהֶם
3:18b ὅτι αὐτοὶ κτήνη εἰσὶν καί 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.[198] 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.[199]

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 אין 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.[200]

Personal Pronoun > Personal Pronoun:
Matching Gender, Number, Person
(274)

1 c.s. Pronoun (51)

1:13a, 1:16a, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:17a, 2:1a, 2:3a, 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:4a, 2:4b, 2:4b, 2:5a, 2:6a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:9a, 2:9b, 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, 2:18a, 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,[201] 9:13b, 12:1b, 12:12a.

2 m.s. Pronoun (47)

---

[199]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.

[200]The categorization is borrowed from Gentry, *Greek Job*, 151-67.

[201]The Translator might have read ולבור את in MT as ולבי ראה.

2:1a, 4:17a, 5:1a, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:5a, 5:5a, 5:5b, 5:5b, 7:9a, 7:17b, 7:18a, 7:21a, 7:21b, 7:21b, 7:22a, 7:22a,[202] 9:7a, 9:7a, 9:7b, 9:8a, 9:8b, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:9b, 9:9b, 9:10a, 9:10a, 10:4a, 10:4a, 10:20a, 10:20a, 11:1a, 11:6a, 11:6a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9a, 11:9b, 11:10a, 11:10a, 12:1a, 12:1a.

2 f.s. Pronoun (6)

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

3 m.s. Pronoun (116)

1:3b, 1:5b, 1:6b, 1:13b, 2:14a, 2:14a, 2:18b, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:22a, 2:22a, 2:23a, 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, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:19a, 5:19b, 6:2a, 6:2a, 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)

5:10a, 5:10b, 7:12b, 7:26a, 7:26a, 7:26b, 7:26b, 9:14a, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:15a.

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,[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.

Pseudoverbs With Pronominal

---

[202]It is a doublet, i.e., the Hebrew is rendered twice in 7:22a.

[203]The 3 m.p. pronoun is rendered by the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος. The deitic force of the pronoun is emphasized.

Suffixes (12)

There are 12 instances where the existential pseudoverb אין with pronominal suffixes is rendered. The 3 m.s. pronoun is affixed to אין in 7 instances, the 3 m.p. pronoun in 3 instances, and the 3 m.p. pronoun in 2 instances.[204] In 10 instances out of 12, the negative οὐκ plus copula verb renders the pseudoverb אין with pronouns.[205] 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 וְהַיָּם אֵינֶנּוּ מָלֵא
1:7a καὶ ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔσται ἐμπιμπλαμένη

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

9:2a וְלַזֹּבֵחַ וְלַאֲשֶׁר אֵינֶנּוּ זֹבֵחַ
9:2a καὶ τῷ θυσιάζοντι καὶ τῷ μὴ θυσιάζοντι

11:6b כִּי אֵינְךָ יוֹדֵעַ אֵי זֶה יִכְשָׁר הַזֶּה אוֹ־זֶה
11:6b ὅτι οὐ γινώσκεις ποῖον στοιχήσει ἢ τοῦτο ἢ τοῦτο

In 9:2a the אשר-clause is the object of the preposition. The Translator used for the clause the articular participle functioning as substantive. The pseudoverb אין is rendered by the negative μή, and the 3 m.s. pronoun affixed to אין is expressed in the person of participle. In 11:6b the participle יודע is rendered by the present indicative γινώσκεις, 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 suprising.

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 וְהָרוּחַ תָּשׁוּב אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר נְתָנָהּ
12:7b καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς τὸν θεόν ὃς ἔδωκεν αὐτό

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

Personal Pronun > 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]Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, §322.

m.p.

9:3b וְגַם לֵב בְּנֵי־הָאָדָם מָלֵא־רָע
וְהוֹלֵלוֹת בִּלְבָבָם בְּחַיֵּיהֶם
וְאַחֲרָיו אֶל־הַמֵּתִים
9:3b καί γε καρδία υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπληρώθη πονηροῦ
καὶ περιφέρεια ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν ἐν ζωῇ αὐτῶν
καὶ ὀπίσω αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς νεκρούς

In Hebrew it is not clear to what the 3 m.s. pronoun in אחריו refers because everything is plural in 9:3b except the distributive singular לב, 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.

10:15a עֲמַל הַכְּסִילִים תְּיַגְּעֶנּוּ
10:15b אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדַע לָלֶכֶת אֶל־עִיר
10:15a μόχθος τῶν ἀφρόνων κοπώσει αὐτούς
10:15b ὃς οὐκ ἔγνω τοῦ πορευθῆναι εἰς πόλιν

Context requires that the pronoun 3 m.s. in תיגענו refer to the plural noun הכסילים. The lack of concord in gender presents a textual problem. Several Hebrew manuscripts attest the singular הכסיל, which agrees with the pronoun in number.[208] LXX^{SA} also have ἀφρόνος and αὐτόν. The singular forms fit well with the singular verb ידע (ἔγνω) 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, πονηροῦ,.περιφέρεια, ζωῇ), 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.[209] 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 כִּי מִי יֹאכַל וּמִי יָחוּשׁ חוּץ מִמֶּנִּי
2:25a ὅτι τίς φάγεται καὶ τίς φείσεται πάρεξ αὐτοῦ

The 1 c.s. pronoun in 2:25a is rendered by a 3 m.s. pronoun in Greek. The Greek words πάρεξ αὐτου reflect חוץ ממנו instead of חוץ ממני. 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 י- is actually 3 m.s.[210] However, the pronoun י- is never used as 3. m.s. elsewhere in Ecclesiastes.[211] The letters ו and י 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.

[210]M. Dahood, "The Phoenician Background of Qoheleth," *Bib* 47 (1966): 269; Whitley, *Koheleth*, 29; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 141.

[211]Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 141.

to be considered in their contexts.

5:16a גַּם כָּל־יָמָיו בַּחֹשֶׁךְ יֹאכֵל
5:16b וְכַעַס הַרְבֵּה וְחָלְיוֹ וָקָצֶף
5:16a καί γε πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτοῦ ἐν σκότει καὶ πένθει
5:16b καὶ θυμῷ πολλῷ καὶ ἀρρωστίᾳ καὶ χόλῳ

7:18b כִּי־יִרֵא אֱלֹהִים יֵצֵא אֶת־כֻּלָּם
7:18b ὅτι φοβούμενος τὸν θεὸν ἐξελεύσεται τὰ πάντα

11:6b וְאִם־שְׁנֵיהֶם כְּאֶחָד טוֹבִים
11:6b καὶ ἐὰν 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.[212] He must have read חליו (noun plus 3 m.s. pronoun) in 5:16b simply as a noun חלי with the *waw* resulting from haplography.[213] 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: כל ("all") in 7:18b and שני ("two") in 11:6b. The Translator did not render the pronouns. It is possibly because the nouns themselves could convey the idea of quantity.[214]

Demonstratives

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

---

[212]The Translator read the verb יאכל in MT as a noun with *waw* (*wā'ēbel*), and the verb כעס also as a noun (*ka'as*).

[213]If the reading of LXX is orginal, then the reading in MT is due to dittography.

זה (*zeh* m.s. Near Demonstrative)

The form זה (*zeh*) occurs 37 times in Ecclesiastes. In 35 instances, זה is construed as the near demonstrative m.s. and is rendered by some form of οὗτος.[215]

Example:
2:19b גַּם־זֶה הֶבֶל
2:19b καί γε τοῦτο ματαιότης

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

זה (*zōh* f.s. Near Demonstrative)

The near demonstrative pronoun f.s. זה (*zōh*) occurs 11 times in MT, and 6 of them are in Ecclesiastes.[216] זאת is not used in Ecclesiastes.[217] The Translator employed the neuter forms of οὗτος for all occurrences.[218]

Example:
2:2b וּלְשִׂמְחָה מַה־זֹּה עֹשֶׂה
2:2b καὶ τῇ εὐφροσύνῃ τί τοῦτο ποιεῖς

---

[214]However, the 3 m.p. pronoun affixed to כל or שני is rendered by the corresponding prounoun in 2:14b, 4:3a, 9:11b, 11:8a.

[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, 6:5b, 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 ל plus זה is simply rendered by the dative form of οὗτος.

[216]The 6 occurrences are 2:2b, 2:24b, 5:15a, 5:18b, 7:23a, 9:13a. Cf. Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §17.2a.

[217]Ibid., §17 n 6.

[218]For the feminine used as a neutrum in Hebrew, see Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §17.4.3b.

אלה (m.p. Near Demonstrative)

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

Example:
11:9b וְדָע כִּי עַל־כָּל־אֵלֶּה יְבִיאֲךָ הָאֱלֹהִים בַּמִּשְׁפָּט
11:9b καὶ γνῶθι ὅτι ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις ἄξει σε ὁ θεὸς ἐν κρίσει

הוא (m.s. Far Demonstrative)

In 4 instances, הוא is rendered by demonstratives: twice by the near demonstrative τοῦτο (2:1b, 7:2a) and twice by the far demonstrative ἐκεῖνος (5:13a, 9:15b). There may be a reason why the Translator rendered הוא 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 τοῦτο for the former and ἐκεῖνος for the latter.

Examples:
2:1b וְהִנֵּה גַם־הוּא הָבֶל
2:1b καὶ ἰδοὺ καί γε τοῦτο ματαιότης

5:13a וְאָבַד הָעֹשֶׁר הַהוּא בְּעִנְיַן רָע
5:13a καὶ ἀπολεῖται ὁ πλοῦτος ἐκεῖνος ἐν περισπασμῷ πονηρῷ

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

---

[219]Joüon argues that only the articular form ההוא can function as demonstrative but not the anarthrous form הוא (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

מי (Animate Interrogative)

The animate interrogative 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 מי is straightforwardly literal.

מה (Inanimate Interrogative)

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

מה with Preposition ל (4)

למה > ἵνα μή (5:5b, 7:17b); למה > ἵνα τί (2:15a); למה > μήποτε (7:16b). In Hebrew, למה is mainly used for a simple question: "why?" למה in 2:15a is understood in this way and rendered by ἵνα τί, which also asks "why?"

2:15a וְלָמָּה חָכַמְתִּי אֲנִי אָז יוֹתֵר
2:15a καὶ ἵνα τί ἐσοφισάμην ἐγὼ τότε περισσόν

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

---

[220]In 4:8b, the Translator used τίνι (the dative of τίς) for למי (*l^e^mî*).

[221]The total number includes the case of 3:19b where מותר might have been understood as *mā yōtar*. See p. 18 of this dissertation.

alternative: "lest something else happen," or "otherwise something else will happen."[222] 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 ἵνα μή or μήποτε for reflecting the negative sense of the clauses. The conjunction μήποτε is a stylistic variation of ἵνα μή. Both mean: "in order that / so that . . .not"[223]

Example:
7:16a וְאַל־תִּתְחַכַּם יוֹתֵר
7:16b לָמָּה תִּשּׁוֹמֵם
7:16a καὶ μὴ σοφίζου περισσά
7:16b μήποτε ἐκπλαγῇς

In 5:5b and 7:17b as well as 7:16b, מה follows a negative command while מה in 2:15a follows an assertive sentence. The מה-clauses after negative commands should be understood as rhetorical questions. On the other hand, the מה-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 מה betray that he understood Hebrew sentences in their deep structures.

מה followed by ש (7)

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

1:9a מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה הוּא שֶׁיִּהְיֶה
וּמַה־שֶּׁנַּעֲשָׂה הוּא שֶׁיֵּעָשֶׂה
1:9a τί τὸ γεγονός αὐτὸ τὸ γενησόμενον
καὶ τί τὸ πεποιημένον αὐτὸ τὸ ποιηθησόμενον

8:7a כִּי־אֵינֶנּוּ יֹדֵעַ מַה־שֶּׁיִּהְיֶה
8:7a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν γινώσκων τί τὸ ἐσόμενον

---

[222]Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §18.3c.

10:14b לֹא־יֵדַע הָאָדָם מַה־שֶּׁיִּהְיֶה
10:14b οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ ἄνθρωπος τί τὸ γενόμενον

מה ש > τό (1). The single example occurs in 3:15a.

3:15a מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה כְּבָר הוּא
3:15a τὸ γενόμενον ἤδη ἐστίν

במה ש > ἐν ᾧ ἐὰν (1). The one example occurs in 3:22b.

3:22b כִּי מִי יְבִיאֶנּוּ לִרְאוֹת בְּמֶה שֶׁיִּהְיֶה אַחֲרָיו
3:22b ὅτι τίς ἄξει αὐτὸν τοῦ ἰδεῖν ἐν ᾧ ἐὰν γένηται μετ' αὐτόν

מה ש > εἴ τι (1). The one example occurs in 6:10a.

6:10a מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה כְּבָר נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ
6:10a εἴ τι ἐγένετο ἤδη κέκληται ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

Four instances of מה in 1:9a, 1:9a, 8:7a, and 10:14b function as the interrogative "what?" and ש as the headless relative.[224] The Translator used the interrogative τί for מה and nominalizes the ש-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, מה ש is rendered simply by the article τό. The Translator probably rendered ש by the article and did not render מה on purpose. By doing this he made clear that he construed 3:15a as one sentence rather than two. If he rendered מה ש by τί τό, 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 מה ש 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, מה is not only followed by the relative particle ש but also associated with the preposition ב. The relative clause becomes the object of the preposition in this verse. The Translator rendered מה ש by ὃς ἐάν. Since ὃς ἐάν 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 מה ש-clause is also understood as the indefinite relative clause. The Translator used the so-called conditional relative for the מה ש. The conditional relative clause introduced by εἴ τι can also express the indefinite sense.[227] Therefore, εἴ τι is also a functional equivalent for מה ש in 6:10a.

---

[225]For the analysis, the present writer is indebted to Gentry (private conversation).

[226]The pronoun מה for the indefinite use is sometimes followed by ש. See Waltke and O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §18.3e; Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, §436; GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §137c.

[227]For the indefinite sense of the conditional relatives, see Robertson, *Grammar*, 956.

In sum, the approach to מה followed by ש is varied but functionally literal. Each rendering reflects the Translator's sensitivity to the context.

מה Standing Alone (16)

מה > 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 כִּי מֶה־הוֹוֶה לָאָדָם בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ
2:22a ὅτι τί γίνεται τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ

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

Example:
1:3a מַה־יִּתְרוֹן לָאָדָם
1:3a τίς περισσεία τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ

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

2:12b כִּי מֶה הָאָדָם שֶׁיָּבוֹא אַחֲרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ
2:12b ὅτι τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐπελεύσεται ὀπίσω τῆς βουλῆς

When מה 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 περισσεία (1:3a, 3:9a, 5:15b, 6:8a) and ἡ ὁδὸς (11:5a). In 1 instance the translator used the animate pronoun τίς

---

[228]The Translator probably read מותר in 3:19b as *mā yōtēr*. See p. 18 of this dissertation.

(m./f.s.) for מה (2:12b). In 2:12b, מה is rhetorically used for self-abasement or insult.[229] Since the referent of מה 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 כִּי מַה־יּוֹתֵר לֶחָכָם מִן־הַכְּסִיל
6:8b מַה־לֶּעָנִי יוֹדֵעַ לַהֲלֹךְ נֶגֶד הַחַיִּים
6:8a ὅτι τίς περισσεία τῷ σοφῷ ὑπὲρ τὸν ἄφρονα
6:8b διότι ὁ πένης οἶδεν πορευθῆναι κατέναντι τῆς ζωῆς

Only in 6:8b the Translator rendered מה 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 מה which makes sense. διὰ τί seems to be confused for διότι paleographically in an early stage of transmission. Furthermore, the change from ὅτι to διότι as in 6:8a and 6:8b is standard.[231]

7:24a רָחוֹק מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה
7:24a μακρὰν ὑπὲρ ὃ ἦν

The preposition ὑπέρ probably renders the comparative מן rather than the interrogative מה. The Translator's rendering of 7:24aβ reflects משהיה (*miššehāyâ*) or

---

[229]George W. Coats, "Self-Abasement and Insult Formulas," *JBL* 89 (1970): 17-19; Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §18.3g.

[230]123^{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 ὅτι, see LSJ, s.v. διότι II.

מהחיה (*mihahõyeh*) not מה־שהיה. Therefore, this case must be excluded from the instances of the interrogative מה and regarded as an instance of the preposition מן.

אי and Related Form איך

אי-זה > ποῖον (2:3b, 11:6b)

Example:
11:6b כִּי אֵינְךָ יוֹדֵעַ אֵי זֶה יִכְשָׁר הַזֶּה אוֹ־זֶה
11:6b ὅτι οὐ γινώσκεις ποῖον στοιχήσει ἢ τοῦτο ἢ τοῦτο

איך > πῶς (2:16b, 4:11b)

Example:
2:16b וְאֵיךְ יָמוּת הֶחָכָם עִם־הַכְּסִיל
2:16b καὶ πῶς ἀποθανεῖται ὁ σοφὸς μετὰ τοῦ ἄφρονος

The word אי is interrogative in use and locative in reference ('where?').[232] With the emphatic זה, אי זה means literally 'where indeed.' Both instances of אי זה in 2:3b and in 11:6b occur in indirect questions with the meaning of 'which?'[233] Its Greek equivalent ποῖος had already been used for אי זה by other LXX translators.[234]

The form איך ('how?'), which is a related form to אי, 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 איך.

Relatives

---

[232]Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §18.4a.

[233]Ibid., §18 n.25.

[234]Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, 1170.

אשר

The form אשר occurs 89 times in Ecclesiastes.[235] אשר can introduce relative clauses. subordinate clauses, and substantive clauses in Hebrew.[236] Whether אשר is construed as a relative or not, all the occurrences of the form will be discussed here for the sake of completeness. The form אשר is translated in various ways in Ecclesiastes. All the renderings of אשר can be grouped according to their functions:

אשר > ὅς (36) / ὅσος (8) / ὅστις (4)
/ ὅς εἰμί (1)

The Greek relative ὅς renders אשר in 36 occurrences (40 percent).[237] The relative ὅς is an appropriate and expected rendering of אשר functioning as relative.

Example:
12:7b וְהָרוּחַ תָּשׁוּב אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר נְתָנָהּ
12:7b καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς τὸν θεόν ὃς ἔδωκεν αὐτό

In 5:17a, the second אשר is rendered by ὅς εἰμί. The adjective יפה functions as 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, 5:17a, 5:17b, 5:18a, 6:1a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:10a, 6:12b, 7:2a, 7:13b, 7:18a, 7:19b, 7:20b, 7:21a, 7:21b, 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, 8:15a, 8:15b, 8:16a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2b, 9:3a, 9:4a, 9:6b, 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.

[236]Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, §145, §154f, §157a, d, e, §167j, and §168f; Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §19, §38; GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §36, §138, §155, §157c, §165d, §165b, and §166b.

[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, 9:9a, 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.

5:17a הִנֵּה אֲשֶׁר־רָאִיתִי אָנִי טוֹב אֲשֶׁר־יָפֶה
5:17a ἰδοὺ ὃ εἶδον ἐγὼ ἀγαθόν ὅ ἐστιν καλόν

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

Example:
3:14a יָדַעְתִּי כִּי כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה הָאֱלֹהִים הוּא יִהְיֶה לְעוֹלָם
3:14a ἔγνων ὅτι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός αὐτὰ ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

There are 2 cases in which אשר is rendered by ὅσα functioning as an adverbial accusative (2:12a, 8:9b).[242] In both instances, אשר is preceded by so-called the *nota accusativi*.[243] The construction את אשר occurs 5 times in Ecclesiastes.[244] The Translator rendered it by τὰ ὅσα only when interpreting את אשר 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]ὅς is used in 1:16a, 2:10a, 6:2a; ὅσος is used in 3:14a, 4:16a.

[242]See p. 68 of this dissertation.

[243]In 8:9b, עת must be read as את. See p. 21 of this dissertation.

[244]The 5 instances are 2:12a, 4:3a, 5:3b, 7:13b, 8:9b

Example:
2:12a כִּי מֶה הָאָדָם שֶׁיָּבוֹא אַחֲרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־כְּבָר עֲשׂוּהוּ
2:12a ὅτι τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐπελεύσεται ὀπίσω τῆς βουλῆς τὰ ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτήν

5:3b אֵת אֲשֶׁר־תִּדֹּר שַׁלֵּם
5:3b σὺν ὅσα ἐὰν εὔξῃ ἀπόδος

The Translator construed the clause introduced by את אשר in 2:12a as adverbial accusative clause ("in as many things as he made it") and used τὰ ὅσα for את אשר.[246] On the other hand, the אשר-clause in 5:3b must be the object of the main verb שלם, so the Translator employed a different approach.

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

4:3a וְטוֹב מִשְׁנֵיהֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־עֲדֶן לֹא הָיָה
4:3a καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο τούτους ὅστις οὔπω ἐγένετο

7:26a וּמוֹצֶא אֲנִי מַר מִמָּוֶת אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה
אֲשֶׁר־הִיא מְצוֹדִים וַחֲרָמִים לִבָּהּ אֲסוּרִים יָדֶיהָ
7:26a καὶ εὑρίσκω ἐγὼ πικρότερον ὑπὲρ θάνατον σὺν τὴν γυναῖκα
ἥτις ἐστὶν θηρεύματα καὶ σαγῆναι καρδία αὐτῆς δεσμοὶ χεῖρες αὐτῆς

12:1b עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָבֹאוּ יְמֵי הָרָעָה
12:1b ἕως ὅτου μὴ ἔλθωσιν ἡμέραι τῆς κακίας

12:6a עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִרְחַק חֶבֶל הַכֶּסֶף
12:6a ἕως ὅτου μὴ ἀνατραπῇ σχοινίον τοῦ ἀργυρίου

The ὅστις in 4:3a must be an indefinite and headless relative with a general

---

[245]This is based upon Rahlfs' text. Ziegler and Gentry propose σὺν τὰ ὅσα 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).

[246]Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 2.

reference: "anyone who."[247] This is a normal use of ὅστις.[248] In 7:26a, ὅστις functions as a definite relative. The indefinite relative ὅστις frequently takes the place of the simple relative ὅς in Hellenistic Greek.[249] The phrase ἕως ὅτου in 12:1b and 12:6a is a fixed expression and an excellent rendering for עד אשר.

אשר > ὅς ἐάν (2) or ὅς ἄν (1) /
ὅσος ἐάν (1) or ὅσος ἄν (1)[250]
בשל אשר > ὅσος ἄν (1)

As mentioned above, ὅς and ὅσος are often indistinguishable in Hellenistic Greek. The particle ἐάν is also frequently used in place of ἄν after relatives.[251] The relative clauses introduced by ὅς or ὅσος become modal with ἐάν or ἄν. They denote not concrete realities but general assertions or suppositions.[252] In all 5 instances, the Translator understood the clause as implying a modal sense and so used the subjunctive for the verbs.

Examples:

---

[247]So-called *nota accusativi* in Hebrew is construed as the marker of the subject in this verse. The nominative function of את 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.

[248]LSJ, s.v. "ὅστις"; Bauer, s.v. "ὅστις."

[249]BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §293; Bauer, s.v. "ὅστις." Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ὅστις."

[250]For the equivalents of אשר, the Translator uses ὅς ἐάν in 4:17a and 8:3b, ὅς ἄν in 7:13b, ὅσος ἐάν in 5:3b, and ὅσος ἄν in 9:10a.

[251]According to Thackeray's research, the form ὅς ἐάν becomes common after 2 BC and supercedes ὅς ἄν after AD 1. See Henry St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint,* vol. 1, *Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 65ff.

[252]BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §380.

5:3b אֵת אֲשֶׁר־תִּדֹּר שַׁלֵּם
5:3b σὺν ὅσα ἐὰν εὔξῃ ἀπόδος

8:3b כִּי כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יַחְפֹּץ יַעֲשֶׂה
8:3b ὅτι πᾶν ὃ ἐὰν θελήσῃ ποιήσει

In 5:3b, the Translator emphasized the reference by using ὅσα and adding ἐάν: "whatever you vow." If כל rendered by πᾶν precedes the relative clause as in 8:3b, the indefiniteness of the reference becomes more general with ἐάν: "anything that he wants."

In 8:17a, the phrase בשל אשר is rendered by ὅσα ἄν.

8:17a בְּשֶׁל אֲשֶׁר יַעֲמֹל הָאָדָם לְבַקֵּשׁ וְלֹא יִמְצָא
8:17b וְגַם אִם־יֹאמַר הֶחָכָם לָדַעַת לֹא יוּכַל לִמְצֹא

8:17a ὅσα ἂν μοχθήσῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ζητῆσαι καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσει
8:17b καί γε ὅσα ἂν εἴπῃ ὁ σοφὸς τοῦ γνῶναι οὐ δυνήσεται τοῦ εὑρεῖν

The form של is analyzed as the *lamed* of possession with the relative particle ש and is the standard marker of possession in late Hebrew.[253] The literal meaning of the phrase, בשל אשר, may be "through that which belongs to," but the phrase is not common in Biblical Hebrew.[254] It is regarded as the translation of Aramaic בריל די, meaning "on account of the fact that" i.e., "because" or "since."[255] In Hebrew, 8:17a is probably a ground statement ("since"), and 8:17b begins with a concessive clause (אם "although"). The Translator rendered both בשל אשר in 8:17a and אם in 8:17b by ὅσα ἄν. When introducing the indefinite relative clause, ὅσα makes its reference more general by adding the particle

---

[253]Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, 43-44, 199-200.

[254]בשל occurs in Jonah 1:7 and 1:12, and בשל אשר occurs only in Eccl 8:17. Cf. A. Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Bible* (Jerusalem: Kjiryat-Sefer, 1998), 1097.

ἄν: "whatever."[256] 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.

אשר > ὁ (13) / zero (1)

In 13 occurrences, אשר is rendered by the definite article (15 percent).[257] The Translator nominalized the relative clauses in Hebrew by articular participles in 11 instances and by articular infinitives in 2 instances.[258] Both the articular participle and articular infinitive are excellent equivalents for the Hebrew relative clause.

Examples:
1:10b כְּבָר הָיָה לְעֹלָמִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה מִלְּפָנֵנוּ
1:10b ἤδη γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν

5:4a טוֹב אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִדֹּר
5:4a ἀγαθὸν τὸ μὴ εὔξασθαί σε

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 היה or the *Niphal* form of עשה.[259] When the Translator used the articular infinitive, he added the

---

[255]BDB, s.v. "ש." cf. KB, s.v. "ש."

[256]Bauer, s.v. "ὅσος."

[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 זבח and נתן respectively. The *Qal* perfect form of היה 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 וְלַזֹּבֵחַ וְלַאֲשֶׁר אֵינֶנּוּ זֹבֵחַ
9:2a καὶ τῷ θυσιάζοντι καὶ τῷ μὴ θυσιάζοντι

In 9:2a, the verb in the אשר-clause is a participle.[260] The Translator construed the *lamed* before אשר as the marker of dative, and rendered אשר by the article.

10:14b לֹא־יֵדַע הָאָדָם מַה־שֶּׁיִּהְיֶה
וַאֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מֵאַחֲרָיו מִי יַגִּיד לוֹ
10:14b οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ ἄνθρωπος τί τὸ γενόμενον
καὶ τί τὸ ἐσόμενον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ τίς ἀναγγελεῖ αὐτῷ

In 10:14b, the Translator must have understood מה to be gapped before אשר.[261] In other words, the אשר-clause is construed as the indirect question introduced by מה, which is assumed. The interrogative τί is used for the gapped מה. The indirect question functions as the object of the verb יגיד.

9:3a זֶה רָע בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־נַעֲשָׂה תַּחַת הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ
9:3a τοῦτο πονηρὸν ἐν παντὶ πεποιημένῳ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

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

אשר > ὅτι (7) / ὡς (1)

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

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

[261]See its parallel clause מה־שיהיה in the previous line.

There are 7 instances where ὅτι renders אשר (8 percent).[262] The Translator used ὅτι because he construed the אשר-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 וְיִשְׁתַּכְּחוּ בָעִיר אֲשֶׁר כֵּן־עָשׂוּ
8:10a καὶ ἐπῃνέθησαν ἐν τῇ πόλει ὅτι οὕτως ἐποίησαν

(nominal)
8:12b כִּי גַּם־יוֹדֵעַ אָנִי אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה־טּוֹב לְיִרְאֵי הָאֱלֹהִים
8:12b ὅτι καί γε γινώσκω ἐγὼ ὅτι ἔσται ἀγαθὸν τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸν θεόν

(consecutive)
8:14a יֵשׁ צַדִּיקִים אֲשֶׁר מַגִּיעַ אֲלֵהֶם כְּמַעֲשֵׂה הָרְשָׁעִים
8:14a εἰσὶ δίκαιοι ὅτι φθάνει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποίημα τῶν ἀσεβῶν

There is a textual problem in 8:10a where the Translator translated the main verb ישתכחו in MT by ἐπῃνέθησαν. He must have understood the verb as ישתבחו. Consequently, the following אשר-clause is understood as causal explaining why they were praised.[263] In 8:15a, the אשר-clause provides the reason why *Qoheleth* commends joy. The causal sense of the אשר-clause in 6:12b is somewhat loose. The conjunction ὅτι is often used for such loose subordination in Hellenistic Greek.[264] In 8:11a, the preceding line, which begins with על כן, clarifies that the אשר-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 אשר-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 אשר-clause in 8:12b is understood as the object clause of the main verb יודע. The Translator interpreted the אשר-clause in 8:14a as another nominal clause, which is the apposition of הבל. The appositional function of ὅτι is well attested in Hellenistic Greek.[265]

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

9:1a כִּי אֶת־כָּל־זֶה נָתַתִּי אֶל־לִבִּי וְלָבוּר אֶת־כָּל־זֶה
אֲשֶׁר הַצַּדִּיקִים וְהַחֲכָמִים וַעֲבָדֵיהֶם בְּיַד הָאֱלֹהִים
9:1a ὅτι σὺν πᾶν τοῦτο ἔδωκα εἰς καρδίαν μου καὶ καρδία μου σὺν πᾶν εἶδεν τοῦτο
ὡς οἱ δίκαιοι καὶ οἱ σοφοὶ καὶ ἐργασίαι αὐτῶν ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ θεοῦ

There is 1 instance where אשר is rendered by ὡς. In 9:1a. ὡς introduces a substantive clause, which is the appositive for τοῦτο and functions as the object of the verb εἶδεν.[269] The conjunction ὡς is a functional equivalent to אשר in this verse.

אשר > ὅπως (4) / ὅπου (1)

The Translator employed ὅπως for אשר 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).

---

[265]Robertson, *Grammar*, 400.

[266]Cf. GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §166b.

[267]Robertson, *Grammar*, 1001.

[268]Ibid.

[269]Cf. ὅτι in 8:14a.

Examples:

3:11b גַּם אֶת־הָעֹלָם נָתַן בְּלִבָּם
מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְצָא הָאָדָם אֶת־הַמַּעֲשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה הָאֱלֹהִים

3:11b καί γε σὺν τὸν αἰῶνα ἔδωκεν ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν
ὅπως μὴ εὕρῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸ ποίημα ὃ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός

7:22a כִּי גַּם־פְּעָמִים רַבּוֹת יָדַע לִבֶּךָ

7:22b אֲשֶׁר גַּם־אַת קִלַּלְתָּ אֲחֵרִים

7:22a ὅτι πλειστάκις πονηρεύσεταί σε καὶ καθόδους πολλὰς κακώσει καρδίαν σου

7:22b ὅπως καί γε σὺ κατηράσω ἑτέρους

In 3:11b מבלי אשר 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 אשר as a relative adverb denoting manner ("as," "in such manner as") and used ὅπως.[272] His interpretation arises from a different reading of ידע in 7:22a, which MT vocalizes *yāda'* ("to know"), but the Translator read *yārēa'* (ירע "to mistreat").[273] The different reading is due to the graphic confusion between ד and ר. The servant very often mistreats him *in the way as* he cursed others.[274]

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

9:10b כִּי אֵין מַעֲשֶׂה וְחֶשְׁבּוֹן וְדַעַת וְחָכְמָה בִּשְׁאוֹל
אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה הֹלֵךְ שָׁמָּה

9:10b ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ποίημα καὶ λογισμὸς καὶ γνῶσις καὶ σοφία ἐν ᾅδῃ
ὅπου σὺ πορεύῃ ἐκεῖ

---

[270]The 4 instances are 3:11b, 7:21b, 7:22a, 8:12b.

[271]Cf. KB, s.v. "בלי."

[272]For the use of אשר 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 רעע.

The locative adverb שמה is the resumptive element in the אשר-clause and becomes the signal to interpret אשר as the relative adverb denoting place. Using the locative ὅπου for אשר is, therefore, an appropriate rendering.

כאשר > καθώς (4) / καθώς ἄν (1)
באשר > ἐν (4) / καθότι (1)

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

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

Examples:
5:14a כַּאֲשֶׁר יָצָא מִבֶּטֶן אִמּוֹ
5:14b עָרוֹם יָשׁוּב לָלֶכֶת כְּשֶׁבָּא
5:14a καθὼς ἐξῆλθεν ἀπὸ γαστρὸς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ
5:14b γυμνός ἐπιστρέψει τοῦ πορευθῆναι

---

[274]The ὅπως of 8:12b is also used as relative adverb denoting manner ("as").

[275]All the 38 instances of הבל are rendered by ματαιότης.

8:7a כִּי־אֵינֶנּוּ יֹדֵעַ מַה־שֶּׁיִּהְיֶה
8:7b כִּי כַּאֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִי יַגִּיד לוֹ
8:7a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν γινώσκων τί τὸ ἐσόμενον
8:7b ὅτι καθὼς ἔσται τίς ἀναγγελεῖ αὐτῷ

The clause introduced by כאשר in 5:14a is understood as comparative. The Translator conveyed the comparative idea by employing καθώς: "just as."[276] The case of 9:2b is also interpreted as comparative. In 8:7b, however, כאשר 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 καθώς ἄν and emphasized the indefinite sense: "whenever."

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

Examples:
7:2a טוֹב לָלֶכֶת אֶל־בֵּית־אֵבֶל מִלֶּכֶת אֶל־בֵּית מִשְׁתֶּה
בַּאֲשֶׁר הוּא סוֹף כָּל־הָאָדָם
7:2a ἀγαθὸν πορευθῆναι εἰς οἶκον πένθους ἢ ὅτι πορευθῆναι εἰς οἶκον πότου
καθότι τοῦτο τέλος παντὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

9:2a הַכֹּל כַּאֲשֶׁר לַכֹּל
9:2a ματαιότης ἐν τοῖς πᾶσιν

The Translator construed באשר in 7:2a as causal and employed καθότι for the form. The use of καθότι for the causal clause is a normal practice in Hellenistic Greek.[277] The באשר in 9:2a is rendered not by conjunction or relative but by the preposition ἐν 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 כאשר, see Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, §256. For the use of καθώς for comparison, see Bauer, s.v. "καθώς."

ש

The form ש occurs 68 times in Ecclesiastes. The Translator employed various approaches to render the form in question. Whether ש is construed as relative or not, all the instances will be discussed here in this section for convenience.[278]

ש > ὅς (20) / ὅς ἐάν (2) / ὅστις (1)

In 20 instances, the Translator construed ש as relative and renders it by the relative ὅς (29 percent).[279] The relative ὅς is a both formal and functional equivalent of the relative ש.

Example:
1:3a מַה־יִּתְרוֹן לָאָדָם
1:3b בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ שֶׁיַּעֲמֹל תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
1:3a τίς περισσεία τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ
1:3b ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ ᾧ μοχθεῖ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

The Translator interpreted 2 instances of ש-clause as indefinite relative clauses and uses ὅς ἐάν for ש (5:17a, 12:3a).

5:17a טוֹב אֲשֶׁר־יָפֶה לֶאֱכוֹל־וְלִשְׁתּוֹת וְלִרְאוֹת טוֹבָה
בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ שֶׁיַּעֲמֹל תַּחַת־הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
5:17a ἀγαθόν ὅ ἐστιν καλόν τοῦ φαγεῖν καὶ τοῦ πιεῖν καὶ τοῦ ἰδεῖν ἀγαθωσύνην
ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ ᾧ ἐὰν μοχθῇ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

12:3a בַּיּוֹם שֶׁיָּזֻעוּ שֹׁמְרֵי הַבַּיִת
12:3a ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἐὰν σαλευθῶσιν φύλακες τῆς οἰκίας

---

[277]Robertson, *Grammar*, 963; Bauer, s.v. "καθότι."

[278]So one can compare the renderings of ש with those of אשר.

[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 ש is generalized: "in all his toil at whatever he toils under the sun."[280] In 12:3a, the relative clause is temporal. By using ἐάν with the subjunctive in temporal clause, the Translator describes the event with probability. The event can and will occur, but its time is uncertain.[281]

There is 1 instance where the Translator rendered ש by ὅστις (6:3a).

6:3a וְשָׁנִים רַבּוֹת יִחְיֶה וְרַב שֶׁיִּהְיוּ יְמֵי־שָׁנָיו
6:3a καὶ ἔτη πολλὰ ζήσεται καὶ πλῆθος ὅ τι ἔσονται ἡμέραι ἐτῶν αὐτοῦ

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 אשר is rendered by ὅστις. Alternating between ὅστις and ὅς is a normal feature in Hellenistic Greek.[282]

ש > ὁ (19)

There are 19 instances where the article renders ש (28 percent).[283] In 16 instances, the ש-clauses are rendered by articular participles. As in אשר-clauses, the verbs היה (x 9) and עשה (x 4) are predominant as the main verbs in the ש-clauses.[284] Eleven instances of the articular participles are substantival, and 5 are attributive.[285]

---

[280]Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 5.

[281]Cf. Bauer, s.v. "ἄν."

[282]BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §293; Bauer, s.v. "ὅστις." Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ὅστις."

[283]The 19 instances are 1:9a, 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 היה is predicate in 1:9a, 1:9a, 1:11b, 1:11b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:18b, 8:7a, 10:14b; the verb עשה 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, 1:9a, 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 מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה הוּא שֶׁיִּהְיֶה
1:9a τί τὸ γεγονός αὐτὸ τὸ γενησόμενον [286]

(attributive)
1:14a רָאִיתִי אֶת־כָּל־הַמַּעֲשִׂים שֶׁנַּעֲשׂוּ תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
1:14a εἶδον σὺν πάντα τὰ ποιήματα τὰ πεποιημένα ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

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

1:11a אֵין זִכְרוֹן לָרִאשֹׁנִים
1:11b וְגַם לָאַחֲרֹנִים שֶׁיִּהְיוּ
1:11a οὐκ ἔστιν μνήμη τοῖς πρώτοις
1:11b καί γε τοῖς ἐσχάτοις γενομένοις

The preposition ל 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 ש-clause in 1:11b would be translated by the articular attributive participle, i.e., καί γε τοῖς ἐσχάτοις τοῖς γενομένοις. By omitting the expected article before γενομένοις, the Translator modified the syntax of 1:11b. The ש-clause is an adjective clause and functions attributively. However, the Translator rendered the clause by a substantival participle. On the other hand אחרנים 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]

---

participles used as attributive are 1:14a, 2:17a, 2:18b, 4:2a, 9:12a. In 2:7b, 2:9a, 11:8b, the אשר-clauses function as attributive but are rendered by substantive participles because the אשר-clauses modify the substantive כל , and כל is rendered by adjective πᾶς.

[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 ש-clause, and the ש-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 ש-clauses in these 2 cases.

(attributive)[288]
2:26a כִּי לְאָדָם שֶׁטּוֹב לְפָנָיו נָתַן חָכְמָה
2:26a ὅτι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ἀγαθῷ πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν σοφίαν

(substantive)[289]
6:10b וְלֹא־יוּכַל לָדִין עִם שֶׁהַתְּקִיף מִמֶּנּוּ
6:10b καὶ οὐ δυνήσεται τοῦ κριθῆναι μετὰ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ ὑπὲρ αὐτόν

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

5:4a טוֹב אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִדֹּר
5:4b מִשֶּׁתִּדּוֹר וְלֹא תְשַׁלֵּם
5:4a ἀγαθὸν τὸ μὴ εὔξασθαί σε
5:4b ἢ τὸ εὔξασθαί σε καὶ μὴ ἀποδοῦναι

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

ש > ὅτι (11)

The Translator uses ὅτι for ש in 11 instances (16 percent).[290] In 9 instances out

---

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

[289]The Translator probably followed *Qere* (שתקיף, *šettaqqîp*). The form שתקיף may have resulted from weakening of guttural ה out of שהתקיף. 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.[291] There is 1 instance where the Translator used ὅτι because he interpreted the ש-clause as causal (2:18b). Finally, the ש in 8:14a seems to be construed as consecutive. The ὅτι used for ש in 8:14a is parallel to the ὅτι, which renders אשר on the previous line. In MT the relatives אשר and ש 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.[292]

Examples:
(Nominal)
1:17b יָדַעְתִּי שֶׁגַּם־זֶה הוּא רַעְיוֹן רוּחַ
1:17b ἔγνων ὅτι καί γε τοῦτ' ἔστιν προαίρεσις πνεύματος

(Causal, 2:18b)
2:18a וְשָׂנֵאתִי אֲנִי אֶת־כָּל־עֲמָלִי שֶׁאֲנִי עָמֵל תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
2:18b שֶׁאַנִּיחֶנּוּ לָאָדָם שֶׁיִּהְיֶה אַחֲרָי
2:18a καὶ ἐμίσησα ἐγὼ σὺν πάντα μόχθον μου ὃν ἐγὼ μοχθῶ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον
2:18b ὅτι ἀφίω αὐτὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ γινομένῳ μετ' ἐμέ

(Consecutive, ὅτι 2°)
8:14a יֵשׁ צַדִּיקִים אֲשֶׁר מַגִּיעַ אֲלֵהֶם כְּמַעֲשֵׂה הָרְשָׁעִים
וְיֵשׁ רְשָׁעִים שֶׁמַּגִּיעַ אֲלֵהֶם כְּמַעֲשֵׂה הַצַּדִּיקִים
8:14a εἰσὶ δίκαιοι ὅτι φθάνει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποίημα τῶν ἀσεβῶν
καὶ εἰσὶν ἀσεβεῖς ὅτι φθάνει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποίημα τῶν δικαίων

---

[290]The 11 instances are 1:17b, 2:13a, 2:14b, 2:15b, 2:18b, 3:18b, 7:10a, 8:14a, 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 אשר-clause in 5:4a and the ש-clause in 5:4b.

ש > ἵνα (3)

In 3 instances where ש introduces a final clause or result clause, the Translator rendered the ש by ἵνα. The ἵνα clause in 3:14b may be analyzed as final, the ἵνα clause in 5:14b as result, and the ἵνα clause in 7:14b as final/result.[293]

Example:
3:14b וְהָאֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה שֶׁיִּרְאוּ מִלְּפָנָיו
3:14b καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἵνα φοβηθῶσιν ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ

ש > καί (1)

1:10a יֵשׁ דָּבָר שֶׁיֹּאמַר רְאֵה־זֶה חָדָשׁ הוּא
1:10a ὃς λαλήσει καὶ ἐρεῖ ἰδὲ τοῦτο καινόν ἐστιν

In 1:10a, the relative ש is rendered by καί. The relative clause ὃς λαλήσει probably reflects שידבר rather than יש דבר.[294] The form שידבר is analyzed as relative plus imperfect 3 m.s. form.[295] The different reading is due to the metathesis of *yod* and *šin*. If שידבר is in the parent text of the Translator, two ש clauses are connected asyndetically: שידבר שיאמר. The Translator might have made the awkward sentences smooth by translating the second ש simply by conjunction καί.

ש > ὅταν (1)

4:10b וְאִילוּ הָאֶחָד שֶׁיִּפּוֹל וְאֵין שֵׁנִי לַהֲקִימוֹ

---

[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. "ἵνα". 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.

4:10b καὶ οὐαὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἑνί ὅταν πέσῃ καὶ μὴ ᾖ δεύτερος τοῦ ἐγεῖραι αὐτόν

In Hellenistic Greek, ὅταν can be temporal or causal.[296] ש by itself is never used temporally in Biblical Hebrew nor in Mishnaic Hebrew. When denoting time, the particle ש is always preceded by prepositions such as עד or כ , or nouns such as יום.[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."

כש > ὅταν (2) / ὡς (2)
בש > καθότι (1)

The form ש follows the preposition כ in 4 instances.[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 ὡς.

Examples:
(temporal)
10:3a וְגַם־בַּדֶּרֶךְ כשהסכל הֹלֵךְ לִבּוֹ חָסֵר
10:3a καί γε ἐν ὁδῷ ὅταν ἄφρων πορεύηται καρδία αὐτοῦ ὑστερήσει[299]

(comparative)
12:7a וְיָשֹׁב הֶעָפָר עַל־הָאָרֶץ כְּשֶׁהָיָה
12:7a καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ ὁ χοῦς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὡς ἦν

---

[296]LSJ, s.v. "ὅταν."

[297]For the use of ש in Biblical Hebrew, see Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, §470-474; BDB, s.v. "ש"; KB, s.v. "ש." For ש in Mishnaic Hebrew, see Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, §513. For the grammatical difference between אשר and ש in biblical Hebrew, see Roger Schwarzschild, "The Syntax of אשר in Biblical Hebrew with Special Reference to Qoheleth," *HS* 31 (1990): 7-37.

[298]The 4 instances are 5:14a, 9:12b, 10:3a, 12:7a.

[299]The Greek equivalent seems to reflect *Qere* (כשסכל, *k^e^šessākāl*). The form כשסכל may have resulted from weaking of guttural ה out of כשהסכל. 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. . ."[300] In 12:7a, ὡς functions as a conjunction denoting comparison: "as it was." The approach of the Translator on ש is compared with his treatment on כאשר. For כאשר, the Translator used καθώς, whether it is temporal or comparative, while he used ὅταν for temporal ש and used ὡς for comparative ש.

When the form ש is prefixed by the preposition ב, the Translator used καθότι for בש as he did for באשר. The clause in 2:16b introduced by בש is construed as causal, and καθότι is a good choice for the causal conjunction.

2:16a כִּי אֵין זִכְרוֹן לֶחָכָם עִם־הַכְּסִיל לְעוֹלָם
2:16b בְּשֶׁכְּבָר הַיָּמִים הַבָּאִים הַכֹּל נִשְׁכָּח
2:16a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν μνήμη τοῦ σοφοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ἄφρονος εἰς αἰῶνα
2:16b καθότι ἤδη αἱ ἡμέραι αἱ ἐρχόμεναι τὰ πάντα ἐπελήσθη

מה ש > εἰ τις (1) / ὅς ἐάν (1) / ὁ (1)

There are 3 instances where the form ש is preceded by the interrogative מה.[301] In 2 instances the Translator construed the clauses introduced by מה ש as indefinite clauses and uses ὅς ἐάν (3:22b) and εἰ τις (6:10a). The indefinite use of מה with ש is quite common in late Hebrew.[302] In 3:15a he simply used the article ὁ for מה ש 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 מה is rendered by the interrogative pronoun τί, and the ש-clause is rendered by an articular participle functioning as substantive (1:9a, 1:9a, 8:7a, 10:14b). These have been discussed above. The מה preceding ש in 7:24a is also excluded because the form מה in MT seems to be construed as preposition מן. 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 מה.[303]

ש עמת ל > ὥσπερ (1)

5:15a כָּל־עֲמַת שֶׁבָּא כֵּן יֵלֵךְ
5:15a ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεγένετο οὕτως καὶ ἀπελεύσεται

Modern scholars suggest that the Greek words ὥσπερ γάρ may reflect *kil'ummat še* (כלעמת ש) not *kol'ummat še* as MT.[304] From the perspective of Hebrew, the word עמה is always combined with the preposition ל in Biblical Hebrew, and the combination functions as a preposition meaning "corresponding to."[305] The ש-clause becomes the objective of the preposition לעמת. Consequently, the first letter כ is isolated and must be understood as the defective spelling of conjunction *kî*. The conjunction γάρ is an excellent rendering of כ (*kî*). The Translator used a pair of comparative adverbs: ὥσπερ in the protasis and οὕτως in apodosis. The ὥσπερ is the functional equivalent of לעמת ש, and οὕτως fits well not only functionally but also formally to כן.

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. "עמה."

[305]KB, s.v. "עמה"; BDB, s.v. "עמה."

His shrewdness, for example, is shown in his rendering the form הוא. 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 למה, 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 מה. 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.[306] 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. אבל > πένθος 3 (5:16a, 7:2a, 7:4a)

2. אבן > λίθος 3 (3:5a, 3:5a, 10:9a)

3. אדם > ἄνθρωπος 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. אור > φῶς 3 (2:13b, 11:7a, 12:2a)

5. איש > ἀνήρ 10 (1:8a, 4:4a, 6:2a, 6:2a, 6:3a, 7:5b, 9:14b, 9:15a, 9:15b, 12:3a)

6. אשה > γυνή 3 (7:26a, 7:28b, 9:9a)

7. בהמה > κτῆνος 4 (3:18b, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:21b)

8. בן > 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);
   בני בית > οἰκογενής 1 (2:7a)

9. בשר > σάρξ 5 (2:3a, 4:5b, 5:5a, 11:10a, 12:12b)

10. דעת > γνῶσις 8 (1:16b, 1:17a, 1:18b, 2:21a, 2:26a, 7:12a, 9:10b, 12:9b)

כעס > γνῶσις 1 (1:18a)
רעה > γνῶσις 1 (8:6b)

11. דרך > ὁδός 4 (10:3a, 11:5a, 11:9a, 12:5a)

12. הבל > 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. חי > ζάω 8 (4:2b, 4:2b, 4:15a, 7:2b, 9:4a, 9:4b, 9:5a, 10:19a)

14. חיים > ζωή 13 (2:3b, 2:17a, 3:12b, 5:17b, 5:19a, 6:8b, 6:12a, 6:12a, 8:15b, 9:3b, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:9b)

15. חכם > σοφός 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. חכמה > σοφία 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. חשך > σκότος 6 (2:13b, 2:14a, 5:16a, 6:4a, 6:4b, 11:8b)

18. טוב > ἀγαθός 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. טובה > ἀγαθωσύνη 7 (4:8b, 5:10a, 5:17a, 6:3a, 6:6a, 7:14a, 9:18a)

20. יד > χείρ 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. יום > ἡμέρα 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. יין > οἶνος 3 (2:3a, 9:7a, 10:19a)

23. כל > πᾶς 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, 2:10b, 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, 3:13a, 3:14a, 3:17b, 3:17b, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:20a, 3:20b, 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, 9:4a, 9:6b, 9:8a, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:10a,

9:11b, 10:19b, 11:5b, 11:8a, 11:8b, 11:9b, 12:4b, 12:8b, 12:13a, 12:13b, 12:14a, 12:14a)
כל + ל > πᾶς 2 (8:6a, 10:3b)
כל + ה > ματαιότης 1 (9:2a)

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

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

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

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

28. מלך > 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. מעט > ὀλίγος 4 (5:1a, 5:11a, 9:14a, 10:1a)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

38. עמל > μόχθος 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. ענין > περισπασμός 8 (1:13b, 2:23a, 2:26b, 3:10a, 4:8b, 5:2a, 5:13a, 8:16a)

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

41. עץ > ξύλον 5 (2:5b, 2:6b, 10:9b, 11:3a, 11:3b)

42. עשר > πλοῦτος 6 (4:8a, 5:12b, 5:13a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 9:11a)

43. עת > καιρός 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, 3:5a, 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, 3:11a, 3:17b, 3:17b, 7:17b, 8:5b, 8:6a, 9:8a, 9:11b, 9:12a, 9:12b, 10:17b)

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

45. פנים > πρόσωπον 6 (7:3b, 8:1b, 8:1b, 8:3a, 10:10a, 11:1a);
פנים + ל > πρὸ προσώπου 6 (2:26a, 2:26b, 5:1a, 5:5a, 7:26b, 9:1b);
> ἔμπροσθεν 4 (1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a, 4:16a)
פנים + ל + מן > ἀπὸ προσώπου 4 (3:14b, 8:12b, 8:13b, 10:5b)
> ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν 1 (1:10b)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

53. שר > ἄρχων 3 (10:7b, 10:16b, 10:17b)

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

55. שם > ὄνομα 3 (6:4b, 6:10a, 7:1a)

56. שמים > οὐρανός 4 (1:13a, 3:1b, 5:1b, 10:20b)
שמים > ἥλιος 1 (2:3b)

57. שמן > ἔλαιον 3 (7:1a, 9:8b, 10:1a)

58. שמש > ἥλιος 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)
שמים > ἥλιος 1 (2:3b)

59. שנה > ἔτος 5 (6:3a, 6:3a, 6:6a, 11:8a, 12:1b)

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

Category 1 – Continued:
More Than One Hebrew Lexeme
Rendered by One Greek Lexeme

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

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

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

64. לב > καρδία 42 (1:13a, 1:16a, 1:16b, 1:17a, 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) [לבב > καρδία 1 (9:3b)]

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

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

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

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

69. רב (*rōb*) > πλῆθος 6 (1:18a, 1:18a, 5:2a, 5:2b, 5:6a, 11:1b) [רב (*rab*) > πλῆθος 1 (6:3a); רבה > πλῆθος 1 (5:10a); המון > πλῆθος 1 (5:9a)]

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

71. רעיון > προαίρεσις [רעות > προαίρεσις]

72. שנים > δύο 5 (4:3a, 4:9a, 4:11a, 4:12a, 11:6b) [חפן > δύο 1 (4:6b)]

Category 2 – Regular Equivalents
One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered by
More Than One Greek Lexeme

73. אחד > εἷς 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. בית > οἶκος 8 (2:4b, 4:14a, 4:17a, 7:2a, 7:2a, 7:4a, 7:4b, 12:5b);
> οἰκία 2 (10:18b, 12:3a);
בני בית > οἰκογενής 1 (2:7a)

75. בעל > παρά 3 (5:10b, 5:12b, 8:8b);
> ὁ παρά 1 (7:12b);
> ὅς παρά 1 (12:11a);
> ἔχω 1 (10:20b);
בעל לשון > ἐπᾴδω 1 (10:11b)

76. גבה > ὑψηλός 4 (5:7b, 5:7b, 5:7b, 7:8b);
> ὕψος 1 (12:5a)

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

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

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

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

81. סכל > ἄφρων 3 (2:19a, 10:3a, 10:14a);
> ἀφροσύνη 1 (10:3a);
> σκληρός 1 (7:17a)

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

83. פעם > κάθοδος 2 (6:6a, 7:22a);
רב + פעם > πλειστάκις 1 (7:22a)

84. ראש > κεφαλή 2 (2:14a, 9:8b);
> ἀρχή 1 (3:11b)

85. רוח > πνεῦμα 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);
> ἄνεμος 2 (5:15b, 11:4a);
רוח + ארך > μακρόθυμος 1 (7:8b)

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

86. ארץ > πόλις 1 (10:16a) [עיר > 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. דבר > λόγος 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) [דברה > λόγος 1 (8:2b)];
> ῥῆμα 3 (1:1a, 8:1a, 8:5a)

88. דברה > λόγος 1 (8:2b) [דבר > λόγος 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)];
> λαλιά 2 (3:18a, 7:14b);

89. הוללות (*hôlēlôt*) > περιφορά 2 (2:12a, 7:5b) [הלל > περιφορά 1 (2:2a)];
> περιφέρεια 1 (9:3b) [הוללות (*hôlēlût*) > περιφέρεια 1 (10:13b)];
> παραβολή 1 (1:17a) [משל > παραβολή 1 (12:9b)]

90. חשבון (*ḥešbôn*) > λογισμός 2 (7:27b, 9:10b) [חשבון (*ḥišābôn*) > λογισμός 1 (7:29b)];
> ψῆφος 1 (7:25a)

91. יותר > περισσεία 2 (6:8a, 7:11b) [יתרון > 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. כסיל > ἄφρων 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) [סכל (*sākāl*) > ἄφρων 3 (2:19a, 10:3a, 10:14a); סכל (*sekel*) > ἄφρων 1 (10:6a)];
> ἀφροσύνη 1 (9:17b) [סכלות > ἀφροσύνη 5 (2:3b, 2:12a, 2:13a, 10:1b, 10:13a); כסל (*kesel*) > ἀφροσύνη 1 (7:25b); סכל (*sākāl*) > ἀφροσύνη 1 (10:3b)]

93. סכלות > ἀφροσύνη 5 (2:3b, 2:12a, 2:13a, 10:1b, 10:13a) [כסיל > ἀφροσύνη 1 (9:17b); כסל > ἀφροσύνη 1 (7:25b); סכל > ἀφροσύνη 1 (10:3b)];
> σκληρία 1 (7:25b);
שכלות > ἐπιστήμη 1 (1:17a)

94. צדק > δίκαιος 2 (3:16b, 7:15b) [צדיק > δίκαιος 8 (3:17a, 7:15b, 7:16a, 7:20a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:1a, 9:2a)];
> δικαιοσύνη 1 (5:7a)

95. רב (*rab*) > πολύς 5 (6:1b, 6:3a, 7:22a, 7:29b, 8:6b) [הרבה > 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)];
> μέγας 2 (2:21b, 10:6a) [גדול > μέγας 4 (9:13b, 9:14b, 9:14b, 10:4b)];
> πλῆθος 1 (6:3a) [רב (*rōb*) > πλῆθος 6 (1:18a, 1:18a, 5:2a, 5:2b, 5:6a, 11:1b); רבה > πλῆθος 1 (5:10a); המון > πλῆθος 1 (5:9a)];
רב + פעם > πλειστάκις 1 (7:22a)

96. רע > 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) [רעה > πονηρός 4 (5:15a, 8:11a, 9:12a, 11:2b)];
> κακός 3 (4:17b, 9:2a? 9:12a)

97. רעה > κακία 4 (5:12a, 7:14a, 7:15b, 12:1b) [רע (*rōaʿ*) > κακία 1 (7:3b)];
> πονηρός 4 (5:15a, 8:11a, 9:12a, 11:2b) [רע (*raʿ*) > 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);
חולה + רעה > ἀρρωστία 1 (5:12a) [חלה > ἀρρωστία 2 (5:12a? 5:15a); חלי > ἀρρωστία 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 אחרון and אחרית rendered by ἔσχατος in entry 61, יתרון and יותר rendered by περισσεία in entry 63, לב and לבב rendered by καρδία in entry 64, רב (*rōb*), רב (*rab*) and רבה rendered by πλῆθος in entry 69, and רעיון and רעות rendered by προαίρεσις in entries 70 and 71.

Thus the evidence supports the strong tendency to stereotypical renderings.[307]

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

According to entry 10, the Translator seems to have read the form רעת in MT as דעת in 8:6a by the visual confusion between ר and ד. The rendering כעס by γνῶσις in 1:18a may be explained by the context.[308] The noun דעת occurs in 1:17a and 1:18b. Thus, it is likely that γνῶσις in 1:18a reflects דעת than than כעס. 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 דעת and כעס.

---

[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 יָקָר מֵחָכְמָה מִכָּבוֹד סִכְלוּת מְעָט
10:1b τίμιον ὀλίγον σοφίας ὑπὲρ δόξαν ἀφροσύνης μεγάλης

The Hebrew sentence is syntactically awkward for two reasons: (1) disagreement of gender between the alleged subject סכלות (f.) and the alleged predicate יקר (m.); (2) the asyndetic relationship between מחכמה and מכבוד. The Translator may have construed מן of מחכמה as partitive and may have rendered it by ὀλίγον. Then, the subject is ὀλίγον σοφίας (< מחכמה). The adjective μεγάλης does not necessarily reflect גדולה. The Translator may have contextually interpreted מעט 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 כל + ל by forms of πᾶς. He seems to have construed ל as marking the case or function of כל. Thus in these 2 instances, כל is rendered by πᾶς as in the other occurrences, and ל is rendered by the cases of πᾶς. The instance in 9:2a is not to be regarded as a variation because the Translator read כל + ה in MT as the noun הבל.

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

In entry 45, when פני is prefixed by other prepositions (ל or ל + מן) and functions as a semipreposition, he employed πρὸ προσώπου, ἔμπροσθεν, ἀπὸ προσώπου, or ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν in different combinations. Although none of the Greek equivalents are idiomatic Hellenistic Greek except ἔμπροσθεν, certain patterns are observed.[309] The Translator used πρὸ προσώπου or ἀπὸ προσώπου for the spatial use of לפני or of מלפני respectively but used ἔμπροσθεν or ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν for the temporal use of לפני or of מלפני respectively. Since the Translator treated לפני or מלפני differently from פנים in other syntactic settings, the establishment of the stereotypical rendering of פנים by πρόσωπον is still maintained.[310]

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

---

[309]See p. 325 of this dissertation. Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ἔμπροσθεν"; s.v. "πρόσωπον," and Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Dissertations Humanarum Litterarum no. 19 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 30-31, 95.

[310]Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 137.

lexeme in question The expression תחת שמש is more dominant in Ecclesiastes than תחת שמים and may have been regarded as the standard idiom.[311]

The word ארץ is stereotypically rendered by γῆ.[312] In entry 68, πόλις is employed once for ארץ. 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, כאחד is rendered by ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in 11:6b. This is idiomatic Greek and the only instance where אחד is not rendered by εἷς.

In entry 74, οἶκος is used in a functional sense while according to the context οἰκία 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 חפץ in entry 78, the Translator discerned the meaning by context. For example, where he interpreted חפץ 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 חפץ, he rendered it by πρᾶγμα.

---

[311]תחת שמש 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 תחת שמים 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 משפט in 5:7a rather than κρίσις as in the other instances. He may have interpreted משפט (> 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, סכל 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 σκληρία for סכלות in 7:25b (see entry 93).

The Translator's semantic discernment is seen in his rendering of ראש 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 ἄνεμος for רוח as a stylistic variation for πνεῦμα or if he used two different words for two distinct contextual meanings. In 5:15b, רוח has a metaphorical sense connoting "evanescent." The רוח in 11:4a represents natural wind, which the sower may detect. The Greek equivalent ἄνεμος 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, רוח in 1:6b indicates natural wind, but the Translator used πνεῦμα for it because רוח is described as a subject moving actively. Another example is the recurrent expression προαίρεσις πνεύματος for רעות רוח, 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

προαίρεσις πνεύματος in 1:14b. As for πνεῦμα in 11:5a, he obviously contrasted it with ἄνεμος in 11:4a: one can perceive the way of ἄνεμος (רוח), but one can not recognize the way of πνεῦμα (רוח).

In entries 87 and 88, the Translator seems to have used λόγος for individual or specific utterance. On the other hand, he probably employed ῥῆμα 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 הוללות by παραβολή once in entry 89.[313] 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 הוללות based upon the translation technique of the Translator.[314] If such scribal error actually occurred, it probably happened so early that it dominated the textual tradition.[315]

According to entry 90, the form חשבון occurs 3 times in 7:25-7:29.[316] There are parallel expressions in 7:25a and 7:29b where the verb בקש is followed by חשבון. The Translator used ζητέω ψῆφον for one (7:25a) and ζητέω λογισμόν 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 חשבנות (pl.).

ψῆφος may be understood as a stylistic variation of λογισμός without any semantic distinction.

According to entry 93, שכלות occurs only once, not only in Ecclesiastes, but also through the entire MT, and modern scholars generally analyze the form as a variation of סכלות with the support of most manuscripts.[317] However, in rendering the form by ἐπιστήμη, the Translator evidently interpreted שכלות as a derived form from שכל ("to be prudent").[318]

In entry 97, an abnormal rendering is observed for רעה חולה in 5:12a. The Translator used ἀρρωστία for חולה or חלי in the other instances. Twice, רעה or רע appear with חולה or חלי, and he translated both רעה and רע by πονηρία. Based upon the translation pattern, one would expect πονηρὰ ἀρρωστία for רעה חולה in 5:12a. Did the Translator fail to translate רעה, or does ἀρρωστία stand for two words, רעה חולה? Two minuscules (766I, 766II) have δεινή ἀρρωστία, but all other manuscripts and papyri attest only to ἀρρωστία.[319] Not only in Greek Ecclesiastes but also in the entire Septuagint, the adjective δεινή ("fearful, "terrible") is never used as the equivalent of רעה.[320] Thus δεινή ἀρρωστία 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. "שכל"; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 125.

[319]The attestation is confirmed from the Göttingen Collation Books.

[320]Cf. Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. "δεινός."

חולה and חלי focus on 5:12-6:2, one could posit that the Translator may have rendered רעה חולה by ἀρρωστία in the first instance, then changed his approach, and used ἀρρωστία only for חולה thereafter. The motivation for the change is probably seen in 5:16b where חלי occurs alone, and where the Translator may have felt it necessary to differentiate the rendering for the חלי in 5:16b from the renderings for the immediately preceding רעה חולה in 5:15a and the following חלי רע 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. אלהים > θεός 40 (1:13b, 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 > Δαυιδ 1 (1:1a)

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

101. ישראל > Ισραηλ 2 (1:1b? 1:12b)

102. קהלת > ἐκκλησιαστής 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 אלהים by θεός in entry 98 is standard for all Septuagint translators.[322] In entries 99, 100 and 101, Ιερουσαλημ, Δαυιδ and Ισραηλ are faithful transliterations for ירושלם, דוד and ישראל respectively. On the other hand, the rendering ἐκκλησιαστής for קהלת in entry 102 is etymologically motivated. The noun קהלת occurs only in Ecclesiastes, and its equivalent ἐκκλησιαστής is also attested only in Greek Ecclesiastes. However, the Greek cognate noun ἐκκλησία rendering Hebrew nouns קהל, קהלה, or מקהל is ubiquitous in the Septuagint.[323] The verb ἐκκλησιάζω is also used 6 times for the verb קהל in *hiphil* by the other Greek translators.[324] 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. "ἐκκλησία."

[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. "ἐκκλησιάζειν." 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 יש and אין are traditionally treated as particles.[327] The Translator generally translated them by verbs (i.e., forms of ἐιμί), 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 (יש and אין).

Structural Analysis of Finite Verbs

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

---

ἐξεκκλησιάζω is also employed for קהל 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.[329] First, the Hebrew verbal system is based upon the two conjugations: prefix forms (*yqtl*) and suffix forms (*qtl*).[330] 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.[331]

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. F. Marcos (Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1985), 16-17.

[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."[332] 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*).[333] 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.[334] In his definition, tense is the presentation of time as points in a sequence.[335] 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."[336] Aspect is defined as the relationship between an event and the frame within which it is perceived or viewed.[337] 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

---

[332]E. J. Revell, "The System of the Verb in Standard Biblical Prose," *HUCA* 55 (1989): 3.

[333]Mats Eskhult, "Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose" (Ph.D. diss., Uppsala University, 1990), 121.

[334]Peter J. Gentry, "The System of the Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew," *HS* 39 (1998): 7-39.

[335]Gentry borrows Gropp's definition to explain the tense. Gentry, "System of the Finite Verb," 14. Also see D.M. Gropp, "The Function of the Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew," *HAR* 13 (1991): 53.

[336]Gentry, "System of the Finite Verb," 14.

is perceived as an ongoing process."[338]

For Gentry, the opposition between *qtl* and *yqtl* or between *wayyqtl* and *w^{e}qtl* is, first of all, described in terms of aspect. The form *qtl* and *wayyqtl* are perfective, and *yqtl* and *w^{e}qtl* 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 *w^{e}qtl*) 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

---

[337]Ibid., 14-15.

[338]Ibid., 15.

[339]Ibid.

[340]The 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.

[341]Ibid., 22-35; Revell, "The System of the Verb," 13-29; A. Niccacci, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, trans. W.G. Watson, JSOTSup 86 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990); Ahouva Shulman, "The Use of Modal Verb Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1996), 241-48.

imperfective.[342]

In Hellenistic Greek, most modern scholars understand the Greek verbal system as describing aspect not time.[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."[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."[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.[346] The stativity as an independent aspect may be supported by the morphological pecularity (i.e., reduplication) in the

---

[342]Gentry, "System of the Finite Verb," 32-33.

[343]Most significant recent works on verbal aspect of the Hellenistic Greek are done by Porter and Fanning. Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989); Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

[344]Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 124. See also Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 91; Trevor V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 19. Fanning uses the term "aorist aspect" instead of the "perfective aspect" and the "present aspect" instead of the "imperfective aspect."

[345]Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 124. See also Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 91; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 18.

[346]Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 91.

formation of the perfect or pluperfect verb.[347] In short, Greek seems to have stative aspect, which is grammaticalized.[348]

The more controversial aspect may be the future. McKay takes future as an aspect to represent an intention or expectation.[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.[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

---

[347]Cf. James A. Brooks and Carlton L. Winbery, *A Morphology of New Testament Greek: A Review and Reference Grammar* (New York: University Press of America, 1994), §180.

[348]There are two types of verb in Hebrew: fientive 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 *Aktionsart* (cf. Waltke and O'Connor, *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.

[349]For Porter, the term "expectation" is a unique category apart from aspects. See Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 427.

[350]Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 39-40; Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 120-24.

grounds rather than functional grounds.[351] 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 מותר in 3:19b,[352] 2 occurrences of דבר in 1:10a[353] and 8:4a,[354] and בשתי in 10:17b.[355] 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 יאכל (*yqtl* > noun) in 5:16a,[356] וכעס (*wqtl* > noun) in 5:16b,[357] ובאו (*wyqtl* > participle) in 8:10a,[358] יביע (*yqtl* > noun) in 10:1a,[359] or ואזן (*wqtl* > noun) and תקן (*qtl* > noun) in 12:9b.[360] 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* (*w^{e}yqtl* 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 *â* 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 אל 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.

[362]For the forms, which are distinct between long prefix and short prefix, see Gentry, "System of the Finite Verb," 12. Cf. Anson F. Rainey, "Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation," *HS* 27. 1 (1986): 5.

[363]The nine headings are *yqtl*, *w^{e}yqtl*, *wayyqtl*, *qtl*, *wqtl*, Imperative with *waw* prefix, Imperative without *waw* prefix, Short *yqtl/yqtl* + *â* suffix: with *waw* prefix, and finally, Short *yqtl/yqtl* + *â* suffix: without *waw* prefix.

attested for the pattern. For example, the subheading, *yqtl* > Future Indicative (114), means the *yqtl* 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)

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

yqtl > future indicative (114). The translator rendered *yqtl* by a future indicative 114 out of 179 times (64 percent). The future indicative is a default rendering for *yqtl* 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, 2:24a, 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, 6:2a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:4b, 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, 7:24b, 7:26b, 7:26b, 8:1b, 8:1b, 8:3a, 8:3b, 8:4b, 8:4b, 8:5a, 8:7b, 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 *yqtl* 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 וְיָדַעְתִּי גַם־אָנִי שֶׁמִּקְרֶה אֶחָד יִקְרֶה אֶת־כֻּלָּם
2:14b καὶ ἔγνων καί γε ἐγὼ ὅτι συνάντημα ἓν συναντήσεται τοῖς πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς

2:16b בְּשֶׁכְּבָר הַיָּמִים הַבָּאִים הַכֹּל נִשְׁכָּח
וְאֵיךְ יָמוּת הֶחָכָם עִם־הַכְּסִיל

2:16b καθότι ἤδη αἱ ἡμέραι αἱ ἐρχόμεναι τὰ πάντα ἐπελήσθη
καὶ πῶς ἀποθανεῖται ὁ σοφὸς μετὰ τοῦ ἄφρονος

In 2:14b the *yqtl* form יקרה 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 איך-clause in 2:16b is a rhetorical question and implies that both the wise and the fool die and are soon forgotten. The adverb כבר ("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

---

[364]Cf. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996), 571.

[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.

[366]Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 2.

[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 אם.[370] The conditional particle אם is rendered by ἐάν, 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. "ἐάν."

[372]Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 188.

(πέσωσιν) for *yqtl* (יפלו) to describe the "falling" in a consummative sense.[373]

Example:
4:10a כִּי אִם־יִפְּלוּ הָאֶחָד יָקִים אֶת־חֲבֵרוֹ
4:10a ὅτι ἐὰν πέσωσιν ὁ εἷς ἐγερεῖ τὸν μέτοχον αὐτοῦ

In 8 instances the *yqtl* occurs in a temporal clause. The Translator construed five independent clauses introduced by עד אשר as temporal and employed Greek temporal clauses for them, introduced by ἕως οὗ or ἕως ὅτου (2:3b, 12:1b, 12:2a, 12:6a, 12:7b)[374] The temporal conjunctions ἕως ου or ἕως ὅτου generally take either aorist indicative or aorist subjunctive.[375] The Translator understood the clause as indefinite and employed the subjunctive for *yqtl*.[376]

Example:
12:1a וּזְכֹר אֶת־בּוֹרְאֶיךָ בִּימֵי בְּחוּרֹתֶיךָ
12:1b עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָבֹאוּ יְמֵי הָרָעָה
12:1a καὶ μνήσθητι τοῦ κτίσαντός σε ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητός σου
12:1b ἕως ὅτου 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.

---

[373]For the consummative sense of aorist aspect in subjunctive, see Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 394; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 559-561.

[374]The *yqtl* form תשוב in 12:7b is understood to be governed by עד אשר in 12:6a. For the case in which ἕως takes the subjunctive the particle ἄν has been allowed to fall out in Hellenistic Greek, see Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 168; BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §383 (2).

[375]Bauer, s.v. "ἕως."

[376]Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ἕως."

The relative particle ש in 4:10b and its compound form כש in 9:12b are also construed as temporal and are rendered by ὅταν.

Example:
4:10b וְאִילוֹ הָאֶחָד שֶׁיִּפּוֹל וְאֵין שֵׁנִי לַהֲקִימוֹ
4:10b καὶ οὐαὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἑνί ὅταν πέσῃ καὶ μὴ ᾖ δεύτερος τοῦ ἐγεῖραι αὐτόν

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 (εὔξῃ) for the *yqtl* (תדר), which is in the temporal clause introduced by כאשר.

5:3a כַּאֲשֶׁר תִּדֹּר נֶדֶר לֵאלֹהִים אַל־תְּאַחֵר לְשַׁלְּמוֹ
5:3a καθὼς ἂν εὔξῃ εὐχὴν τῷ θεῷ μὴ χρονίσῃς τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι αὐτήν

The relative כאשר is rendered by καθὼς ἄν, 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 *yqtl* is rendered by an aorist subjunctive, which occurs in a final clause. The Translator construed the particles ש in 3:14b and 7:14b, and אשר in 3:11b and 7:21b as final, so rendered them by ἵνα and μήποτε respectively.

Example:
3:14b וְהָאֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה שֶׁיִּרְאוּ מִלְּפָנָיו
3:14b καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἵνα φοβηθῶσιν ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ

---

[377]Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ὅταν."

[378]See Robertson, *Grammar*, 1411f.; Porter, *Idioms*, 214.

In 3:14b, the subjunctive (φοβηθῶσιν) is used for *yqtl* (יראו) 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 למה (5:5b, 7:16b, 7:17b).[379]

5:5a אַל־תִּתֵּן אֶת־פִּיךָ לַחֲטִיא אֶת־בְּשָׂרֶךָ
וְאַל־תֹּאמַר לִפְנֵי הַמַּלְאָךְ כִּי שְׁגָגָה הִיא
5:5b לָמָּה יִקְצֹף הָאֱלֹהִים עַל־קוֹלֶךָ
5:5a μὴ δῷς τὸ στόμα σου τοῦ ἐξαμαρτῆσαι τὴν σάρκα σου
καὶ μὴ εἴπῃς πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι ἄγνοιά ἐστιν
5:5b ἵνα μὴ ὀργισθῇ ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ φωνῇ σου

7:16a אַל־תְּהִי צַדִּיק הַרְבֵּה וְאַל־תִּתְחַכַּם יוֹתֵר
7:16b לָמָּה תִּשּׁוֹמֵם
7:16a μὴ γίνου δίκαιος πολὺ καὶ μὴ σοφίζου περισσά
7:16a μήποτε ἐκπλαγῇς

7:17a אַל־תִּרְשַׁע הַרְבֵּה וְאַל־תְּהִי סָכָל
7:17b לָמָּה תָּמוּת בְּלֹא עִתֶּךָ
7:17a μὴ ἀσεβήσῃς πολὺ καὶ μὴ γίνου σκληρός
7:17b ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνῃς ἐν οὐ καιρῷ σου

In all 3 instances the rhetorical question introduced by למה follows two negative commands (אל 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 *yqtl* in the indefinite relative clause. The relative אשר

---

[379]See p. 89 of this dissertation.

is rendered by ὅσα ἐάν in 5:3b and by ὃ ἐάν in 8:3b; אם is rendered by ὅσα ἄν in 8:17b; ש is rendered by ᾗ ἐάν in 12:3a; and the compound relative מה ש is rendered by ᾧ ἐάν in 3:22b and בשל אשר is rendered by ὅσα ἄν in 8:17a.[381] The particle ἐάν or ἄν requires subjunctive.[382]

Example:
5:3b אֵת אֲשֶׁר־תִּדֹּר שַׁלֵּם
5:3b σὺν ὅσα ἐὰν εὔξῃ ἀπόδος

The subjunctive is suitable for the indefinite relative clause with ἐάν. 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 *yqtl* 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 ἄν. See LSJ, s.v. "ἵνα." For μήποτε, see Bauer, s.v. "μήποτε."

[381]Both בשל אשר in 8:17a and אם in 8:17b are rendered by ὅσα ἂν 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 ἐὰν appears frequently instead of ἄν after relatives in Hellenistic Greek. After analyzing the papyri (Pentateuch), Thackeray concluded that "Ος ἂν was, thus, the usual form in iii/-ii/B.C. down to 133 B.C., when ὃς ἐὰν 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 וּלְאֶחָד אֵיךְ יֵחָם
4:11b καὶ ὁ εἷς 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 θερμανθῇ for the *yqtl* יחם 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 לא, which are always with a long prefix form; and ירבה (III-ה 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:
10:14a וְהַסָּכָל יַרְבֶּה דְבָרִים
10:14a καὶ ὁ ἄφρων πληθύνει λόγους

1:3a מַה־יִּתְרוֹן לָאָדָם בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ
1:3b שֶׁיַּעֲמֹל תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
1:3a τίς περισσεία τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ
1:3b ᾧ μοχθεῖ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

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).

---

[387]Cf. Gentry, "System of the Finite Verb," 14-15; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 211-39; Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 198-240.

[388]Cf. Porter, *Idioms*, 32; Robertson, *Grammar*, 866.

[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.[392] The circularity of human activities (1:9-11) is noted in 1:3b. Every man toils, and the toiling recurs. The *yqtl* (יעמל) 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 יֵשׁ אֶחָד וְאֵין שֵׁנִי גַּם בֵּן וָאָח אֵין־לוֹ
וְאֵין קֵץ לְכָל־עֲמָלוֹ
גַּם־עֵינָיו לֹא־תִשְׂבַּע עֹשֶׁר
4:8a ἔστιν εἷς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν δεύτερος καί γε υἱὸς καὶ ἀδελφὸς οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν περασμὸς τῷ παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ
καί γε ὀφθαλμὸς αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐμπίπλαται πλούτου

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* (תשבע) 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.[393] 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

---

[391]English translation is from NASB.

[392]Cf. Derek Kidner, *An Introduction to Wisdom Literature: The Wisdom of Proverbs, Job & Ecclesiastes* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1985), 97.

[393]8:7 "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 ש or אשר.[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 וְגַם לָאַחֲרֹנִים שֶׁיִּהְיוּ
לֹא־יִהְיֶה לָהֶם זִכָּרוֹן עִם שֶׁיִּהְיוּ לָאַחֲרֹנָה
1:11b καί γε τοῖς ἐσχάτοις γενομένοις
οὐκ ἔσται αὐτοῖς μνήμη μετὰ τῶν γενησομένων εἰς τὴν ἐσχάτην

(attributive)
2:18b שֶׁאַנִּיחֶנּוּ לָאָדָם שֶׁיִּהְיֶה אַחֲרָי

---

[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 Finite Verb," 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 ש-clauses (1:9a, 1:11b, 1:11b, 2:18b, 8:7a, 10:14b); and 1 instance appears in the אשר-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.

2:18b ὅτι ἀφίω αὐτὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ γινομένῳ μετ' ἐμέ

There are two identical ש-clauses in 1:11b.[397] The first ש-clause modifies the antecedent אחרנים. 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 ש-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 ש by the article τῷ and the *yqtl* יהיה by the participle γενόμενον.[398] The relative clause functions as an attributive and modifies אדם. The Greek articular participle for the ש-clause maintains the same attributive function.

As for tense and aspect, Greek tense seems to be related to function in the instances where the *yqtl* 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 לֹא־יֵדַע הָאָדָם מַה־שֶּׁיִּהְיֶה
וְאֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מֵאַחֲרָיו מִי יַגִּיד לוֹ
10:14b οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ ἄνθρωπος τί τὸ γενόμενον
καὶ τί τὸ ἐσόμενον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ τίς ἀναγγελεῖ αὐτῷ

The same *yqtl* forms (יהיה) in the relative clauses are rendered by the aorist (γενόμενον) in the first line and by the future (ἐσόμενον) in the second line. The adverbial phrase מאחריו ("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 γενομένοις and the future γενησομένων) for the same forms (יהיה) 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 מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה הוּא שֶׁיִּהְיֶה
1:9a τί τὸ γεγονός αὐτὸ τὸ γενησόμενον

In 1:9a *qtl* היה contrasts with *yqtl* יהיה. The Translator also used the perfect γεγονός for the *qtl* and the future γενησόμενον 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 שֶׁאַנִּיחֶנּוּ לָאָדָם שֶׁיִּהְיֶה אַחֲרָי
2:18b ὅτι ἀφίω αὐτὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ γινομένῳ μετ' ἐμέ

The adverbial phrase אחרי clearly indicates the relative future time. One would expect the future tense for the *yqtl* יהיה based upon the normal pattern of the Translator and upon the context.[399] Codex Alexandrinus attests to the future γενησόμενῳ instead of γινομένῳ, 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.[400] 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:
3:14a יָדַעְתִּי כִּי כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה הָאֱלֹהִים הוּא יִהְיֶה לְעוֹלָם
3:14a ἔγνων ὅτι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός αὐτὰ ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

---

[399]For how the Translator rendered the *yqtl* after a similar adverbial phrase (מאחריו), 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 ἐποίησεν is employed for the *yqtl* יעשה 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 (ἔγνω) in 9:12a is clearly gnomic, and the aorist (ἔγνω) in 10:14b is employed for relative past time contrasting with relative future time (ἀναγγελεῖ).

8:10a וּמִמְּקוֹם קָדוֹשׁ יְהַלְּכוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכְּחוּ בָעִיר
8:10a καὶ ἐκ τόπου ἁγίου ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ ἐπηνέθησαν ἐν τῇ πόλει

In 8:10a the Translator construed the *yqtl* form (יהלכו) to have a preterite value and employed the aorist indicative (ἐπορεύθησαν).[401] 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 *yqtl* is followed by *w^e^yqtl* (וישתכחו), and the *w^e^yqtl* is evidently a short prefix form.[402] The *yqtl*, therefore, is to be construed as short. The aorist indicative is a proper equivalent to the alleged short *yqtl*. The action of going from the temple is portrayed in a constative sense and is seen as antecedent to the time of speaking.

yqtl* > *present subjunctive (4). In 4 instances *yqtl* is rendered by a present subjunctive, all in dependent clauses. The Translator strongly favored an aorist

---

[401]According to Gentry, *yqtl* 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 חו-. The long form would have נו-. 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 אשר-clause in 4:17a and the ש-clause in 5:17a as indefinite relative clauses and employed ᾧ ἐάν for both relatives. In 2:18b he interpreted the particle ש as causal and rendered it by ὅτι.[404] Finally the Translator understood the אשר-clause in 8:12b as a final clause and utilized a ὅπως. 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 וְלִרְאוֹת טוֹבָה בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ שֶׁיַּעֲמֹל תַּחַת־הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ
5:17a καὶ τοῦ ἰδεῖν ἀγαθωσύνην ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ ᾧ ἐὰν μοχθῇ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

(*yqtl* > aorist subjunctive)
8:17a בְּשֶׁל אֲשֶׁר יַעֲמֹל הָאָדָם לְבַקֵּשׁ וְלֹא יִמְצָא
8:17a ὅσα ἂν μοχθήσῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ζητῆσαι καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσει

The same *yqtl* form יעמל is rendered by the present subjunctive μοχθῇ in 5:17a and an aorist subjunctive μοχθήσῃ in 8:17a. In 5:17a the Translator viewed יעמל as an activity in the customary sense, of multiple repetitions.[405] Thus, the imperfective aspect is the preferred form. On the other hand, the יעמל in 8:17a should be depicted as a

---

[403]Cf. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 400-04.

[404]Both of them are introduced by ᾧ ἐὰν.

[405]Cf. Porter, *Idioms*, 29; Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 390.

complete action because the subsequent result clause (οὐχ εὑρήσει) presupposes completion of the previous action. The perfective aspect is the form of choice.

The present subjunctive ἀφίω 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 πορεύῃ 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 μή (3:11b, 7:21b), but a present subjunctive occurs in a ὅπως clause without μή (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 טוֹב אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִדֹּר
5:4b מִשֶּׁתִּדּוֹר וְלֹא תְשַׁלֵּם
5:4a ἀγαθὸν τὸ μὴ εὔξασθαί σε
5:4b ἢ τὸ εὔξασθαί σε καὶ μὴ ἀποδοῦναι

In 5:4a the Translator employed the substantival infinitive (εὔξασθαι) for *yqtl* (תדר) in the nominal clause, and the nominal clause functions as the subject. The relative particle אשר is translated by the article τό, and the accusative of the second person pronoun follows the infinitive as a subject of the infinitive.[406] 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 (תדור and תשלם) are found in the nominal clause functioning as the object of the preposition מן. The preposition מן is comparative and is rendered by the Greek comparative particle ἤ. The Translator utilized the substantival infinitives for the *yqtl* forms as functional equivalents.

yqtl > present imperative (1). 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.

9:8a בְּכָל־עֵת יִהְיוּ בְגָדֶיךָ לְבָנִים
9:8b וְשֶׁמֶן עַל־רֹאשְׁךָ אַל־יֶחְסָר
9:8a ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἔστωσαν ἱμάτιά σου λευκά
9:8b καὶ ἔλαιον ἐπὶ κεφαλήν σου μὴ ὑστερησάτω

The first line (9:8a) shows a parallelism with the second line (9:8b): Predicate (Adverbial Phrase + Verb) + Subject / Subject + Predicate (Adverbial Phrase + Verb). The *yqtl* יחסר in the second line is a short form and must be a modal because it follows אל. In the parallelism יהיו the *yqtl* in the first line is to be interpreted as a short form.[407]

---

[406]The same pattern of translation is seen in 7:18a.

[407]The short *yqtl* יהיו 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 ὑστερησάτω for the יחסר, but the present ἔστωσαν for יהיו because the verb εἰμί does not have an aorist form for imperative.

***w^e^yqtl* (14).** A *w^e^yqtl* form occurs fourteen times in Ecclesiastes. The Translator employed six different combinations of Greek tenses and moods to render *w^e^yqtl*: aorist subjunctive, future indicative, present indicative, aorist indicative, aorist imperative, and participle.[408] The translation pattern for *w^e^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).[409] These are the major three tenses, which the Translator employed for *w^e^yqtl*: an aorist subjunctive (36 percent), future indicative (21 percent), and present indicative (14 percent).[410] The first place is switched between *yqtl* (future indicative) and *w^e^yqtl* (aorist subjunctive), but the future indicative is functionally parallel to the aorist subjunctive in Hellenistic Greek.[411] The data, therefore, indicate that the Translator treated the functional value of *w^e^yqtl* as similar to that of *yqtl*.[412]

---

phrase בכל עת may be understood as a focus in 9:8a. The short form following אל (such as יחסר 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;

[412]Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 183.

w^e^yqtl* > *aorist subjunctive (5). The Translator employed an aorist subjunctive for *w^e^yqtl* 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.

12:5a גַּם מִגָּבֹהַּ יִרָּאוּ וְחַתְּחִתִּים בַּדֶּרֶךְ
וְיָנֵאץ הַשָּׁקֵד וְיִסְתַּבֵּל הֶחָגָב וְתָפֵר הָאֲבִיּוֹנָה
12:5a καί γε ἀπὸ ὕψους ὄψονται καὶ θάμβοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ
καὶ ἀνθήσῃ τὸ ἀμύγδαλον καὶ παχυνθῇ ἡ ἀκρίς καὶ διασκεδασθῇ ἡ κάππαρις

In 12:5a, 3 *w^e^yqtl* forms (וינאץ, ויסתבל, and ותפר) are rendered by aorist subjunctives (ἀνθήσῃ, παχυνθῇ, and διασκεδασθῇ) with the conjunction καί.[413] The Translator seems to have construed *yqtl* (יראו) in the previous line as a main verb and rendered it by a future indicative (ὄψονται). He understood the following 3 *w^e^yqtl* 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."[414]

12:6a עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִרְחַק חֶבֶל הַכֶּסֶף וְתָרֻץ גֻּלַּת הַזָּהָב
12:6b וְתִשָּׁבֵר כַּד עַל־הַמַּבּוּעַ וְנָרֹץ הַגַّלְגַּל אֶל־הַבּוֹר
12:6a ἕως ὅτου μὴ ἀνατραπῇ σχοινίον τοῦ ἀργυρίου καὶ συνθλιβῇ ἀνθέμιον τοῦ χρυσίου
12:6b καὶ συντριβῇ ὑδρία ἐπὶ τὴν πηγήν καὶ συντροχάσῃ ὁ τροχὸς ἐπὶ τὸν λάκκον

In 12:6a and 12:6b the Translator rendered 2 *w^e^yqtl* forms (ותרץ and ותשבר) by aorist subjunctives (συνθλιβῇ and συντριβῇ) with καί. The Translator had to utilize the subjunctives because the verbal forms must be compatible with the indefinite temporal

---

[413]For the first *weyqtl* וינאץ, the Translator understood its root as נצץ not נאץ. cf. GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §73g.

conjunction ἕως ὅτου. There are 5 instances where *yqtl* is rendered by an aorist subjunctive following ἕως ὅτου or ἕως οὗ (2:3b, 12:1b, 12:2a, 12:6a, 12:7b). The evidence demonstrates that Translator may have treated the functional value of *w^e^yqtl* as nearly equivalent to *yqtl*.

w^e^yqtl > future indicative (3). The Translator employed a future indicative for w^e^yqtl 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 *w^e^yqtl* as that of *yqtl*. 11:8b is taken as an example.

11:8a בְּכֻלָּם יִשְׂמָח
11:8b וְיִזְכֹּר אֶת־יְמֵי הַחֹשֶׁךְ
11:8a ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς εὐφρανθήσεται
11:8b καὶ μνησθήσεται τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ σκότους

The structure of 11:8a and 11:8b is a chiastic parallelism (A B / B′ A′). By the context, the *yqtl* (ישמח) and *w^e^yqtl* (ויזכר) are identical in their functional values. The Translator recognized this and employed the same future indicative for both forms.

w^e^yqtl > present indicative (2). In 2 instances the Translator rendered *w^e^yqtl* 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 וּמִי יוֹדֵעַ הֶחָכָם יִהְיֶה אוֹ סָכָל וְיִשְׁלַט בְּכָל־עֲמָלִי
2:19a καὶ τίς οἶδεν εἰ σοφὸς ἔσται ἢ ἄφρων καὶ ἐξουσιάζεται ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ μου

---

[414]Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 11.

The temporal reference is future by context. Since the *yqtl* יהיה is rendered by the future indicative ἔσται, one would expect the future indicative also for *w*^{e}*yqtl* וישלט. The Translator employed the present indicative ἐξουσιάζεται with καί for וישלט. 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.[415]

7:7a כִּי הָעֹשֶׁק יְהוֹלֵל חָכָם
7:7b וְיַאֲבֵד אֶת־לֵב מַתָּנָה
7:7a ὅτι ἡ συκοφαντία περιφέρει σοφὸν
7:7b καὶ ἀπόλλυσι τὴν καρδίαν εὐτονίας αὐτοῦ

The statements in 7:7 are proverbial. The *yqtl* יהולל and *w*^{e}*yqtl* ויאבד must be gnomic. The Translator employed gnomic presents for both *yqtl* and *w*^{e}*yqtl*.[416] This instance provides another evidence that the Translator understood *w*^{e}*yqtl* to be functionally identical to *yqtl*. He used the present to portray the process of "destroying" as being in progress and not as complete.

w^{e}*yqtl* > *aorist indicative (2).* There are 2 instances where the Translator employed an aorist indicative for *w*^{e}*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^e^yqtl* in 8:10a has been addressed above in the discussion of *yqtl* in 8:10a.[417] The *w^e^yqtl* in 6:12a must now be examined.

6:12a כִּי מִי־יוֹדֵעַ מַה־טּוֹב לָאָדָם בַּחַיִּים
מִסְפַּר יְמֵי־חַיֵּי הֶבְלוֹ וְיַעֲשֵׂם כַּצֵּל
6:12b אֲשֶׁר מִי־יַגִּיד לָאָדָם
מַה־יִּהְיֶה אַחֲרָיו תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
6:12a ὅτι τίς οἶδεν τί ἀγαθὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ
ἀριθμὸν ἡμερῶν ζωῆς ματαιότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὰς ἐν σκιᾷ
6:12b ὅτι τίς ἀπαγγελεῖ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ
τί ἔσται ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

The form ויעשם in 6:12a is indistinguishable whether it is a long prefix and a short prefix. It is possible that the Translator read *w^e^yqtl* as *wayyqtl* having preterite value. In context, the temporal reference of 6:12a is relative past to that of 6:12b. The *yqtl* יהיה in 6:12b implies relative future, and it is clarified by the adverbial phrase אחריו. 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^e^yqtl > aorist imperative (1). In 11:9a the Translator employed aorist imperative for *w^e^yqtl*.

11:9a שְׂמַח בָּחוּר בְּיַלְדוּתֶיךָ
וִיטִיבְךָ לִבְּךָ בִּימֵי בְחוּרוֹתֶיךָ
וְהַלֵּךְ בְּדַרְכֵי לִבְּךָ וּבְמַרְאֵי עֵינֶיךָ
11:9a εὐφραίνου νεανίσκε ἐν νεότητί σου

---

[417]See p. 155 of this dissertation.

[418]Cf. Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 58;

[419]Cf. Gordis, *Koheleth*, 254

καὶ ἀγαθυνάτω σε ἡ καρδία σου ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητός σου
καὶ περιπάτει ἐν ὁδοῖς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὁράσει ὀφθαλμῶν σου

The *w^e^yqtl* form has a pronominal suffix (ויטיבך), so one is unable to determine whether it is a long or short prefix. The form follows the imperative שמח and precedes another imperative with *waw,* והלך. 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.[420] The Translator construed the *w^e^yqtl* as projective, presumably by the context and employed the imperative ἀγαθυνάτω for it as he did for the other two Hebrew imperatives. The aorist seems to denote the ingressive sense—"to begin doing good."[421]

w^e^yqtl > participle (1). In 1 :18b the *w^e^yqtl* form ויוסיף is rendered by the articular participle ὁ προστιθείς with καί. The articular participle functions as a subject.

1:18b וְיוֹסִיף דַּעַת יוֹסִיף מַכְאוֹב
1:18b καὶ ὁ προστιθεὶς γνῶσιν προσθήσει ἄλγημα

There may be more than one way to explain the rendering. First, the Translator could have read ויוסיף as a *Qal* participle. There are 2 instances in MT where the form is a participle (יוסף) but vocalized like *Hiphil yqtl* (*yôsip*) in defective spelling (Isa 29:14; 38:5).[422] The form ויוסיף 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^e^yqtl* 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 ויוסיף.

***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 ואתנה in 1:17a and וארא in 4:1a and 4:7a.

Evidence:
1:17a, 4:1a, 4:7a.

The form ואתנה in 1:17a has the so-called cohortative ה-, 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 ה- suffix does not mark projective but indicates an action directed towards the speaker.[423] All the 3 *wayyqtl* forms in Ecclesiastes follow *w*^{e}*qtl* or *qtl* in sequence. One example is given for illustration.

Example:
4:1a וְשַׁבְתִּי אֲנִי וָאֶרְאֶה אֶת־כָּל־הָעֲשֻׁקִים
4:1a καὶ ἐπέστρεψα ἐγὼ καὶ εἶδον σὺν πάσας τὰς συκοφαντίας

The Translator understood the *w*^{e}*qtl* (ושבתי) as having perfective aspect and past time reference. He construed the following *wayyqtl* (וארא) as having the same

---

[422]BDB, s.v. "יסף."

functional value as the *w^e^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^e^yqtl* is akin to that of *yqtl*. The Translator frequently employed an aorist subjunctive for *yqtl* or *w^e^yqtl* 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,

---

[423]Gentry, "System of the Finite Verb," 21-38; A. Shulman, "The Use of Modal Verb Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1996).

4:13b, 4:14b, 4:15a, 4:16a, 5:10a, 5:12a, 5:14a, 5:15a, 5:17a, 5:17b, 5:18a, 6:1a, 6:3a, 6:3b, 6:4a, 6:5a, 6:5a, 6:6a, 6:6a, 6:10a, 7:10a, 7:10b, 7:14b, 7:15a, 7:22b, 7:23a, 7:23b, 7:25a, 7:27a, 7:27a, 7:28a, 7:28a, 7:28b, 7:28b, 7:29a, 7:29a, 7:29b, 8:9a, 8:9b, 8:10a, 8:10a, 8:11b, 8:14b, 8:15b, 8:16a, 9:1a, 9:3a, 9:3b, 9:5b, 9:6a, 9:7b, 9:9a, 9:11a, 9:13a, 9:15b, 10:5a, 10:6a, 10:7a, 10:10a, 10:15b, 12:3b, 12:7b, 12:8a, 12:9a, 12:9b, 12:10a, 12:11b.

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 אשר or ש 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 כְּבָר הָיָה לְעֹלָמִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה מִלְּפָנֵנוּ
1:10b ἤδη γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν

---

[424]אשר-clauses occur 8 times in 1:10b, 1:13a, 4:3b, 7:19b, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:6b, 9:9a; and ש-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.

(substantive)
1:9a מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה הוּא שֶׁיִּהְיֶה וּמַה־שֶּׁנַּעֲשָׂה הוּא שֶׁיֵּעָשֶׂה
1:9a τί τὸ γεγονὸς αὐτὸ τὸ γενησόμενον καὶ τί τὸ πεποιημένον αὐτὸ τὸ ποιηθησόμενον

In 1:10b the second *qtl* היה follows אשר. The Translator rendered the relative clause by the articular participle. This participle is in the second attributive position modifying τοῖς αἰῶσιν. In Ecclesiastes, היה disagrees in number with its antecedent עלמים, which is plural.[427] The verb היה occasionally neglects gender and number in Biblical Hebrew.[428] The word עלמים is generally treated as singular.[429] The disagreement, therefore, is allowed within the convention of Biblical Hebrew. The Translator literally rendered the antecedent עלמים as a plural and took the participle in plural, γενομένοις, for היה to match αἰῶσιν rendering עלמים. The Translator seems to have noticed the inconsistency of the usage of היה, and corrected it to agree with the number of the antecedent.[430] The translation is literalistic but not mechanical.

In 1:9a 2 *qtl* forms (היה and נעשה) in ש- 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 עלמים is treated as a singular in Isa 26:4, 45:17, and Dan 9:24. Isa 51:9 is the only place where עלמים is treated as a plural, and Ps 145:13 cannot be judged. In other places עלמים 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. עלמים; cf. Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 110-11.

be done."[431] The Translator construed the ש- clauses as headless relative clauses.[432] The articular participles are excellent functional equivalents to the headless relative clauses.

1:9a מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה הוּא שֶׁיִּהְיֶה וּמַה־שֶּׁנַּעֲשָׂה הוּא שֶׁיֵּעָשֶׂה
1:9a τί τὸ γεγονός αὐτὸ τὸ γενησόμενον καὶ τί τὸ πεποιημένον αὐτὸ τὸ ποιηθησόμενον

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:
1:14a רָאִיתִי אֶת־כָּל־הַמַּעֲשִׂים שֶׁנַּעֲשׂוּ תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
1:14a εἶδον σὺν πάντα τὰ ποιήματα τὰ πεποιημένα ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

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 כל.

[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 עשה (7 times).[435]

The Translator employed the aorist participle 6 times for *qtl*.[436] Four of these are forms of היה, which are rendered by γενόμενος.[437] The aorist participle basically denotes the summary aspect.[438] 1:10b is given for illustration.

Example:
1:10b כְּבָר הָיָה לְעֹלָמִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה מִלְּפָנֵנוּ
1:10b ἤδη γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν

The "ages" (τοῖς αἰῶσιν) is summarized in aorist aspect (γενομένοις). 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 וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־לִבִּי לִדְרוֹשׁ וְלָתוּר בַּחָכְמָה
עַל כָּל־אֲשֶׁר נַעֲשָׂה תַחַת הַשָּׁמָיִם
1:13a καὶ ἔδωκα τὴν καρδίαν μου τοῦ ἐκζητῆσαι καὶ τοῦ κατασκέψασθαι ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ
περὶ πάντων τῶν γινομένων ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν

The Translator must have understood the activities of Qoheleth expressed in *wqtl* and 2 infinitives (ונתתי, לדרוש, and ולתור) as past actions in perfective aspect since he expressed

---

[435]The other two verbs are עבד (5:8b) and היה (1:9a).

[436]The 6 instances are 1:10b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 3:15a, 4:2a, 9:9a.

[437]The verb היה rendered by a participle occurs 5 times. One instance in 1:9a is rendered by a perfect participle which parallels the πεποιημένα in 1:9a. The other 2 verbs rendered by an aorist participle are מוּת (4:2a) and נתן (9:9a). and בוא (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 (כל) which Qoheleth explores is described in *qtl* (נעשה). The Translator interpreted נעשה as occurrence in progress and so employed the present (γινομένων). 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 הַכֹּל הוֹלֵךְ אֶל־מָקוֹם אֶחָד
3:20b הַכֹּל הָיָה מִן־הֶעָפָר וְהַכֹּל שָׁב אֶל־הֶעָפָר
3:20a τὰ πάντα πορεύεται εἰς τόπον ἕνα
3:20b τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τοῦ χοός καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐπιστρέφει εἰς τὸν χοῦν

A general statement is given in 3:20a and is specified in 3:20b. In 3:20b, the Translator rendered the first *qtl* form (היה) 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* (שב) by a present indicative (ἐπιστρέφει). 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 non-past event. On the other hand "coming into existence 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 יָשׁוּב לָלֶכֶת כְּשֶׁבָּא כַּאֲשֶׁר
5:14a ἐπιστρέψει τοῦ πορευθῆναι ὡς ἥκει

The *qtl* form בא is rendered by a present indicative ἥκει.[441] The form ἥκει 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 ἥκει, therefore, corresponds well to בא denoting a present perfect state.

There is 1 instance where the *qtl* is not gnomic but is rendered by the present indicative.

12:13a סוֹף דָּבָר הַכֹּל נִשְׁמָע
12:13a τέλος λόγου τὸ πᾶν ἀκούεται

---

[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. "ἥκω"; Bauer, s.v. "ἥκω"; Robertson, *Grammar*, 337.

[443]Cf. Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §30.5.2,

נשמע may convey a present perfect state emphasizing the completion of "hearing" in the context. The Translator employed the present ἀκούεται for *qtl*. The verb ἀκούω is often used as a perfective present in Hellenistic Greek.[444] Another possibility is that the Translator might have interpreted נשמע as performative.[445] 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 כבר (1:10a, 3:15a, 6:10a).

Example:
1:10b כְּבָר הָיָה לְעֹלָמִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה מִלְּפָנֵנוּ
1:10b ἤδη γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν

The first היה 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 כבר ("already"). The Greek perfect indicative is an excellent equivalent to the *qtl* denoting the stativity.[446]

In the remaining 2 cases the *Niphal* form of עשה is construed as a perfect (8:9a, 8:14a).

---

[444]Robertson, *Grammar*, 881.

[445]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.

Example:
8:9a וְנָתוֹן אֶת־לִבִּי לְכָל־מַעֲשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר נַעֲשָׂה תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
8:9a καὶ ἔδωκα τὴν καρδίαν μου εἰς πᾶν ποίημα ὃ πεποίηται ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

The noun מעשה is an antecedent of the אשר-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* נעשה 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 ש-clause.[448]

Evidence:
7:10a, 7:24a, 12:7a.

Example:
7:10a אַל־תֹּאמַר מֶה הָיָה שֶׁהַיָּמִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים הָיוּ טוֹבִים מֵאֵלֶּה
7:10a μὴ εἴπῃς τί ἐγένετο ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι αἱ πρότεραι ἦσαν ἀγαθαὶ ὑπὲρ ταύτας

The *qtl* form היו is rendered by the imperfect indicative ἦσαν.[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 ש is rendered by ὅτι (7:10a), ὅ (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.[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 כִּי מִי יוּכַל לְתַקֵּן אֵת אֲשֶׁר עִוְּתוֹ
7:13b ὅτι τίς δυνήσεται τοῦ κοσμῆσαι ὃν ἂν ὁ θεὸς διαστρέψῃ αὐτόν

The *qtl* עותו 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 ἄν requires the subjunctive in Greek. The subjunctive in Hellenistic Greek strongly favors the aorist tense over the present.[452] In aorist aspect the activity of God ("making crooked") is summarized as a whole. The temporal deixis of the *qtl* עותו is understood as a relative past to the time of the main verb יוכל לתקן ("to be able to make straight"), which is rendered by the future indicative with the aorist infinitive (δυνήσεται τοῦ κοσμῆσαι).[453] Therefore, the aorist is used by the context, and the subjunctive is employed according to the norm of the target language.

10:10a אִם־קֵהָה הַבַּרְזֶל

---

[451]For the customary imperfect, see Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 242-49.

[452]Ibid., 402-04.

[453]Turner, *Syntax*, 107.

10:10a ἐὰν ἐκπέσῃ τὸ σιδήριον

The *qtl* קהה occurs in the protasis of the conditional sentence introduced by אם. The Translator employed ἐάν for אם and the aorist subjunctive ἐκπέσῃ for קהה. The subjunctive is the proper mood for the ἐάν-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 *yqtl* 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.

(יצא in 4:14a)
4:13a טוֹב יֶלֶד מִסְכֵּן וְחָכָם
4:13b מִמֶּלֶךְ זָקֵן וּכְסִיל אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדַע לְהִזָּהֵר עוֹד
4:14a כִּי־מִבֵּית הָסוּרִים יָצָא לִמְלֹךְ
4:13a ἀγαθὸς παῖς πένης καὶ σοφὸς
4:13b ὑπὲρ βασιλέα πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἄφρονα ὃς οὐκ ἔγνω τοῦ προσέχειν ἔτι
4:14a ὅτι ἐξ οἴκου τῶν δεσμίων ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ βασιλεῦσαι

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 ἐξελεύσεται for the *qtl* יצא and accordingly, emphasized the relative future time of "becoming a new king" over the lad's poor origin.[454] It may be also possible that the Translator read יצא as *yëṣë'* (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.

7:22a כִּי גַּם־פְּעָמִים רַבּוֹת יָדַע לִבֶּךָ
7:22a ὅτι πλειστάκις πονηρεύσεταί σε καὶ καθόδους πολλὰς κακώσει καρδίαν σου

There is a textual problem involved in 7:22a. The whole line in Greek Ecclesiastes shows *lectio duplex*. The adverbial phrase פעמים רבות is rendered twice by πλειστάκις and again by καθόδους πολλάς. The main verb ידע is probably read as ירע by the confusion of ד and ר.[455] The presumed ירע is also duplicated as πονηρεύσεται and κακώσει. Since the Translator read the form in question as *yqtl* not *qtl*, the future indicative is an expected equivalent for the presumed *yqtl*.

It is noticeable that both instances rendered by future indicative involve I-*waw* verbs in Ecclesiastes.[456] I-*waw* verbs in *qtl* 3 m. s. can be easily confused with *yqtl* 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, 2:9a, 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, 5:13b, 5:18a, 8:15a, 8:17a, 9:16a, 12:3b, 12:5b.

---

[455]ירע (*yëra'*) is a 3 m.s. prefix form from the root רעע. The verb רעע is rendered by κακόω in 8:9b and also in 10:15 of B. Its adjective forms רע (*ra'*), רע (*rōa'*) or רעה (*rā'â*) are rendered by κακός or κακία 7 times, and by πονηρός or πονηρία 22 times. The data support the suggestion that both πονηρεύσεται and κακώσει in 7:22a are employed for ירע. Cf. Jarick, *Concordance*, 268-269.

[456]I.e., יצא in 4:14a, and ידע in 7:22a.

The *wqtl* follows *qtl* or is in the series of *wqtl* following *qtl* in 23 instances.[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*.[458] The instance of 1:13a is given for an example.

(ונתתי in 1:13a)
1:12 אֲנִי קֹהֶלֶת הָיִיתִי מֶלֶךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּירוּשָׁלִָם
1:13a וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־לִבִּי לִדְרוֹשׁ וְלָתוּר בַּחָכְמָה
1:12 ἐγὼ Ἐκκλησιαστὴς ἐγενόμην βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ Ισραηλ ἐν Ιερουσαλημ
1:13a καὶ ἔδωκα τὴν καρδίαν μου τοῦ ἐκζητῆσαι καὶ τοῦ κατασκέψασθαι ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ

A *wqtl* form ונתתי in 1:13a follows *qtl* הייתי in 1:12. The Translator employed the aorist indicative for both *qtl* and *wqtl*. He must have understood the value of ונתתי to be the value of הייתי 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.

---

[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* וסבבו in 12:5b follows the active participle הלך (*hōlēk*) in Ecclesiastes. The Translator employed the aorist indicatives for both forms. He probably read הלך as *hālak* (*qtl* 3 m.s.). See p. 248 of this dissertation.

[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," *HAR* 9 (1985): 279-80.

(*wqtl* in 5:13b)
5:12a יֵשׁ רָעָה חוֹלָה רָאִיתִי תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
5:12b עֹשֶׁר שָׁמוּר לִבְעָלָיו לְרָעָתוֹ
5:13a וְאָבַד הָעֹשֶׁר הַהוּא בְּעִנְיַן רָע
5:13b וְהוֹלִיד בֵּן וְאֵין בְּיָדוֹ מְאוּמָה
5:12a ἔστιν ἀρρωστία ἣν εἶδον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον
5:12b πλοῦτον φυλασσόμενον τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰς κακίαν αὐτοῦ
5:13a καὶ ἀπολεῖται ὁ πλοῦτος ἐκεῖνος ἐν περισπασμῷ πονηρῷ
5:13b καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱὸν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ οὐδέν

The *wqtl* form והוליד in 5:13b is rendered by aorist indicative, which may denote perfective aspect and past-time reference. The difficulty lies with the previous *wqtl* ואבד in 5:13a, which is rendered by a future indicative, not aorist indicative. The Translator understood the *wqtl* as having the value of *yqtl* by context not by the sequence since the form is not preceded by *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…"[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."[460] The Translator switched tenses from aorist (ἐγέννησεν) to present (ἔστιν). 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 ἔστιν.

---

[459]Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 5.

[460]Ibid., 5.

Two different tenses used for the same *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 *wqtl* forms in this unit. The Translator employed three different moods / tenses for the *wqtl* forms. The first *wqtl* is rendered by an aorist subjunctive, and then the second *wqtl* is rendered by an aorist indicative, and finally the next 2 *wqtl* forms are rendered by future indicatives.

12:3a בַּיּוֹם שֶׁיָּזֻעוּ שֹׁמְרֵי הַבַּיִת
וְהִתְעַוְּתוּ אַנְשֵׁי הֶחָיִל
12:3b וּבָטְלוּ הַטַּחֲנוֹת כִּי מִעֵטוּ
וְחָשְׁכוּ הָרֹאוֹת בָּאֲרֻבּוֹת
12:4a וְסֻגְּרוּ דְלָתַיִם בַּשּׁוּק בִּשְׁפַל קוֹל הַטַּחֲנָה
12:3a ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἐὰν σαλευθῶσιν φύλακες τῆς οἰκίας
καὶ διαστραφῶσιν ἄνδρες τῆς δυνάμεως
12:3b καὶ ἤργησαν αἱ ἀλήθουσαι ὅτι ὠλιγώθησαν
καὶ σκοτάσουσιν αἱ βλέπουσαι ἐν ταῖς ὀπαῖς
12:4a καὶ κλείσουσιν θύρας ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ φωνῆς τῆς ἀληθούσης

The temporal clause is introduced by ביום ש. The first verb in the temporal clause is *yqtl* יזעו. The *yqtl* is followed by 4 *wqtl* forms (והתעותו, ובטלו, וחשכו, and וסגרו). The sequence indicates that all of the *wqtl* forms have the functional value of *yqtl*, which they follow. The temporal clause beginning at 12:3a and ending at 12:4a, therefore, comprises of 5 finite verbs all having *yqtl* value.

The Translator construed the temporal clause as an indefinite by using ἐάν. The indefinite temporal clause with the relative pronoun and ἐάν normally takes the

subjunctive.[461] The Translator employed the aorist subjunctives (σαλευθῶσιν and διαστραφῶσιν) for the first 2 verbs in 12:3a—i.e., *yqtl* (יזעו) and the first *wqtl* (והתעותו). He switched from subjunctive to the aorist indicative (ἤργησαν) for the second *wqtl* (ובטלו) in 12:3b. He used another tense—future indicative (σκοτάσουσιν and κλείσουσιν)—for the following 2 *wqtl* (וחשכו and וסגרו) in 12:3b-12:4a.

The 2 aorist subjunctives (σαλευθῶσιν and διαστραφῶσιν) used in 12:3a are proper choices for the Greek indefinite temporal clause. The aorist indicative (ἤργησαν) 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).[462] The Greek indefinite temporal clause with ἐάν has a conditional force.[463] 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."[464] 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").[465]

---

[461]LSJ, s.v. "ἄν," §(A) B. I. 2.

[462]Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 269. Cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, 846.

[463]LSJ, s.v. "ἄν," §(A) B. I. 2.

[464]Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 232-33. The English translation is from Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 11.

[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:
3:13a, 5:5b, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:15a, 12:1b, 12:2b, 12:3a, 12:6b.

3:13a וְגַם כָּל־הָאָדָם שֶׁיֹּאכַל וְשָׁתָה וְרָאָה טוֹב
3:13a καί γε πᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς φάγεται καὶ πίεται καὶ ἴδῃ ἀγαθὸν

The Translator construed the first *wqtl* ושתה to be a verb of the ש-clause along with *yqtl* יאכל 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* וראה as a main verb to the relative clause and used the aorist subjunctive ἴδῃ. The Translator may have construed וראה 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.[467] 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 *wqtl* is rendered by present subjunctive (5:5b), the Hebrew rhetorical question introduced by למה is transformed into a result/purpose clause in Greek—i.e., ἵνα clause.

5:5b לָמָה יִקְצֹף הָאֱלֹהִים עַל־קוֹלֶךָ וְחִבֵּל אֶת־מַעֲשֵׂה יָדֶיךָ
5:5b ἵνα μὴ ὀργισθῇ ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ φωνῇ σου καὶ διαφθείρῃ τὰ ποιήματα χειρῶν σου

In the ἵνα clause, two Hebrew verbs, *yqtl* (יקצף) and *wqtl* (וחבל) are rendered by aorist subjunctives, ὀργισθῇ and διαφθείρῃ with καί respectively.[468] The first aorist subjunctive seems to have an ingressive sense here emphasizing the point of transition at which God becomes angry.[469] The following aorist subjunctive may denote a constative idea viewing God's destroying activity as a whole.

The *wqtl* follows the *yqtl* in its functional value according to the sequence. Both *yqtl* and *wqtl* in the rhetorical question can be understood as a projective. The subjunctive is an appropriate mood for the Hebrew projective.

(ובא, וסבב, and ובנה in 9:14b and ומצא in 9:15a)
9:14a עִיר קְטַנָּה וַאֲנָשִׁים בָּהּ מְעָט
9:14b וּבָא־אֵלֶיהָ מֶלֶךְ גָּדוֹל וְסָבַב אֹתָהּ

---

[467]It may be the first class condition. Cf. BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §380, Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 688.

[468]See p. 146 of this dissertation. Even though διαφθείρῃ 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 *wqtl* elsewhere.

[469]Cf. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 393.

וּבָנָה עָלֶיהָ מְצוֹדִים גְּדֹלִים
9:15a וּמָצָא בָהּ אִישׁ מִסְכֵּן חָכָם
וּמִלַּט־הוּא אֶת־הָעִיר בְּחָכְמָתוֹ
9:15b וְאָדָם לֹא זָכַר אֶת־הָאִישׁ הַמִּסְכֵּן הַהוּא
9:14a πόλις μικρὰ καὶ ἄνδρες ἐν αὐτῇ ὀλίγοι
9:14b καὶ ἔλθῃ ἐπ' αὐτὴν βασιλεὺς μέγας καὶ κυκλώσῃ αὐτήν
καὶ οἰκοδομήσῃ ἐπ' αὐτὴν χάρακας μεγάλους
9:15a καὶ εὕρῃ ἐν αὐτῇ ἄνδρα πένητα σοφόν
καὶ διασώσει αὐτὸς τὴν πόλιν ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ
9:15b καὶ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἐμνήσθη σὺν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τοῦ πένητος ἐκείνου

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 (ἔλθῃ, κυκλώσῃ, οἰκοδομήσῃ, and εὕρῃ) and 1 future indicative (διασώσει) for 5 *wqtl* 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.[470] 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 *wqtl* 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 *wqtl* occurs in the indefinite temporal clause introduced by ἕως ὅτου or ἕως οὗ.[472]

Example:
12:6b עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִרְחַק חֶבֶל הַכֶּסֶף וְתָרֻץ גֻּלַּת הַזָּהָב
12:6b ἕως ὅτου μὴ ἀνατραπῇ σχοινίον τοῦ ἀργυρίου καὶ συνθλιβῇ ἀνθέμιον τοῦ χρυσίου

The *wqtl* ותרץ is preceded by *yqtl* ירחק, so its value is probably that of *yqtl*. 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 עד אשר by ἕως ὅτου. The subjunctive is an appropriate mood for the indefinite temporal clause introduced by ἕως ὅτου.[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]ἕως ὅτου or ἕως οὗ are employed for עד אשר.

[473]LSJ, s.v. "ἕως"; Bauer, s.v. "ἕως."

present tense in a ἕως-clause.[474] Finally the aorist subjunctive rendering *wqtl* in 12:3a has been already discussed above.[475]

wqtl > future indicative (7). In 7 instances out of 45 *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 *wqtl* form in 3:13a follows *yqtl* and is construed as having the same functional value as *yqtl*.[476] The future indicative is employed for the *wqtl* form in 5:13a to reflect the relative future time according to the context.[477] In 9:15a, the Translator used the future indicative for *wqtl* as a variation of aorist subjunctive.[478] The 2 future indicatives for *wqtl* in 12:3b and 12:4a denote prophetic future.[479] The *wqtl* form in 12:9b seems to be read as *yqtl* by the confusion between ו and י.[480] Finally, the instance in 10:3b is discussed as follows:

(ואמר in 10:3b)
10:3a וְגַם־בַּדֶּרֶךְ כְּשֶׁהַסָּכָל הֹלֵךְ לִבּוֹ חָסֵר
10:3b וְאָמַר לַכֹּל סָכָל הוּא

---

[474]For the temporal clauses with ἕως, the present subjunctive is never used in NT, but the aorist subjunctive is used 50 times. See Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 400 (Table 6.2).

[475]See p. 180 of this dissertation.

[476]See p. 182 of this dissertation.

[477]See p. 179 of this dissertation.

[478]See p. 184 of this dissertation.

[479]See p. 180 of this dissertation.

[480]See p. 17 of this dissertation.

10:3a καί γε ἐν ὁδῷ ὅταν ἄφρων πορεύηται καρδία αὐτοῦ ὑστερήσει
10:3b καὶ ἃ λογιεῖται πάντα ἀφροσύνη ἐστίν

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 חסר and אמר, both of which are rendered by future indicatives ὑστερήσει and λογιεῖται. 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 וְזָרַח הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וּבָא הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
1:5a καὶ ἀνατέλλει 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 (וזרח and ובא) in 1:5a. One is that the 2 *wqtl* forms may have been construed as a perfect consecutive.[483]

---

[481]For the gnomic use of the Hebrew suffix form, see Rogland, *Alleged Non-Past Uses*, 15-48. For the Greek gnomic future, see Robertson, *Grammar*, 876; BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §349; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 411, 423-24; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 571.

[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.

[483]Cf. GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §112k; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 106.

Since they follow participles in 1:4 the Translator may have understood the functional value of וזרח and ובא 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.

wqtl > noun (1). In one example, the Translator rendered *wqtl* by a noun.

4:11a גַּם אִם־יִשְׁכְּבוּ שְׁנַיִם וְחַם לָהֶם
4:11b וּלְאֶחָד אֵיךְ יֵחָם
4:11a καί γε ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν δύο καὶ θέρμη αὐτοῖς
4:11b καὶ ὁ εἷς πῶς θερμανθῇ

The verb חמם occurs twice in Ecclesiastes, and both of them are in 4:11. In Greek Ecclesiastes they are rendered differently. The *wqtl* form וחם in 4:11a is translated by the noun θέρμη with καί. On the other hand the *yqtl* form יחם in 4:11b is rendered by the aorist subjunctive θερμανθῇ. The question is whether the Translator construed the form וחם 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."[484] If the Translator construed the form in question as a noun he may have vocalized וחם as *w^e^hām*. However, since the contextual meaning is not changed, it is also possible that he read the form וחם as a *wqtl* but used the noun intentionally. If this is the case, he pursued

---

[484]The dative (αὐτοῖς) may denote possessive.

stylistic variation in translating וחם in 4:11a and יחם 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.[485] 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.[486] A good example for comparison between two aspects is the imperative cluster in 11:9a-12:1a.

11:9a שְׂמַח בָּחוּר בְּיַלְדוּתֶיךָ
וְהַלֵּךְ בְּדַרְכֵי לִבְּךָ
11:9b וְדָע כִּי עַל־כָּל־אֵלֶּה יְבִיאֲךָ הָאֱלֹהִים בַּמִּשְׁפָּט
11:10a וְהָסֵר כַּעַס מִלִּבֶּךָ
וְהַעֲבֵר רָעָה מִבְּשָׂרֶךָ
12:1a וּזְכֹר אֶת־בּוֹרְאֶיךָ בִּימֵי בְּחוּרֹתֶיךָ
11:9a εὐφραίνου νεανίσκε ἐν νεότητί σου
καὶ περιπάτει ἐν ὁδοῖς καρδίας σου
11:9b καὶ γνῶθι ὅτι ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις ἄξει σε ὁ θεὸς ἐν κρίσει
11:10a καὶ ἀπόστησον θυμὸν ἀπὸ καρδίας σου
καὶ παράγαγε πονηρίαν ἀπὸ σαρκός σου
12:1a καὶ μνήσθητι τοῦ κτίσαντός σε ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητός σου

The present imperative is used for the first 2 imperatives (שמח and הלך) in 11:9a, and for the other 4 imperatives (דע, הסר, העבר, and זכר) 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 ראה ("to see, consider") always occurs in the aorist form (2:1a, 7:13a, 7:14a, 7:27a, 7:29a, 9:9a). The word for ירא ("to fear") takes the present form in the imperative (5:6b, 12:3b). The imperative for שמר ("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 לך is rendered by the adverb δεῦρο.[487]

2:1a לְכָה־נָּא אֲנַסְּכָה בְשִׂמְחָה וּרְאֵה בְטוּב
2:1a δεῦρο δὴ πειράσω σε ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἰδὲ ἐν ἀγαθῷ

9:7a לֵךְ אֱכֹל בְּשִׂמְחָה לַחְמֶךָ וּשְׁתֵה בְלֶב־טוֹב יֵינֶךָ
9:7a δεῦρο φάγε ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ ἄρτον σου καὶ πίε ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀγαθῇ οἶνόν σου

In both instances the imperative לך is followed by a volitive: cohortative in 2:1a, and imperative in 9:7a. When לך 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 לך.

---

[486]Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 329.

[487]In 2:1a, the form (לכה) has a paragogic *he*. Cf. Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, §48d.

[488]BDB, s.v. "הלך," *Qal* 5. f.

[489]Cf. LSJ, s.v. "δεῦρο."

Short *yqtl / yqtl* + *â* suffix with *waw* prefix (2). Short *yqtl / yqtl* + *â* suffix with *waw* prefix (2) are rendered by either aorist indicative or aorist subjunctive.

Short yqtl / yqtl + â suffix with waw prefix > aorist indicative (1). The equivalent occurs in 1:17a.

1:16b וְלִבִּי רָאָה הַרְבֵּה חָכְמָה וָדָעַת
1:17a וָאֶתְּנָה לִבִּי לָדַעַת חָכְמָה וְדַעַת הוֹלֵלוֹת וְשִׂכְלוּת
1:16b καὶ καρδία μου εἶδεν πολλά σοφίαν καὶ γνῶσιν
1:17a καὶ ἔδωκα καρδίαν μου τοῦ γνῶναι σοφίαν καὶ γνῶσιν παραβολὰς καὶ ἐπιστήμην

The Translator construed the form ואתנה in 1:17a as *wayyqtl* following *qtl* (ראה) in 1:16b. It is not evident how he understood the suffix *â* in ואתנה. Modern scholars such as Gentry, propose that the suffix *â* 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 + â suffix with waw prefix > aorist subjunctive (1). The equivalent occurs in 12:7a.

12:6a עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִרְחַק חֶבֶל הַכֶּסֶף
12:7a וְיָשֹׁב הֶעָפָר עַל־הָאָרֶץ כְּשֶׁהָיָה
12:7b וְהָרוּחַ תָּשׁוּב אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר נְתָנָהּ
12:6a ἕως ὅτου μὴ ἀνατραπῇ σχοινίον τοῦ ἀργυρίου
12:7a καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ ὁ χοῦς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὡς ἦν
12:7b καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς τὸν θεόν ὃς ἔδωκεν αὐτό

The form וישב 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 ἐπιστρέψῃ with καί for it. He likely understood that the form fits the indefinite temporal clause

---

[490]Gentry, "System of the Finite Verb," 29-31.

introduced by עד אשר in 12:6a. The succeeding 6 aorist subjunctives from ἀνατραπῇ in 12:6a to ἐπιστρέψῃ in 12:7b seem to have been construed as verbs for the temporal clause. Consequently the Translator may have assumed the negative particle לא to be gapped before וישב. Since the negative לא 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 *w*^{e}*yāšub*–i.e., a long *yqtl* with a defective spelling.[491]

Short *yqtl / yqtl* + *â* suffix without *waw* prefix (26). For short *yqtl / yqtl* + *â* suffix without *waw* prefix (26), the Translator employed the aorist subjunctive, present or aorist imperative, or future indicative.

Short yqtl / yqtl + â 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 אל.[492] Functionally, the negative אל plus the jussive in the second person expresses a prohibition.[493] The Greek equivalent to this Hebrew negative command is μή 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.

[493]Cf. GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §109c; Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, §160f.

with μή also denotes prohibition, the prohibitory subjunctive is an excellent functional equivalent to the 14 Hebrew jussive forms.[494] An example is given for illustration.

5:5a אַל־תִּתֵּן אֶת־פִּיךָ לַחֲטִיא אֶת־בְּשָׂרֶךָ
5:5a μὴ δῷς τὸ στόμα σου τοῦ ἐξαμαρτῆσαι τὴν σάρκα σου

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.[495]

There is 1 instance, which is not with אל, but the Translator construed it as jussive (5:14b).

5:14b וּמְאוּמָה לֹא־יִשָּׂא בַעֲמָלוֹ שֶׁיֵּלֵךְ בְּיָדוֹ
5:14b καὶ οὐδὲν οὐ λήμψεται ἐν μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ ἵνα πορευθῇ ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ

The form ילך is vocalized as a *Hiphil* jussive in Ecclesiastes ("to take," or "to carry").[496] In context, the implied subjective of ילך is the rich (cf. 5:13). On the other hand, the Translator vocalized the form in question differently from MT. Its Greek equivalent πορευθῇ reflects *yēlēk* ("to go") in Hebrew–i.e., a *Qal* jussive form. If the verb is read as *Qal*, then its subject is מאומה. 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 ש-clause. The subjunctive is required by the ἵνα-clause which renders the ש-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

---

[494]For the prohibitive subjunctive, see BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §364; Roberston, *Grammar*, 932.

[495]Cf. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 337. Translation is from Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 5.

[496]For its meaning in *Hiphil*, see BDB, s.v. "הלך"; KB, s.v. "הלך."

for the Hebrew jussive according to context and complies with the demand of the target language.

Short yqtl / yqtl + â 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 + â 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 אל and so must be jussive.[497] Jussive with אל 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 אַל־תִּרְשַׁע הַרְבֵּה וְאַל־תְּהִי סָכָל
7:17a μὴ ἀσεβήσῃς πολὺ καὶ μὴ γίνου σκληρός

The first אל plus jussive (אל־תרשע) is rendered by μή plus an aorist subjunctive (μὴ ἀσεβήσῃς), and the second אל plus jussive (אל־תהי) is rendered by μή plus a present imperative (μὴ γίνου). 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.

[498]Cf. BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §427; Robertson, *Grammar*, 943.

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 כִּי הָאֱלֹהִים בַּשָּׁמַיִם וְאַתָּה עַל־הָאָרֶץ עַל־כֵּן יִהְיוּ דְבָרֶיךָ מְעַטִּים
5:1b ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ σὺ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἔστωσαν οἱ λόγοι σου ὀλίγοι

The form יהיו in 5:1b is not preceded by the negative אל 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 אַל־תְּבַהֵל עַל־פִּיךָ
וְלִבְּךָ אַל־יְמַהֵר לְהוֹצִיא דָבָר לִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים
5:1a μὴ σπεῦδε ἐπὶ στόματί σου
καὶ καρδία σου μὴ ταχυνάτω τοῦ ἐξενέγκαι λόγον πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ

While there is no aspectual difference between תבהל and ימהר 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.

[500]Norbert Lohfink, *Qoheleth*, A Continental Commentary, trans. Sean McEvenue (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 74; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 44; Gordis, *Koheleth*, 154; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 193.

[501]The adverbial phrase על־כן may not affect the form's initial position. Cf. Gentry, "System of the Finite Verb," 34-39.

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").[502] 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.[503]

Short yqtl / yqtl + â 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 אָמַרְתִּי אֲנִי בְלִבִּי לְכָה־נָּא אֲנַסְּכָה בְשִׂמְחָה וּרְאֵה בְטוֹב
2:1a εἶπον ἐγὼ ἐν καρδίᾳ μου δεῦρο δὴ πειράσω σε ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἰδὲ ἐν ἀγαθῷ

The form אנסכה is analyzed as 1 c.s. *yqtl* form of נסה with a 2 m.s. suffix in *plene* spelling.[504] Formally אנסכה is indistinguishable whether it is a long or short *yqtl*, but the introductory word לכה is frequently followed by projectives in Biblical Hebrew.[505] The initial position of אנסכה 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. "הלך," §I.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.[506] Porter notes that the future can carry "a higher degree of expectation for fulfillment regarding the action" than the hortatory subjunctive.[507] Therefore, the modal use of the future indicative is suitable for the Hebrew cohortative: "Come now, let me test you with enjoyment."[508]

Lastly, the problematic form יהוא in 11:3b is discussed here.

11:3a וְאִם־יִפּוֹל עֵץ בַּדָּרוֹם וְאִם בַּצָּפוֹן
11:3b מְקוֹם שֶׁיִּפּוֹל הָעֵץ שָׁם יְהוּא
11:3a καὶ ἐὰν πέσῃ ξύλον ἐν τῷ νότῳ καὶ ἐὰν ἐν τῷ βορρᾷ
11:3b τόπῳ οὗ πεσεῖται τὸ ξύλον ἐκεῖ ἔσται

Gordis suggests that the form יהוא is a conflation of הוא and יהיה, but most modern scholars tend to analyze the form in question as a short prefix form יהו (*y^{e}hû*) from הוה with anomalous א.[509] The verb הוה occurs in 2:22a as a participle, and the Translator rendered it by the present indicative of γίνομαι. One could argue that the Translator may have interpreted the form in question as הוא (*hû'*).[510] The pronoun הוא (*hû'*) occurs 27 times. When it is used as a copular verb (9 instances), it is always rendered by ἐστιν (present indicative of εἰμί). The form הוא (*hû'*) is never translated by

---

[506]Porter, *Idioms*, 45.

[507]Ibid., 45.

[508]English translation is from Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 2.

[509]Gordis, *Koheleth*, 320-321; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 108; Whitley, *Koheleth*, 93. Cf. GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §23i, 75s; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 336.

[510]Cf. BHS-Horst; GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §75s.

the future indicative. As do modern scholars, the Translator likely construed the form in question as an anamolous short prefix form rather than הוא.

Even though יהוא is understood as a short prefix form, its function does not seem to be a modal in 11:3b.[511] 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").[512] The future indicative, which the Translator employed for יהוא, is probably gnomic future.[513] 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 *yqtl*, 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 *yqtl* is employed normally for dependent clauses and is decided by the norm of the target language. The Translator treated the *w^{e}yqtl* forms in the same manner as he treated *yqtl* while he construed *wayyqtl* 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

---

[511]Cf. Schoors, *The Preacher*, 42-43.

[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 *wqtl* as *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 (*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 μή plus aorist subjunctive or μή plus imperative as a stylistic variation. Different tenses signify different aspects not temporal deixes.

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.[514] Gender cannot be compared because the Greek verb does not inflect for gender while the Hebrew verb inflects for gender in 2nd and 3rd 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.

---

[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.[515] 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 כל (*kol*).[516] Whereas כל is treated as a singular in Hebrew the Translator rendered כל by the plural forms of πᾶς in all 4 instances, probably according to context.[517] Consequently the Greek verb in the relative clause follows the number of the antecedent—i.e., the plural form of πᾶς. 1:13a is given as an example.

1:16a וְהוֹסַפְתִּי חָכְמָה עַל כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־הָיָה לְפָנַי
1:16a καὶ προσέθηκα σοφίαν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἳ ἐγένοντο ἔμπροσθέν μου

In 1:10b the antecedent עלמים is plural, but the verb היה in the relative clause does not agree with the number of the antecedent.

1:10b כְּבָר הָיָה לְעֹלָמִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה מִלְּפָנֻנוּ
1:10b ἤδη γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν

The form עלמים may be understood as a plural of extension and denotes a lengthened period of time.[518] Since the plural is used for intensification, it can be construed as a

---

[515]There is no instance where person does not agree.

[516]The relative clauses are introduced either by אשר or by ש.

[517]The word כל seems to be used distributively, meaning "any." See Whitley, *Koheleth*, 15-16; Schoors, *The Preacher*, 157.

[518]GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §124b; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 6.

singular.[519] Some Hebrew manuscripts have the plural form היו, 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.

2:7a וּבְנֵי־בַיִת הָיָה לִי
2:7a καὶ οἰκογενεῖς ἐγένοντό μοι

10:1a זְבוּבֵי מָוֶת יַבְאִישׁ
10:1a μυῖαι θανατοῦσαι σαπριοῦσιν

10:12b וְשִׂפְתוֹת כְּסִיל תְּבַלְּעֶנּוּ
10:12b καὶ χείλη ἄφρονος καταποντιοῦσιν αὐτόν

Several manuscripts attest the plural form היו rather than היה in 2:7a, but this may indicate scribal correction for harmonization.[520] The singular of the verb may be either impersonally used ("there was to me") or be attracted to the number of בית.[521] Joüon and Muraoka note that the plural is sometimes neglected with היה ל in Biblical Hebrew, and היה ל tends to remain uninflected.[522] The singular verb in Hebrew in 2:7a, therefore, appears to be conventional. The Translator used the plural verb ἐγένοντο perhaps because either he or his parent text harmonized the number of the verb with that of the subject.

---

[519]Whitley, *Koheleth*, 11; Schoors, *The Preacher*, 157.

[520]BHS-Horst; Schoors, *The Preacher*, 22;

[521]GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §145u; Gordis, *Koheleth*, 207; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 129.

[522]Joüon 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 זבובי מות is divided incorrectly and emend it as זבוב ימות–a singular with asyndeton.[523] Horst and Whitley expect the singular form זבוב to accord with the singular verb.[524] Gordis suggests the attraction to מות. The parent text of the Translator evidently had a plural subject זבובי, which is rendered by the plural μυῖαι. He harmonized the number of the verb with that of the subject.

10:12b וְשִׂפְתוֹת כְּסִיל תְּבַלְּעֶנּוּ
10:12b καὶ χείλη ἄφρονος καταποντιοῦσιν αὐτόν

The subject שפתות 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.[525] The Translator followed the Greek convention and employed the plural form of the verb (καταποντιοῦσιν) 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).

2:12b מֶה הָאָדָם שֶׁיָּבוֹא אַחֲרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־כְּבָר עֲשׂוּהוּ

---

[523]Fox, *Qoheleth*, 264-65; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 311-12.

[524]BHS-Horst; Whitley, *Koheleth*, 83.

[525]GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §145k; Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, §150d, g;

2:12b τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐπελεύσεται ὀπίσω τῆς βουλῆς τὰ ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτήν

In 2:12b, the lack of a main verb, the function of את, and the plural form עשוהו 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 ἐποίησεν for the plural עשוהו.[526] He read the form מלך with an Aramaic meaning ("plan" or "counsel") and probably understood האדם not המלך as the subject of the verb.[527] Although many Hebrew manuscripts attest the singular form עשהו, one cannot be sure whether the Translator had the singular or the plural form in his parent text.[528] 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 languge 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 ἐποίησαν 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 עשהו is the original reading, the subject is the king. On the other hand, if the original reading is עשוהו, then the subject is indefinite royal predecessors. See Schoor, *The Preacher*, 157; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 20.

[528]Gentry argues that עשהו may be considered a defective spelling for עשוהו. and that ἐποίησαν is the original text of OG. See Gentry, "Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three," 165-67. For the evidence of the singular form עשהו, 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.[529] Niphal basically marks either middle or passive.[530] Piel is an active stem denoting factitive with intransitive verbs and resultative with transitive verbs.[531] Pual is the passive counterpart of Piel.[532] Hithpael is used primarily as a reflexive counterpart of the Piel and is used secondarily as passive.[533] Hiphil, a causative stem, denotes the active voice, which can be used either intransitively or transitively.[534] Hophal is the passive opposition to the Hiphil stem.[535] 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.

[531]Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §24.1-3. Cf. Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, §52d; GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §52f-g.

[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.[536] The active voice has its own distinctive endings and includes transitive and intransitive verbs.[537] 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."[538] 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.[539] C. W. Conrad goes further by arguing that -θη- 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.[540] The -θη- 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.

[538]Andrew L. Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), §414.

[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 σα-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.[541] Conrad uses the term MP1 to designate the -μην / -σο / -το etc endings and MP2 to designate the -θην / -θης / -θη etc endings.[542] Semantically MP2 forms denote intransitive/quasi-passive or even convey middle function and not exclusively passive function.[543] In short, as their forms overlap extensively, so the MP1 and MP2 forms overlap in function extensively.[544]

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.'[545] In addition, Conrad shows that intransitivity is indicated by basic, MP1, and MP2 forms.[546] 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.

[541]Ibid., §5.1.

[542]MP2 includes the -ην / -ης / -η etc endings.

[543]For example, the verb ἐγείρω can be either (1) transitive and active or (2) passive or (3) intransitive. The form ἠγέιρθη 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 ἀπεκρίθη. Ibid., §4.3; Robertson, *Grammar*, 332.

[544]Gentry, "Transitivity and Voice in Hellenistic Greek," 3.

[545]Conrad, "New Observattion," §7.1.1.-7.1.2.

There are 453 instances which are legitimate for the analysis of voices in Ecclesiastes.[547] 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, 1:5a, 1:9a, 1:10a, 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, 2:11a, 2:12a, 2:12b, 2:13a, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:17a, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:20a, 2:20a, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:24b, 2:26a, 2:26b, 3:10a, 3:10a, 3:11a, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:11b, 3:12a, 3:13a, 3:14a, 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, 5:5a, 5:7a, 5:7a, 5:12a, 5:14a, 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.

6:3b, 6:4a, 6:5a, 6:5a, 6:6a, 6:6a, 6:12a, 7:10a, 7:10a, 7:10b, 7:13a, 7:14a, 7:14a, 7:14b, 7:14b, 7:15a, 7:17a, 7:17b, 7:19a, 7:19a, 7:20b, 7:21a, 7:21b, 7:23b, 7:24a, 7:24b, 7:25a, 7:27a, 7:27a, 7:27a, 7:28a, 7:28b, 7:28b, 7:29a, 7:29a, 7:29a, 8:2a, 8:3a, 8:3b, 8:3b, 8:4b, 8:4b, 8:9a, 8:10a, 8:10a, 8:14b, 8:15b, 8:16a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 8:17b, 9:1a, 9:7a, 9:7a, 9:7b, 9:8a, 9:8b, 9:9a, 9:9a, 9:10a, 9:10a, 9:11a, 9:12a, 9:12b, 9:13a, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:15a, 9:16a, 10:4a, 10:5a, 10:7a, 10:11a, 10:14b, 10:15b, 10:16b, 10:18b, 11:1b, 11:2a, 11:2b, 11:3a, 11:4a, 11:4b, 11:5b, 11:6a, 11:6b, 11:9b, 12:1b, 12:1b, 12:4a,[548] 12:7a, 12:7a, 12:7b, 12:7b, 12:8a.

Examples:
(intransitive)
1:3b בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ שֶׁיַּעֲמֹל תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
1:3b ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ ᾧ μοχθεῖ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

(transitive)
3:11a גַּם אֶת־הָעֹלָם נָתַן בְּלִבָּם
3:11a καί γε σὺν τὸν αἰῶνα ἔδωκεν ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν

In 1:3b the Hebrew intransitive verb יעמל (עמל "to labour") in Qal is rendered by the Greek active form μοχθεῖ, (μοχθέω "to labour"), which is also intransitive.[549] In 3:11a the form נתן is a Qal and a transitive verb having an object (את־העלם). The Greek transitive verb ἔδωκεν 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 סגרו, which is vocalized in MT as *sugg^{e}rû*, a Pual suffix form in MT, as the Qal suffix form *sāg^{e}rû*. 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. "μοχθέω"; BDB, s.v. "עמל."

(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.[550] Evidence is presented, and two examples are given for illustration.

Evidence:
1:8a, 1:9a, 1:10b, 1:11b, 1:11b, 1:12a, 1:13a, 1:15a, 1:15b, 1:16a, 2:3a, 2:7a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:7b, 2:9a, 2:10b, 2:12b, 2:18b, 2:23a, 2:25a,[551] 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,[552] 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,[553] 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 שֶׁאַנִּיחֶנּוּ לָאָדָם שֶׁיִּהְיֶה אַחֲרָי
2:18b ὅτι ἀφίω αὐτὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ γινομένῳ μετ' ἐμέ

(transitive)
5:3a כַּאֲשֶׁר תִּדֹּר נֶדֶר לֵאלֹהִים אַל־תְּאַחֵר לְשַׁלְּמוֹ
5:3a καθὼς ἂν εὔξῃ εὐχὴν τῷ θεῷ μὴ χρονίσῃς τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι 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 חוש (*ḥûš*) means "to make haste." Its Greek equivalent φείδομαι ("to spare") seems to reflect *ḥûś* for *ḥûs*. See BHS-Horst; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 25.

[552]MT vocalizes ילך as a *Hiphil* prefix form (*yōlēk*), but the Translator probably read it as a Qal prefix (*yēlēk*).

[553]In MT, the form הלך 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 הלך occurs in the Qal stem, it is always rendered by πορεύομαι. Therefore, while the MT vocalizes the form יהלכו in 8:10a as the Piel prefix form *y^{e}hallēkû*, 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,[554] 2:24a, 2:25a, 3:13a, 3:13a, 3:22a, 4:16a, 5:11a, 5:14b, 6:2a, 6:3a,[555] 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 מְקוֹם שֶׁיִּפּוֹל הָעֵץ שָׁם יִהוּא
11:3b τόπῳ οὗ πεσεῖται τὸ ξύλον ἐκεῖ ἔσται

(transitive)
11:5b כָּכָה לֹא תֵדַע אֶת־מַעֲשֵׂה הָאֱלֹהִים
11:5b οὕτως οὐ γνώσῃ τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ θεοῦ

(stative)
2:19a וּמִי יוֹדֵעַ הֶחָכָם יִהְיֶה אוֹ סָכָל
2:19a καὶ τίς οἶδεν εἰ σοφὸς ἔσται ἢ ἄφρων

Finally, in 32 instances, Greek medio-passive forms have their counterpart active forms but are chosen for semantic reasons (24 percent). Evidence is fully presented and discussed.

Evidence:
1:8b, 1:8b, 2:9a, 2:9b, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:15a, 2:19a, 2:19a, 4:8a, 4:12a, 4:15b, 5:9a, 5:10a, 5:13a, 6:3a, 6:7b, 7:3b, 7:9b, 7:23b, 8:9b, 8:11b, 9:3b, 9:6a, 9:11b, 10:6b, 11:3a, 11:9a, 12:3a, 12:3b, 12:6a, 12:4b.

---

possibly construed it as the Qal prefix form *yahal^{e}kû* (cf. Jer 9:4, Job 14:20, Ps 73:9) or *yēl^{e}kû* (ילכו). See p. 155 of this dissertation.

[554]The form φάγομαι is a new form used in Hellenistic Greek instead of ἔδομαι. See BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §74 (2); LSJ, s.v. "ἐσθίω."

[555]The active form ζήσω sometimes appears along with the medio-passive form ζήσομαι in Hellenistic Greek. See Bauer, s.v. "ζάω"; BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §77, Robertson, *Grammar*, 356.

The verb שמח in Qal stem ("to rejoice") is rendered by εὐφραίνω 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 שמח.[556]

A medio-passive form of συναντάω ("to happen" in the medio-passive form' "to encounter" in the active form) is used for קרה ("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 חכם ("to become wise," "act wisely") is rendered by medio-passive forms of σοφίζω ("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 חכם.[560]

In 2:19a and 8:9b, the verb שלט 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 שלט 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. "שמח"; LSJ, s.v. "εὐφραίνω"; Bauer, s.v. "εὐφραίνω."

[557]LSJ, s.v. "συναντάω"; Bauer, s.v. "συναντάω."

[558]LSJ, s.v. "συναντάω"; Bauer, s.v. "συναντάω."

[559]KB, s.v. "חכם"; LSJ, s.v. "σοφίζω."

[560]Cf. Bauer, s.v. "σοφίζω."

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 נוח in the Qal stem ("to rest," "stay settled").[563] the meaning of the medio-passive form signals the same kind of intransitivity as נוח in the Qal.

A medio-passive form of καθίημι ("to sit" in the medio-passive form; "to let fall," "to send down" in the active form) renders ישב ("to sit") in 10:6b.[564] The meaning of καθίημι in the medio-passive form is equivalent to the meaing of ישב.

A Qal form of קום ("to rise," "to stand up") in 12:4b is rendered by the medio-passive form of ἀνίστημι ("to rise" in the medio-passive form; "to make to stand up, "to raise up" in the active form).[565] ἀνίστημι is transitive in the active forms and intransitive in the medio-passive forms. The medio-passive form is semantically comparable to קום in the Qal stem.

---

[561]KB, s.v. "שלט."

[562]LJS does not list the causative meaning under ἐξουσιάζω in the active voice. It should be supplemented.

[563]KB, s.v. "נוח"; LSJ, s.v. "ἀναπαύω."

[564]KB, s.v. "ישב"; LSJ, s.v. "καθίημι."

[565]KB, s.v. "קום"; LSJ, s.v. "ἀνίστημι."

The verb עמד ("to stand," "to remain standing") is rendered by the medio-passive forms of ἵστημι ("to stand" in the medio-passive form; "to make to stand" in the active form) in 2:9b, 4:12a, and 4:15b.[566] While its active form denotes a causative sense, a medio-passive form of ἵστημι is used in an intransitive sense and is equivalent to the meaning of עמד in the Qal stem.

In 2:9a the verb גדל in Qal ("to become great") is rendered by the medio-passive form of μεγαλύνω ("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 זוע in Qal ("to tremble") is rendered by the medio-passive form of σαλεύω ("to be shaken" in the medio-passive form; "to cause to rock," "to make to vibrate" in the active form) in 12:3a.[567] The Hebrew verb is used intransitively, and the meaning of σαλεύω in the medio-passive form may be comparable to the Hebrew.

The verb שבע 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.[568] The Translator used medio-passive forms of ἐμπίμπλημι or of πίμπλημι (both "to be filled with" in the medio-passive form; "to fill full

---

[566]KB, s.v. "עמד"; LSJ, s.v. "ἵστημι."

[567]KB, s.v. "זוע"; BDB, s.v. "זוע"; LSJ, s.v. "σαλεύω"; Bauer, s.v. "σαλεύω."

[568]BDB treats the verb שבע 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 Joüon and Muraoka call the phenomenon as 'the

of" in the active form) for שבע.[569] The meaning of the medio-passsive forms is comparable to that of the Hebrew verb.

The verb מלא ("to be full of") occurs in the Qal stem in 1:8b, 6:7b, 9:3b, and 11:3a.[570] The verb is formally a stative verb, but sometimes functions as a fientive verb.[571] 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 מלא are indicated by a direct object whereas in Greek one uses the genitive. The Greek equivalents to מלא are medio-passive forms of πληρόω ("to be filled" in the medio-passive form; "to make full" in the active form).[572] The meaning in the Greek medio-passive form is equivalent in function to that of the Hebrew verb. For מלא 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).[573] The meaning of the Greek form is contextually comparable to the Hebrew verb.

The two Qal forms of אבד ("to perish," "to be destroyed") in 5:13a and 9:6a respectively are rendered by medio-passive forms of ἀπόλλυμι ("to be lost" in the medio-

---

encroachment of the active on the stative.' See Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §22.2.3b; Joüon and Muraoka, *Hebrew Grammar*, §41b.

[569]LSJ, s.v. "ἐμπίμπλημι" and also s.v. "πίμπλημι."

[570]KB, s.v. "מלא."

[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 אבד.

The verb רבב ("to be or become numerous") in 5:10a is rendered by a medio-passive form of πληθυνώ ("to be multiplied," "to increase" in the medio-passive form; "to make multiple" in the active form).[574] The meaning of the Greek form is intransitive and approximately compares in sense to the Qal of רבב.[575]

In 7:3b, the verb יטב ("to be glad" or "to becomes glad") in Qal is rendered by a medio-passive form of ἀγαθύνω ("to become glad" in the medio-passive form; "to cheer," "to magnify" in the active form).[576] The Translator chose the Greek medio-passive form because its lexical meaning matches the Hebrew.

In 12:3b a medio-passive form of ὀλιγόω ("to become few" in the medio-passive form; "to lessen," "to diminish" in the active form) is used for the verb מעט ("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 רצץ ("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. "רבב"; BDB, s.v. "רבב"; LSJ, s.v. "πληθυνώ."

[575]Cf. Bauer, s.v. "πληθυνώ."

[576]KB, s.v. "יטב"; BDB, s.v. "יטב"; LSJ, s.v. "ἀγαθύνω."

[577]KB, s.v. "מעט"; BDB, s.v. "מעט"; LSJ, s.v. "ὀλιγόω."

[578]BDB, s.v. "רצץ." Cf. KB, s.v. "רצץ."

intransitive or quasi-passive sense ("to get crushed").[579] 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").[580] 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.[581]

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. "רצץ."

[580]BHS-Horst; KB, s.v. "רצץ."

[581]LSJ, s.v. "συνθλίβω"; Bauer, s.v. "συνθλίβω."

1:8b 1:9a, 1:9a, 1:13a, 1:14a, 2:16b, 2:17a, 4:3b, 4:12b, 4:14b, 5:8b, 6:7b, 6:10a, 7:2b, 7:26b, 7:26b, 8:5b, 8:9a, 8:14a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:3a, 9:5b, 9:6b, 9:9a,[582] 10:6a, 10:9a, 10:18a, 11:3a, 12:2b, 12:3b, 12:3b, 12:4b, 12:5b, 12:6a, 12:6b, 12:11b, 12:12a, 12:13a, 12:13b.

Examples:
(passive)
1:9a וּמַה־שֶּׁנַּעֲשָׂה הוּא שֶׁיֵּעָשֶׂה
1:9a καὶ τί τὸ πεποιημένον αὐτὸ τὸ ποιηθησόμενον

(intransitive)
1:13a עַל כָּל־אֲשֶׁר נַעֲשָׂה תַּחַת הַשָּׁמָיִם
1:13a περὶ πάντων τῶν γινομένων ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν

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,[583] 10:9b, 12:6b). Each instance is presented and discussed.

In 8:3a תבהל, a Niphal prefix form of בהל ("to be in haste" in Niphal), is rendered by σπουδάσῃς, an active subjunctive form of σπουδάζω ("to be hasty," "to be anxious").[584] In the context, the Greek verb is used intransitively describing an emotionally anxious state.[585] The verb בהל is used in the Piel stem in other two places

---

[582]The form נתן is vocalized as *nātan*, a Qal active in MT, but is rendered by the medio-passive participle δοθείσας. The Translator seems to have vocalized נתן 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. "בהל"; LSJ, s.v. "σπουδάζω"; Bauer, s.v. "σπουδάζω." Cf. KB, s.v. "בהל."

[585]Peter Walters argues that σπουδάζω used as an equivalent for בהל 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 סכן in Niphal ("to be endangered," "to endanger oneself") is rendered by κινδυνεύσει a future active form of κινδυνεύω ("to run a risk").[586] The meaning of κινδυνεύω 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.[587]

The form נרץ in 12:6b is analyzed as a Niphal suffix 3 m.s. (*nārōṣ*) from רצץ ("to be crushed") according to the MT.[588] The Translator rendered the form with συντροχάσῃ, a subjunctive aorist active form from συντροχάζω ("to run together").[589] His rendering seems to reflect the prefix form ירץ (*yāruṣ*) from רוץ ("to run") as in Syriac and Targum. Since it is in *w^e^yqtl* sequence, the form in question may have been construed as a *w^e^yqtl* rather than *w^e^qtl*. Another possibility may be that συντροχάσῃ is used for a functional equivalent to the Niphal נרץ 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. "סכן"; BDB, s.v. "סכן"; LSJ, s.v. "κινδυνεύω."

[587]BDB, s.v. "סכן."

[588]Ibid., s.v. "רצץ." Cf. KB, s.v. "רצץ."

[589]LSJ, s.v. "συντροχάζω."

reciprocity.[590] Furthermore, by doing this the Translator had the subject τροχός and the verb συντροχάζω 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 קלל ("to declare cursed") are rendered by aorist indicative medio-passive forms from καταράομαι ("to call down curses upon").[591] 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 חקר (*ḥiqqēr*, "to search out") in 12:9b is rendered by ἐξιχνιάσεται, a future indicative medio-passive form of ἐξιχνιάζω ("to track out").[592] 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. "קלל"; LSJ, s.v. "καταράομαι"; Bauer, s.v. "καταράομαι."

[592]KB, s.v. "חקר"; LSJ, s.v. "ἐξιχνιάζω." Cf. BDB, s.v. "חקר."

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 יחבר (*yeḥubbar*, Pual imperfect from חבר "to be united to" in Pual) rather than Ketib יבחר (*yibbāḥēr*, Niphal imperfect from בחר "to be chosen" in Niphal).[593] The Greek equivalent κοινωνεῖ, an

---

[593]A Niphal form of בחר never occurs in MT. See BDB, s.v. "בחר" and s.v. "חבר"; KB, s.v. "בחר" and s.v. "חבר." Cf. BHS-Horst; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 89.

active form of κοινωνέω ("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 אוה ("to desire" in Piel) occurs in a Hithpael form ("to crave for," "to long for" in Hithpael) in 6:2a.[594] The Translator used an active form of ἐπιθυμέω ("to long for") for the Hebrew.[595] Since the meaning in the active form is comparable to the Hebrew Hithpael in this case, it is functionally equivalent.[596] 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[597] The medio-passive forms for the Hebrew verbs in Hithpael

---

[594]KB, s.v. "אוה"; BDB, s.v. "אוה."

[595]LSJ, s.v. "ἐπιθυμέω."

[596]The Hithpael meaning for אוה is analyzed as a benefactitive reflexive with durative sense. See E.A. Speiser, "The Durative Hithpa'el: A *tan* Form," in *Oriental and Biblical Studies*, ed. J.J. Finkelstein and Moshe Greenberg (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1967), 506-14; Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §26n18.

[597]There is 1 instance in Ecclesiastes where the Hithpolel occurs. The precise meaning for the form תשומם (Hithpolel prefix form from שמם "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 furthur discussion is necessary.

Evidence:
1:16a, 1:18b, 1:18b, 2:4a, 2:9a, 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 הגדלתי from גדל ("to become great" in Qal) in 1:16a is rendered by the aorist indicative medio-passive form ἐμεγαλύνθην from μεγαλύνω ("to grow" in the medio-passive form; "to make great" in the active form). The meaning of the medio-passive

---

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. "שמם." For the middle sense, Lohfink, *Qoheleth*, 96; KB, s.v. "שמם."

[598]In 8:10a ἐπηνέθησαν, a medio-passive form of ἐπαινέω ("to praise"), renders ישתכחו, a Hithpael form from שכח ("to become forgotten"). The Translator probably read

form corresponds well to the Hebrew.[599] Thus, ἐμεγαλύνθην is a functional equivalent to הגדלתי.

Hophal (1)

Hophal > medio-passive form. The form תפר in 12:5a is vocalized in MT as *tāpër* a Hiphil prefix form of פרר ("to frustrate" in Hiphil).[600] The Translator rendered תפר by the aorist subjunctive medio-passive form διασκεδασθῇ from διασκεδάζω ("to disperse" in active).[601] The subject אביונה is a hapax legomenon in Biblical Hebrew but is interpreted as a caper-berry (κάππαρις). The Greek verb διασκεδασθῇ denotes a passive meaning in context ("the caper-berry is scattered") and reflects the Hophal *tupar* ("to be

---

the form ישתכחו as ישתבחו, a Hithpael form from שבח ("boast of," "to pride oneself about something") due to the graphical confusion between כ and ב.

[599]There is possibility in which ἐμεγαλύνθην reflects the Qal suffix form גדלתי. First, the same medio-passive form ἐμεγαλύνθην renders the Qal form גדלתי in 2:9a. The prefix ה can be explained by a dittography or haplography with the preceding ה of הנה. Secondly, the Hebrew verb is followed by הוספתי 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 הגדלתי in 2:4a is rendered by the active form ἐμεγαλύνα, not a medio-passive form. Nevertheless, while the word pair גדלתי והוספתי in 2:9a does not have any external object, הוספתי in 1:16a has the object הכמה and thus, הגדלתי 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 גדלתי והוספתי in the perspective of Hebrew, see Whitley, *Koheleth*, 14-15; Schoors, *Preacher*, 30; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 123-24.

[600]BDB, s.v. "פרר"; KB, s.v. "פרר."

[601]LSJ, s.v. "διασκεδάζω."

frustrated") not the Hiphil.[602] If the Translator construed the Hebrew form as Hophal, διασκεδασθῇ 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 קברים as a plural noun (*q*^{e}*bārîm*), which is vocalized as a participle (*q*^{e}*bûrîm*) in MT.[603] The form מאריך in 8:12a is vocalized as a *Hiphil* participle from ארך in MT, but the Greek equivalent reflects the preposition מן plus ארך (*'ōrek*).[604] Since

---

[602]Cf. Gordis, *Koheleth*, 336.

[603]See p. 15 of this dissertation.

[604]Ibid.

both קברים in 8:10a and מאריך 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: מעשה in 8:11a and הטחנה in 12:4a. These two forms have already been discussed under nouns and are included here in the analysis of participles.[605] 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, 4:1b, 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, 8:11a, 8:12b, 8:13b, 8:16b, 9:1b, 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, 10:7b, 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.[606]

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).[607] This statistic demonstrates the Translator's literal tendency. Two cases require further explanation.[608]

(מושל in 9:17b)
9:17a דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים בְּנַחַת נִשְׁמָעִים
9:17b מִזַּעֲקַת מוֹשֵׁל בַּכְּסִילִים
9:17a λόγοι σοφῶν ἐν ἀναπαύσει ἀκούονται
9:17b ὑπὲρ κραυγὴν ἐξουσιαζόντων ἐν ἀφροσύναις

In 9:17b, the singular participle מושל is rendered by the plural ἐξουσιαζόντων. It is not evident whether the parent text of the Translator read מושלים בכסילים due to dittography of לים-. A better explanation may be that the Translator harmonized מושל with its parallel noun חכמים in number.[609]

12:1a וּזְכֹר אֶת־בּוֹרְאֶיךָ בִּימֵי בְּחוּרֹתֶיךָ
12:1a καὶ μνήσθητι τοῦ κτίσαντός σε ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητός σου

In 12:1a, the form בוראיך may be analyzed as an active participle plural with a 2 m.s. pronominal suffix. The plural participle is rendered by the singular participle κτίσαντός. Modern scholars have various opinions regarding the form בוראיך. Most of them agree that the referent of the form must be a singular.[610] Some propose that the

---

[607]Singular participles both in Hebew 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, 9:2b, 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).

[608]They are 9:17b and 12:1a.

[609]Gordis, *Koheleth*, 302.

[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.[611] The form בוראיך is, however, never used as honorific plural elsewhere in MT.[612] Second, following several manuscripts, some argue that the original form is the singular בוראך (*bôra'ăkā*), and the form בוראיך is a scribal error.[613] The *lectio difficilior* is בוראיך not בוראך according to the context, so בוראך seems to be a later correction for a smoother reading. Finally, others suggest that בוראיך can be understood by analogy to III-ה verbs, which is not unusual in the Mishinaic vocalization.[614] Fox contends that the *yod* does not indicate a plural ending but is a full representation of the *e*-vowel.[615] The last position is the most plausible. Even if the Translator had בוראיך 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 (בוראך).

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

---

[611]Gordis, *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.

[612]Even-Shoshan, *Concordance*, 203. Cf. Jason S. DeRouchie, "The Translation of Participles in the Greek Ecclesiastes" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA, 24 November 2003), 7.

[613]Whitely, *Koheleth*, 95-96.

[614]Gordis, *Koheleth*, 330; Fox, *Qoheleth*, 299. For other examples on the confusion of III-א and III-ה, Schoor suggests חוטא (2:26, 8:12, 9:2, 18), מוצא (7:26), ישנא (8:1). See Schoor, *Preacher*, 98.

[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.[616] F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp and Galia Hatav also posit that the predicative participle has the progressive aspect.[617] 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."[618] Following D. Pardee, DeRouchie understands Hebrew participle as a non-aspectual nominal even when it functions as a predicate.[619] Pardee's view is based upon the work by his student Peter Nash. Nash calls the participle a non-finite process indicator.[620] 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.

[617]F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp, "Biblical Hebrew Statives and Situation Aspect," *JSS* 45/1 (2000): 24; Galia Hatav, *The Semantics of Aspect and Modality: Evidence from English and Biblical Hebrew* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. 1997), 103-16.

[618]DeRouchie, "The Translation of Participles," 13.

[619]Ibid.; D. Pardee, "The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in a Nutshell" (unpublished draft, November 2003), 7-8.

[620]P. Nash, "The Hebrew Qal Active Participle: A Non-Aspectual Narrative Backgrounding Element" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1992), 100.

completion (i.e., imperfective aspect).[621] According to Nash the participle functions as a non-aspectual narrative background element.[622]

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.[623] The aorist participle presents the occurrence as a whole from beginning to end and thus is labeled perfective aspect.[624] Lastly, the perfect participle emphasizes the resulting state or condition from the anterior activity, and its aspect can be called stative.[625]

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.

[623]Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 408; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 89, 91. Cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, 891.

[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. שרים "singers" in 2:8b) or social classes (e.g. העשקים "the oppressed" in 4:1b). This kind of *nomen agentis* may be better understood in impefective 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

---

probably different from perfective and also from imperfective. Cf. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 112-20, 416; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 89, 91; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 30.

[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 οἶδα render the participle forms of ידע. 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 אין or יש (12 instances, 19 percent).[629] The Translator rendered them by the analytic tenses in Greek (εἰμί verb + participle).[630] The analytic tenses are used to constitute a single finite verb tense in Hellenistic Greek.[631] The aspect of the analytic tenses is identical with the aspect of the participle, not with the aspect of εἰμί verb.[632]

Examples:
1:7a וְהַיָּם אֵינֶנּוּ מָלֵא
1:7a καὶ ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔσται ἐμπιμπλαμένη

5:11b וְהַשָּׂבֵע לֶעָשִׁיר אֵינֶנּוּ מַנִּיחַ לוֹ לִישׁוֹן
5:11b καὶ τῷ ἐμπλησθέντι τοῦ πλουτῆσαι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀφίων αὐτὸν τοῦ ὑπνῶσαι

The future periphrastic participle is used only once (1:7a). In 1:7a, the Translator interpreted the lexically stative מלא as having a future stative sense in imperfective aspect.[633] 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 אין or יש, 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.

[633]Cf. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 318.

are little different from the aspect of the present indicative.[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.[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).[636] This category includes proverbial sayings and general facts.

Examples:
4:1b וְהִנֵּה דִמְעַת הָעֲשֻׁקִים וְאֵין לָהֶם מְנַחֵם
4:1b καὶ ἰδοὺ δάκρυον τῶν συκοφαντουμένων καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς παρακαλῶν

5:11b וְהַשָּׂבָע לֶעָשִׁיר אֵינֶנּוּ מַנִּיחַ לוֹ לִישֹׁן
5:11b καὶ τῷ ἐμπλησθέντι τοῦ πλουτῆσαι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀφίων αὐτὸν τοῦ ὑπνῶσαι

The contexts of 14 participles are general facts either of human condition or of nature.[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

---

[634]Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 312.

[635]These instances are discussed below.

[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.[638] The gnomic truth can be expressed not only by the present but also by the aorist, perfect, or future in Greek.[639] 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.[640]

There is 1 instance where the Hebrew participle is rendered by the aorist participle.

---

[637]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.

[638]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.

[639]For the gnomic present tense, see Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 208-17; Porter, *Idioms*, 32-33; Robertson, *Grammar*, 866; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 523. For the gnomic aorist tense, see Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 265-69; Porter, *Idioms*, 38-39; Robertson, *Grammar*, 836-37; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 562. For the gnomic perfect tense, see Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 304; Porter, *Idioms*, 41-42; Robertson, *Grammar*, 897; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 580. For the gnomic future tense, see Porter, *Idioms*, 44; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 571.

[640]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).

12:1a וּזְכֹר אֶת־בּוֹרְאֶיךָ בִּימֵי בְּחוּרֹתֶיךָ
12:1a καὶ μνήσθητι τοῦ κτίσαντός σε ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητός σου

In 12:1a, the context demands the perfective aspect for the Hebrew participle בוראיך. 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 οἶδα are employed for the participle forms of ידע (4:17b, 9:1b). The verb οἶδα is always perfect in form but has present semantic value in Hellenistic Greek.[641] 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.[642] Three of them are used as substantives and 2 as attributives. Two examples are given for illustration.

1:15a מְעֻוָּת לֹא־יוּכַל לִתְקֹן
1:15a διεστραμμένον οὐ δυνήσεται τοῦ ἐπικοσμηθῆναι

In 1:15a, מעות 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."

12:11a דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים כַּדָּרְבֹנוֹת
וּכְמַשְׂמְרוֹת נְטוּעִים בַּעֲלֵי אֲסֻפּוֹת
12:11a λόγοι σοφῶν ὡς τὰ βούκεντρα
καὶ ὡς ἧλοι πεφυτευμένοι οἳ παρὰ τῶν συναγμάτων

The attributive participle נטועים in 12:11a modifies the antecedent משמרות. The *Qal* passive participle describes the state of the antecedent. This stative aspect is effectively expressed by the perfect participle. Another attributive participle in 12:14a 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.[643] 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 וּדְבָרָיו אֵינָם נִשְׁמָעִים
9:16b καὶ λόγοι αὐτοῦ οὔκ εἰσιν ἀκουόμενοι

In sum, the aspect of the participles in passive stems seems to be related to their functions in Hebrew.[644] If the participle is predicative, 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.

---

[642]A *Qal* passive form appears in 3:2b, 12:10b, 12:11a; *Pual* stem in 1:15a; *Niphal* stem in 12:14a.

[643]The 4 instances are 5:12b, 9:12a, 9:16b, 9:16b.

[644]The function is of the Hebrew participle, not of the Greek one.

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 וְשַׁבֵּחַ אֲנִי אֶת־הַמֵּתִים שֶׁכְּבָר מֵתוּ
4:2a ἐπῄνεσα ἐγὼ σὺν τοὺς τεθνηκότας τοὺς ἤδη ἀποθανόντας

The articular participle המתים is used as a substantive. The participle can mean either the dying, or the dead, or the one who will die.[645] The Translator understood המתים 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."[646] The context also requires the meaning, "the dead." The participle is modified by the relative clause, and the adverb כבר ("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. "מות."

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. *qātēl*).[647] Among the 50 active participles, 45 Hebrew participles are rendered by the Greek active participles (90 percent).[648] The other 10 Greek equivalents for the Hebrew active participle are all medio-passive forms.[649] The verbs ἔρχομαι in 2:16b, καταράομαι 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 אבד with the meaning of "perishing" is rendered effectively by the Greek ἀπολλύμενος (ἀπόλλυμαι), which is medio-passive in form and middle in meaning.[650] In 12:5b the Translator used the medio-passive form κοπτόμενοι (κόπτομαι)

---

[646]GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §116d.

[647]The 50 Hebrew participles in active form are 1:5b, 1:6b, 2:6b, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:16b, 2:26b, 3:9a, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:2a, 4:15a, 4:17b, 5:9a, 5:10a, 5:11b, 6:11a, 7:5b, 7:11b, 7:15b, 7:21b, 7:26b, 8:5a, 8:7a, 8:11a, 8:16b, 9:1b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:5b, 9:11a, 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. The 15 instances in the Niphal stem are 1:15a, 3:2b, 3:15b, 4:1a, 4:1b, 5:12b, 8:11a, 9:2b, 9:12a, 9:12a, 9:16b, 9:16b, 12:10b, 12:11a, 12:14a. The 6 instances of *qātēl* form are 1:7a, 6:2a, 7:18b, 8:12b, 8:13b, 9:2b.

[648]The 45 instances are 1:5b, 1:6b, 2:6b, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:26b, 3:9a, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:1b, 4:2a, 4:15a, 4:17b, 5:9a, 5:10a, 5:11b, 6:11a, 7:5b, 7:11b, 7:15b, 7:26b, 8:5a, 8:7a, 8:11a, 8:16b, 9:1b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:2b, 9:5b, 9:11a, 9:17b, 9:18b, 10:4a, 10:8a, 10:8b, 10:9a, 10:9b, 11:4a, 11:4b, 11:5a, 12:1a, 12:3b, 12:3b, 12:4a.

[649]They are 2:16b, 7:15b, 7:21b, 10:7b, 12:5b.

[650]The active form ἀπόλλυμι has the meaning of "to destroy." Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ἀπόλλυμι."

for the Hebrew active participle ספדים because only the meaning of middle voice of the Greek verb corresponds to that of ספד ("to mourn).[651]

Fourteen out of 15 participles in the Niphal stem are rendered in the medio-passive forms (93 percent).[652] Twelve of the Greek medio-passive forms are used with passive meanings as expected, but 2 participles may be not passive. The *Niphal* participles נעשים in 4:1a and נעשה in 8:11a are rendered by the participle forms of γίνομαι, which does not have an active form. The *Niphal* form of עשה, 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 עשה (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 עשה (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 עשה, 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, 9:12a, 9:16b, 9:16b, 12:10b, 12:11a, 12:14a.

active participle form in Greek. In 9:2b the *Niphal* form of שבע is used as a substantive and rendered by the active participle form ὀμνύων. The word שבע has the meaning of "to swear" only in its *Niphal* stem, and the same meaning is given in the active form of ὀμνύω.[653] In this case, the lexical nature of the word שבע was considered in determining the voice.[654]

The participle forms of stative verbs occur 6 times in Ecclesiastes.[655] The verbs are מלא in 1:7a, חסר in 6:2a, and ירא 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 מלא, חסר, and ירא in 8:13b come after איננו. (אין + 3 m.s. pronominal suffix). אין with pronominal suffixes occurs 9 times in Ecclesiastes besides these 3 instances.[656] 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 ירא in 7:18b, 8:12b, 9:2b can be either adjectives or participles.[657] Since all of them

---

[653]KB, s.v. "שבע I"; Bauer, s.v. "ὀμνύω."

[654]Cf. DeRouchie, "The Translation of Participles," 19.

[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 ירא functions as the predicate in the אשר-clause. If ירא 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 אשר-clause in Ecclesiastes. See 4:1a, where the participle נעשים is predicate in the אשר-clause.

are rendered by the substantival participles, they are treated here as participles for convenience.

The participle מלא in 1:7a is translated by ἐμπιμπλαμένη, and the meaning in a medio-passive form is comparable to the Hebrew. The equivalents of the 4 instances of the participle ירא are participles of φοβέομαι, and a medio-passive form was only available to the Translator. Finally חסר (*ḥāsēr*) in 6:2a is translated by ὑστερῶν, 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]

1. Free Forms

Total	60
(1) Arthrous > Arthrous	12[659]
(2) Arthrous > Anarthrous	0
(3) Anarthrous > Arthrous	7[660]

[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	41[661]

2. Indeterminate Forms

Total	6
(1) Arthrous in MT > Arthrous	4[662]
(2) Arthrous in MT > Anarthrous	0
(3) Anarthrous in MT > Arthrous	2[663]
(4) Anarthrous in MT > Anarthrous	0

3. Bound Forms with Pronominal Suffixes

Total	4
(1) > Arthrous	1 (12:1a)
(2) > Anarthrous	3[664]

4. Bound Forms Functioning as *nomen regens*

Total	1 (3)
(1) Anarthrous > Arthrous	(2)[665]
(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, 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, 8:7a, 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* את, 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.[666] 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 וְחוֹטֵא יִלָּכֶד בָּהּ
7:26b καὶ ἁμαρτάνων συλλημφθήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ

8:5a שׁוֹמֵר מִצְוָה לֹא יֵדַע דָּבָר רָע
8:5a ὁ φυλάσσων ἐντολὴν 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.[667]

Example:
9:2b וְלַזֹּבֵחַ וְלַאֲשֶׁר אֵינֶנּוּ זֹבֵחַ
9:2b καὶ τῷ θυσιάζοντι καὶ τῷ μὴ θυσιάζοντι

In 9:2b the relative particle is prefixed by the preposition ל. The preposition ל is regarded as the dative marker, so the relative particle and the ל are rendered together by the dative article.[668]

---

[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.

[667]Cf. DeRouchie, "The Translation of Participles," 21.

Two indeterminate forms in 7:11b and 8:12b are anarthrous and prefixed by the ל of the benefactive dative. This ל 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 וְיֹתֵר לְרֹאֵי הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
7:11b καὶ περισσεία τοῖς θεωροῦσιν τὸν ἥλιον

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 בוראיך. 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 ל, 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 ל 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, 1:4a, 1:4b, 1:5b, 1:6a, 1:6a, 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, 3:21a, 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, 8:12a, 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).[670] 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.[671] According to Segal, the participle becomes equivalent to the finite verb in Mishnaic Hebrew.[672] 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, 1:6b, 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.

[672]Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, 155.

act in the process of being performed and, therefore, indicates the present tense.[673] 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.[674] Two examples are given for illustration.

Examples:
1:7a כָּל־הַנְּחָלִים הֹלְכִים אֶל־הַיָּם
1:7a πάντες οἱ χείμαρροι πορεύονται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν

2:2b וּלְשִׂמְחָה מַה־זֹּה עֹשָׂה
2:2b καὶ τῇ εὐφροσύνῃ τί τοῦτο 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.[675] In 2:2b the participle is used in an indirect question and denotes present progressive action: "Why are you doing this?"[676]

Participle > aorist indicative (9).[677] A total of 6 predicate participles occurs in proverbial sayings or universal truths (4:5a, 4:5b, 5:9a, 8:12a, 8:12a, 12:5b). The aorist indicatives employed for those 6 participles must be gnomic.

4:5a הַכְּסִיל חֹבֵק אֶת־יָדָיו
4:5b וְאֹכֵל אֶת־בְּשָׂרוֹ
4:5a ὁ ἄφρων περιέλαβεν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ
4:5b καὶ ἔφαγεν τὰς σάρκας αὐτοῦ

---

[673]Ibid., 156.

[674]Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 260-61.

[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.[678] "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 חבק and ואכל as suffixed forms. One could argue that the subject הכסיל is followed by the form חבק, and thus, the word order seems to indicate that חבק 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.[679] The fronting of the subject mostly marks a change of the subject (e.g., אני קהלת in 1:12a, זה 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 וּמוֹצֶא אֲנִי מַר מִמָּוֶת אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה
7:26a καὶ εὑρίσκω ἐγὼ πικρότερον ὑπὲρ θάνατον σὺν τὴν γυναῖκα

12:5b כִּי־הֹלֵךְ הָאָדָם אֶל־בֵּית עוֹלָמוֹ
12:5b ὅτι ἐπορεύθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς οἶκον αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ

---

[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 מוצא in 7:26a is clearly marked as a participle in a consonantal text, but the form הלך 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 האדם indicates not a specific man but implies human beings in general.[680] The Translator, therefore, did not likely render the participle by the aorist indicative according to the context but rather construed the verb הלך 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 וּמִי־אֹהֵב בְּהָמוֹן לֹא תְבוּאָה
5:9a καὶ τίς ἠγάπησεν ἐν πλήθει αὐτῶν γένημα

8:12a אֲשֶׁר חֹטֵא עֹשֶׂה רָע מְאַת וּמַאֲרִיךְ לוֹ
8:12a ὃς ἥμαρτεν ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν ἀπὸ τότε καὶ ἀπὸ μακρότητος αὐτῷ

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.[681] 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 מי. However, it does not undermine the possibility of the suffix form for three reasons. First, another finite verbal form, the prefix form frequently follows מי in Ecclesiastes (2:25, 3:22, 6:12,

forms, "sinning" and "doing (evil)," may also be better understood in imperfective aspect. The adverbial phase (ἀπὸ τότε καὶ ἀπὸ μακρότητος) 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 אהב in 5:9a and עשה חטא 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 תַּרְתִּי בְלִבִּי לִמְשׁוֹךְ בַּיַּיִן אֶת־בְּשָׂרִי
2:3b וְלִבִּי נֹהֵג בַּחָכְמָה
2:3a κατεσκεψάμην ἐν καρδίᾳ μου τοῦ ἑλκύσαι εἰς οἶνον τὴν σάρκα μου
2:3b καὶ καρδία μου ὡδήγησεν ἐν σοφίᾳ

In 2:3b נהג follows the suffix form תרתי in 2:3a, so the functional value of נהג is determined by that of תרתי.[682] It is also possible that the form נהג in 2:3b and נודע in

---

7:13, 7:24, 8:4, 8:7, 10:14). Second, the participle coming after מי is always יודע elsewhere in Ecclesiastes (2:19, 3:21, 6:12, 8:1). Finally, the interrogative מי can be followed by the suffix form in biblical Hebrew (e.g., Gen 3:11; Job 12:9). In other words מי does not restrict the suffix form from being the predicate.

[682]Cf. DeRouchie, "Translation of Participles," 36, 38.

6:10a are read as suffix forms.

Finally, the equivalent of the form יצא in 10:5b may be decided by the context.

10:5a יֵשׁ רָעָה רָאִיתִי תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
10:5b כִּשְׁגָגָה שֶׁיֵּצֵא מִלִּפְנֵי הַשַּׁלִּיט
10:5a ἔστιν πονηρία ἣν εἶδον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον
10:5b ὡς ἀκούσιον ὃ ἐξῆλθεν ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ ἐξουσιάζοντος

The relative clause in 10:5b modifies שגגה ("involuntary offense"). By employing the aorist indicative for the predicate participle יצא, 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 וְהָאָרֶץ לְעוֹלָם עֹמָדֶת

---

[683]Cf. DeRouchie, "Translation of Participles," 39. For the perfective aspect of aorist indicative, see Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 255-61; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 557.

[684]Since שגגה is a feminine noun, it is not likely that יצא 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 ἡ γῆ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἕστηκεν

In 1:4b, the predicate participle עמדת 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 לעולם 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, יודע 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 כִּי הַחַיִּים יוֹדְעִים שֶׁיָּמֻתוּ
וְהַמֵּתִים אֵינָם יוֹדְעִים מְאוּמָה
9:5a ὅτι οἱ ζῶντες γνώσονται ὅτι ἀποθανοῦνται
καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ οὔκ εἰσιν γινώσκοντες οὐδέν

10:3a וְגַם־בַּדֶּרֶךְ כְּשֶׁהַסְּכָל הֹלֵךְ לִבּוֹ חָסֵר
10:3a καί γε ἐν ὁδῷ ὅταν ἄφρων πορεύηται καρδία αὐτοῦ ὑστερήσει

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 γνώσονται and ὑστερήσει 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.[690] 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.[691] The main verb (ὑστερήσει) 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 πορεύηται renders הלך. The subjunctive is employed because of ὅταν. When ὅταν is used as temporal conjunction, it approaches the meaning of ἐάν, so the subjunctive normally follows.[692] The present tense is used because not only is the action progressive, it is also contemporaneous with that of the main clause.[693] 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: העבד > τοῦ δούλου
5:11a מְתוּקָה שְׁנַת הָעֹבֵד אִם־מְעַט וְאִם־הַרְבֶּה יֹאכֵל
5:11a γλυκὺς ὕπνος 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

Total	7
(1) Arthrous > Arthrous	2[696]
(2) Arthrous > Anarthrous	0
(3) Anarthrous > Arthrous	0
(4) Anarthrous > Anarthrous	5[697]

2. Indeterminate Forms

Total	0
(1) Arthrous in MT > Arthrous	0
(2) Arthrous in MT > Anarthrous	0
(3) Anarthrous in MT > Arthrous	0
(4) Anarthrous in MT > Anarthrous	0

3. Bound Forms with Pronominal Suffixes

Total	0
(1) > Arthrous	0
(2) > Arnarthrous	0

4. Bound Forms Functioning as *nomen regens*

Total	1
(1) Anarthrous > Arthrous	0
(2) Anarthrous > Anarthrous	1 (12:3a)

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:
4:12b, 4:14a, 4:14b, 5:7a, 9:3b, 9:4b, 9:5b, 9:11a.

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.[698] The other 2 Hebrew participles function as attributives modifying their antecedents and are rendered by attributive adjectives in Greek.[699] The 8 Greek adjectives rendering the Hebrew participles, therefore, are functional equivalents.

Examples:
(substantive: המתים > τοὺς νεκρούς)
9:3b וְאַחֲרָיו אֶל־הַמֵּתִים
9:3b καὶ ὀπίσω αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς νεκρούς

(attributive: המת > τὸν νεκρόν)
9:4b כִּי־לְכֶלֶב חַי הוּא טוֹב מִן־הָאַרְיֵה הַמֵּת
9:4b ὅτι ὁ κύων ὁ ζῶν αὐτὸς ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τὸν λέοντα τὸν νεκρόν

Number. As for the number, 4 participles in Hebrew are singular forms, and 4 are plurals.[700] 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 רש 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.[701]

1. Free Forms

Total	7
(1) Arthrous > Arthrous	5[702]
(2) Arthrous > Anarthrous	0
(3) Anarthrous > Arthrous	0
(4) Anarthrous > Anarthrous	2[703]

2. Indeterminate Forms

Total	1
(1) Arthrous in MT > Arthrous	1 (9:11a)
(2) Arthrous in MT > Anarthrous	0
(3) Anarthrous in MT > Arthrous	0
(4) Anarthrous in MT > Anarthrous	0

3. Bound Forms with Pronominal Suffixes

Total	0
(1) > Arthrous	0
(2) > Arnarthrous	0

4. Bound Forms Functioning as *nomen regens*

Total	0
(1) Anarthrous > Arthrous	0
(2) Anarthrous > Anarthrous	0

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.

---

[701]For the analytic frame, see Gentry, *Greek Job*, 258-259.

[702]The 5 instances are 4:12b, 4:14a, 9:3b, 9:4b, 9:5b.

[703]The 2 instances are 4:14b, 5:7a.

Participle > Infinitive (1)

5:7b כִּי גָבֹהַּ מֵעַל גָּבֹהַּ שֹׁמֵר וּגְבֹהִים עֲלֵיהֶם
5:7b ὅτι ὑψηλὸς ἐπάνω ὑψηλοῦ φυλάξαι καὶ ὑψηλοὶ ἐπ' αὐτούς

The participle שמר functions as a predicate in 5:7b. The Translator uncharacteristically employed the aorist infinitive φυλάξαι for the participle. The participle שמר is syntactically vague. It can be either predicative or attributive modifying the second גבה.[704] 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 (*šᵉmōr*). With respect to aspect, the sentence denotes a universal truth, so the aorist must be gnomic. The Translator perceived the action (שמר "looking out") to be repeated or generalized and summarized its occurrence in the aorist tense.[705]

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).

[705]Cf. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 395.

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 ידע (> οἶδα).

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 קרוב in

4:17a.[706]

4:17a שְׁמֹר רגליך כַּאֲשֶׁר תֵּלֵךְ אֶל־בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים וְקָרוֹב לִשְׁמֹעַ
4:17a φύλαξον πόδα σου ἐν ᾧ ἐὰν πορεύῃ εἰς οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐγγὺς τοῦ ἀκούειν

The form קרוב (*qārôb*) can be analyzed either as a free infinitive or as an adjective.[707] 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.

9:1a כִּי אֶת־כָּל־זֶה נָתַתִּי אֶל־לִבִּי וְלָבוּר אֶת־כָּל־זֶה
9:1a ὅτι σὺν πᾶν τοῦτο ἔδωκα εἰς καρδίαν μου καὶ καρδία μου σὺν πᾶν εἶδεν τοῦτο

The form לבור (*lābûr*) in MT is analyzed as the preposition ל plus a bound infinitive from the root בור or ברר.[708] The Translator added a subject καρδία μου, which is missing in MT, and uses an aorist indicative εἶδεν rather than an infinitive. Neither בור nor ברר are rendered by εἰδεῖν in LXX.[709] 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 ו and י might occur, and ולבו becomes ולבי. The ר is

---

[706]NKJV, NIV, and NASB read קרוב as infinitive, which functions as imperative. NRSV also takes the form in question as infinitive but functioning as substantive.

[707]Gordis, *Koheleth*, 237.

[708]Some scholars explain the root בור as the by-form of ברר (KB, s.v. "בור"). Others analyze לבור as a bound infinitive from a geminate root but as the analogy with II-*waw* verb (GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §67r).

[709]Cf. T. Muraoka, "Aramaic Index to the Septuagint," 233, 238.

separated from ולבי, and is joined to the next word. The next two consonants את are read twice with another confusion between ת and ה. Consequently, the Translator's parent text might read ולבי ראה את־כל־זה.[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) ראות in 5:10b, which is vocalized as the noun (*r^e'ût*) in MT but must have been construed as the bound infinitive form (*r^e'ôt*),[711] (2) לעשיר in 5:11b, which is a noun prefixed by a preposition (*le'ăšîr*) in MT but must have been understood as the a *Hiphil* infinitive with a syncopated ה (*la'ăšîr*);[712] and finally (3) לרע in 8:9b, which is read as the preposition plus noun (*l^era'*) in MT but is probably interpreted as *Hiphil* infinitive with a syncopated ה (*lāra'*)[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 ה 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 הרבה (*harbēh*) is used as an adjective or adverb. The Translator always rendered the form in question by πολύς. In 8 instances he construed הרבה 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 הרבה as an adverb and used the neuter accusative of πολύς for the Hebrew form.[715] There is 1 instance where the Translator construed הרבה as a predicate adjective (11:8b).

Examples:
(attributive adjective)
2:7b גַּם מִקְנֶה בָקָר וָצֹאן הַרְבֵּה הָיָה לִי
2:7b καί γε κτῆσις βουκολίου καὶ ποιμνίου πολλὴ ἐγένετό μοι

(adverb)
5:19a כִּי לֹא הַרְבֵּה יִזְכֹּר אֶת־יְמֵי חַיָּיו
5:19a ὅτι οὐ πολλὰ μνησθήσεται τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ

(predicate adjective)
11:8b כִּי־הַרְבֵּה יִהְיוּ כָּל־שֶׁבָּא הָבֶל
11:8b ὅτι πολλαὶ ἔσονται πᾶν τὸ ἐρχόμενον 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 Herbew," *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.

8:9a אֶת־כָּל־זֶה רָאִיתִי וְנָתוֹן אֶת־לִבִּי לְכָל־מַעֲשֶׂה
8:9a καὶ σὺν πᾶν τοῦτο εἶδον καὶ ἔδωκα τὴν καρδίαν μου εἰς πᾶν ποίημα

9:11a שַׁבְתִּי וְרָאֹה תַחַת־הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ כִּי לֹא לַקַּלִּים הַמֵּרוֹץ
9:11a ἐπέστρεψα καὶ εἶδον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον ὅτι οὐ τοῖς κούφοις ὁ δρόμος

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.

4:1a וְשַׁבְתִּי אֲנִי וָאֶרְאֶה אֶת־כָּל־הָעֲשֻׁקִים
4:2a וְשִׁבַּחַ אֲנִי אֶת־הַמֵּתִים שֶׁכְּבָר מֵתוּ
4:1a καὶ ἐπέστρεψα ἐγὼ καὶ εἶδον σὺν πάσας τὰς συκοφαντίας
4:2a καὶ ἐπῄνεσα ἐγὼ σὺν τοὺς τεθνηκότας τοὺς ἤδη ἀποθανόντας

The first conjunction with שבתי is construed as simple *waw* i.e., *waw* conjunction, but the second *waw* with אראה 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 ל or מן. 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*

Septuaginta.[717]

Bound infinitive without preposition > τοῦ + 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 עֵת לִבְכּוֹת וְעֵת לִשְׂחוֹק
3:4b עֵת סְפוֹד וְעֵת רְקוֹד
3:5a עֵת לְהַשְׁלִיךְ אֲבָנִים וְעֵת כְּנוֹס אֲבָנִים
3:4a καιρὸς τοῦ κλαῦσαι καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ γελάσαι
3:4b καιρὸς τοῦ κόψασθαι καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ ὀρχήσασθαι
3:5a καιρὸς τοῦ βαλεῖν λίθους καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ συναγαγεῖν λίθους

The bound infinitives ספוד, רקוד in 3:4b and כנוס in 3:5a modify the antecedent nouns. The 3 bound infinitives are not prefixed by the preposition ל while other bound infinite forms in 3:2-8 have the preposition ל. Nevertheless, the Translator consistently used τοῦ + Infinitive for Hebrew bound infinitives whether or not they are prefixed by ל. 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 τοῦ + Infinitive in Greek is, therefore, appropriate. This pattern of rendering is also attested in other places of LXX.[720]

---

[717]I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Series B, vol. 132, 1 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965).

[718]Cf. Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §36.2.1c.

[719]Robertson, *Grammar*, 1076.

[720]See Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 26.

5:10b וּמַה־כִּשְׁרוֹן לִבְעָלֶיהָ כִּי אִם־רְאִית עֵינָיו
5:10b καὶ τί ἀνδρεία τῷ παρ' αὐτῆς ὅτι ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ ὁρᾶν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ

In 5:10b the Translator probably read ראית as the bound infinitive form ראות (*r*^{e}*ôt*). Its Greek equivalent τοῦ ὁρᾶν 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 סַבּוֹתִי אֲנִי וְלִבִּי לָדַעַת וְלָתוּר
וּבַקֵּשׁ חָכְמָה וְחֶשְׁבּוֹן
7:25b וְלָדַעַת רֶשַׁע כֶּסֶל וְהַסִּכְלוּת הוֹלֵלוֹת
7:25a ἐκύκλωσα ἐγώ καὶ ἡ καρδία μου τοῦ γνῶναι καὶ τοῦ κατασκέψασθαι
καὶ ζητῆσαι σοφίαν καὶ ψῆφον
7:25b καὶ τοῦ γνῶναι ἀσεβοῦς ἀφροσύνην καὶ σκληρίαν καὶ περιφοράν

12:12b עֲשׂוֹת סְפָרִים הַרְבֵּה אֵין קֵץ
12:12b ποιῆσαι βιβλία πολλά οὐκ ἔστιν περασμός

The infinitive form בקש (*baqqēš*) in 7:25a must be a bound infinitive even though the free infinitive has the same form.[722] The preposition ל is probably gapped, and the infinitive has an adverbial function denoting a final sense as the previous infinitives לדעת ולתור and the following infinitive לדעת in7:25b do.[723] A bound infinitive עשות 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 חכמה וחשבון must fit to לדעת ולתור as well as בקש. 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.[724]

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 וְיוֹם הַמָּוֶת מִיּוֹם הִוָּלְדוֹ
7:1b καὶ ἡμέρα τοῦ θανάτου ὑπὲρ ἡμέραν γενέσεως αὐτοῦ

10:10b וְיִתְרוֹן הַכְּשִׁיר חָכְמָה
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.[725]

ל + **bound infinitive** > τοῦ + **infinitive (87).** There are 87 instances in which the Hebrew bound infinitive prefixed by ל 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, 3:5b, 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, 5:17a, 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.

[725]Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 24-25.

7:25b, 7:27b, 8:8a, 8:9b, 8:11b, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:16a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 8:17b, 8:17b, 9:10a, 10:15b, 11:7b, 12:10a.

In all these instances, the genitive article τοῦ is regarded as an equivalent of ל.[726] The evidence is categorized into 3 groups according to their function: (1) independent uses, (2) adjectival uses, and (3) adverbial uses.[727]

Adverbial ל *+ 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.[728] Examples are given for illustration.

(final ל + Bound Infinitive)
1:17a וָאֶתְּנָה לִבִּי לָדַעַת חָכְמָה וְדַעַת הוֹלֵלוֹת וְשִׂכְלוּת
1:17a καὶ ἔδωκα καρδίαν μου τοῦ γνῶναι σοφίαν καὶ γνῶσιν παραβολὰς καὶ ἐπιστήμην

(complementary ל + Bound Infinitive)
1:8a כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים יְגֵעִים לֹא־יוּכַל אִישׁ לְדַבֵּר
1:8a πάντες οἱ λόγοι ἔγκοποι οὐ δυνήσεται ἀνὴρ τοῦ λαλεῖν

(ל + Bound Infinitive as direct object)
4:17b כִּי־אֵינָם יוֹדְעִים לַעֲשׂוֹת רָע
4:17b ὅτι οὔκ εἰσιν εἰδότες τοῦ ποιῆσαι κακόν

---

[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 ל plus bound infinitive that are a subject or predicate. The second group contains adjectival uses, in which ל plus bound infinitive modifies preceding nominals. The final group includes adverbial uses, in which Soisalon-Soininen subgroups ל plus bound infinitive into a direct object, final, and epexegetical functions. See Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 29-75.

[728](1) Final ל + Bound Infinitive: 1:13a, 1:13a, 1:13b, 1:17a, 2:6b, 2:11a, 2:26b, 3:10b, 3:22b, 4:14a, 4:17a, 5:5a (result), 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 7:25a, 7:25a, 7:25b, 7:27b, 8:9b, 8:16a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 12:10a; (2) Complementary ל + Bound Infinitive: 1:7b, 1:8a, 1:8b, 1:15b, 2:3a, 2:3b, 2:12a, 2:20a, 5:1a, 5:3a, 5:11b, 5:11b, 5:14a, 6:10b, 7:9a, 7:13b, 8:11b, 8:17a, 8:17b, 9:10a; (3) As Direct Object: 4:13b, 4:17b, 10:15b.

The ל 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.[729] The ל plus a bound infinitive in 1:8a is used as complement for the verb יוכל. The main verbs, after which a complementary infinitive occurs, are mostly: אחר, בהל, יכל, מהר, מצא, מלא, נוח, פנה, and שוב. For these complementary infinitives, the Translator used τοῦ plus an infinitive. As in 4:17b the ל plus a bound infinitive functioning as direct object always occurs after the verb ידע. The Translator utilized τοῦ plus an infinitive for these cases as well. The same approach is already established by the earlier translators of LXX.[730]

Adjectival ל + bound infinitive (28). In 28 instances the ל plus a bound infinitive is used attributively and rendered by τοῦ plus infinitive in Greek.[731]

Example:
3:2a עֵת לָלֶדֶת וְעֵת לָמוּת
3:2a καιρὸς τοῦ τεκεῖν καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν

The bound infinitives with preposition ל modify the preceding nouns as genitival attributive. The Translator employed τοῦ plus infinitive for the form in question.[732] When the bound infinitive functions as adjectival modifier, whether it is with ל or without ל, 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.[733]

Independent ל + *bound infinitive (11).* In 8 instances, the ל plus bound infinitive functions as subject, and in 3 instances as predicate.[734]

Examples:
3:12a יָדַעְתִּי כִּי אֵין טוֹב בָּם
3:12b כִּי אִם־לִשְׂמוֹחַ וְלַעֲשׂוֹת טוֹב בְּחַיָּיו
3:12a ἔγνων ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς
3:12b εἰ μὴ τοῦ εὐφρανθῆναι καὶ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἀγαθὸν ἐν ζωῇ αὐτοῦ

3:15a מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה כְּבָר הוּא וַאֲשֶׁר לִהְיוֹת כְּבָר הָיָה
3:15a τὸ γενόμενον ἤδη ἐστίν καὶ ὅσα τοῦ γίνεσθαι ἤδη γέγονεν

Two bound infinitives with ל follow the particle of exception כי אם in 3:12b.[735] The particle כי אם functions as a conjunction ("unless"), and the forms לשמוח and לעשות function as subject. The predicate (טוב) in the clause is gapped. The Translator used τοῦ plus infinitives as the functional equivalent for לשמוח and לעשות. Use of τοῦ plus infinitive as subject is frequently attested elsewhere in LXX.[736]

In 3:15a the bound infinitive prefixed by ל is used as predicate in the headless relative clause introduced by אשר. Some modern scholars describe להיות as the

---

[732]Most instances are focused on 3:2-8 (85 percent).

[733]See Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 37-38.

[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 כי אם. 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.

[735]Cf. KB, s.v. "כי אם."

[736]Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 30; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1067.

periphrastic future.[737] The Translator utilized τοῦ plus infinitive, and its function in the clause is exactly the same as that of להיות. The same approach is observed in the renderings of other LXX translators.[738]

ל + bound infinitive > anarthrous infinitive (4). The equivalent occurs in 3:14a, 3:14a, 6:8b, and 7:2a.

Independent ל + bound infinitive (3). There are 3 instances where ל plus bound infinitive 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 עָלָיו אֵין לְהוֹסִיף וּמִמֶּנּוּ אֵין לִגְרֹעַ
3:14a ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν προσθεῖναι καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀφελεῖν

In 3:14a the bound infinitives with a preposition ל, להוסיף and לגרע, follow אין. The אין-clause probably means here "it is impossible, it is not allowed" and must have a nominal subject.[739] The Translator understood the forms להוסיף and לגרע as subject in the clause and employed an anarthrous infinitive in Greek for the Hebrew forms.[740] One may expect an article for the formal equivalent of ל, but the anarthrous infinitive is also

---

[737]Whitely, *Koheleth*, 114; M. Dahood, "Canaanite-Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth," *Biblica* 33 (1952): 51.

[738]Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 30-31.

[739]Schoors, *Preacher*, 183.

[740]In Ecclesiastes 3:14a is the only place where the ל plus infinitive follows אין and functions as subject.

used as subject in Hellenistic Greek.[741]

ל + *bound infinitive as direct object (1).* In 1 instance ל plus bound infinitive functions as direct object and is rendered by the anarthrous infinitive in Greek.

6:8b מַה־לֶּעָנִי יוֹדֵעַ לַהֲלֹךְ נֶגֶד הַחַיִּים
6:8b διότι ὁ πένης οἶδεν πορευθῆναι κατέναντι τῆς ζωῆς

In 6:8b, להלך (ל plus *Qal* bound infinitive) is used as the object of יודע. The Translator rendered it by the anarthrous infinitive. The article may be expected for the equivalent of ל as in the other 3 instances, where the arthrous infinitive renders ל plus bound infinitive functioning an object.[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.[743]

In sum, the anarthrous infinitive for ל plus a bound infinitive is limited to the substantival uses of a bound infinitive, in which the form functions as subject or as object.

ל + bound infinitive > τῷ + infinitive (1). The equivalent occurs in 1:16a.

1:16a דִּבַּרְתִּי אֲנִי עִם־לִבִּי לֵאמֹר אֲנִי הִנֵּה הִגְדַּלְתִּי
1:16a ἐλάλησα ἐγὼ ἐν καρδίᾳ μου τῷ λέγειν ἐγὼ ἰδοὺ ἐμεγαλύνθην

The frozen expression לאמר introduces direct speech and is described as

---

[741]See. Robertson, *Grammar*, 1058; Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 29. In 8 instances, the article τοῦ is used for the equivalent of ל which is conjoined to the bound infinitive functioning as subject.

[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 ידע.

epexegetical.[744] The form in question is normally rendered by a participle form of λέγειν in LXX.[745] However, the Translator employed τῷ plus an infinitive for לאמר, not a participle nor τοῦ plus an infinitive as one expects. This is the only place in Ecclesiastes where τῷ is employed for the equivalent of ל with bound infinitive.

ל + bound infinitive > τό + infinitive (1). In 7:5a, ל plus bound infinitive is used as subject. The Translator rendered the form by τό plus an infinitive in Greek.

7:5a טוֹב לִשְׁמֹעַ גַּעֲרַת חָכָם
7:5a ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἀκοῦσαι ἐπιτίμησιν σοφοῦ

The nominative case of the article seems to be natural for the subject function of the infinitive. Although 7:5a is the only instance where the nominative article translates ל in Greek Ecclesiastes, the approach is frequently used by the earlier translators of LXX.[746]

ל + bound infinitive > ὅτι + indicative (1). In 3:18a ל plus bound infinitive functioning as direct object is rendered by an indicative with ὅτι.

3:18a אָמַרְתִּי אֲנִי בְּלִבִּי עַל־דִּבְרַת בְּנֵי הָאָדָם
לְבָרָם הָאֱלֹהִים
3:18a εἶπα ἐγὼ ἐν καρδίᾳ μου περὶ λαλιᾶς υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ὅτι διακρινεῖ αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός

---

[743]Soisalon-Soininen does not list any evidence of such case in his work. For the evidences of an anarthrous infinitive used as object, see Robertson, *Grammar*, 1059.

[744]Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 68-69.

[745]Ibid., 69.

[746]Ibid., 29.

The form לברם (*lᵉbārām*) is analyzed as bound infinitive prefixed by a preposition ל and suffixed by the 3 m.p. pronominal suffix. The word האלהים is the subject of the bound phrase, and the whole phrase לברם האלהים functions as the object of the main verb אמרתי. The Translator employed the ὅτι-clause for לברם האלהים. The ὅτι-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 ὅτι-clause to avoid the confusion. The approach is already established in other translators in LXX.[747]

In sum, formally, ל 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 ל is rendered by τοῦ 87 times (93 percent). In 4 instances, there is no equivalent for ל, and the anarthrous infinitives are employed (4 percent). Both τῷ and τό are employed once each for ל. An indicative with ὅτι is used for ל plus a bound infinitive once.

When ל 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 ὅτι once (20 percent). However, for the cases in which the form in question functions as predicate, attributive,

---

[747]Ibid., 42.

complement, or final clause, τοῦ plus an infinitive is utilized in all occurrences (100 percent). Finally, the epexegetical ל plus a bound infinitive is rendered by τῷ plus an infinitive.

מן + bound infinitive > ἀπό + noun (2). The equivalent occurs in 1:8b and 3:5b.

1:8b לֹא־תִשְׂבַּע עַיִן לִרְאוֹת וְלֹא־תִמָּלֵא אֹזֶן מִשְּׁמֹעַ
1:8b οὐκ ἐμπλησθήσεται ὀφθαλμὸς τοῦ ὁρᾶν καὶ οὐ πληρωθήσεται οὖς ἀπὸ ἀκροάσεως

3:5b עֵת לַחֲבוֹק וְעֵת לִרְחֹק מֵחַבֵּק
3:5b καιρὸς τοῦ περιλαβεῖν καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ μακρυνθῆναι ἀπὸ περιλήμψεως

The form משמע in 1:8b is analyzed as the *Qal* bound infinitive prefixed by the preposition מן, and the form מחבק in 3:5b as the *Piel* bound infinitive prefixed by מן. The Translator rendered both forms by ἀπό 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 מן may denote means or agent in 1:8b, and separation in 3:5b.[749] Its equivalent ἀπό conveys the same meanings in Hellenistic Greek.[750] This approach is well established in earlier LXX books.[751]

---

[748]W. F. Howard, *Accidence and Word-Formation*, vol. 2 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark Ltd., 1979), 373-74.

[749]Cf. Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §11.2.11; Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, §315, 320.

[750]LSJ, s.v. "ἀπό"; BDF, §210-11; Robertson, *Grammar*, 574-80.

[751]See Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 104-05.

מן + bound infinitive > ὑπέρ + noun (1) / participle (1). The equivalent occurs in 4 :17a.

4:17a וְקָרוֹב לִשְׁמֹעַ מִתֵּת הַכְּסִילִים זָבַח
4:17a καὶ ἐγγὺς τοῦ ἀκούειν ὑπὲρ δόμα τῶν ἀφρόνων θυσία σου

The form מתת is analyzed as the bound infinitive with the preposition מן. The Translator rendered the form by ὑπέρ plus the noun δόμα. The preposition מן here denotes comparison, and the Greek comparative ὑπέρ is an excellent equivalent to the מן. As for the noun δόμα for the bound infinitive, some modern scholars suggest that the Translator might have had a text that read ממתת (*mimmattat*, מן plus the noun).[752] However, employing a noun for a bound infinitive prefixed by מן is the Translator's standard equivalent as well as that of the earlier translators.[753] Furthermore, the noun δόμα is deverbative and can be labeled a result noun.[754] In other words, the noun belongs to the semantic category of action.[755] Therefore, the deverbative 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.

6:9a טוֹב מַרְאֵה עֵינַיִם מֵהֲלֹךְ־נָפֶשׁ
6:9a ἀγαθὸν ὅραμα ὀφθαλμῶν ὑπὲρ πορευόμενον ψυχῇ

In 6:9a, the Translator utilizes ὑπέρ plus the participle for מהלך. The comparative ὑπέρ is an expected equivalent to the comparative מן. The bound infinitive

---

[752]BHS-Horst; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 45.

[753]See the instances of 1:8b and 3:5b. Cf. 5:10a, 12:4a; Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 100-10.

[754]Howard, *Accidence and Word-Formation*, 353-54.

in Hebrew functions as a object of the preposition מן. The Greek participle πορευόμενον renders the form הלך. One cannot decide whether the Translator read הלך as the bound infinitive or as the participle. In either case, the Greek participle, which is used as substantive, functionally matches the form.

מן + bound infinitive > ἢ ὅτι + anarthrous infinitive (1). The equivalent occurs in 7:2a.

7:2a טוֹב לָלֶכֶת אֶל־בֵּית־אֵבֶל מִלֶּכֶת אֶל־בֵּית מִשְׁתֶּה
7:2a ἀγαθὸν πορευθῆναι εἰς οἶκον πένθους ἢ ὅτι πορευθῆναι εἰς οἶκον πότου

The form מלכת is analyzed as the preposition מן plus the bound infinitive, and the Translator rendered the form by ἢ ὅτι plus the infinitive. The Greek infinitive is a formal equivalent to the Hebrew bound infinitive, and the comparative ἢ is a functional equivalent to the comparative מן.[756] The conjunction ὅτι may be pleonastic.[757] Soisalon-Soininen presented this as the only instance where ἢ ὅτι renders the comparative מן in all the LXX, so the approach is unprecedented in LXX.[758]

In sum, when a bound infinitive is used with מן, the bound infinitive is rendered by the noun 3 times, and by a substantival participle or infinitive twice. Therefore, all 5 bound infinitives with מן are rendered by substantives in Greek (100 percent). As the equivalent of מן, ἀπό is used for separative or means, and ὑπέρ or ἢ ὅτι

---

[755]Ibid.

[756]The particle ἤ can be used with infinitive. See BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §185 (2).

[757]Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ὅτι"; Robertson, *Grammar*, 666.

is employed for the comparative sense of מן.

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 בִּרְבוֹת הַטּוֹבָה רַבּוּ אוֹכְלֶיהָ
5:10a ἐν πλήθει τῆς ἀγαθωσύνης ἐπληθύνθησαν ἔσθοντες αὐτήν

12:4a וְסָגְרוּ דְלָתַיִם בַּשּׁוּק בִּשְׁפַל קוֹל הַטַּחֲנָה
12:4a καὶ κλείσουσιν θύρας ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ φωνῆς τῆς ἀληθούσης

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 רבות and שפל 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 ל prefixed to a bound infinitive, mostly the article τοῦ is employed, and no Greek preposition ever renders ל. On the other hand, for מן 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"

[761]Howard, *Accidence and Word-Formation*, 334, 347-48.

the proper Greek corresponding prepositions are employed in all but 1 case.[763] 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 יש occurs 16 times in Ecclesiastes and its negative counterpart אין 44 times. In 31 out of 44 instances the form אין is vocalized as *'ên*, 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.

אין (44)

Bound form אין without pronoun (31). They are normally rendered by οὐκ ἔστιν.

אין > 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, 8:8a, 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 אין, and this constitutes the normal pattern. The approach is functionally literal. Two examples are presented for illustration.

Examples:
1:9b וְאֵין כָּל־חָדָשׁ תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
1:9b καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν πᾶν πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

8:11a אֲשֶׁר אֵין־נַעֲשָׂה פִּתְגָם מַעֲשֵׂה הָרָעָה מְהֵרָה
8:11a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν γινομένη ἀντίρρησις ἀπὸ τῶν ποιούντων τὸ πονηρὸν ταχύ

The bound form אין rendered by οὐκ ἔστιν is normally followed by substantives as in 1:9b.[764] When a participle follows אין as in 8:11a, the Greek equivalent becomes a periphrastic construction.[765]

אין > μὴ ᾖ (1). In 4:10b, the bound form אין is rendered by the negative μή plus the subjunctive ᾖ.

4:10b וְאִילוֹ הָאֶחָד שֶׁיִּפּוֹל וְאֵין שֵׁנִי לַהֲקִימוֹ
4:10b καὶ οὐαὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἑνί ὅταν πέσῃ καὶ μὴ ᾖ δεύτερος τοῦ ἐγεῖραι αὐτόν

The Translator construed the ש-clause as a temporal clause and rendered it by ὅταν. When it is used for a conditional sense, the ὅταν normally takes μή for a negative and the subjunctive for a verb as ἐάν.[766] Therefore, μὴ ᾖ can be understood simply as a grammatical variation of οὐκ ἔστιν according to the norms of Greek and is a functional equivalent to the אין in the temporal ש-clause.

---

[763]The exceptional case is 7:2a where the comparative ἢ ὅτι is used.

[764]There is one exception. In 7:20a a predicate adjective follows אין.

[765]Another periphrastic construction is attested in 9:1b.

[766]Bauer, s.v. "ὅταν"; LSJ, s.v. "ὅταν."

Bound form אין *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 אין has a pronominal suffix, the Translator employed various approaches. The form אין with 3 m.s. suffix occurs 7 times.[767] In 5 of them איננו is rendered by οὐκ ἔστιν.[768] 5:11b is given for an example.

5:11b וְהַשָּׂבָע לְעָשִׁיר אֵינֶנּוּ מַנִּיחַ לוֹ לִישׁוֹן
5:11b καὶ τῷ ἐμπλησθέντι τοῦ πλουτῆσαι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀφίων αὐτὸν τοῦ ὑπνῶσαι

As discussed above, the Translator used the same οὐκ ἔστιν as equivalent to the bound form אין without a pronoun.[769] In other words, he did not distinguish between the 5 instances of אין with 3 m.s. suffix and אין without a pronoun because the form ἔστιν is marked for person.

In 1:7a, the Translator used a future indicative form (ἔσται) instead of a present form (ἔστιν).

1:7a כָּל־הַנְּחָלִים הֹלְכִים אֶל־הַיָּם
וְהַיָּם אֵינֶנּוּ מָלֵא
1:7a πάντες οἱ χείμαρροι πορεύονται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν
καὶ ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔσται ἐμπιμπλαμένη

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 οὐκ ἔσται for אין 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 איננו.

9:2a וְלַזֹּבֵחַ וְלַאֲשֶׁר אֵינֶנּוּ זֹבֵחַ
9:2a καὶ τῷ θυσιάζοντι καὶ τῷ μὴ θυσιάζοντι

The 3 m.s. pronominal suffix in איננו 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 אין has a 3 m.p. personal suffix—i.e., אינם.[771] In all 3 instances, οὔκ εἰσιν is used for אינם. The form εἰσίν already implies the third person plural subject in itself, so οὔκ εἰσιν is a functional equivalent to אינם.

Example:
4:17b כִּי־אֵינָם יוֹדְעִים לַעֲשׂוֹת רָע
4:17b ὅτι οὔκ εἰσιν εἰδότες τοῦ ποιῆσαι κακόν

Finally, אין with a 2m.s. suffix occurs twice (11:5a, 11:6b). Each case deserves full presentation.

(אֵינְךָ in 11:5a)
11:4a שֹׁמֵר רוּחַ לֹא יִזְרָע
11:4b וְרֹאֶה בֶעָבִים לֹא יִקְצוֹר
11:5a כַּאֲשֶׁר אֵינְךָ יוֹדֵעַ מַה־דֶּרֶךְ הָרוּחַ
כַּעֲצָמִים בְּבֶטֶן הַמְּלֵאָה
11:5b כָּכָה לֹא תֵדַע אֶת־מַעֲשֵׂה הָאֱלֹהִים
11:4a τηρῶν ἄνεμον οὐ σπερεῖ
11:4b καὶ βλέπων ἐν ταῖς νεφέλαις οὐ θερίσει
11:5a ἐν οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν γινώσκων τίς ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ πνεύματος
ὡς ὀστᾶ ἐν γαστρὶ τῆς κυοφορούσης
11:5b οὕτως οὐ γνώσῃ τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ θεοῦ

In 11:5a, כאשר 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 כאשר as באשר due to the confusion between כ and ב, and the clause becomes a temporal one, and not a comparative one. The Translator seems to have construed the באשר-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…"[772] Consequently, the subject of the relative clause in 11:5a is understood as the third person singular in light of 11:4.[773] The new sentence in Greek begins with ὡς ὀστᾶ ἐν γαστρὶ τῆς κυοφορούσης: "As bones in the belly of the pregnant woman…" The Translator's rendering אינך by οὐκ ἔστιν is, therefore, due to the different syntactical reading from MT. It is also possible that the Translator interpreted the clause introduced by אינך as a gnomic 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 אינך יודע.

11:6b כִּי אֵינְךָ יוֹדֵעַ אֵי זֶה יִכְשָׁר הַזֶּה אוֹ־זֶה
11:6b ὅτι οὐ γινώσκεις ποῖον στοιχήσει ἢ τοῦτο ἢ τοῦτο

One may expect a Greek periphrastic construction for אינך יודע as the Translator did in other instances. Although 11:6b deviates from the normal pattern, οὐ γινώσκεις is a good functional equivalent to אינך יודע.

The Translator's renderings for the bound form אין with or without a pronoun

---

[772]Rahlfs' 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 אין or איננו.

are either formally or functionally literal in all instances.

Free form אין (1). In 3:19b, אין is vocalized as a free form.

3:19b וּמוֹתַר הָאָדָם מִן־הַבְּהֵמָה אָיִן כִּי הַכֹּל הָבֶל
3:19b καὶ τί ἐπερίσσευσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος παρὰ τὸ κτῆνος οὐδέν

The form אין 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 מותר as a interrogative plus verb and אין as the answer to the question: "and in what way did humans excel above cattle? Nothing."[774] Even though the Translator interpreted the syntax of אין 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, οὐδέν is a formal equivalent to אין.

יש (16)

יש > ἐστίν / εἰσίν (15). The equivalent occurs in 2:13a, 2:21a, 4:8a, 4:9b, 5:12a, 6:1a, 6:11a, 7:15b, 7:15b, 8:6a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:4a, and 10:5a.

The positive pseudo-verb יש is rendered by ἐστίν in 12 instances and by εἰσί(ν) in 3 instances according to the number of the subject (94 percent).[775] This approach tallies with the approach for אין, for which οὐκ ἔστιν is employed in 97 percent of cases. The Translator's renderings of יש show a literal and consistent pattern with the rendering pattern for אין.

---

[774]English translation is from Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 4. For the rendering for the form מותר see p. 18 of this dissertation.

Examples:
2:13a וְרָאִיתִי אָנִי שֶׁיֵּשׁ יִתְרוֹן לַחָכְמָה מִן־הַסִּכְלוּת
2:13a καὶ εἶδον ἐγὼ ὅτι ἔστιν περισσεία τῇ σοφίᾳ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀφροσύνην

6:11a כִּי יֵשׁ־דְּבָרִים הַרְבֵּה מַרְבִּים הָבֶל
6:11a ὅτι εἰσὶν λόγοι πολλοὶ πληθύνοντες ματαιότητα

יש > ὅς (1). The equivalent occurs in 1:10a.

1:10a יֵשׁ דָּבָר שֶׁיֹּאמַר רְאֵה־זֶה חָדָשׁ הוּא
1:10b כְּבָר הָיָה לְעֹלָמִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה מִלְּפָנֵנוּ
1:10a ὃς λαλήσει καὶ ἐρεῖ ἰδὲ τοῦτο καινόν ἐστιν
1:10b ἤδη γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν

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 . . ."[776] The Translator rendered 1:10a by a relative clause functioning as the subject of 1:10b. Seow suggests that the form ישדבר (יש + noun) is read as שידבר (ש + verb) with metathesis of י and ש.[777] 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.[778] 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

---

[775]ἔστιν 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; εἰσί(ν) in 6:11a, 8:14a, 8:14a.

[776]See Fox, *Qoheleth*, 169; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 6; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 110. Cf. GKC, *Hebrew Grammar*, §159dd.

[777]Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 110.

[778]Cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, 960-62; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 687-88.

not only to the context but also to Greek.

The Translator's renderings of אין and יש 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 ἄφρων ἐκ περισσεύματος λαλεῖ in 2:15 may be regarded as gloss, so the λαλεῖ 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. אבד > ἀπόλλυμι 6 (3:6a, 5:13a, 7:7b, 7:15b, 9:6b, 9:18b)

2. אכל > 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. בהל (Piel) > σπεύδω 2 (5:1a, 7:9a);

3b. בהל (Niphal) > σπουδάζω 1 (8:3a)

4. בנה > οἰκοδομέω 3 (2:4b, 3:3b, 9:14b)

5. בקש (Piel) > ζητέω 7 (3:6a, 3:15b, 7:25a, 7:28a, 7:29b, 8:17b, 12:10a)

6. גדל (Hiphil, Qal) > μεγαλύνω 3 (1:16a, 2:4a, 2:9a)

7. דבר > λαλέω 5 (1:8a, 1:10a, 1:16a, 2:15b, 3:7b, 7:21a, 8:4a)[780]

8. זכר > μιμνήσκω 4 (5:19a, 9:15b, 11:8b, 12:1a)

9a. חבק (Qal) > περιλαμβάνω 2 (3:5b, 4:5a);

9. חבק (Piel Inf.cs.) > περίλημψις 1 (3:5b)

10a. חטא (Qal) > ἁμαρτάνω 6 (2:26b, 7:20b, 7:26b, 8:12a, 9:2b, 9:18b);

10b. חטא (Hiphil) > ἐξαμαρτάνω 1 (5:5a)

11a. חיה (Qal) > ζάω 3 (6:3a, 6:6a, 7:14a,[781] 11:8a)

---

[780]דבר in 1:10a and 8:4a, which are nouns (*dābār*) in MT, are construed as verbs.

[781]The form היה in MT may have been read as חיה.

11b. חיה (Piel) > ζωοποιέω 1 (7:12b)

12. חכם > σοφίζω 4 (2:15a, 2:19a, 7:16a, 7:23b)

13. יכל > δύναμαι 7 (1:8a, 1:15a, 1:15b, 6:10b, 7:13b, 8:17a, 8:17b)

14a. יצא (Qal) > ἐξέρχομαι 4 (4:14a, 5:14a, 7:18b, 10:5b);

14b. יצא (Hiphil) > ἐκφέρω 1 (5:1a)

15. ירא > φοβέω 8 (3:14b, 5:6b, 7:18b, 8:12b, 8:12b, 8:13b, 9:2b, 12:13b)[782]

16. כנס > συνάγω 3 (2:8a, 2:26b, 3:5a)

17a. מלא (Niphal) > πληρόω 4 (1:8b, 6:7b, 9:3b, 11:3a);

17b. מלא (Qal) > πληροφορέω 1 (8:11b)

18a. מלט (Piel) > διασῴζω 2 (8:8b, 9:15a);

18b. מלט (Niphal) > ἐξαιρέω 1 (7:26b)

19. מצא > εὑρίσκω 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. נגד > ἀναγγέλλω 2 (8:7b, 10:14b);
> ἀπαγγέλλω 2 (6:12b, 10:20b)

21. נגע > φθάνω 3 (8:14a, 8:14a, 12:1b)

22. נדר > εὔχομαι 4 (5:3a, 5:3b, 5:4a, 5:4b)

23. נטע > φυτεύω 5 (2:4b, 2:5b, 3:2b, 3:2b, 12:11a)

24. נפל > πίπτω 4 (4:10a, 4:10b, 11:3a, 11:3b);
> ἐμπίπτω 1 (10:8a);
> ἐπιπίπτω 1 (9:12b)

25. עוה > διαστρέφω 3 (1:15a, 7:13b, 12:3a)

---

[782]The form יראו is vocalized as *yirā'û* in MT (prefix defective form 3 m.p. from ירא), but its Greek equivalent reflects *yir'û* (prefix form 3 m.p. from ראה).

26. עמד > ἵστημι 5 (1:4b, 2:9b, 4:12a, 4:15b, 8:3a)

27. עמל > μοχθέω 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. ענה > περισπάω 3 (1:13b, 3:10b, 5:19b)

29a. קום (Hiphil) > ἐγείρω 2 (4:10a, 4:10b);

29b. קום (Qal) > ἀνίστημι 1 (12:4b)

30a. קלל (Piel) > καταράομαι 4 (7:21b, 7:22b, 10:20a, 10:20a);

30b. קלל (Pilpel) > ταράσσω 1 (10:10a)

31. קרה > συναντάω 3 (2:14b, 2:15a, 9:11b)

32. שבח > ἐπαινέω 2 (4:2a, 8:10a,[783] 8:15a)

33. שבע > πίμπλημι 1 (5:9a);
> ἐμπίμπλημι 3 (1:8b, 4:8a, 6:3a)

34. שלם > ἀποδίδωμι 3 (5:3a, 5:3b, 5:4b)

35. שמח > εὐφραίνω 9 (2:10b,[784] 3:12b, 3:22b, 4:16a, 5:18a, 8:15a, 10:19a, 11:8a, 11:9a)

36. שמע > ἀκούω 7 (4:17a, 7:5a, 7:5b, 7:21b, 9:16b, 9:17a, 12:13a);
> ἀκρόασις 1 (1:8b)

37. שנא > μισέω 4 (2:17a, 2:18a, 3:8a, 8:1b[785])

38. שתה > πίνω 5 (2:24a, 3:13a, 5:17a, 8:15a, 9:7a)

39. תור > κατασκέπτομαι 3 (1:13a, 2:3a, 7:25a)

---

[783]The form שכח in MT is read as שבח.

[784]The form is vocalized as *śāmēah* in MT.

[785]*šnh* ("to change") in MT is construed as *śn'*.

More Than One Hebrew Lexeme
Rendered by One Greek Lexeme

40. יסף > προστίθημι 5 (1:16a, 1:18b, 1:18b, 2:9a, 3:14a) [אסף > προστίθημι 1 (2:26b)]

41. רבה > πληθύνω 2 (6:11a, 10:14a) [רבב > πληθύνω 1 (5:10a)];
> πλῆθος 1 (5:10a)
הרבה > 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. שוב > ἐπιστρέφω 10 (1:6b, 1:7b, 3:20b, 4:1a, 4:7a, 5:14a, 9:11a, 12:2b, 12:7a, 12:7b) [סבב > ἐπιστρέφω 1 (2:20a)]

43. שלט > ἐξουσιάζω 4 (2:19a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 8:9b) [משל > ἐξουσιάζω 2 (9:17b, 10:4a)]

Category 2 – Regular Equivalents

One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered by
More Than One Greek Lexeme

44. אהב > ἀγαπάω 3 (5:9a, 5:9a, 9:9a);
> φιλέω 1 (3:8a)

45. אחז > θηρεύω 2 (9:12a, 9:12a);
> ἀντέχω 1 (7:18a);
> κρατέω 1 (2:3b)

46. אמר > 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. בוא > ἔρχομαι 6 (1:4a, 2:16b, 6:4a, 9:14a, 11:8b, 12:1b);
> ἄγω 3 (3:22b, 11:9b, 12:14a);
> παραγίνομαι 2 (5:2a, 5:15a);
> δύω 1 (1:5a);
> εἰσάγω 1 (8:10a);
> ἐπέρχομαι 1 (2:12b);
> ἥκω 1 (5:14a)

48. הלך > 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);
> δεῦρο 2 (2:1a, 9:7a);
> περιπατέω 2 (4:15a, 11:9a);

> ἀπέρχομαι 1 (5:15a);
> ἀποφέρω 1 (10:20b)

49. ידע > 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] [Ø > οἶδα 1]

50. ילד > γεννάω 3 (4:14b, 5:13b, 6:3a);
> γένεσις 1 (7:1b);
> τίκτω 1 (3:2a)

51. מות > ἀποθνῄσκω 5 (2:16b, 3:2a, 4:2a, 7:17b, 9:5a);
> νεκρός 3 (9:3b, 9:4b, 9:5b);
> θνῄσκω 1 (4:2a)

52. נוח > ἀφίημι 4 (2:18b, 5:11b, 10:4a, 11:6a);
> ἀνίημι 1 (7:18a);
> ἀναπαύω 1 (7:9b);
> καταπαύω 1 (10:4b)

53. נתן > δίδωμι 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);
> δόμα 1 (4:17a);
> τίθημι 1 (7:21a)

54. ראה > ὁράω 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, 4:4a, 4:7a, 4:15a, 5:7a, 5:10b,[787] 5:12a, 5:17a, 5:17a, 6:1a, 6:5a, 6:6a, 7:13a, 7:14a, 7:15a, 7:27a, 7:29a, 8:9a, 8:10a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:1a,[788] 9:9a, 9:11a, 9:13a, 10:5a, 10:7a, 12:5a[789]);
> βλέπω 4 (8:16a, 11:4b, 11:7b, 12:3b);
> δείκνυμι 2 (2:24b, 3:18b[790]);

---

[786]In 7:22a, ידע in MT is read as ירע with the confusion between ד and ר.

[787]The *Ketib* form ראות is vocalized as a noun in MT, but the Translator seems to have construed it as an infinitive from ראה.

[788]MT has ולבור את כל זה, but the Translator seems to have read ולבי ראה את כל זה. The verb ראה is created by the wrong word division, dittography of את, and the confusion between ת and ה.

[789]See above entry 15.

> θεωρέω 1 (7:11b);

Category 3 – Non-Standard Equivalents

55. היה > γίγνομαι 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) [עשה > γίγνομαι 3 (1:13a, 4:1a, 8:11a); הוה > γίγνομαι 1 (2:22a)];
> εἰμί 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) [הוא > εἰμί 9 (1:10a, 1:17b, 2:23b, 3:15a, 4:8b, 5:8a (*Qere*), 6:2b, 6:10a, 10:3b); היא > εἰμί 8 (2:24b, 3:13b, 5:5a, 5:8a *Ketib*, 5:18b, 6:1b, 7:26a, 9:13b); הוה > εἰμί 1 (11:3b); הם > εἰμί 1 (3:18b)][791]

56. סבב > ἐπιστρέφω 1 (2:20a) [שוב > ἐπιστρέφω 10 (1:6b, 1:7b, 3:20b, 4:1a, 4:7a, 5:14a, 9:11a, 12:2b, 12:7a, 12:7b)];
> κυκλόω 6 (1:6a, 1:6b, 1:6b, 7:25a, 9:14b, 12:5b)

57. עשה > γίγνομαι 3 (1:13a, 4:1a, 8:11a) [היה > γίγνομαι 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); הוה > γίγνομαι 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, 8:11b, 8:12a, 8:14a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 9:3a, 9:6b, 9:10a, 10:19a, 11:5b, 12:12b)

58. שמר > φυλάσσω 7 (3:6b, 4:17a, 5:7b, 5:12b, 8:2a, 8:5a, 12:13b) [זהר > φυλάσσω 1 ( )];
> τηρέω 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 בהל, but σπουδάζω is used for its Niphal stem. The Translator employed ἁμαρτάνω for the Qal stem of חטא and ἐξαμαρτάνω for the Hiphil stem in entry 10. In entry 11, he used ζάω for the Qal stem of חיה and ζωοποιέω for the Piel stem. In the same way, ἐξέρχομαι renders the Qal stem of יצא, and ἐκφέρω renders the Hiphil in entry 14. In entry 17, the Translator used πληρόω for the Niphal stem of מלא, while he used πληροφορέω for the Qal stem. Similarly, he employed διασῴζω for the Niphal stem of מלט, and ἐξαιρέω for the Piel in entry 18. In entry 29, for the Hiphil stem of קום, 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 קלל by καταράομαι, while he rendered the Pilpel stem by ταράσσω in entry 30. Examples are also found in categories 2 and 3. In entry 45, θηρεύω is probably employed for passive meanings of אחז. In entry 47, the Translator employed ἔρχομαι as a default rendering for the Qal stem of בוא, while he used ἄγω for the Hiphil stem. In entry 52, נוח in the Qal stem is rendered by ἀναπαύω, while the Hiphil stem is rendered by ἀφίημι, ἀνίημι, or καταπαύω (10:4b). The Translator employed περιπατέω for the Piel stem of הלך, 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 ראה, while he used ὁράω, 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 נגד, while he used ἀπαγγέλλω when the direct object follows the verb. The compound forms ἐμπίπτω and ἐπιπίπτω are employed along with the simplex form πίπτω in entry 24. The compound forms are decided by their governing prepositions: ἐν and ἐπί. There is no evident semantic difference between πίμπλημι and ἐμπίμπλημι in entry 33. Examples are also observed in categories 2 and 3. In entry 51, θνῄσκω is used in perfect, while the compound form ἀποθνῄσκω is used for future and aorist.[793] Two Greek equivalents ἀφίημι and ἀνίημι for נוח 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: מן (entries 9, 36) or ב (entry 41). In entry 9, he used περίλημψις for an infinitive form of חבק, and it may be

---

[792]Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 298.

[793]LSJ, s.v. "θνῄσκω." According to LSJ, the practice, in which θνῄσκω is used for perfect and pluperfect while ἀποθνῄσκω is used for present, future, and aorist, has its

understood as a stylistic variation since another חבק in the same line is rendered by the cognate verb περιλαμβάνω. In entry 41, the noun πλῆθος is used for רבה once. The Greek equivalent is a stylistic variation of πληθύνω, which is used for רבב in the same line.[794] Examples are found also in categories 2 and 3: entries 50, 53, and 58. In entry 50, γένεσις , the cognate noun of γεννάω, is used for ילד. Similarly, the Translator probably employed δόμα for נתן in entry 53 and φύλαξ for שמר 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 אחז according to context.[795] 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]רבב in 5:10a is a bi-form of רבה.

[795]The passive voice of the Hebrew word may also affect the choice of θηρεύω.

In entry 47, the default rendering for בוא with the meaning of "to go" is ἔρχομαι. On the other hand, παραγίνομαι ("to arrive"), δύω ("to sink"), ἐπέρχομαι (metaphorically "to follow"), and ἥκω (with perfect sense "to have come") are chosen by the contextual sensitivity of the Translator.

In entry 48, הלך in 5:15 contextually denotes "to go away," in contrast to בוא (contextually "to arrive"), so the Translator used ἀπέρχομαι for הלך rather than the default rendering πορεύομαι.

In entry 55, the Translator seems to have been very sensitive to the contextual meaning of היה. If היה has inchoative sense with the meanings of "to happen," "to come (into existence)," "to be born," "to become," or "to possess," with ל, he always employed γίγνομαι. On the contrary, for the instances where היה simply functions as copula, he used εἰμί as an equivalent to היה.

In entry 56, the Translator generally rendered סבב by κυκλόω ("to circle") but used ἐπιστρέφω for סבב in 2:20a because he contextually interpreted סבב with the meaning of "to turn."

In entry 57, a Niphal form of עשה is rendered by a present medio-passive form of γίγνομαι 3 times and by perfect medio-passive form of ποιέω 10 times. The Translator probably employed a medio-passive form of γίγνομαι for a middle sense and a medio-passive form of ποιέω for a passive sense.

Finally, in entry 58, the Translator used τηρέω for שמר in 11:4a where שמר 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 אמר when אמר is followed by either direct or indirect speech.[796] For אמר in 10:3b, which is not followed by direct speech nor by indirect speech, he employed λογίζομαι. In entry 48, δεῦρο is used for an imperative form of הלך.[797] In entry 50, if ילד 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 ילד in 3:2a, which does not have an object in 3:2a, he used τίκτω. In entry 49, while the default rendering for ידע is γιγνώσκω, the Translator always employed οἶδα for ידע when ידע occured after an interrogative. Finally, according to entry 54, participle forms of ראה are always rendered either by βλέπω or θεωρέω, not by ὁράω.[798] 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, παραγίνομαι in 5:15a may be used as a stylistic variation to ἥκω in 5:14a without any significant distinction. According to entry 53, τίθημι is used once for נתן (7:21a). The verb נתן takes לב as its object in 7:21a. The same grammatical construction (נתן לב) is observed in

---

[796]There is only 1 instance where an indirect speech (infinitive) follows אמר (8:17b).

[797]δεῦρο is used as an equivalent of הלך (imperative) in 58 instances out of 60 in the Greek Old Testament. E. Eynikel and J. Lust, "The Use of δεῦρο and δεῦτε in the LXX," *ETL* 67 (1991):57-68.

[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 δίδωμι for נתן. Since no different contextual meaning or grammatical condition is found in 7:21a from other 4 instances above, τίθημι is better understood as stylistic variation to δίδωμι.

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."[799] They include prepositions, conjunctions, adverbs, articles, interjections, and exclamations.[800] Some nouns are used as adverbs (e.g. מהרה in 8:11a) or with the force of prepositions (e.g. עמה with ל in 7:14b); and certain conjunctions are occasionally followed, not by clauses, but by nouns or nominal phrases (e.g. אם 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, כ, and ל. As the preposition מן 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.[801] 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.[802] There are also prepositions that always occur as components of compound prepositions. They are not presented here independently.[803]

---

[800]Ibid.

[801]The categories for analysis are borrowed from Gentry, *Greek Job*, 314-55.

[802]For example, the form מלפני is presented under the preposition מן, under ל, and under semiprepositions.

[803]For example, עמה is always associated with the preposition ל and never appears alone as a preposition. Therefore, עמה is not presented as an independent subcategory of prepositions.

Inseparable Prepositions

ב

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 ὡς, and in 8:4a, the compound form באשר is rendered by καθώς. The Greek equivalents may reflect כ rather than ב in all the 3 instances.[804] In 10:17b, the form בשתי, which is analyzed as ב plus noun שתי ("drinking") in MT, is rendered by the verb αἰσχυνθήσονται (fut. medio-passive from αἰσχύνω "to be ashamed" in passive).[805] The Translator probably construed בשתי as a suffix verb form from בוש ("to be ashamed").[806] 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 כ in MT and are rendered by ἐν. Four of them are compound forms with כאשר (4:17a, 8:16a, 9:2a, 11:5a).[807] Since ἐν is a normal equivalent to ב rather than כ, the 6 instances are regarded as the instances of ב. Consequently, the legitimate forms for the analysis of ב total 161.

---

[804]For כ rendered by ὡς, see below the analysis of כ; for כאשר rendered by καθώς, see p. 105 of this dissertation.

[805]KB, s.v. "שתי"; BDB, s.v. "שתי"; LSJ, s.v. "αἰσχύνω."

[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, 2:15a, 2:15b, 2:19a, 2:21a, 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, 7:14a, 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, 9:3b, 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, 11:9a, 11:9b, 12:1a, 12:1b, 12:3a, 12:3b, 12:4a, 12:4a, 12:5a, 12:5b, 12:14a.

Examples:
1:18a כִּי בְּרֹב חָכְמָה רָב־כָּעַס
1:18a ὅτι ἐν πλήθει σοφίας πλῆθος γνώσεως

2:1a לְכָה־נָּא אֲנַסְּכָה בְשִׂמְחָה וּרְאֵה בְטוֹב
2:1a δεῦρο δὴ πειράσω σε ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἰδὲ ἐν ἀγαθῷ

7:9a אַל־תְּבַהֵל בְּרוּחֲךָ לִכְעוֹס
7:9a 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 תַּרְתִּי בְלִבִּי לִמְשׁוֹךְ בַּיַּיִן אֶת־בְּשָׂרִי
2:3a κατεσκεψάμην ἐν καρδίᾳ μου τοῦ ἑλκύσαι εἰς οἶνον τὴν σάρκα μου

In Hellenistic Greek the preposition εἰς is often used in the place of ἐν with

---

[807]In 9:2a כאשר is rendered by ἐν. It is somewhat dubious whether ἐν renders כ only or כאשר as a whole.

various nuances.[808] 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.[809] In addition to that, משך frequently takes ב unless the subject is Yahweh, but ἕλκω is more common with εἰς than ἐν.[810] 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.

2:3b וְלִבִּי נֹהֵג בַּחָכְמָה וְלֶאֱחֹז בְּסִכְלוּת
2:3b καὶ καρδία μου ὡδήγησεν ἐν σοφίᾳ καὶ τοῦ κρατῆσαι ἐπ' ἀφροσύνῃ

In 2:3b, the second ב is rendered by ἐπί. The verb אחז normally occurs with ב when it is used with a preposition.[811] On the other hand, the Greek verb κρατέω 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 κρατέω. 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 וְשָׂרַיִךְ בָּעֵת יֹאכֵלוּ
10:17b καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντές σου πρὸς καιρὸν φάγονται

---

[808]BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §206; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, §369; Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, §90; Soisalon-Soininen, "ἐν für εἰς in der Septuaginta," *VT* 32:2 (1982): 190-200.

[809]Cf. Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, §90.

[810]If the subject is Yahweh, the preposition used is אל. See BDB, s.v. "משך"; cf. KB, s.v. "משך." For the prepositions following ἕλκω, see Bauer, s.v. "ἕλκω."

[811]BDB, s.v. "אחז"; KB, s.v. "אחז."

The Translator used πρός rather than ἐν for ב 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 ב as having the sense of approximate temporal boundary for the "proper time (עת)."

4:12b וְהַחוּט הַמְשֻׁלָּשׁ לֹא בִמְהֵרָה יִנָּתֵק
4:12b καὶ τὸ σπαρτίον τὸ ἔντριτον οὐ ταχέως ἀπορραγήσεται

8:10a וּבְכֵן רָאִיתִי רְשָׁעִים קְבֻרִים וָבָאוּ
8:10a καὶ τότε εἶδον ἀσεβεῖς εἰς τάφους εἰσαχθέντας

In the 2 instances above, ב is prefixed to the noun מהרה ("haste") or adverb כן ("thus").[813] The compound forms, במהרה in 4:12b and בכן 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 במהרה and בכן respectively.

2:16b בְּשֶׁכְּבָר הַיָּמִים הַבָּאִים הַכֹּל נִשְׁכָּח
2:16b καθότι ἤδη αἱ ἡμέραι αἱ ἐρχόμεναι τὰ πάντα ἐπελήσθη

7:2a בַּאֲשֶׁר הוּא סוֹף כָּל־הָאָדָם
7:2a καθότι τοῦτο τέλος παντὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

8:17a בְּשֶׁל אֲשֶׁר יַעֲמֹל הָאָדָם לְבַקֵּשׁ
8:17a ὅσα ἂν μοχθήσῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ζητῆσαι

---

[812]LSJ, s.v. "πρός"; Bauer, s.v. "ἐν."

[813]BDB, s.v. "מהרה" and s.v. "כן"; KB, s.v. "מהרה" and s.v. "כן."

In the above 3 instances, ב is associated with relatives: ש in 2:16b, אשר in 7:2a, and אשר של in 8:17a.[814] Construing ש and אשר as having the identical value in 2:16b and 7:2a, the Translator used καθότι for both בש and באשר. He probably interpreted the Hebrew compound relatives with a causal notion ("because").[815] For אשר בשל in 8:17a, the indefinite relative pronoun ὅσα and ἄν are used. The Translator may have understood the Hebrew phrase as an indefinite relative ("whatever").[816]

כ

The preposition כ occurs 32 times in Ecclesiastes, but the Translator probably confused 6 of them with the preposition ב (4:17a, 6:12a, 8:13a, 8:16a, 9:2a, 11:5a).[817] Thus, 6 forms are to be regarded as ב. On the contrary, in 3 instances the preposition ב is construed as כ (7:12a, 8:4a, 9:10a).[818] These 3 instances are counted as כ. A total of 29 occurrences, therefore, are legitimate for the analysis of the preposition כ. The preposition כ is categorized according to its function whether the prepositional phrase modifies a nominal or a verb or introduces a dependent clause.[819] Its functions are decided in the perspective of the Translator.

---

[814]There are 4 instances where the Translator construed כאשר as באשר (4:17a, 8:16a, 9:2a, and 11:5a). He rendered ב of the forms by ἐν 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 כשגגה in 10:5b modifies the noun רעה in 10:5a. The preposition כ is rendered by ὡς.

10:5a יֵשׁ רָעָה רָאִיתִי תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
10:5b כִּשְׁגָגָה שֶׁיֵּצֵא מִלִּפְנֵי הַשַּׁלִּיט
10:5a ἔστιν πονηρία ἣν εἶδον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον
10:5b ὡς ἀκούσιον ὃ ἐξῆλθεν ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ ἐξουσιάζοντος

Verbal modifiers (19). When כ functions as a verbal modifier, it is normally rendered by ὡς.

כ > *ὡς (17).* The equivalent occurs in 2:13b, 2:15a, 3:19a, 7:6a, 7:12a, 8:14a, 8:14a, 9:2b, 9:2b,[820] 9:10a, 9:12a, 9:12a, 9:12b, 10:7b, 11:5a, 12:11a, and 12:11a.

Examples:
9:12b כָּהֵם יוקְשִׁים בְּנֵי הָאָדָם
9:12b ὡς αὐτὰ παγιδεύονται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

12:11a דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים כַּדָּרְבֹנוֹת
12:11a λόγοι σοφῶν ὡς τὰ βούκεντρα

The prepositional phrase כהם is understood to modify the participle יוקשים functioning as a predicate in 9:12b. In 12:11a, the prepositional phrase כדרבנות is construed as a predicate.[821]

כ > *different Greek syntagmeme (2).* The occurrences are 8:1a and 11:6b.

8:1a מִי כְּהֶחָכָם וּמִי יוֹדֵעַ פֵּשֶׁר דָּבָר
8:1a τίς οἶδεν σοφοὺς καὶ τίς οἶδεν λύσιν ῥήματος

11:6b וְאִם־שְׁנֵיהֶם כְּאֶחָד טוֹבִים

---

[820]The Greek equivalent is used with an accent (ὧς) and functions as a demonstrative ("so," "thus"). See LSJ, s.v. "ὡς."

[821]There are 2 other instances where the prepositional phrase functions as predicate (12:11a, 7:12a).

11:6b ἐὰν τὰ δύο ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀγαθά

In 8:1a, כהחכם functions as a predicate: "Who is like the wise?" Aquila reads τίς ὧδε σοφός, and it seems to reflect מי כה חכם with different word division from the MT.[822] Is οἶδεν in Greek Ecclesiastes possibly a corruption of ὧδε in Aquila?[823] The plural σοφούς may be due to the dittography of the next ומ with the confusion of ו and י. There may have been a Hebrew text, which had a different word division from MT and the dittography: מי כה חכמים. With the different Hebrew text, Aquila's translation (τίς ὧ δὲ σοφός) was probably corrupted into τίς οἶδεν σοφούς. The corruption may have also been an attempt to parallel with the next מי clause.[824] 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 (οἶδεν) and the plural noun (σοφούς). The latter explanation may be preferable because the former has to postulate a text which is not attested.[825]

In 11:6b, the preposition כ is rendered by the preposition ἐπί. The Greek expression ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό signifies "together" as is כאחד in Hebrew.[826] The ἐπί is, therefore

---

[822]Fields, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 2: 395; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 80.

[823]Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 80; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 277. The relationship between the Translator and Aquila will be discussed in chap. 3.

[824]Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 277.

[825]I.e., τίς ὧδε σοφούς, or τίς οἶδεν σοφός, or their corresponding Hebrew texts.

[826]BDB, s.v. "אחד"; Bauer, s.v. "ἐπί."

used because of Greek convention.

Dependent clause marker (9). In 9 instances, כ fuctions as a dependent clause marker together with other conjunctions.

כאשר > καθώς (4) / καθώς ἄν (1).[827] For כאשר, the Translator employed καθώς in 5:14a, 8:4a, 8:7b, 9:2b and καθώς ἄν in 5:3a .

Examples:
5:3a כַּאֲשֶׁר תִּדֹּר נֶדֶר לֵאלֹהִים
5:3a καθὼς ἂν εὔξῃ εὐχὴν τῷ θεῷ

5:14a כַּאֲשֶׁר יָצָא מִבֶּטֶן אִמּוֹ עָרוֹם
5:14a καθὼς ἐξῆλθεν ἀπὸ γαστρὸς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ γυμνός

כש > ὡς (2) / ὅταν (2).[828] For כש, ὡς is used in 5:14a and 12:7a, and ὅταν is used in 9:12b and 10:3a.

Evidence:
ὡς: 5:14a, 12:7a.
ὅταν: 9:12b, 10:3a.

Examples:
5:14a יָשׁוּב לָלֶכֶת כְּשֶׁבָּא
5:14a ἐπιστρέψει τοῦ πορευθῆναι ὡς ἥκει

9:12b כְּשֶׁתִּפּוֹל עֲלֵיהֶם פִּתְאֹם
9:12b ὅταν ἐπιπέσῃ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἄφνω

Summary. The patterns betray the literal characteristics of the translation. For כ, the Translator employed ὡς in 20 instances and its related form καθώς in 5 instances (86 percent). Nevertheless, his rendering is not stereotyped. He was sensitive

---

[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.

ל

The preposition ל occurs 234 times in Ecclesiastes. The form לבור 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 לבי ("my heart").[829] The compound form למה occurs in 4 instances (2:15a, 5:5b, 7:16b, 7:17b) and functions as interrogative. These 4 instances of למה are not considered for this analysis.

On the other hand, there are 3 forms, which do not follow the preposition ל, but the Translator construed as such. In 4:10b, the Translator probably understood the form אילו ("if"?) as אי לו. ("woe to him!"), so it is treated under the preposition ל. As for כל עמת (*kol-'ummat*) in 5:15a, he may have construed it as עמת + ל + defective כי. Finally, αὐτῶν is the corresponding Greek equivalent for לא in 5:9a. The Translator probably construed the form as לו (ל + personal pronoun 3 m.s.).[830] In sum, a total of 232 instances are considered for the analysis of the preposition ל in Ecclesiastes.

Nominal modifiers (76). When ל 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:
2:16a כִּי אֵין זִכְרוֹן לֶחָכָם עִם־הַכְּסִיל לְעוֹלָם
2:16a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν μνήμη τοῦ σοφοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ἄφρονος εἰς αἰῶνα

3:2a עֵת לָלֶדֶת וְעֵת לָמוּת
3:2a καιρὸς τοῦ τεκεῖν καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν

In 2 instances (2:16a, 5:8b), ל is prefixed to a noun and modifies a previous noun in a bound phrase. For the other 26 instances, ל is prefixed to the bound infinitive and functions attributively to modify a noun as is the example in 3:2a.

Rendered by dative of respect (47). In 35 instances, ל is rendered by the article in dative.

Evidence:
1:3a, 1:11a, 1:11a, 2:3b, 2:13a, 3:1a, 3:1b, 3:17b, 3:19a, 4:8a, 4:16a, 5:10b, 6:8a, 6:11b, 6:12a, 7:11b, 8:12b, 8:13a, 8:15a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a,[831] 9:3a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 10:11b, 11:7b.

Example:
1:3a מַה־יִּתְרוֹן לָאָדָם בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ
1:3a τίς περισσεία τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ

In 12 instances, ל is just marked by the dative case of the following word:

1:11b, 3:19a, 4:9b, 4:10b, 4:11a, 5:15b, 6:5b, 8:6a, 8:12a, 9:5b, 9:6b, 10:16a.

Example:
8:6a כִּי לְכָל־חֵפֶץ יֵשׁ עֵת וּמִשְׁפָּט
8:6a ὅτι παντὶ πράγματι ἔστιν καιρὸς καὶ κρίσις

Verbal modifiers (156). When functions as a verbal modifier, the Translator normally utilized nominals in dative or τοῦ + Infinitive (61).

ל > *article in nominative (5).* In 5 instances, the ל phrase functions as a subject, and ל is rendered by the article in nominative. In 4:11b, 6:8b, 9:4b, and 10:3b, a noun follows ל, and in 7:5a, an infinitive follows.

Examples:
6:8b מַה־לֶּעָנִי יוֹדֵעַ לַהֲלֹךְ נֶגֶד הַחַיִּים
6:8b διότι ὁ πένης οἶδεν πορευθῆναι κατέναντι τῆς ζωῆς

7:5a טוֹב לִשְׁמֹעַ גַּעֲרַת חָכָם
7:5a ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἀκοῦσαι ἐπιτίμησιν σοφοῦ

ל *phrase* > *nominal in dative (43).* In 27 instances, the preposition ל has a pronominal suffix and is rendered by the dative case of the Greek pronoun.[832]

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 בָּנִיתִי לִי בָּתִּים
2:4b ᾠκοδόμησά μοι οἴκους

In 16 instances, for the ל 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 לִשְׂחוֹק אָמַרְתִּי מְהוֹלָל
2:2a τῷ γέλωτι εἶπα περιφοράν

---

[831]לאשר is rendered by τῷ.

[832]All are personal pronouns except 4:8b, which is an interrogative.

ל phrase > nominal in accusative (1). In 5:11b, the Translator understood לו as the object of the verb and so used the pronoun in accusative according to the norm of the target language.

5:11b אֵינֶנּוּ מַנִּיחַ לוֹ לִישׁוֹן
5:11b οὐκ ἔστιν ἀφίων αὐτὸν τοῦ ὑπνῶσαι

ל phrase > εἰς + nominal in accusative (18) / ἐν + nominal in dative (1). The occurrences are 1:4b, 1:11b, 2:16a, 3:14a, 3:21a, 3:21b, 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 ל phrases with adverbial functions and employed εἰς for ל. Three times, he construed the ל phrase as articular form (1:4b, 1:11b, 3:14a) but for all the other instances, as anarthrous forms.

Example:
1:4b וְהָאָרֶץ לְעוֹלָם עֹמָדֶת
1:4b καὶ ἡ γῆ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἕστηκεν

2:16a כִּי אֵין זִכְרוֹן לֶחָכָם עִם־הַכְּסִיל לְעוֹלָם
2:16a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν μνήμη τοῦ σοφοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ἄφρονος εἰς αἰῶνα

In 1:10b, the Translator rendered לעלמים by ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν not by εἰς τοῖς αἰῶσιν.

1:10b כְּבָר הָיָה לְעֹלָמִים
1:10b ἤδη γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν

When עולם suffixed by ל is a singular, he used εἰς for ל (1:4b, 2:16a, 3:14a, 9:6b). On the other hand, the form עלמים 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.

ל + *bound infinitive* > *τοῦ* + *infinitive (61).* 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, 4:13b, 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, 7:25a, 7:25b, 7:27b, 8:9b, 8:11b, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:16a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 8:17a, 8:17b, 8:17b, 9:10a, 10:15b, and 12:10a.

Example:
(Final ל)[833]
1:13a וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־לִבִּי לִדְרוֹשׁ
1:13a καὶ ἔδωκα τὴν καρδίαν μου τοῦ ἐκζητῆσαι

(Nominal ל)[834]
4:13b אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדַע לְהִזָּהֵר עוֹד
4:13b ὃς οὐκ ἔγνω τοῦ προσέχειν ἔτι

(Complementary ל)[835]
1:8a לֹא־יוּכַל אִישׁ לְדַבֵּר
1:8a οὐ δυνήσεται ἀνὴρ τοῦ λαλεῖν

Predicate ל + *bound infinitive* > *τοῦ* + *infinitive (1).* The equivalent occurs in 3:15a.

3:15a וַאֲשֶׁר לִהְיוֹת כְּבָר הָיָה
3:15a καὶ ὅσα τοῦ γίνεσθαι ἤδη γέγονεν

---

[833]The final ל is seen in 32 instances: 1:7b, 1:13a, 1:13a, 1:13b, 1:17a, 2:6b, 2:11a, 2:12a, 2:20a, 2:26b, 2:26b, 2:26b, 3:10b, 3:18b, 3:22b, 4:14a, 4:17a, 5:5a, 5:11b, 5:18a, 5:18a, 5:18a, 6:2a, 7:25a, 7:25a, 7:25b, 7:27b, 8:9b, 8:16a, 8:16a, 8:17a, 12:10a.

[834]The nominal ל is seen in 15 instances: 2:3a, 2:3b, 3:12b, 3:12b, 4:13b, 4:17b, 5:17a, 5:17a, 5:17a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:17b, 9:10a, 10:15b.

[835]The complementary ל 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.

ל + *bound infinitive* > *different Greek syntagmeme (2).* The occurrences are 1:16a and 3:18a.

1:16a דִּבַּרְתִּי אֲנִי עִם־לִבִּי לֵאמֹר
1:16a ἐλάλησα ἐγὼ ἐν καρδίᾳ μου τῷ λέγειν

3:18a לְבָרָם הָאֱלֹהִים
3:18a ὅτι διακρινεῖ αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός

In 1:16a לאמר is a marker to signal the beginning of quoted speech.[836] The Translator rendered it by the article in dative followed by the infinitive. The ל phrase in 3:18a functions as an objective clause and is properly rendered by the ὅτι-clause.

ל *phrase* > *adverb (2).* The equivalent occurs in 3:21b and 7:29a.

3:21b הַיֹּרֶדֶת הִיא לְמַטָּה לָאָרֶץ
3:21b εἰ καταβαίνει αὐτὸ κάτω εἰς γῆν

7:29a לְבַד רְאֵה־זֶה מָצָאתִי
7:29a πλὴν ἰδὲ τοῦτο εὗρον

The form למטה in 3:21b is analyzed as ל plus adverb, and לבד in 7:29a is ל plus noun. The Translator interpreted both forms as having adverbial functions and used Greek adverbs for their equivalents.

ל > *zero (5).* The occurrences are 2:21b, 3:14a, 3:14a, 6:8b, and 7:2a.

Examples:
2:21b וּלְאָדָם שֶׁלֹּא עָמַל־בּוֹ יִתְּנֶנּוּ חֶלְקוֹ
2:21b καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὃς οὐκ ἐμόχθησεν ἐν αὐτῷ δώσει αὐτῷ μερίδα αὐτοῦ

7:2a טוֹב לָלֶכֶת אֶל־בֵּית־אֵבֶל
7:2a ἀγαθὸν πορευθῆναι εἰς οἶκον πένθους

---

[836]S. G. Dempster, "Linguistic Features of Hebrew Narrative: Discourse Analysis of Narrative from the Classical Period" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1985), 124; Gentry, *Greek Job*, 270.

All 5 instances where ל is rendered by zero are to be construed either as subject or as object. The form לאדם 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 ל plus a bound infinitive functions as the subject, and is rendered by the anarthrous infinitive.

ל in compound preposition לעמת ש > ὥσπερ (1) / לעמה > σύμφωνος (1). The occurrences are 5:15a and 7:14b.

5:15a כָּל־עֲמַת שֶׁבָּא כֵּן יֵלֵךְ[837]
5:15a ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεγένετο οὕτως καὶ ἀπελεύσεται

7:14b גַּם אֶת־זֶה לְעֻמַּת־זֶה עָשָׂה הָאֱלֹהִים עַל־דִּבְרַת
7:14b καί γε σὺν τοῦτο σύμφωνον τούτῳ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς περὶ λαλιᾶς

The rendering is not mechanical for the same form as the Translator was sensitive to the context and employed appropriate Greek equivalents.

ל in semipreposition לפני > πρὸ προσώπου (6) / ἔμπροσθεν (5) / πρόσωπον (4). The Translator employed πρὸ προσώπου in 2:26a, 2:26b, 5:1a, 5:5a, 7:26b, and 9:1b, ἔμπροσθεν 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 וְאַל־תֹּאמַר לִפְנֵי הַמַּלְאָךְ
5:5a καὶ μὴ εἴπῃς πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ

2:7b וְצֹאן הַרְבֵּה הָיָה לִי מִכֹּל שֶׁהָיוּ לְפָנַי
2:7b καὶ ποιμνίου πολλὴ ἐγένετό μοι ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς γενομένους ἔμπροσθέν μου

3:14b שֶׁיִּרְאוּ מִלְּפָנָיו
3:14b ἵνα φοβηθῶσιν ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ

Summary. The Translator employed the dative for 91 instances of the nominal prefixed by ל (39 percent) and genitive for 90 instances of the bound infinitive prefixed by ל (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 ל by the article (65 percent). If we lay aside cases of ל + pronouns (38), adverbial phrases (21), and compound or semiprepositions (15), the percentage of the instances of ל 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 ל.

Separable Preposition מן

The preposition מן occurs in 75 instances in Ecclesiastes. In 3 instances, the form is not a מן prepositional phrase in MT, but the Translator construed it as such (7:24a, 8:11a, 8:12a). The Translator rendered the form מה היה (interrogative + verb) in 7:24a by ὑπὲρ ὃ ἦν. The Greek equivalent reflects משהיה (*miššehāyâ*) or as מהיה (*mihahōyeh*).[838] In 8:11a and 8:12a, the nouns beginning with מ are misconstrued as a מן preposition plus nominal: מעשה in 8:11a as מעשי (*mē'ōśay*) and מאת in 8:12a as מאז (*mē'āz*).[839] These 3 instances are to be included in the analysis. The total of instances of the preposition מן is 78.

---

[837]The Translator probably read כלעמת as *kil'ummat*.

[838]See p. 93 of this dissertation.

The מן prepositional phrases normally function as verbal modifiers. Apart from 9 instances, all cases of מן are prefixed with assimilation of *nun* to the first letter of the following word.[840] The evidence is presented according to frequency.

מן > ἀπό + 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 לְהַשְׁקוֹת מֵהֶם יַעַר צוֹמֵחַ עֵצִים
2:6b τοῦ ποτίσαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν δρυμὸν βλαστῶντα ξύλα

5:18a וְהִשְׁלִיטוֹ לֶאֱכֹל מִמֶּנּוּ
5:18a καὶ ἐξουσίασεν αὐτὸν τοῦ φαγεῖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ

6:3a וְנַפְשׁוֹ לֹא־תִשְׂבַּע מִן־הַטּוֹבָה
6:3a καὶ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐμπλησθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγαθωσύνης

8:12a אֲשֶׁר חָטָא עֹשֶׂה רָע מֵאַת
8:12a ὃς ἥμαρτεν ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν ἀπὸ τότε

The Translator employed ἀπό for מן 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.[841] The Translator interpreted מן 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 מפני and מלפני are also understood as locative. Other miscellaneous locatives are 4:4a, 8:11a, and 12:5a.

3 instances, the מן was probably understood as מן of agency (1:8b, 2:24b, 6:3a). Finally, the instance in 8:12a is the only place where the Translator construed the מן as temporal.

מן > 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 מן by ὑπέρ (38 percent), and all are comparative.

Example:
2:13a שֶׁיֵּשׁ יִתְרוֹן לַחָכְמָה מִן־הַסִּכְלוּת
2:13a ὅτι ἔστιν περισσεία τῇ σοφίᾳ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀφροσύνην

מן > ἐκ + Genitive (4)

Evidence:
4:14a, 8:10a, 12:11b, 12:12a.

The preposition ἐκ is employed when מן is construed as locative denoting origin (4:14a, 8:10a, 12:12a) or as agency (12:11b).

Examples:
4:14a כִּי־מִבֵּית הָסוּרִים יָצָא לִמְלֹךְ
4:14a ὅτι ἐξ οἴκου τῶν δεσμίων ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ βασιλεῦσαι

12:11b בַּעֲלֵי אֲסֻפּוֹת נִתְּנוּ מֵרֹעֶה אֶחָד
12:11b οἳ παρὰ τῶν συναγμάτων ἐδόθησαν ἐκ ποιμένος ἑνός

מן > ἐν + Dative (2)

2:10b כִּי־לִבִּי שָׂמֵחַ מִכָּל־עֲמָלִי
2:10b ὅτι καρδία μου εὐφράνθη ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ μου

7:10b כִּי לֹא מֵחָכְמָה שָׁאַלְתָּ עַל־זֶה
7:10b ὅτι οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐπηρώτησας περὶ τούτου

The ἐν in 2:10b may be used to render the locative sense of מן. On the other hand, the instance in 7:10b is probably interpreted as means or instrumental מן.

מן > παρά + Accusative (2)

2:9a וְהוֹסַפְתִּי מִכֹּל שֶׁהָיָה לְפָנַי
2:9a καὶ προσέθηκα παρὰ πάντας τοὺς γενομένους ἔμπροσθέν μου

3:19b וּמוֹתַר הָאָדָם מִן־הַבְּהֵמָה אָיִן
3:19b καὶ τί ἐπερίσσευσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος παρὰ τὸ κτῆνος οὐδέν

In both instances, the Translator used παρά with accusative to render the comparative מן.

מן > Different Greek Syntagmeme (3)

3:22a אֵין טוֹב מֵאֲשֶׁר יִשְׂמַח הָאָדָם בְּמַעֲשָׂיו
3:22a οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθὸν εἰ μὴ ὃ εὐφρανθήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ποιήμασιν αὐτοῦ

5:4a טוֹב אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִדֹּר
5:4b מִשֶּׁתִּדּוֹר וְלֹא תְשַׁלֵּם
5:4a ἀγαθὸν τὸ μὴ εὔξασθαί σε
5:4b ἢ τὸ εὔξασθαί σε καὶ μὴ ἀποδοῦναι

7:2a טוֹב לָלֶכֶת אֶל־בֵּית־אֵבֶל מִלֶּכֶת אֶל־בֵּית מִשְׁתֶּה
7:2a ἀγαθὸν πορευθῆναι εἰς οἶκον πένθους ἢ ὅτι πορευθῆναι εἰς οἶκον πότου

10:1b יִקָּר מֵחָכְמָה מִכָּבוֹד סִכְלוּת מְעָט
10:1b τίμιον ὀλίγον σοφίας ὑπὲρ δόξαν ἀφροσύνης μεγάλης

In 3:22a, מן is interpreted as restrictive—probably ablative mixed with comparative—and is rendered by εἰ μή. The next 2 instances of מן are understood as comparatives and are rendered by ἤ in 5:4b and ἢ ὅτιin 7:2a. In 10:1b, מחכמה is perhaps construed as a partitive genitive.

Compound Forms (4)

2:25b וּמִי יָחוּשׁ חוּץ מִמֶּנִּי
2:25b καὶ τίς φείσεται πάρεξ αὐτοῦ

3:11b מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְצָא הָאָדָם אֶת־הַמַּעֲשֶׂה
3:11b ὅπως μὴ εὕρῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸ ποίημα

5:7b כִּי גָבֹהַּ מֵעַל גָּבֹהַּ שֹׁמֵר
5:7b ὅτι ὑψηλὸς ἐπάνω ὑψηλοῦ φυλάξαι

10:14b וַאֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מֵאַחֲרָיו מִי יַגִּיד לוֹ
10:14b καὶ τί τὸ ἐσόμενον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ τίς ἀναγγελεῖ αὐτῷ

In 2:25b, the Translator may have interpreted חוץ מן (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, מבלי, followed by אשר, is construed as a conjunction, which introduces a result/purpose clause. The Translator employed ὅπως for it. The Translator construed two compound prepositions, מעל in 5:7b and מאחר in 10:14b in the locative and temporal sense respectively. He used a proper Greek preposition for each case.

The Translator construed מן as locative in 34 instances out of 77 (44 percent), and generally employed ἀπό for the locative מן (26 instances, 76 percent). He treated 33 instances of מן as comparative (43 percent) and used ὑπέρ for 29 instances (88 percent). For the partitive מן or מן of agency, he mainly employed ἀπό. In translating the preposition מן, the Translator was not mechanical, but was sensitive to the semantics of the preposition and utilized various approaches.

Separate and Compound Prepositions.

אחר > ὀπίσω (1)

12:2b וְשָׁבוּ הֶעָבִים אַחַר הַגָּשֶׁם
12:2b καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν τὰ νέφη ὀπίσω τοῦ ὑετοῦ

אחרי (7)

The Translator rendered אחרי by μετά in 2 instances and ὀπίσω in 5 instances. They are all interpreted as temporal except for 1 instance (2:12b), which has spatial sense. The μετά and ὀπίσω may be stylistic variations.

אחרי > μετά + accusative (2). The equivalent occurs in 2:18b and 3:22b.

Example:
2:18b שֶׁאַנִּיחֶנּוּ לָאָדָם שֶׁיִּהְיֶה אַחֲרָי
2:18b ὅτι ἀφίω αὐτὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ γινομένῳ μετ' ἐμέ

אחרי (4) / מאחרי (1) > ὀπίσω. The occurrences are 2:12b, 6:12b, 7:14b, 9:3b, and 10:14b (מאחרי).

Example:
6:12b מִי־יַגִּיד לָאָדָם מַה־יִּהְיֶה אַחֲרָיו תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
6:12b τί ἔσται ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

אל (23)

The Translator employed three different Greek prepositions for אל: εἰς (13), πρός (8), and ἐπί (2). He may have used εἰς for the terminative sense of אל ("into").[842] In all the instances where εἰς renders אל, the objectives of אל are specific places such as

---

[842]Even though εἰς can denote the directive sense ("toward"), the directive אל seems to be reserved for πρός.

מקום (4), בית (4), לב (2), etc. On the other hand, the Translator probably employed πρός to represent the directive sense of אל ("toward"). Its objects are either direction (דרום, צפון) or person (המתים, החיים, האלהים, personal pronouns). Finally, for the contingent locative senses of אל such as "near" or "at," the Translator used ἐπί.

אל > εἰς + 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:
1:7a כָּל־הַנְּחָלִים הֹלְכִים אֶל־הַיָּם
1:7a πάντες οἱ χείμαρροι πορεύονται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν

אל > 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 הוֹלֵךְ אֶל־דָּרוֹם וְסוֹבֵב אֶל־צָפוֹן
1:6a πορεύεται πρὸς νότον καὶ κυκλοῖ πρὸς βορρᾶν

אל > ἐπί + accusative (2). The equivalent occurs in 9:14b and 12:6b.

Example:
12:6b וְנָרַץ הַגַּלְגַּל אֶל־הַבּוֹר
12:6b καὶ συντροχάσῃ ὁ τροχὸς ἐπὶ τὸν λάκκον

מבלי (1)

3:11b מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְצָא הָאָדָם אֶת־הַמַּעֲשֶׂה
3:11b ὅπως μὴ εὕρῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸ ποίημα

The compound preposition מבלי with אשר and the pleonastic לא is rendered by the conjunction ὅπως with the negative μή.

עד (5) / עדן (2)

When עד functions as a conjunction, the Translator employed ἕως. On the other hand, when עד functions as a preposition, he used μέχρι. The conjunction ἕως introduces indefinite temporal clauses in Greek Ecclesiastes while μέχρι is followed by a definite time.

עד > ἕως (4). The equivalent occurs in 2:3b, 12:1b, 12:2a, and 12:6a.

Example:
2:3b עַד אֲשֶׁר־אֶרְאֶה אֵי־זֶה טוֹב לִבְנֵי הָאָדָם
2:3b ἕως οὗ ἴδω ποῖον τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

עד > μέχρι (1). The equivalent occurs in 3:11b.

3:11b אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה הָאֱלֹהִים מֵרֹאשׁ וְעַד־סוֹף
3:11b ὃ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ μέχρι τέλους

The form עדן occurs twice in Ecclesiastes and is analyzed as עד + הן.[843] The Translator rendered the form עדנה (עד + הנה) by ἕως τοῦ νῦν ("until now") in 4:2b and the form with לא together by οὔπω ("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.

עדן > ἕως τοῦ νῦν (1). The equivalent occurs in 4:2b.

4:2b מִן־הַחַיִּים אֲשֶׁר הֵמָּה חַיִּים עֲדֶנָה
4:2b ὑπὲρ τοὺς ζῶντας ὅσοι αὐτοὶ ζῶσιν ἕως τοῦ νῦν

---

[843]KB, s.v. "עדן"; BDB, s.v. "עדנה."

עדן + > οὔπω **(1).** The equivalent occurs in 4 :3a.

4:3a וְטוֹב מִשְּׁנֵיהֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־עֲדֶן לֹא הָיָה
4:3a καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο τούτους ὅστις οὔπω ἐγένετο

על (38)

The preposition על occurs in 38 instances. The Translator employed ἐπί for most of the locative uses of על. When על denotes reference, he used περί.

Locative על > ἐπι + 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 וְעַל־סְבִיבֹתָיו שָׁב הָרוּחַ
1:6b καὶ ἐπὶ κύκλους αὐτοῦ ἐπιστρέφει τὸ πνεῦμα

Locative על > ἐπι + 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 עָלָיו אֵין לְהוֹסִיף
3:14a ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν προσθεῖναι

Locative על > ἐπι + genitive (4). The equivalent occurs in 5:1b, 8:14a, 8:16a, and 10:7b.

Example:
5:1b כִּי הָאֱלֹהִים בַּשָּׁמַיִם וְאַתָּה עַל־הָאָרֶץ
5:1b ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ σὺ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

על of reference > περί + genitive (5). The equivalent occurs in 1:13a, 3:18a,

7:10b, 7:14b, and 8:2b.

Example:
7:14b עָשָׂה הָאֱלֹהִים עַל־דִּבְרַת
7:14b ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς περὶ λαλιᾶς

על > ἐν + dative (2). The occurrences include 1:16a and 12:14a.

1:16a וְהוֹסַפְתִּי חָכְמָה עַל כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־הָיָה לְפָנַי עַל־יְרוּשָׁלִָם
1:16a καὶ προσέθηκα σοφίαν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἳ ἐγένοντο ἔμπροσθέν μου ἐν Ιερουσαλημ

12:14a כִּי אֶת־כָּל־מַעֲשֶׂה הָאֱלֹהִים יָבִא בְּמִשְׁפָּט עַל כָּל־נֶעְלָם
12:14a ὅτι σὺν πᾶν τὸ ποίημα ὁ θεὸς ἄξει ἐν κρίσει ἐν παντὶ παρεωραμένῳ

The Translator construed the second על in 1:16a as locative and employed the locative ἐν for it. The word ירושלם normally takes the preposition ב, and the ב is rendered by ἐν.[844] The rendering על in 1:16a may be influenced by the other instances where בירושלם is rendered by ἐν Ιερουσαλημ. The ἐν for על in 12:14a seems to have been used for reference.

על > διά + accusative (1). The single example occurs in 8:11b.

8:11b עַל־כֵּן מָלֵא לֵב בְּנֵי־הָאָדָם
8:11b διὰ τοῦτο ἐπληροφορήθη καρδία υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

The phrase על כן is rendered by διὰ τοῦτο in 8:11b. It is compared with על כן in 5:1b where it is rendered by ἐπὶ τούτῳ.

Compound preposition מעל > ἐπάνω + genitive (1).[845] The single example

---

[844]The word ירושלם 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 כִּי גָבֹהַּ מֵעַל גָּבֹהַּ שֹׁמֵר
5:7b ὅτι ὑψηλὸς ἐπάνω ὑψηλοῦ φυλάξαι

In sum, the Translator was sensitive to the context in rendering על and chose proper equivalents according to the norm of Greek.

עם (8)

The Translator employed the μετά of accompaniment ("with") for 7 instances of עם. There is 1 instance where he construed עם as locative ("in") and used ἐν for it. The Translator was not mechanical in rendering עם.

עם > μετά (7). The equivalent occurs in 1:11b, 2:16a, 2:16b, 4:15b, 6:10b, 7:11a, and 9:9a.

Example:
2:16a כִּי אֵין זִכְרוֹן לֶחָכָם עִם־הַכְּסִיל
2:16a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν μνήμη τοῦ σοφοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ἄφρονος

עם > ἐν (1). The single example occurs in 1:16a.

1:16a דִּבַּרְתִּי אֲנִי עִם־לִבִּי
1:16a ἐλάλησα ἐγὼ ἐν καρδίᾳ μου

תחת (34)

The Translator interpreted 33 instances of תחת as simple locative "under" and employed ὑπό + accusative for them. The word שמש occurs 31 times as an object of the preposition, and שמים and סיר follow תחת each once.[846] In 1 instance, he construed תחת in

---

[846]In 2:3b, the Translator read שמים in MT as שמש.

the sense of substitution ("in place of") and so, used ἀντί for it. The Translator utilized different Greek prepositions as equivalents to תחת according to the different nuances of each context.

Spatial תחת > ὑπό + 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 וְאֵין כָּל־חָדָשׁ תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
1:9b καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν πᾶν πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

תחת of substitution > ἀντί + genitive (1). The single example occurs in 4:15b.

4:15b עִם הַיֶּלֶד הַשֵּׁנִי אֲשֶׁר יַעֲמֹד תַּחְתָּיו
4:15b μετὰ τοῦ νεανίσκου τοῦ δευτέρου ὃς στήσεται ἀντ' 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]

---

[847]Sollamo, *Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 1.

Semiprepositions with the Stem פני (17)

In 17 of the 21 occurrences of the word פנים in Ecclesiastes, it becomes a component of semiprepositions.

לפני > πρὸ προσώπου (6). The equivalent occurs in 2:26a, 2:26b, 5:1a, 5:5a, 7:26b, and 9:1b.

In 6 instances, the semipreposition לפני is rendered by πρὸ προσώπου. The לפני may be used either as denoting pure location ("in front of") or as denoting value judgment ("in view of") in metaphorical sense.[848]

Examples:
2:26a כִּי לְאָדָם שֶׁטּוֹב לְפָנָיו נָתַן חָכְמָה
2:26a ὅτι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ἀγαθῷ πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν σοφίαν

5:1a וְלִבְּךָ אַל־יְמַהֵר לְהוֹצִיא דָבָר לִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים
5:1a καὶ καρδία σου μὴ ταχυνάτω τοῦ ἐξενέγκαι λόγον πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ

According to Sollamo, the approach is already established by other translators of LXX while πρὸ προσώπου is not attested outside the LXX and NT.[849]

לפני > ἔμπροσθεν (4). The equivalent occurs in 1:16a, 2:7b, 2:9a, and 4:16a.

When the semipreposition לפני is temporal, the Translator always rendered it by ἔμπροσθεν.

Example:
2:9a וְהוֹסַפְתִּי מִכֹּל שֶׁהָיָה לְפָנַי בִּירוּשָׁלִָם
2:9a καὶ προσέθηκα παρὰ πάντας τοὺς γενομένους ἔμπροσθέν μου ἐν Ιερουσαλημ

---

[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. "פנה."

[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 לפני is always followed by human beings as objects.[850] The approach is attested in the antecedent translators of LXX, and ἔμπροσθεν with temporal force is also attested in Hellenistic Greek literature outside the LXX and NT.[851]

מלפני > ἀπὸ προσώπου (4). The equivalent occurs in 3:14b, 8:12b, 8:13b, and 10:5b.

Example:
8:13b אֲשֶׁר אֵינֶנּוּ יָרֵא מִלִּפְנֵי אֱלֹהִים
8:13b ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν φοβούμενος ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ

מלפני > ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν (1). The single example occurs in 1:10b.

1:10b כְּבָר הָיָה לְעֹלָמִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה מִלְּפָנֵנוּ
1:10b ἤδη γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν

There are 5 instances where a semipreposition לפני is prefixed by מן. Just as πρὸ προσώπου is employed for the spatial force of לפני and ἔμπροσθεν for the temporal force, so ἀπὸ προσώπου is utilized for מלפני with a spatial notion and ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν for מלפני with a temporal notion.[852] The case in 1:10b, in which מלפני is rendered by ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν, is unique in LXX.[853] Sollamo concludes that Eccl 1:10 is a curious case.[854]

---

[850]The Qoheleth comes after לפני in 1:16a, 2:7b, and 2:9a; and the human beings in 4:16a.

[851]Sollamo, *Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 34-35, 320-21.

[852]In 1:10b, the antecedent of אשר is לעלמים, so the temporal force of מלפנו is evident in the context.

[853]See the table in Sollamo, *Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 96.

[854]Ibid., 101.

Nevertheless, the Translator consistently employed ἔμπροσθεν for the temporal force whether it was for לפני or מלפני. On the other hand, as in 8:13b, the Translator always used ἀπὸ προσώπου for מלפני in a locative sense.[855] The object of מלפני rendered by ἀπὸ προσώπου is always God or someone in power as it is when the spatial לפני 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.[856] The Translator used two different approaches to render מלפני/לפני 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).

מפני > ἀπὸ προσώπου (1). The single example occurs in 8:3a.

8:3a אַל־תִּבְהַל מִפָּנָיו תֵּלֵךְ
8:3a ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ πορεύσῃ

על־פני > ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (1). The single example occurs in 11:1a.

11:1a שַׁלַּח לַחְמְךָ עַל־פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם
11:1a ἀπόστειλον τὸν ἄρτον σου ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ ὕδατος

The semipreposition מפני in 8:3a denotes local direction. The Translator employed ἀπὸ προσώπου for the form and did not distinguish מפני from מלפני in translation. The rendering is formally and functionally literal, and also good Hellenistic

---

[855]The מלפני in 10:5b denotes the sense of origin, and it is a subcategory of the locative.

[856]Sollamo, *Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 95.

Greek.[857] 11:1a is not likely prepositional because the form bears its literal meaning "surface."[858]

Semiprepositions with the Stem יד (5)

ביד > ἐν χειρὶ (3). The occurrences are 5:13b, 5:14b, and 9:1a.

Example:
5:13b וְהוֹלִיד בֵּן וְאֵין בְּיָדוֹ מְאוּמָה
5:13b καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱόν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ οὐδέν

Sollamo lists two categories in which ביד is regarded as prepositional. The first category is ביד *loci*, having the meaning of "in the power of," or "in the possession of."[859] The second category is ביד *instrumenti* which means "by the action of," "by," or "through."[860] All instances of ביד 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.[861]

מיד > ἀπὸ χειρὸς (2). The occurrences are 2:24b and 4:1b.

Example:
2:24b גַּם־זֹה רָאִיתִי אָנִי כִּי מִיַּד הָאֱלֹהִים הִיא
2:24b καί γε τοῦτο εἶδον ἐγὼ ὅτι ἀπὸ χειρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν

The Greek equivalent ἀπὸ χειρὸς for מיד is not only a literal rendering but also

---

[857]Sollamo, *Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 85.

[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.

[861]Cf. Sollamo, *Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 160-61.

a normal Greek expression.[862] In both 2:24b and 4:1b, the semipreposition מיד may denote origin ("to come from").

עין with Prepositions (2)

8:16b שֵׁנָה בְּעֵינָיו אֵינֶנּוּ רֹאֶה
8:16b ὕπνον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν βλέπων

11:7b וְטוֹב לָעֵינַיִם לִרְאוֹת אֶת־הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
11:7b καὶ ἀγαθὸν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῦ βλέπειν σὺν τὸν ἥλιον

When the form בעיני has a prepositional function, it means either "in the judgement of" or "in the presence of."[863] However, exegesis eliminates the possibility of there being a semipreposition for בעיניו in 8:16b, because בעיניו literally designates physical human eyes. For the case of 11:7b, even though עינים is prefixed by ל, it is a free form and does not function as a preposition.

פה with Prepositions (2)

5:1a אַל־תְּבַהֵל עַל־פִּיךָ
5:1a μὴ σπεῦδε ἐπὶ στόματί σου

6:7a כָּל־עֲמַל הָאָדָם לְפִיהוּ
6:7a πᾶς μόχθος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς στόμα αὐτοῦ

The form על־פי can be functionally prepositional only when it means "according to" or "according to word or command."[864] על־פי in 5:1a is used metaphorically and implies "utterance." The form may be regarded as an ordinary noun

---

[862]Ibid., 197.

[863]Ibid., 123.

[864]KB, s.v. "פה"; Sollamo, *Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 224.

with a preposition על rather than a semipreposition.

Another related form, לפי, can be prepositional with the meaning of "according to." In 6:7a, the meaning of לפי is literally "for mouth" by the context and may metaphorically imply "greed." Therefore, לפי 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 accusativi* is completely analyzed in the noun section and is not dealt with here. The other six particles to be excluded are: בד (7:29a), בלי (3:11b), חוץ (2:25b), מטה (3:21b), עמה (5:15a, 7:14b), and של (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]

או > ἢ (2)

2:19a וּמִי יוֹדֵעַ הֶחָכָם יִהְיֶה אוֹ סָכָל
2:19a καὶ τίς οἶδεν εἰ σοφὸς ἔσται ἢ ἄφρων

11:6b כִּי אֵינְךָ יוֹדֵעַ אֵי זֶה יִכְשָׁר הֲזֶה אוֹ־זֶה
11:6b ὅτι οὐ γινώσκεις ποῖον στοιχήσει ἢ τοῦτο ἢ τοῦτο

---

[865]See ל for בד, מטה, and עמה; see מן for בלי and חוץ; and finally for של, see ב and אשר.

אז > τότε (2)

2:15a אֲנִי אָז יוֹתֵר וְדִבַּרְתִּי בְלִבִּי
2:15a ἐγὼ τότε περισσὸν ἐλάλησα ἐν καρδίᾳ μου

8:12a אֲשֶׁר חָטָא עֹשֶׂה רָע מְאַת
8:12a ὃς ἥμαρτεν ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν ἀπὸ τότε[866]

אי (*'î*) > οὐαί (2)

4:10b וְאֵילוֹ הָאֶחָד שֶׁיִּפּוֹל
4:10b καὶ οὐαὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἑνί ὅταν πέσῃ[867]

10:16a אֵי־לְךָ אֶרֶץ שֶׁמַּלְכֵּךְ נָעַר
10:16a οὐαί σοι πόλις ἧς ὁ βασιλεύς σου νεώτερος

אי (*'ê*) > ποῖος (2)

2:3b עַד אֲשֶׁר־אֶרְאֶה אֵי־זֶה טוֹב לִבְנֵי הָאָדָם
2:3b ἕως οὗ ἴδω ποῖον τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

11:6b כִּי אֵינְךָ יוֹדֵעַ אֵי זֶה יִכְשָׁר הַזֶּה אוֹ־זֶה
11:6b ὅτι οὐ γινώσκεις ποῖον στοιχήσει ἢ τοῦτο ἢ τοῦτο

איך > πῶς (2)

2:16b וְאֵיךְ יָמוּת הֶחָכָם עִם־הַכְּסִיל
2:16b καὶ πῶς ἀποθανεῖται ὁ σοφὸς μετὰ τοῦ ἄφρονος

4:11b וּלְאֶחָד אֵיךְ יֵחָם
4:11b καὶ ὁ εἷς πῶς θερμανθῇ

---

[866]The Translator read מאת as מאז. See p. 22 of this dissertation.

[867]The Translator construed אילו as אי לו.

אל (*'al*) > μή (21)

5:1a, 5:1a, 5:3a, 5:5a, 5:5a, 5:7a, 7:9a, 7:10a, 7:16a, 7:16a, 7:17a, 7:17a, 7:18a, 7:21a, 8:3a, 8:3a, 9:8b, 10:4a, 10:20a, 10:20a, 11:6a.

Example:
5:1a אַל־תְּבַהֵל עַל־פִּיךָ
5:1a μὴ σπεῦδε ἐπὶ στόματί σου

אלו > εἰ (1)

6:6a וְאִלּוּ חָיָה אֶלֶף שָׁנִים פַּעֲמַיִם
6:6a καὶ εἰ ἔζησεν χιλίων ἐτῶν καθόδους

אם (21)

אם > ἐάν (15)

Evidence:
4:10a, 4:11a, 4:12a, 5:7a, 6:3a, 10:4a, 10:10a, 10:11a, 11:3a, 11:3a, 11:3a, 11:6b, 11:8a, 12:14b, 12:14b.

Example:
4:12a וְאִם־יִתְקְפוֹ הָאֶחָד
4:12a καὶ ἐὰν ἐπικραταιωθῇ ὁ εἷς

אם > ὅσος ἄν (1)

8:17b וְגַם אִם־יֹאמַר הֶחָכָם לָדַעַת
8:17b ὅσα ἂν εἴπῃ ὁ σοφὸς τοῦ γνῶναι

Where אם introduces a protasis in a conditional sentence, the Translator mainly used ἐάν as equivalent for the אם, 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.[868]

אם > εἰ (2)

Example:
5:11a מְתוּקָה שְׁנַת הָעֹבֵד אִם־מְעַט וְאִם־הַרְבֶּה יֹאכֵל
5:11a γλυκὺς ὕπνος τοῦ δούλου εἰ ὀλίγον καὶ εἰ πολὺ φάγεται

When אם is used in double indirect question (5:11a and 12:4b), the Translator employed εἰ for 5:11a and ἐάν for 12:4b. The example of 5:11a may be a stylistic variation for 12:4b.

אם > εἰ μή (2)

3:12a יָדַעְתִּי כִּי אֵין טוֹב בָּם
3:12b כִּי אִם־לִשְׂמוֹחַ וְלַעֲשׂוֹת טוֹב
3:12a ἔγνων ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς
3:12b εἰ μὴ τοῦ εὐφρανθῆναι καὶ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἀγαθὸν ἐν ζωῇ αὐτοῦ[869]

8:15a אֵין־טוֹב לָאָדָם תַּחַת הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ כִּי אִם־לֶאֱכוֹל וְלִשְׂתּוֹת וְלִשְׂמוֹחַ
8:15a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον ὅτι εἰ μὴ τοῦ φαγεῖν

אם > ἀλλά ἤ (1)

5:10b וּמַה־כִּשְׁרוֹן לִבְעָלֶיהָ כִּי אִם־רְאִית עֵינָיו
5:10b καὶ τί ἀνδρεία τῷ παρ' αὐτῆς ὅτι ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ ὁρᾶν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ

אם is used in the restrictive sense "except" with כי in 3 instances (3:12b, 5:10b, 8:15a). Two follow the negative אין (3:12b, 8:15a), and one is preceded by a rhetorical question (5:10b). The Translator differentiated two cases by employing εἰ μή for the

---

[868]The approach should be considered together with the preceding sentence where בשל אשר is rendered also by ὅσα ἄν. For the use of the indefinite relative with a conditional sense, see Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 688; Robertson, *Grammar*, 961-62.

former case and ἀλλὰ ἤ for the latter case. His rendering is elaborate. Additionally, he did not interpret כי אם 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.

אף > καί γέ (1)

2:9b אַף חָכְמָתִי עָמְדָה לִי
2:9b καί γε σοφία μου ἐστάθη μοι

גם (58)

גם > καί 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, 9:1b, 9:6a, 9:6a, 9:6a, 9:12a, 9:13a, 10:20a, 12:5a.

Example:
2:23a גַּם־בַּלַּיְלָה לֹא־שָׁכַב לִבּוֹ
2:23a καί γε ἐν νυκτὶ οὐ κοιμᾶται ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ

גם > 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, 10:3a, 11:2a

Example:
6:3a וְגַם־קְבוּרָה לֹא־הָיְתָה לוֹ
6:3a καί γε ταφὴ οὐκ ἐγένετο αὐτῷ

---

[869]The particle כי may be rendered by zero because כי is always rendered by ὅτι when it is followed by אם (cf. 4:10a, 5:10b, 8:15a, 11:8a).

גם > καί (1)

7:22a כִּי גַּם־פְּעָמִים רַבּוֹת יָדַע לִבֶּךָ
7:22a ὅτι πλειστάκις πονηρεύσεταί σε καὶ καθόδους πολλὰς κακώσει καρδίαν σου

In 14 instances where גם follows the conjunction ו, the Translator always rendered גם by γέ (100 percent). On the other hand, if גם does not follow ו, he used καί γέ for גם in 43 instances out of 44 (98 percent). The גם has two functions in Ecclesiastes. In most cases, it has an emphatic function—i.e., emphasizing the following substantive or clause.[870] It may also be a clause marker. In 27 instances out of 43, גם introduces asyndeton clauses (63 percent). Finally, there is 1 instance where גם is rendered by καί (7:22a). In 7:22a, the Translator duplicated the Hebrew in two synonymous clauses. The first Greek clause is introduced by ὅτι, which reflects כי. The second clause is connected to the first one by καί. καί could correspond to גם, but it is more likely that the Translator has rendered the emphatic גם in an indirect way by duplication. In sum, the Translator's rendering גם 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 > εἰ (3)

Evidence:
2:19a, 3:21a, 3:21b.[871]

---

[870]Gentry uses English "indeed" for both καί γέ and γέ. His translation clearly reflects the emphatic use of גם. See Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," 1-11.

[871]The MT pointed ה as an article in 3:21a and 3:21b, but the Translator construed the form as a question marker in both instances.

Example:
3:21a מִי יוֹדֵעַ רוּחַ בְּנֵי הָאָדָם הָעֹלָה הִיא לְמָעְלָה
3:21a καὶ τίς οἶδεν πνεῦμα υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ ἀναβαίνει αὐτὸ εἰς ἄνω

ה > ἤ (1)

11:6b כִּי אֵינְךָ יוֹדֵעַ אֵי זֶה יִכְשָׁר הַזֶּה אוֹ־זֶה
11:6b ὅτι οὐ γινώσκεις ποῖον στοιχήσει ἢ τοῦτο ἢ τοῦτο

הלא > μή οὐκ (1)

6:6b הֲלֹא אֶל־מָקוֹם אֶחָד הַכֹּל הוֹלֵךְ
6:6b μὴ οὐκ εἰς τόπον ἕνα τὰ πάντα πορεύεται

In 3:21a and 3:21b where ה is construed as a question marker ("whether") to introduce a dependent interrogative clause, the Translator used εἰ for ה. In 2:19a and 11:6b, ה is correlated with או ("whether…or…"), and the Translator employed εἰ…ἤ for 2:19a and ἤ…ἤ for 11:6b. When ה is followed by the negative לא, he used the negative combination μή οὐκ, which strengthens the negation (6:6a).[872] Overall, one could notice the stylistic variations and contextual interpretation from the Translator's approach in treating ה.

הנה > ἰδού (6)

Evidence:
1:14b, 1:16a, 2:1b, 2:11b, 4:1b, 5:17a.

Example:
1:14a וְהִנֵּה הַכֹּל הֶבֶל וּרְעוּת רוּחַ
1:14a καὶ ἰδοὺ τὰ πάντα ματαιότης καὶ προαίρεσις πνεύματος

---

[872]Bauer, s.v. "μή"; BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §365.

ו (361)

ו > καί (356)

Evidence:
1:4a, 1:4b, 1:5a, 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, 2:3b, 2:5a, 2:5b, 2:7a, 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:8a, 2:8a, 2:8a, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:8b, 2:9a, 2:9a, 2:10a, 2:10b, 2:11a, 2:11a, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:11b, 2:12a, 2:12a, 2:12a, 2:13a, 2:14a, 2:14b, 2:15a, 2:15a, 2:16b, 2:17a, 2:17b, 2:18a, 2:19a, 2:19a, 2:19a, 2:20a, 2:21a, 2:21a, 2:21b, 2:21b, 2:22a, 2:23a, 2:24a, 2:24a, 2:25a, 2:26a, 2:26a, 2:26b, 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, 3:8a, 3:8b, 3:11b, 3:12b, 3:13a, 3:13a, 3:13a, 3:14a, 3:14b, 3:15a, 3:15b, 3:16a, 3:16b, 3:17a, 3:17b, 3:18b, 3:19a, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:20b, 3:21b, 3:22a, 4:1a, 4:1a, 4:1b, 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, 4:8a, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:8b, 4:10b, 4:10b, 4:11a, 4:11b, 4:12a, 4:12b, 4:13a, 4:13b, 4:16b, 4:17a, 5:1a, 5:1b, 5:2b, 5:4b, 5:5a, 5:5b, 5:6a, 5:6a, 5:7a, 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, 6:2b, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:3a, 6:4a, 6:4b, 6:5a, 6:6a, 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, 7:25a, 7:25b, 7:25b, 7:26a, 7:26a, 7:26b, 7:28a, 7:28b, 7:29b, 8:1a, 8:1b, 8:2b, 8:4b, 8:5b, 8:6a, 8:8a, 8:8a, 8:8b, 8:9a, 8:10a, 8:10a, 8:10a, 8:12a, 8:13a, 8:13a, 8:14a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:15a, 8:15b, 8:16a, 8:16b, 8:17a, 8:17b, 8:17b, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:1a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:2a, 9:3b, 9:3b, 9:3b, 9:5b, 9:5b, 9:6b, 9:7a, 9:8b, 9:9b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:10b, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11a, 9:11b, 9:12a, 9:13b, 9:14a, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:14b, 9:15a, 9:15a, 9:15b, 9:16a, 9:16b, 9:16b, 9:18b, 10:2b, 10:3a, 10:3b, 10:6b, 10:7b, 10:8b, 10:10a, 10:10a, 10:11b, 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, 12:2a, 12:2b, 12:3a, 12:3b, 12:3b, 12:4a, 12:4b, 12:4b, 12:5a, 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 דּוֹר הֹלֵךְ וְדוֹר בָּא
1:4a γενεὰ πορεύεται καὶ γενεὰ ἔρχεται

ו > Zero (5)

Evidence:
2:15b, 3:19a, 8:5b, 8:10a, 12:9b.

Example:
2:15 וְלָמָּה חָכַמְתִּי אֲנִי אָז יוֹתֵר וְדִבַּרְתִּי בְלִבִּי
2:15 καὶ ἵνα τί ἐσοφισάμην ἐγὼ τότε περισσὸν ἐλάλησα ἐν καρδίᾳ μου

According to Rahlfs' editorial decision, a new sentence begins at ἐγώ, while in MT, ודברתי starts the new sentence. The ἵνα clause seems to be treated as the object of ἐλάλησα. The conjunction ו may have been lacking in the parent text of the Translator.

3:19a מִקְרֵה בְנֵי־הָאָדָם וּמִקְרֵה הַבְּהֵמָה וּמִקְרֶה אֶחָד לָהֶם
3:19a συνάντημα υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ συνάντημα τοῦ κτήνους συνάντημα ἓν αὐτοῖς

MT vocalizes all 3 occurrences of מקרה as free forms, and consequently, 3:19a is read as three independent clauses connected by ו. On the other hand, the Greek translation suggests that the first two מקרה are construed as bound forms. The two bound phrases are subjects, and the final מקרה is a subject complement in function. The second ו is probably lacking in the parent text of the Translator as many Hebrew manuscripts and other ancient versions attest to it.[873]

8:5b וְעֵת וּמִשְׁפָּט יֵדַע לֵב חָכָם
8:5b καὶ καιρὸν κρίσεως γινώσκει καρδία σοφοῦ

The hendiadys עת ומשפט in 8:5b is rendered by the genitive phrase καιρὸν κρίσεως. The same עת ומשפט occurs in 8:6a, but its rendering is formally literal: καιρὸς καὶ κρίσις. One cannot be sure whether the *Vorlage* in 8:5b did not have ו or the Translator deliberately employed a stylistic variation in 8:6a for the same Hebrew phrase.

8:10a וּבְכֵן רָאִיתִי רְשָׁעִים קְבֻרִים וָבָאוּ וּמִמְּקוֹם קָדוֹשׁ יְהַלֵּכוּ
8:10a καὶ τότε εἶδον ἀσεβεῖς εἰς τάφους εἰσαχθέντας καὶ ἐκ τόπου ἁγίου ἐπορεύθησαν

12:9b וְאֵזִן וְחִקֵּר תִּקֵּן מְשָׁלִים הַרְבֵּה
12:9b καὶ οὗς ἐξιχνιάσεται κόσμιον παραβολῶν

---

[873]BHS-Horst; Murphy, *Ecclesiastes*, 30; Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 168. Gordis argues that the vocalization for מקרה designates an abnormal bound form and the second ו has a function to emphasize the predicate. See Gordis, *Koheleth*, 227-28.

The Greek equivalent εἰσαχθέντας for ובאו in 8:10a probably reflects the participle form מובאים. The form וחקר in 12:9b, which is a suffix form with *waw* in MT, may have been read as the prefix יחקר, but neither case is the ו construed as a conjunction.

In sum, the Translator may have not had a conjunction ו 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.

כבר (9)

כבר > ἤδη (8)

Evidence:
1:10b, 2:16b, 3:15a, 3:15a, 4:2a, 6:10a, 9:6a, 9:7b.

Example:
3:15a מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה כְּבָר הוּא
3:15a τὸ γενόμενον ἤδη ἐστίν

כבר > Zero (1)

2:12b מֶה הָאָדָם שֶׁיָּבוֹא אַחֲרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־כְּבָר עֲשׂוּהוּ
2:12b τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐπελεύσεται ὀπίσω τῆς βουλῆς τὰ ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτήν

The absence of ἤδη for כבר in 2:12b is unusual. The evidence is insufficient to establish any pattern for the case.

כי (88)

כי > ὅτι (86)

Evidence:

1:18a, 2:10b, 2:12b, 2:16a, 2:17a, 2:17b, 2:21a, 2:22a, 2:23a, 2:24b, 2:25a, 2:26a, 3:12a, 3:14a, 3:17b, 3:19a, 3:19b, 3:22a, 4:4a, 4:10a, 4:14a, 4:14b, 4:16b, 4:17b, 5:1b, 5:2a, 5:3a, 5:5a, 5:6a, 5:6b, 5:7b, 5:10b, 5:17b, 5:19a, 5:19b, 6:2a, 6:4a, 6:8a, 6:11a, 6:12a, 7:3b, 7:6a, 7:7a, 7:9b, 7:10b, 7:12a, 7:13b, 7:18b, 7:20a, 7:22a, 8:3b, 8:6a, 8:6b, 8:7a, 8:7b, 8:12b, 8:15a, 8:16b, 8:17a, 9:1a, 9:3a, 9:4a, 9:4a, 9:5a, 9:5b, 9:7b, 9:9b, 9:10b, 9:11a, 9:11b, 9:12a, 10:4b, 10:20b, 11:1b, 11:2b, 11:6b, 11:8a, 11:8b, 11:9b, 11:10b, 12:3b, 12:5b, 12:13b, 12:14a.

Examples:
2:10b כִּי־לִבִּי שָׂמֵחַ מִכָּל־עֲמָלִי
2:10b ὅτι καρδία μου εὐφράνθη ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ μου

8:15a אֵין־טוֹב לָאָדָם תַּחַת הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ כִּי אִם־לֶאֱכוֹל
8:15a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον ὅτι εἰ μὴ τοῦ φαγεῖν

כי > Zero (1)

3:12a כִּי אִם־לִשְׂמוֹחַ וְלַעֲשׂוֹת טוֹב בְּחַיָּיו
3:12a εἰ μὴ τοῦ εὐφρανθῆναι καὶ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἀγαθὸν ἐν ζωῇ αὐτοῦ

The combination כי אם occurs 5 times in Ecclesiastes (3:12a, 4:10a, 5:10b, 8:15a, 11:8a). In 4 instances, כי is rendered by ὅτι, and in 1 instance (3:12a), it is rendered by zero. Functionally, כי אם 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 כי would be pleonastic in the Greek syntax.[874] Although 3:12a deviates from the formally literal pattern, it may be a better Greek expression.

כי > γάρ (1)

5:15a וְגַם־זֹה רָעָה חוֹלָה כָּל־עֵמַת שֶׁבָּא כֵּן יֵלֵךְ
5:15a καί γε τοῦτο πονηρὰ ἀρρωστία ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεγένετο οὕτως καὶ ἀπελεύσεται

---

[874]Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ὅτι," II.2.

The Greek translation ὥσπερ γάρ may reflect כי לעמת not כל עמת.[875] The substantive עמת is always used with ל, and the combination לעמת may be rendered by ὥσπερ. Employing γάρ for כי is already an established pattern by other translators.[876]

ככה > οὕτως (1)

11:5b כָּכָה לֹא תֵדַע אֶת־מַעֲשֵׂה הָאֱלֹהִים
11:5b οὕτως οὐ γνώσῃ τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ θεοῦ

כן (7)

כן > οὕτως (4)

Evidence:
3:19a, 5:15a, 7:6a, 8:10a.

Examples:
3:19a כְּמוֹת זֶה כֵּן מוֹת זֶה
3:19a ὡς ὁ θάνατος τούτου οὕτως ὁ θάνατος τούτου

8:10a וְיִשְׁתַּכְּחוּ בָעִיר אֲשֶׁר כֵּן־עָשׂוּ
8:10a καὶ ἐπῃνέθησαν ἐν τῇ πόλει ὅτι οὕτως ἐποίησαν

כן > οὗτος (2)

5:1b עַל־כֵּן יִהְיוּ דְבָרֶיךָ מְעַטִּים
5:1b ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἔστωσαν οἱ λόγοι σου ὀλίγοι

8:11b עַל־כֵּן מָלֵא לֵב בְּנֵי־הָאָדָם בָּהֶם
8:11b διὰ τοῦτο ἐπληροφορήθη καρδία υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν αὐτοῖς

כן + ב > τότε (1)

8:10a וּבְכֵן רָאִיתִי רְשָׁעִים קְבֻרִים וָבָאוּ

---

[875]See p. 306 of this dissertation.

[876]Gentry, *Greek Job*, 371.

8:10a καὶ τότε εἶδον ἀσεβεῖς εἰς τάφους εἰσαχθέντας

In 3 instances, the Translator construed כן as a correlative conjunction with כ (3:19a, 7:6a) or with לעמה (5:15a).[877] He employed Greek correlatives denoting comparison: ὡς...οὕτως for כ...כן, and ὥσπερ...οὕτως for לעמה...כן. In 8:10a, כן is used as a simple adverb to modify the verb, and the Translator rendered it by οὕτως. When כן is combined with the preposition על (5:1b, 8:11b), the Translator employed for כן neuter forms of οὗτος. The ἐπὶ τούτῳ in 5:1b may denote ground, and διὰ τοῦτο in 8:11b may be understood as causal.[878] Finally, another combination form בכן in 8:10a is rendered by τότε. The בכן 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 כן are due to its different functions.

לא (64)

The negation לא occurs in 65 instances. In 1 instance, the Translator may not have construed the form as negative.

5:9a וּמִי־אֹהֵב בְּהָמוֹן לֹא תְבוּאָה
5:9a καὶ τίς ἠγάπησεν ἐν πλήθει αὐτῶν γένημα

In 5:9a, αὐτῶν may reflect לו (*lô*), which is a homonym with לא (*lō*ʾ).[879] This case is not included in the analysis.

---

[877]For לעמה...כן 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.

לא > οὐ (54)

Evidence:
1:8a, 1:8b, 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, 6:3a, 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 לֹא־תִשְׂבַּע עַיִן לִרְאוֹת
1:8b καὶ οὐκ ἐμπλησθήσεται ὀφθαλμὸς τοῦ ὁρᾶν

9:11a כִּי לֹא לַקַּלִּים הַמֵּרוֹץ
9:11a ὅτι οὐ τοῖς κούφοις ὁ δρόμος

The Translator used οὐ for לא when the indicative verb or nominal is negated in Greek.[880]

לא > μή (8)

Evidence:
3:11b,[881] 5:4a, 5:4b, 7:14b, 7:21b, 12:1b, 12:2a, 12:6a.

Examples:
5:4a טוֹב אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִדֹּר מִשֶּׁתִּדּוֹר
5:4a ἀγαθὸν τὸ μὴ εὔξασθαί σε ἢ τὸ εὔξασθαί σε

7:14b שֶׁלֹּא יִמְצָא הָאָדָם אַחֲרָיו מְאוּמָה
7:14b ἵνα μὴ εὕρῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ μηδέν

When the infinitive is negated, or when the verb is rendered by the subjunctive in the independent clause, the Translator employed μή for לא 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 מבלי אשר לא is rendered by ὅπως μή. The לא may be pleonastic. Cf. BDB, s.v. "בלי." See p. 317 of this dissertation.

target language.[882]

לא > Different Greek Syntagmeme (1)

10:10a אִם־קֵהָה הַבַּרְזֶל וְהוּא לֹא־פָנִים קִלְקַל
10:10a ἐὰν ἐκπέσῃ τὸ σιδήριον καὶ αὐτὸς πρόσωπον ἐτάραξεν

The Oriental Manuscripts attest לו for לא. Gordis suggests that the Translator probably rendered לו by αὐτῷ, and it is omitted after αὐτος in the present text.[883] However, the reason for omitting αὐτῷ, which Gordis proposes, does not seem plausable. The absence of negation in LXX may rather be semantic. The Translator seems to have interpreted פנים with the meaning of "human face," not "edge" of instrument such as a sword. The form קלקל (Pilpel form from קלל) occurs only twice in the Hebrew Bible. While modern lexicographers propose the meaning "to sharpen" for קלקל, the meaning for ταράσσω, "to trouble," does not match that of קלקל.[884] A possible proposal may be that the Translator semantically combined לא and קלקל into ταράσσω. In other words, the negative sense of לא may be included in the lexical equivalent he selected, i.e., ταράσσω.

עדן לא > οὔπω (1)

4:3a וְטוֹב מִשְּׁנֵיהֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־עֲדֶן לֹא הָיָה
4:3a καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο τούτους ὅστις οὔπω ἐγένετο

With the meaning of "not yet," οὔπω is a good functional equivalent for עדן לא.

---

[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.

מהרה (2)

מהרה > ταχύ (1)

8:11a אֲשֶׁר אֵין־נַעֲשָׂה פִּתְגָם מַעֲשֵׂה הָרָעָה מְהֵרָה
8:11a ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν γινομένη ἀντίρρησις ἀπὸ τῶν ποιούντων τὸ πονηρὸν ταχύ

מהרה + ב > ταχέως (1)

4:12b וְהַחוּט הַמְשֻׁלָּשׁ לֹא בִמְהֵרָה יִנָּתֵק
4:12b καὶ τὸ σπαρτίον τὸ ἔντριτον οὐ ταχέως ἀπορραγήσεται

Both forms מהרה and במהרה are used adverbially with the same meaning ("quickly").[885] For מהרה, the Translator used ταχύ an adjective in neuter accusative functioning as adverb, and for במהרה, 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.

מעל > ἄνω (1)

3:21a מִי יוֹדֵעַ רוּחַ בְּנֵי הָאָדָם הָעֹלָה הִיא לְמָעְלָה
3:21a καὶ τίς οἶδεν πνεῦμα υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ ἀναβαίνει αὐτὸ εἰς ἄνω

נא > δή (1)

2:1a אָמַרְתִּי אֲנִי בְּלִבִּי לְכָה־נָּא אֲנַסְּכָה בְשִׂמְחָה
2:1a εἶπον ἐγὼ ἐν καρδίᾳ μου δεῦρο δὴ πειράσω σε ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ

עוד > ἔτι (6)

Evidence:

---

[884]KB, s.v. "קלקל"; BDB, s.v. "קלקל"; LSJ, s.v. "ταράσσω."

[885]מהרה is a noun but used adverbial accusative; and במהרה is an adverbial phrase. Cf. KB. s.v. "מהרה"; BDB, s.v. "מהרה."

3:16a, 4:13b, 7:28a, 9:5b, 9:6b, 12:9b.

Example:
9:6b וְחֵלֶק אֵין־לָהֶם עוֹד לְעוֹלָם בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־נַעֲשָׂה תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
9:6b καὶ μερὶς οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς ἔτι εἰς αἰῶνα ἐν παντὶ τῷ πεποιημένῳ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

פתאם > ἄφνω (1)

9:12b כְּשֶׁתִּפּוֹל עֲלֵיהֶם פִּתְאֹם
9:12b ὅταν ἐπιπέσῃ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἄφνω

שם > ἐκεῖ (7)

Evidence:
1:5b, 1:7b, 3:16b, 3:16b, 3:17b, 9:10b, 11:3b.

Example:
1:7b אֶל־מְקוֹם שֶׁהַנְּחָלִים הֹלְכִים שָׁם הֵם שָׁבִים לָלָכֶת
1:7b εἰς τόπον οὗ οἱ χείμαρροι πορεύονται ἐκεῖ αὐτοὶ ἐπιστρέφουσιν τοῦ πορευθῆναι

Summary

The data are sufficient for 13 particles out of 24 to uncover the approach of the Translator in rendering particles: אל, אם, גם, ה, הנה, ו, כבר, כי, כן, לא, מעל, עוד, and שם. 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.[1] 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.[2] 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.[3] He also presents different lexical choices made by the Translator and by Aquila, and shows that the LXX version contains non-Aquilan features.[4] 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.[5] 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.[6] Jarick takes a skeptical view of the possibility of identifying the

---

[1]August Dillmann, "Über die griechische Übersetzung des Qoheleth," *SAW* (1892): 3-16.

[2]Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, *VT* 10, supp. vol. (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 21-30.

[3]Kyösti Hyvärinen, *Die Übersetzung von Aquila*, Coniectana Biblica, Old Testament Series 10 (Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1977), 88.

[4]Hyvärinen, *Aquila*, 88-93, 96-98.

[5]Hyvärinen, *Aquila*, 98-99.

[6]John Jarick, "Aquila's Koheleth," *Textus* 15 (1990): 131-39.

Translator of the Greek Ecclesiastes.[7] 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.[8] In conclusion, he calls for a comprehensive study of the translation technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes to identify its Translator.[9] 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.

[8]Peter Gentry, "The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes in the Marginal Notes of the Syro-Hexapla," *AS* 2.1 (2004): 63-83.

[9]Gentry, "The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion," 83.

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.

---

[10]As Natalio Fernández Marcos points out, Reider's *Index* should not be used without critical evaluation for each item. Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: An Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 118. For verification for each entry, the present writer consults Frederick Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875); 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); and Göttingen Critical Editions. The present writer also adopts the guidelines or corrections made by J. Barr, review of *An Index to Aquila*, by J. Reider, *JSS* 12 (1967): 296-304; R. Hanhart, review of *An Index to Aquila*, by J. Reider, *Trev* 64 (1968): 393-94; E. Tov, "Some Corrections to Reider-Turner's Index to Aquila," *Textus* 8 (1973): 164-74; J. Ziegler, *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob* (Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 1985), 53-66.

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

H	Hebrew (i.e., Masoretic Text)
Tr	Translator (i.e., Greek Ecclesiastes)
γ′	The Three (including all α′, σ′, and θ′)
GJ	Theodotion in Greek Job
MP	*Kaige* Tradition in Greek Minor Prophets from Nahal Hever
X	γ′ / GJ / MP
+	Same Equivalent in X as in Tr
–	Same Equivalent Not in X
	No Equivalent Extant
?	Evidence Questionable / Equivalent Not Characteristic in X
σ′…	Same Equivalent Only Attested Uniquely By Symmachus[12]
Act	Active
Impv	Imperative
M-P	Medio-Passive

---

[11]Aquilan Texts selected by Hyvärinen include 1 Kgs 21(20):7-17, 2 Kgs 23:11-27, Ps 22(21):20-28, 18(17):26-48, 29-31(28-30), 49(48), 92(91):5-10. See Hyvärinen, *Aquila*, 26-87.

Italics All Vocalizations in MT unless otherwise specified.

Table 3[13] Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

Nouns					
#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
Category 1 – Stereotype Equivalents One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By One Greek Lexeme					
1	אבל	πένθος 3	γ′	–[14]	
2	אבן	λίθος 3	γ′	+ 3	+ 1
3	אדם	ἄνθρωπος 49	γ′	+ 10	+ 6
4	אור	φῶς 3	γ′	+ 8	?[15]
5	איש	ἀνήρ 10	γ′	+ 7	+ 3
6	אשה	γυνή 3	γ′		+ 2
7	בהמה	κτῆνος 4	γ′		+ 3
8	בן	υἱός 15	γ′	+ 8/11[16]	+ 2
9a	בני בית	οἰκογενής 1			
9b	בשר	σάρξ 5	γ′	+ 1	+ 1
10	דעת	γνῶσις 10[17]	γ′	+?[18]	
11	דרך	ὁδός 4	γ′	+ 9	+ 3
12	הבל	ματαιότης 38	α′ σ′[19]	–[20]	

[12]I.e., not attested in both α′ and θ′.

[13]Basic format for Table 3 is adopted from Peter Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 419-40.

[14]GJ has παθεινός for אבל (29:25).

[15]In Hab 3:11, φέγγος seems to reflect נגה and not אור. See Gentry, *Greek Job*, 420 n. 131.

[16]τέκνον is used twice (39:4, 39:16), and κόμη once (38:32).

[17]The instances in 1:18a and 8:6b are included where both כעס and רעת in MT are rendered by γνῶσις.

[18]GJ has ἐν ἀγνωσία for בבלי דעת in 35:16. For Alpha privative, see BDF, *Greek Grammar*, §117.

[19]θ′ has μάταιος in Isa 30:7 and Jer 10:8. In Greek Ecclesiastes, α′ and θ′ normally have ἀτμός for הבל.

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
13	חי	ζάω 8	γ′	+ 1	+ 1
14	חיים	ζωή 13	γ′		
15	חכם	σοφός 21	γ′		
16	חכמה	σοφία 28	γ′	+ 3	
17	חשך	σκότος 6	γ′	+ 3	+ 1
18	טוב	ἀγαθός 45	γ′	+ 1/2[21]	+ 2
19	טובה	ἀγαθωσύνη 7	γ′		
20	יד	χείρ 13	γ′	+ 8	+ 1
21	יום	ἡμέρα 26	γ′	+ 9	+ 11
22	יין	οἶνος 3	γ′		+ 1
23a	כל	πᾶς 87	γ′	+ 12/13[22]	+ 18/19
23b	כל + ל	πᾶς 2	γ′		
24	כעס	θυμός 4	γ′		
25	כשרון	ἀνδρεία 3	θ′[23]		
26	לחם	ἄρτος 4	γ′	+ 2	
27	מלך	βασιλεύς 11[24]	γ′	+ 2	+ 4
28	מעט	ὀλίγος 4	γ′		
29	מעשה	ποιήμα 20	α′ θ′[25]		_[26]
30	מקום	τόπος 9	γ′	+ 6	+ 1
31	מקרה	συνάντημα 7	α′[27]		
32	נחת	ἀνάπαυσις 3	γ′[28]	?[29]	
33	נפש	ψυχή 7	γ′	+ 5	+ 2

[20]GJ has ματαίως for הבל (35:16).

[21]GJ has καλός for טוב in 34:4.

[22]GJ has ὅλος for כל in 21:23.

[23]Eccl 4:4. γ′ has ἀνδρεία for כישור (e.g., Prov 31:19).

[24]The instance in 2:12b is excluded where מלך is construed as homonym.

[25]For θ′, see Ps 44(45):2. σ′ generally has ἔργον for מעשה.

[26]MP has ἔργον for מעשה in Jonah 3:10 (= LXX).

[27]1 Sam 6:9.

[28]Eccl 6:5.

[29]GJ has καταβαίνω for נחת 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

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
34	עבד	δοῦλος 4	γ′	+ 1 (42:8)	
35	עולם	αἰών 7	γ′		+ 5
36	עין	ὀφθαλμός 9	γ′	+ 13	+ 2
37	עמל	μόχθος 13	γ′	_[30]	
38	ענין	περισπασμός 8	α′ θ′[31]		
39	עפר	χοῦς 3	γ′	+ 1/8[32]	+ 1/2[33]
40	עץ	ξύλον 5	γ′		+ 1
41	עשר	πλοῦτος 6	γ′		
42	עת	καιρός 39	γ′	+ 3/4[34]	[35]
43	פה	στόμα 7	γ′	+ 6/8[36]	+ 2
44a	פנים	πρόσωπον 6	γ′	+ 17	+ 4
44b	פנים + ל	πρὸ προσώπου 6[37]	α′ σ′[38]		_[39]
44c		ἔμπροσθεν 4[40]	γ′[41]		
44d	מן + ל + פנים	ἀπὸ προσώπου 4[42]	α′ θ′[43]		

[30]GJ has κόπος for עמל in 16:2.

[31]Eccl 1:13 and 5:13. σ′ consistently has ἀσχολία for ענין.

[32]GJ has χῶμα for עפר in 7 instances (14:8, 14:19, 17:16, 19:25, 20:11, 22:24, and 28:6).

[33]MP also has χῶμα for עפר once.

[34]GJ has ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ κυρίου for ברגז קלו in 37:2.

[35]MP has καιρός for מועד in Hab 2:3.

[36]GJ has περιστόμιον for פה in 15:27 and 30:18.

[37]When לפני is spatial.

[38]E.g., Ps 116(114):9. In α′, εἰς πρόσωπον is dominant (Isa 8:4, 40:10, etc.), and in σ′, ἔμπροσθεν is general (Isa 36:7, 41:2, etc.). θ′ normally has ἐνώπιον for spatial לפני (Isa 53:2, Prov 8:30, 25:26).

[39]MP has ἐνώπιον in Zech 3:4. Cf. πρὸ προσώπου in LXX.

[40]When לפני is temporal.

[41]E.g., Jer 34(41):5 (α′) and Prov 15:33 (σ′ θ′). For the temporal לפני, there are various approaches found in α′ and σ′, but they still prefer εἰς πρόσωπον (Prov 16:18, 1 Kgs 14:9) and ἔμπροσθεν (Prov 15:33, 18:12, etc.) respectively as in the cases of spatial לפני. ἔμπροσθεν is exclusive in θ′.

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
44e		ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν 1[44]	[45]		
45	צדיק	δίκαιος 8	γ′	+ 2	+ 1
46	צל	σκιά 4	γ′	+ 3[46]	
47	קול	φωνή 6	γ′	+ 6	+ 4
48	קץ	περασμός 3	–[47]	–[48]	–
49	רשע (*rāšā'*)	ἀσεβής 10	γ′	+ 4	+ 1
50	שחוק	γέλως 4	α′ σ′ (θ′)[49]		
51	שמחה	εὐφροσύνη 8	γ′		+ 1
52	שר	ἄρχων 3	γ′		
53	שליט	ἐξουσιάζω 3	σ′[50]		
54	שם	ὄνομα 3	γ′	+ 2	+ 4
55	שמים	οὐρανός 4[51]	γ′	+ 5	+ 2
56	שמן	ἔλαιον 3	γ′		
57	שמש	ἥλιος 36	γ′		+ 1
58	שנה	ἔτος 5	γ′	+ 3	+ 1
59	שני	δεύτερος 3	γ′		

[42]When מלפני is spatial.

[43]E.g., Ps 114(113):7 (α′), Jer 33:18 (θ′). σ′ has ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου in Ps 17(16):2

[44]When מלפני is temporal.

[45]σ′ has πρό in Eccl 1:10, which is the only evidence of γ′ for the temporal מלפני extant in Field's *Origenis Hexapla*.

[46]The evidence is from σκιὰ θανάτου for צלמות.

[47]γ′ has πέρας for קץ in Job 16:3.

[48]GJ often has πέρας for קץ.

[49]θ′ has γέλως for צחק in Ezek 23:32. שחק may be a by-form of צחק. Two sibilants ש and צ are interchanged. See C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (New York: Lemcke & Buechner, 1908-13), §55d; KB, s.v. "שחק."

[50]Eccl 10:5. σ′ also has ἐξουσιάζω for משל in most cases as α′ and θ′. Cf. 9:17b, 10:4a.

[51]In 2:3b, LXX reflects שמש rather than שמים of the MT, so the instance is regarded as the rendering of שמש.

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

More Than One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By One Greek Lexeme					
#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
60	אחרון	ἔσχατος 3	γ′	+ 1	
61	גדול	μέγας 4	γ′		+ 8/9[52]
62	יתרון	περισσεία 10	–[53]		
63	לב	καρδία 42	γ′	+ 6	+ 2
64	מאומה	οὐδείς 3	θ′[54]		+ 1[55]
65	מלחמה	πόλεμος 3	γ′		+ 3
66	מסכן	πένης 4	[56]		
67	עיר	πόλις 5	γ′		+ 8
68	רב (*rōb*)	πλῆθος 6	γ′	+ 2[57]	+ 2
69	רעות	προαίρεσις 7	–[58]		
70	רעיון	προαίρεσις 3	[59]		
71	שנים	δύο 5	γ′	+ 1	
Category 2 – Regular Equivalents One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By More Than One Greek Lexeme					
72a	אחד	εἷς 18	γ′	+ 2	+ 1
72b		αὐτός 1	–	–	–
73a	בית	οἶκος 8	γ′	+ 2	+ 5

[52]In Nah 3:10, MP has μεγιστάν as in LXX.

[53]The word יתרון only occurs in Ecclesiastes where α′ has πλέον in 1:3, and σ′ has also πλέον in 1:3, περισσόν in 5:15, προέχει in 10:10, and ὄφελος in 10:11. There is no extant evidence in θ′.

[54]Jer 39(46):10, 12 (μηδείς after subjunctive). α′ has ὁτιοῦν τι and ὁστισοῦν for מאומה 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]מסכן 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 עני and אביון; α′ and θ′ sometimes have πένης for דל.

[57]According to *Qere* in 33:19.

[58]רעות ("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]רעיון only occurs in Ecclesiastes. σ′ has νομή in Eccl 1:17 and βόσκησις in Eccl 4:16.

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
73b		οἰκία 2	γ′	+ 1	–
73c	בני בית	οἰκογενής 1			
74a	בעל	παρά 3	α′ σ′[60]		[61]
74b		ὁ παρά 1	–		
74c		ὅς παρά 1	–		
74d		ἔχω 1	γ′		
74e	בעל לשון	ἐπᾴδω 1	[62]		
75a	גבה	ὑψηλός 4	γ′	–[63]	+ 1
75b		ὕψος 1	α′ θ′ (σ′?)[64]	–	–
76a	חלק	μερίς 7	γ′	+ ½[65]	–[66]
76b		μέρος 1	α′ σ′[67]	–	–
77a	חפץ	πρᾶγμα 4	α′[68]	–	
77b		θέλημα 3	γ′	+ 1	
78a	מות	θάνατος 5	γ′	+ 1	+ 1
78b		θἀνατόω 1	–	–	–
79a	משפט	κρίσις 5	γ′	+ 1	–
79b		κρίμα 1	γ′	+ 2	+ 1[69]

[60]I.e., Eccl 12:11 (also see Prov 1:19 for σ′). θ′ has ὁ ἔχων (see also 1 Sam 23:12).

[61]The proper noun בעל is rendered by Βααλ in Zeph 1:4.

[62]Cf. σ′ has one word, τὸ πτερωτόν, for the bound phrase בעל הכנפים in Eccl 10:20 while α′ has ὁ κυριεύων πτέρυγος and θ′ has ὁ ἔχων πτέρυγας for the same phrase. The tendency of σ′ to use one word for a bound phrase beginning בעל is seen also in Isa 41:15 where בעל פיפיות is rendered by the participle, ἐστομωμένον, in σ′, but θ′ also has one word, ἀμφήκη, in the same reference.

[63]GJ has ὑπερήφανος for גבה in j41:26.

[64]σ′ has ὕψος for *gōbah* in Jer 48:29 (LXX 39:29).

[65]GJ has μερίζω for חלק in 31:2. The Greek equivalent reflects a verb rather than a noun. See Gentry, *Greek Job*, 502, 511.

[66]MP has ἄρτος in Hab 1:16 where LXX has μερίς.

[67]E.g. Ps 17(16):14 (α′) and Job 32:17 (σ′).

[68]E.g. Eccl 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 πρᾶγμα for דבר (e.g. Judg 6:29 and Eccl 6:5).

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
80a	סכל (*sākāl*)	ἄφρων 3	σ′ (α′?)[70]		
80b		ἀφροσύνη 1	–[71]		
80c		σκληρός 1	–		
81a	עב	νέφος 2	θ′[72]		
81b		νεφέλη 1	σ′ θ′[73]	+ 4	
82a	פעם	κάθοδος 2	α′[74]	–[75]	
82b	רב + פעם	πλειστάκις 1	[76]		
83a	ראש	κεφαλή 2	γ′	+ 2/4[77]	+ 5
83b		ἀρχή 1	γ′	–	–
84a	רוח	πνεῦμα 21	γ′	+ 1	+ 2
84b		α"νεμος 2	γ′	–	+ 1
84c	רוח + ארך[78]	μακρόθυμος 1			[79]
Category 3 – Non-Standard Equivalents More Than One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By More Than One Greek Lexeme					
85a	ארץ	γῆ 12	γ′	+ 9	+ 15
85b		πόλις 1	–	–	–
86a	דבר	λόγος 19	γ′	+ 4	+ 2/3
86b		ῥῆμα 3	γ′	–	+ 1/3
87a	דברה	λαλιά 2			

[69]Hab 1:7.

[70]σ′ in Eccl 10:3 and Jer 5:21. α′ has ἄφρων for סכל in Eccl 10:6, which is vocalized as *sekel* in MT not as *sākāl*. ἄφρων is normally for אויל in α′.

[71]γ′ usually has ἀφροσύνη for אולת.

[72]Isa 25:5. α′ has πάχος for עב. (e.g. Exod 19:9)

[73]For σ′, Job 36:29, 37:11, Eccl 12:2; for θ′, Job 36:29. α′ has νεφέλη for ענן in most cases.

[74]E.g., Exod 34:24, Deut 9:19, Isa 41:7, etc.

[75]GJ has ὁδός for פעם in 33:29.

[76]σ′ has πλεονάκις for פעמים רבות in Eccl 7:22.

[77]GJ has ἄρχων for ראש in 29:25 and τάγμα in 1:17.

[78]The phrase only occurs in Eccl 7:8.

[79]In Jonah 4:2, ארך אפים is rendered by μακρόθυμος.

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
87b		λόγος 1	α′ σ′[80]		
88a	הוללות	περιφορά 2	θ′?[81]		
88b		περιφέρεια 2[82]	–		
88c		παραβολή 1	–		
89a	חשבון	λογισμός 3[83]	γ′		
89b		ψῆφος 1	–		
90a	יותר	περισσός 5	σ′[84]		
90b		περισσεία 2	α′ θ′[85]		
91a	כסיל	ἄφρων 17	γ′[86]		
91b		ἀφροσύνη 1	–[87]		
92a	סכלות	ἀφροσύνη 5	α′ θ′[88]		
92b		σκληρία 1	–		
93a	צדק	δίκαιος 2	γ′	[89]	
93b		δικαιοσύνη 1	γ′	[90]	
94a	רב (*rab*)	πολύς 5	γ′	+ 2	+ 4[91]

[80]Ps 110(109):4. σ′ also has ἀνάλογον for על דברת in Eccl 7:14(15) and παραβῆναι in Eccl 8:2.

[81]θ′ 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 הוללות (Eccl 1:17, 2:12, 7:25(26), 9:3); σ′ shows various approaches (πλάνη in 2:12, ἔννοια θορυβῶδη in 7:25(26), αὐθάδεια in 9:3, and θόρυβος in 10:13). הוללות only occurs in Ecclesiastes.

[82]In MT, הוללות (*hôlēlût*) in 10:13b is vocalized differently from הוללות (*hôlēlôt*) in 9:3b. The Translator may not have vocalized them differently and thus employed περιφέρεια for both instances.

[83]*ḥiššābôn* in 7:29 is included.

[84]E.g., Eccl 6:8. α′ and θ′ have περισσός for יתרת.

[85]E.g., Eccl 6:8.

[86]E.g., Eccl 4:5, 4:17, 5:3, 7:6(7).

[87]γ′ normally has ἀφροσύνη for אולת (e.g. Prov 13:16).

[88]I.e., Eccl 2:13 where σ′ has ἀμαθία. סכלות only occurs in Ecclesiastes.

[89]In 17:9 and 36:7, צדיק is rendered by δίκαιος.

[90]In 35:8, צדקה is rendered by δικαιοσύνη.

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
94b		μέγας 2	γ′	–	–
94c		πλῆθος 1	α′[92]	–	–
94d	רב + פעם	πλειστάκις 1			
95a	רע	πονηρός 13	γ′	+ 1/2[93]	+ 2
95b		κακός 3	γ′	– (κακία)	–
96a	רעה	κακία 4	γ′	+ 1	+ 1/2[94]
96b		πονηρός 4	γ′	–	–
96c		πονηρία 4	γ′	–	–
96d	חולה + רעה	ἀρρωστία 1			

Verbs					
#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
	Category 1 – Stereotype Equivalents One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By One Greek Lexeme				
97	אבד (Pi., Qal)	ἀπόλλυμι (Act, M-P) 6	γ′	+ 4	+ 2
98	אכל	ἐσθίω 14	γ′	–[95]	+ 6/7[96]
99a	בהל (Pi.)	σπεύδω 2	[97]		
99b	בהל (Ni.)	σπουδάζω (Act) 1	–[98]	–[99]	

[91]In Jonah 4:2, MP has πολυέλεος (= LXX) for רב חסד.

[92]E.g., Ps 89(88):8. γ′ has πλῆθος normally for *rōb*. It is also possible that the Translator may have vocalized רב in 6:3 as *rōb* differently from the MT since he consistently used πλῆθος for *rōb* in 6 instances. Furthermore, a noun is syntactically preferred to an adjective in the clause.

[93]κακία renders רע in 17:5 where the MT vocalizes רע as *rēa'* ("friend"). See Gentry, *Greek Job*, 429 n. 194.

[94]MP has λύπη in Jonah 4:1.

[95]GJ has κατεσθίω for אכל in 22:20. Another form in 34:3 seems to be construed as a noun. See Gentry, *Greek Job*, 510.

[96]In Nah 2:14, κατεσθίω is reconstructed.

[97]σ′ And θ′ have M-P forms of σπουδάζω for בהל in Pual stem (e.g. Prov 20:21).

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
100	בנה	οἰκοδομέω 3	γ′		+ 1
101	בקש	ζητέω 7	γ′		+ 3
102	גדל (Hi., Qal)	μεγαλύνω 3	γ′	–[100]	+ 1
103	דבר	λαλέω 5	γ′	+ 5	+ 2
104	זכר	μιμνήσκω 4	γ′	+ 1	+ 1
105a	חבק (Qal)	περιλαμβάνω 2	α′?[101]		
105b	חבק (Pi. Ptc)	περίλημψις 1			
106a	חטא (Qal)	ἁμαρτάνω 6	γ′		–[102]
106b	חטא (Hi.)	ἐξαμαρτάνω 1	α′ σ′[103]		
107a	חיה (Qal)	ζάω 3	γ′		+ 1
107b	חיה (Pi.)	ζωοποιέω 1	α′ θ′[104]	+ 1	
108	חכם (Qal, Hith.)	σοφίζω (M-P) 4	γ′		
109	יכל	δύναμαι 7	γ′	–[105]	
110a	יצא (Qal)	ἐξέρχομαι 4	γ′	+ 3	+ 3/6[106]
110b	יצא (Hi.)	ἐκφέρω 1	γ′	–[107]	
111	ירא	φοβέω 8	γ′	?[108]	+ 1

---

[98]α′ has M-P forms of σπεύδω for בהל in Niphal stem; σ′ has either Act or M-P forms of σπεύδω. See Ps 90(89):7; Eccl 8:3.

[99]GJ has κατασπουδάζω for בהל in 23:15.

[100]GJ has ἐκτρέφω for גדל (Qal) in 31:18.

[101]α′ has περιλαμβάνω for the derivative noun *ḥibbuq* in Prov 6:10 and 24:33.

[102]ἐξαμαρτάνω in Zeph 1:17.

[103]No extant evidence exists in θ′.

[104]E.g. Job 36:6.

[105]GJ has ὑποφέρω for יכל in 31:23.

[106]MP always has ἐκπορεύομαι for Qal participles of יצא. (Mic 1:3, Zech 2:7, 2:7).

[107]GJ has διανοίγω for יצא (Hi.) in 38:32.

[108]GJ has μεγάλης for נורא 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 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
112	כנס	συνάγω 3	α′ σ′ (θ′)[109]		
113a	מלא (Ni.)	πληρόω (M-P) 4	γ′	[110]	–[111]
113b	מלא (Qal)	πληροφορέω (M-P) 1	–[112]	–[113]	
114a	מלט (Pi.)	διασῴζω 2	σ′[114]	–[115]	
114b	מלט (Ni.)	ἐξαιρέω (M-P)1	–[116]	–[117]	–[118]
115	מצא	εὑρίσκω 17	γ′	+ 3	
116a	נגד (Hi.)	ἀναγγέλλω 2	γ′	+ 3	
116b		ἀπαγγέλλω 2	γ′	+ 2	
117	נגע (Hi.)	φθάνω 3	θ′[119]		
118	נדר	ευ"χομαι 4	γ′		+ 1
119	נטע	φυτεύω 5	γ′		–[120]
120a	נפל	πίπτω 4	γ′	+ ½[121]	+ 1
120b		ἐμπίπτω 1	γ′	–	–
120c		ἐπιπίπτω 1	γ′	–	–

[109]θ′ has συναχθῆναι for כנס in Hithpael stem (Isa 28:20).

[110]πληρόω renders מלא (Pi.).

[111]πίμπλημι (M-P) in Hab 2:14.

[112]γ′ has πληρόω (Act) for מלא in Qal stem.

[113]GJ has ἐμπίμπλημι for מלא (Qal) in 20:11.

[114]I.e., Ps 33(32):17 (cf. Isa 49:24). γ′ commonly has σῴζω or περισῴζω for מלט (Pi.). ῥύομαι is also seen in α′.

[115]In GJ, מלט (Pi.) is rendered by σῴζω (20:20) or ῥύομαι (22:30).

[116]γ′ has M-P forms of σῴζω or περισῴζω for מלט (Ni.). In Dan 11:41, M-P form of διασῴζω is found in θ′.

[117]διασῴζω is used for מלט (Ni.) in 22:30.

[118]ἀνασῴζω is used for מלט (Ni.) in Zech 2:11.

[119]E.g. Eccl 8:14 and Ezek 7:12. α′ normally has either ἅπτω or ἐγγίζω for נגע (Hi.).

[120]καταφυτεύω is used in Zeph 1:13.

[121]GJ has ἀποπίπτω for נפל in 29:24.

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
121	עות (Pi., Pu., Hith.)	διαστρέφω (Act, M-P) 3	σ′?[122]		
122	עמד	ἵστημι 5	γ′	+ 2	+ 7
123	עמל	μοχθέω 13	γ′[123]		
124	ענה	περισπάω 3	θ′[124]		
125a	קום (Hi.)	ἐγείρω 2	–[125]		+ ½[126]
125b	קום (Qal)	ἀνίστημι 1	γ′	+ 2/4[127]	+ 1
126a	קלל (Pi.)	καταράομαι 4	γ′		
126b	קלל (Pilpel)	ταράσσω 1	γ′		
127	קרה	συναντάω 3	[128]		
128	שבח	ἐπαινέω 3	σ′[129]		
129a	חבע	πίμπλημι (M-P) 1	γ′	–	–
129b		ἐμπίμπλημι (M-P) 3	γ′	+ ½[130]	+ 2
130	חלם (Pi.)	ἀποδίδωμι 3	α′ σ′[131]	–[132]	
131	שמח (Qal, Pi.)	εὐφραίνω (M-P) 9	γ′		+ 1
132a	חמע	ἀκούω 7	γ′	+ 8/10[133]	+ 2
132b	חמע (Qal Inf.cs.)	ἀκρόασις 1			
133	שנא	μισέω 4	γ′		

[122]See Eccl 7:13(14) in Field. In Job 8:3, σ′ has μεταστρέφω, and α′ has σκελίζω for עות (Pi.).

[123]E.g., Eccl 2:19 (σ′), 2:21 (α′ and θ′).

[124]E.g., Eccl 1:13. ענה ("to be troubled about") only occurs in Ecclesiastes.

[125]α′ And θ′ have ἐξεγείρω for קום (Hi.); σ′ has ἐπεγείρω or ἀνεγείρω.

[126]In Mic 5:4, MP has ἐπεγείρω.

[127]GJ has ἐπανίστημι for קום (Qal) in 30:12 and ἵστημι in 22:28.

[128]σ′ has ἀπαντάω for קרה in Eccl 3:14.

[129]Eccl 8:10.

[130]GJ has χορτάζω for שבע in 38:27.

[131]θ′ always has either ἀνταποδίδωμι or ἀποτίνω for שלם (Pi.).

[132]GJ has ἀνταποδίδωμι (21:19, 21:31) or ἀποτίνω (34:33) for שלם (Pi.).

[133]GJ has εἰσακούω (34:28) or ἀκοή (37:2) for שמע.

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
134	שתה	πίνω 5	γ′	+ 1	+ 3
135	תור	κατασκέπτομαι 3	θ′?[134]	+ 1	
More Than One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By One Greek Lexeme					
136	יסף (Hi.)	προστίθημι 5	γ′	+ 3	+ 1
137a	רבה	πληθύνω 2	γ′	+ 1	
137b		πλῆθος 1	α′	–	
137c	הרבה	πολύς 15	γ′[135]		
138	שוב	ἐπιστρέφω 10	γ′	+ 1/3[136]	+ 10
139	שלט	ἐξουσιάζω 4	σ′ θ′[137]		
Category 2 – Regular Equivalents One Hebrew Lexeme Rendered By More Than One Greek Lexeme					
140a	אהב	ἀγαπάω 3	γ′		+ 1
140b		φιλέω 1	–[138]		–
141a	אחז (Ni., Qal Pass. Ptc)	θηρεύω (M-P) 2	–[139]		
141b	אחז (Qal)	ἀντέχω (M-P) 1	θ′[140]	+ ¼[141]	
141c		κρατέω 1	α′ θ′[142]	+ 2/4	
142a	אמר	λέγω 19	γ′	+ 12	+ 13
142b		λογίζομαι 1	–	–	–

[134]In Job 39:8, the form יתור 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. "יתור"; KB, s.v. "יתור." α′ has ἐξερευνάω in Eccl 1:13 and νοέω in Eccl 2:3 where θ′ has διανοέομαι for תור.

[135]E.g., σ′ in Eccl 5:16; α′ and θ′ in Eccl 5:19.

[136]GJ has ἀνακάμπτω for שוב (Qal) and ἀποκρίνομαι for שוב (Hi.).

[137]E.g., Eccl 2:19, 8:9. α′ has κυριεύω for שלט.

[138]γ′ has φίλος for *'ōhēb*.

[139]α′ has κατέχω (M-P), and σ′ has κρατέω (M-P) for אחז in Niphal stem (e.g. Gen 22:13, Gen 47:27).

[140]Job 17:9.

[141]GJ has κατέχω for אחז in 23:9.

[142]E.g., Ps 56(55):1 (α′) and Ps 77(76):5 (θ′). σ′ normally has κατέχω for אחז.

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
143a	בוא (Qal)	ε"ρχομαι 6	γ′	+ ½[143]	+ 5/7
143b		ἐπέρχομαι 1	γ′	–	–
143c		παραγίνομαι 2	α′ θ′	–	–
143d		δύω 1	–	–	+ 1
143[e]		ἥκω 1	γ′	–	+ 1
144a	בוא (Hi.)	ἄγω 3	γ′	–[144]	
144b	בוא (Ho.)	εἰσάγω (M-P) 1	σ′ (γ′?)[145]		
145a	הלך (Qal, Pi)[146]	πορεύομαι 24	γ′	–	+ 13[147]
145b		ἀπέρχομαι 1	α′ σ′	+ ½[148]	–
145c	הלך (Qal Impv)	δεῦρο 2	θ′[149]		
145d	הלך (Pi.)	περιπατέω 2	γ′		[150]
145e	הלך (Hi.)	ἀποφέρω 1	–[151]		
146a	ידע	γιγνώσκω 27	γ′	+ 10/11[152]	–
146b		οἶδα 7	γ′	–	+ 1[153]
147a	ילד (Hi., Ni.)	γεννάω (Act, M-P) 3	γ′		
147b	ילד (Ni.)	γένεσις 1	–		
147c	ילד (Qal)	τίκτω 1	γ′	–[154]	+ 2
148a	מות	ἀποθνῄσκω 5	γ′	+ ½[155]	

[143]GJ has δεῦτε for בוא (Qal Impv).

[144]GJ has ἐπάγω for בוא (Hi.) in 34:28.

[145]σ′ in Ezek 40:4. γ′ has εἰσάγω (Act) for בוא (Hi.).

[146]Piel in 8:10.

[147]Piel in Hab 3:11. Two instances of a Qal form in Mic 1:8 and Nah 3:10 are reconstructed.

[148]GJ has προάγω for הלך (Qal Inf cs) in j34:23.

[149]E.g., 2 Kgs 8:1, Dan 12:13. α′ normally has πορεύομαι for הלך (Qal Impv), and σ′ has ἀπέρχομαι.

[150]Hab 3:11 in entry 145a is only occurrence of Piel in MP.

[151]γ′ normally has ἀπάγω for הלך (Hi.).

[152]GJ has ἐπιγινώσκω for ידע in 24:16c. See Gentry, *Greek Job*, 295.

[153]Jonah 3:9.

[154]GJ has τοκετός for ילד (Qal Inf cs) in 39:1.

Table 3—Continued. Lexical Comparison between the Translator and His Congeners

#	H	Tr	γ′	GJ	MP
148b		νεκρός 3	γ′	–	
148c		θνῄσκω 1	γ′	–	
149a	נוח (Hi.)	ἀφίημι 4	α′ σ′	[156]	
149b		ἀνίημι 1	θ′		
149c		καταπαύω 1	γ′		
149d	נוח (Qal)	ἀναπαύω 1	γ′		
150a	נתן (Qal, Ni.)	δίδωμι (Act, M-P) 23	γ′	+ 7	+ 3
150b	נתן (Qal Inf.cs.)	δόμα 1	α′ σ′[157]		
150c		τίθημι 1	γ′	–	–
151a	ראה (Qal)	ὁράω 43	γ′	+ 9/11	+ 6
151b		βλέπω 4	γ′	+ 1/11[158]	–
151c		θεωρέω 1	γ′	–	–
151d	ראה (Hi.)	δείκνυμι 2	γ′		+ 1
Category 3 – Non-Standard Equivalents					
152a	היה	γίγνομαι 28	γ′	+ 1	+ 1
152b		εἰμί 18	γ′	+ 1	+ 5
153a	סבב	κυκλόω 6	γ′		+ 1
153b		ἐπιστρέφω 1	–[159]		–
154a	עשה (Qal, Ni.)	ποιέω (Act, M-P) 40	γ′	+ 5	+ 2
154b	עשה (Ni.)	γίγνομαι (M-P) 3	γ′[160]	–	–
155a	שמר	φυλάσσω 7	γ′	+2/3[161]	+ 2
155b		τηρέω 1	σ′ θ′	–	–
155c	שמר (Qal Act Ptc)	φύλαξ 1	γ′	–	–

[155]GJ has ἀποθνήσκω for מות in 42:17.

[156]In 36:16, καταβαίνω reflects the verb נחת not נוח.

[157]E.g., Eccl 4:17.

[158]GJ has ἐμβλέπω for ראה in 41:26.

[159]Other LXX translators often rendered סבב 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 ἅπτομαι for שמר 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 congeners. The values of each group may differ in deciding the historical place of the Translator.

(1) Tr = γ′ = GJ = MP

(2) Tr = γ′ = GJ / Tr = γ′ = MP / Tr = γ′

(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 α′, σ′ , or θ′ in γ′ column

Tr = γ′ = GJ = MP (58 Entries).

If all congeners agree with the Translator for a certain rendering, the rendering is regarded as common. For example, λίθος in entry 2 is found in all three columns—γ′, GJ, and MP. This means that λίθος is a common translation for אבן. 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 = γ′ = GJ (15 Entries) / Tr = γ′ = MP (19 Entries) / Tr = γ′ (30 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 γ′, and the marker '–' does not appear in both GJ and MP (i.e., Tr = γ′ = GJ or

Tr = γ′ = MP), it may be regarded as a common equivalence. An example is entry 6 where γ′ and MP have γυνή for אשה, thus agreeing with the Translator, but GJ does not have any evidence extant. Another common rendering is entry 15 which shows that γ′ has ἀγαθός for טוב as does the Translator, but there is no evidence for the Hebrew lexeme available in both GJ and MP (i.e., Tr = γ′). This second type of common rendering consists of 64 examples. A total of 15 occurrences of Tr = γ′ = GJ are found in entries 4, 10, 16, 26, 34, 42, 46, 60, 71, 77b, 115, 116a, 116b, 137a, and 148a. The case of Tr = γ′ = 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, Tr = γ′ 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.

Agreement (Tr = MP)			
Relationship	Occurrence	Entry	Total
Tr = MP ≠ GJ = γ′	8	75a, 86b, 98, 102, 143e, 145a, 146b, 147c	11/46 (23.9%)
Tr = MP ≠ GJ ≠ γ′	1	143d	
Tr = MP ≠ γ′	1	125a	
Tr = MP = θ′	1	64	

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 גבה while Tr, MP, and γ′ have ὑψηλός. Since the GJ rendering represents θ′, ὑπερήφανος must be a variant used by θ′. In entries 143d and 143e, Tr and MP employed δύω and ἥκω once respectively for בוא (Qal) based upon contextual interpretation. No context in GJ requires the renderings used by Tr and MP. On the contrary, ἐκτρέφω by GJ for גדל

(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 deverbative noun, τοκετός, for ילד (Qal Inf. cs.) in entry 147c where Tr and MP rendered ילד (Qal) by τίκτω.

The case of entry 86b may imply a lexical connection between Tr and MP against GJ, but the connection is not significant. Tr used ῥῆμα when דבר designated a whole discourse or matter while he utilized λόγος for individual or specific utterance. Even though MP has ῥῆμα 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 הלך both in Tr and MP, but GJ never employs πορεύομαι. In entry 146b, both Tr and MP have οἶδα for ידע if ידע follows the interrogative מי.[162] On the contrary, GJ has γιγνώσκω 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 οὐδείς for מאומה. This approach is already established in the Greek Pentateuch, but α′ and σ′ do not attest to it in the extant evidence.[163] 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 θ′, both Tr and MP agree with γ′ 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 γ′ has compound forms such as ἐξεγείρω, ἐπεγείρω, or ἀνεγείρω, for קום (Hi.) while Tr and MP have the simplex form ἐγείρω. As a whole, Tr, agreeing with MP, is much closer to γ′ than to GJ.

Table 5. Disagreement between Tr and MP.

Disagreement (Tr ≠ MP)			
Relationship	Occurrence	Entry	Total
Tr ≠ MP = γ′	3	106a, 113a, 119	35/46 (76%)
Tr ≠ MP = α′σ′	1	44b	
Tr ≠ MP = α′θ′	1	29	
Tr ≠ MP ≠ GJ = γ′	12	75b, 83b, 94b, 95b, 96b, 96c, 120b, 120c, 129a, 143b, 150c, 151c	
Tr ≠ MP ≠ GJ = α′	1	94c	
Tr ≠ MP ≠ GJ = α′σ′	1	76b	
Tr ≠ MP ≠ GJ = α′θ′	1	143c	
Tr ≠ MP ≠ GJ = σ′θ′	1	155b	
Tr ≠ MP= GJ = γ′	5	73b, 76a, 79a, 146a, 151b	
Tr ≠ MP= GJ = α′σ′	1	145b	
Tr ≠ MP ≠ γ′	2	140b, 153b	
Tr ≠ MP ≠ GJ ≠ γ′	6	48, 72b, 78b, 85b, 114b, 142b	

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

[163]α′ has ὁτιοῦν τι or ὁστισοῦν, and σ′ has μέμψιν.

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 ὕψος for גבה to designate place, but MP employed ὑψηλός (Zeph 1:16). When ὑψηλός is used for גבה in Tr, it always denotes human beings. GJ has ὑπερήφανος implying something proud (j41:26). The rendering, רע > 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 ἀρχή for ראש in the temporal sense of "beginning" while using κεφαλή for the meaning of "head." Any context, in which ראש denotes a temporal idea, is not extant in either MP or GJ. In entry 94b, Tr twice uses μέγας for רב implying size ("great"). On the other hand, he has πολύς 5 times if רב refers to quantity ("many," "much"). The evidence extant in MP and GJ is all related to quantity, so comparison for רב implying size ("great") is not possible. In entries 96b and 96c, Tr has πονηρός and πονηρία for רעה 4 times respectively. MP and GJ have κακία as Tr has in another 4 instances. Rendering רעה 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.

[165]English translation is adopted from Peter J. Gentry, "Ekklesiastes," in *New English Translation of Septuagint*, Provisional Edition [on-line]; accessed 1 February 2005; available from http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/ekkl.pdf; Internet.

relatively few examples.[166] Tr may have applied the approach established by other LXX translators or may have intended to correlate the common equation רע > πονηρός. In 143c, בוא 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 אחר > 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 ארץ > πόλις 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.[167] These 5 cases are not significant.

Stylistic variations are involved in entries 76b and 150c. In 76b, Tr utilized μερίς, the default rendering for חלק, in 5:17, but used μέρος in 5:18 for stylistic variation. MP has ἄρτος in Hab 1:16 where LXX has μερίς; GJ has μερίς. Another stylistic variation may be seen in entry 150c where Tr rendered נתן by τίθημι once, but normally rendered it by δίδωμι. Both MP and GJ have δίδωμι. 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 מות in a bound construction is rendered by an adjectival infinitive form of θανατόω. 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 אמר > λογίζομαι. In Tr, when אמר is followed by a direct or indirect speech, λέγω is always used as its equivalent. If אמר 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 אמר > λογίζομαι in Tr may be unique. On the other hand, entry 151c is noteworthy. Tr has θεωρέω for a participle bound form of ראה while having ὁράω for non-participle forms of ראה. The identical syntax (i.e., participle bound form of ראה) is found once in MP (Nah 3:7) and is rendered by ὁράω.

Unique renderings in Tr against MP/GJ are seen in entries 48 and 114b. In entry 48, Tr consistently has περασμός for קץ in 3 occurrences while MP/ GJ and γ′ have πέρας. περασμός never occurs in LXX except in Tr. In entry 114b, מלט in Niphal stem is rendered by ἐξαιρέω in Tr, but this never occurs in MP, GJ, or γ′, where σῴζω or its compound forms are attested. ἐξαιρέω for מלט (Ni.) is also not seen elsewhere in the LXX. The two Greek lexemes, περασμός for קץ and ἐξαιρέω for מלט (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′.[168] Differences between Tr/γ′ and MP in entries 106a and 119

---

[167]*rāb* may have been construed as *rōb* 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.

involve simplex forms vs. compound forms, and so, they are not significant.[169] In entry 44b, MP has ἐνώπιον for the spatial לפני in Zech 3:4. Since the LXX has πρὸ πρόσωπου in the same reference, MP shows a revision of the LXX. Tr agrees with α′ and σ′ having πρὸ πρόσωπου, but θ′ agrees with MP.

In entry 113a, Tr has πληρόω for מלא (Ni.) in all 4 occurrences. MP has πίμπλημι in Hab 2:14 following the LXX. Although γ′ attests πληρόω in Exod 1:7, πίμπλημι is also seen in σ′ and θ′ outside of the Pentateuch.[170] Other translators in the LXX prefer πίμπλημι (13 occurrences) to πληρόω (4 occurrences).[171] The choice of Tr was possibly made based upon an established approach by earlier translator(s), but the consistent use of πληρόω in Tr is noteworthy.

In entry 29, מעשה is rendered by ποίημα in Tr, α′ and θ′ but by ἔργον in MP and σ′. The noun מעשה occurs 234 times in MT, and ἔργον 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 ἔργον is never used by Tr.[172] ποίημα may have been employed with relation to the equation עשה > 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 ἁμαρτάνω for חטא (Qal), and MP has ἐξαμαρτάνω. In entry 119, Tr and γ′ have φυτεύω for נטע, 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. "πίμπλημι and πληρόω."

[172]Nine occurrences where מעשה 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 ποίησις for מעשה.[173] It is significant that Tr consistently and exclusively has ποίημα for מעשה, 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.[174] 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 בית 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′.[175] Revision by MP is seen in Hab 3:13 where ἀνόμων in the LXX for מבית is replaced by ἐξ οἴκου in MP towards the Hebrew text. In entry 76a, חלק 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 הלך > ἀπέρχομαι is definitely contextual in Tr. The rendering pattern is already established in the Greek Pentateuch. GJ, α′, and σ′ also attest ἀπέρχομαι. Thus, ἀπέρχομαι must have been normal rendering for הלך. 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 ראה by βλέπω is motivated by a certain grammatical condition in Tr—i.e., always the participle of ראה in free form. In GJ, βλέπω is used as a

---

[173]Reider, *Index To Aquila*, 301.

[174]The 7 entries are 73b, 76a, 79a, 113a, 145b, 146a, 151b.

[175]In Tr, οἰκός has functional sense such as prison or palace, but οἰκία denotes general dwelling place. For the contextual distinction between οἰκός and οἰκία in GJ, see Gentry, *Greek Job*, 140.

stylistic variation for ὁράω (10:4).[176] γ′ also allows βλέπω as an alternative rendering. MP follows LXX and stereotypically sticks to ὁράω.[177]

The other 2 entries (79a, 146a) have less significance due to scanty evidence. In entry 79a, Tr and GJ utilize κρίσις for משפט distinguishing it from κρίμα probably based upon contextual distinction, and γ′ 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 ידע > γιγνώσκω 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 γ′, and GJ does not have any extant evidence. In entry 140b, the equation אהב > φιλέω is seen in Tr, but MP and γ′ 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 סבב in Tr for contextual reasons while κυκλόω is a normal rendering. Neither MP nor γ′ attests to ἐπιστρέφω. However, other translators of the LXX used it in 12 occurrences, and these are mainly found in the Historical books.[178] (e.g. 1 Sam 15:12, 2 Kgs 9:18). The Translator may have extended the equivalence סבב > ἐπιστρέφω which was already

---

[176]Gentry, *Greek Job*, 302.

[177]Only instance where MP revised LXX is Hab 3:10 (ὄψονται is revised by εἴδοσαν).

established in Historical books.

In summary, Tr against MP is close to γ′ and distant from GJ. In other words, Tr shows a stronger relationship with γ′ 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 6. Agreement between Tr and GJ

Agreement (Tr = GJ)			
Relationship	Occurrence	Entry	Total
Tr = GJ ≠ MP = γ′	5	73b, 76a, 79a, 146a, 151b	10/57 (17.5%)
Tr = GJ = σ′ θ′	1	81b	
Tr = GJ = α′ θ′	2	107b, 141c	
Tr = GJ = θ′	2	135, 141b	

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 θ′ in all 10 occurrences, α′ in 7, and σ′ in 6. This shows more affinity of θ′ to GJ than affinity of α′ or σ′ to GJ. Since Theodotion is regarded as the translator or revisor of GJ, the close affinity of θ′ 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 νεφέλη for עב, but the Greek equivalent is normally used for ענן in α′. In entry 107b, חיה (Pi.) is rendered by ζωοποιέω in Tr along with GJ, α′, and θ′ while σ′ has διασώζω in Eccl 7:10.[180] A non-σ′ reading is also seen in entry 141c where κρατέω is used for אחז in Tr, GJ, α′, and θ′. For the Hebrew lexeme, σ′ normally uses κατέχω. There are 2 entries (135, 141b) where the Tr shares equivalences with GJ and θ′. The equivalence תור > κατασκέπτομαι in entry 135 is already established in the Greek Pentateuch.[181] Tr may have employed the approach as Theodotion did. The θ′ rendering אחז > ἀντέχω in entry 141b is the same evidence which is presented in GJ by Gentry. The LXX has 1 instance outside the Greek Ecclesiastes where אחז is rendered by ἀτέχω: 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 θ′. The meager percentage of agreement between Tr and GJ/θ′ does not seem to suggest θ′ as the Translator of the Greek Ecclesiastes. Non-α′ renderings are found in entry 81b, 135, and 141b, and non-σ′ 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 διασώζω in σ′, see also Jer 49:11 (29:13), Ps 33(32):19. σ′ has various other equivalents for חיה (Pi.) such as ζάω, ζωόω, etc.

[181]See Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. "κατασκέπτομαι."

cases have been discussed above.[182]

Table 7. Disagreement between Tr and GJ

Disagreement (Tr ≠ GJ)			
Relationship	Occurrence	Entry	Total
Tr ≠ GJ = α′ σ′	2	12, 130	47/57 (82.5%)
Tr ≠ GJ = α′	3	77a, 82a, 137b	
Tr ≠ GJ = σ′	1	114a	
Tr ≠ GJ = γ′	7	1, 37, 109, 110b, 144a, 148b, 148c	
Tr ≠ GJ = MP = γ′	8	75a, 86b, 98, 102, 143e, 145a, 146b, 147c	
Tr ≠ GJ ≠ MP = γ′	12	75b, 83b, 94b, 95b, 96b, 96c, 120b, 120c, 129a, 143b, 150c, 151c	
Tr ≠ GJ ≠ MP = α′ σ′	2	76b, 150b	
Tr ≠ GJ ≠ MP = α′ θ′	1	143c	
Tr ≠ GJ ≠ MP = σ′ θ′	1	155b	
Tr ≠ GJ ≠ MP = α′	1	94c	
Tr ≠ GJ ≠ MP ≠ γ′	6	48, 72b, 78b, 85b, 114b, 142b	
Tr ≠ GJ = MP ≠ γ′	1	143d	
Tr ≠ GJ ≠ γ′	2	99b, 113b	

Tr against GJ agrees with α′ in 36 entries out of 46, with σ′ in 33, and with θ′ in 29. Tr shows least affinity to θ′ among the Three, and it is expected since GJ disagrees with Tr in these entries.

In 7 entries, Tr against GJ shares renderings with either α′ or σ′ (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 Tr.

The equation הבל > ματαιότης in entry 12 is shared by Tr, α′, and σ′.

---

[182]See p. 370 of this dissertation.

Nevertheless, Tr is not Aquilan in this case because α′ has ἀτμός or ἀτμίς for הבל in the Greek Ecclesiastes (e.g. 1:14).[183] Tr is definitely connected to σ′ since σ′ has ματαιότης in Eccl 5:6 and 6:12 (7:1). θ′ has μάταιος in Isa 30:7 and Jer 10:8, and GJ attests a similar form ματαίως in 35:16. Another lexical connection between Tr and σ′ is possible in entry 114a where מלט (Pi.) is rendered by διασῴζω. διασῴζω is never attested in α′ and θ′. They have rather a simplex form: σῴζω, περισῴζω, or ῥύομαι. Only 2 instances of מלט (Pi.) > διασῴζω 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 σ′, but the possibility of Symmachian influence still exists.

In entry 130, Tr has ἀποδίδωμι for שלם (Pi.), and the same rendering is seen in α′ and σ′. θ′ always attests to either ἀνταποδίδωμι or ἀποτίνω as does GJ (21:19, 21:31, 34:33). Neither ἀνταποδίδωμι nor ἀποτίνω may be regarded as Theodotionic because they are also attested to in α′.[184] The consistent use of ἀποδίδωμι in Tr is evidently non-Theodotionic. Previous LXX translators utilized ἀποδίδωμι for שלם (Pi.), and Tr seems to have adopted this approach.[185] Another non-Theodotionic rendering may be in entry 150b where a Qal infinitive bound form of נתן is rendered by the noun δόμα. The equivalence is never attested to in θ′ but is in α′ and σ′.

There are 3 entries (77a, 82a, 137b), in which the Greek renderings may be Aquilan. According to entry 77a, Tr has the equivalence חפץ > πρᾶγμα, and only α′

---

[183]θ′ also has ἀτμός or ἀτμίς for הבל.

[184]Cf. Reider, *Index to Aquila*, 315.

[185]Cf. Deut 23:21(22), 2 Sam 33:9, etc. See Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. ἀποδίδωμι.

shares it.[186] This approach never occurs elsewhere in the LXX. Even though, α′ has θέλημα in Eccl 12:10, πρᾶγμα seems to be Aquilan. GJ and θ′ have θέλημα. The equation פעם > κάθοδος 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 ὁδός as attested to in Job 33:29. The equation רבה > πλῆθος 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 πλῆθος for רבה, 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 אבל > πένθος in entry 1, עמל > μόχθος in entry 37, יכל > δύναμαι in entry 109, יצא (Hi.) > ἐκφέρω in entry 110b, בוא (Hi.) > ἄγω in entry 144a, מות > νεκρός in entry 148b, מות > θνῄσκω in entry 148c. 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.[187] The remaining 2 cases (99b, 113b) require examination.

In entry 99b, Tr has σπουδάζω for בהל (Ni.) against GJ and γ′. α′ and σ′ have either Active or M-P form of σπεύδω, which Tr has for בהל (Pi.). Although there is no extant θ′ fragment for the case in question, GJ attests a compound form, κατασπουδάζω in

---

[186] α′ in Eccl 12:1.

23:15[a]. κατασπουδάζω never occurs for בהל (Ni.) in the LXX except in Job 23:15[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 πληροφορώ for מלא (Qal). γ′ normally has πληρόω, and GJ attests ἐμπίμπλημι in 20:11. πληροφορώ 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′ (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′ (106). Tr shares equivalences with γ′ or its member(s) in 80 entries. On the other hand, disagreement between Tr and γ′ is seen in 26 entries.

In 80 entries, γ′ or its one or two members agree with Tr. When Tr agrees with γ′ 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.

---

[187] Only entries 48 and 114b out of the 5 are found to be important cases.

Table 8. Agreement between Tr and the Three

Agreement (Tr = member(s) of γ')			
Relationship	Occurrence	Entry	Total
Tr = α' θ' = GJ	2	107b, 141c	80/106 (75.5%)
Tr = σ' θ' = GJ	1	81b	
Tr = θ' = GJ	2	135, 141b	
Tr = θ' = MP	1	64	
Tr = γ' = GJ $\neq$ MP	6	73b, 76a, 79a, 145b, 146a, 151b	
Tr = γ' $\neq$ GJ = MP	8	75a, 86b, 98, 102, 143e, 145a, 146b, 147c	
Tr = γ' $\neq$ GJ $\neq$ MP	12	75b, 83b, 94b, 95b, 96b, 96c, 120b, 120c, 129a, 143b, 150c, 151c	
Tr = α' σ' $\neq$ GJ $\neq$ MP	2	76b, 150b	
Tr = α' θ' $\neq$ GJ $\neq$ MP	1	143c	
Tr = σ' θ' $\neq$ GJ $\neq$ MP	1	155b	
Tr = α' $\neq$ GJ $\neq$ MP	1	94c	
Tr = γ' $\neq$ GJ	7	1, 37, 109, 110b, 144a, 148b, 148c	
Tr = α' σ' $\neq$ GJ	2	12, 130	
Tr = α' $\neq$ GJ	3	77a, 82a, 137b	
Tr = σ' $\neq$ GJ	1	114a	
Tr = γ' $\neq$ MP	4	106a, 113a, 119, 145d	
Tr = α' σ' $\neq$ MP	1	44b	
Tr = α' θ' $\neq$ MP	1	29	
Tr = α' σ'	5	74a, 87b, 106b, 149a, 150b	
Tr = α' θ'	4	38, 44d, 90b, 92a	
Tr = σ' θ'	1	139	
Tr = α'	2	31, 105a	
Tr = σ'	5	53, 80a, 90a, 121, 128	
Tr = θ'	7	25, 81a, 88a, 117, 124, 145c, 149b	

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/γ′ and GJ

Agreement		Disagreement		Affinity	
Relationship	Occurrence	Relationship	Occurrence	Occurrence	Percentage
Tr = γ′ = GJ	6	Tr = γ′ ≠ GJ	27	6/33	18.2%
Tr = α′ = GJ	9	Tr = α′ ≠ GJ	36	9/45	20%
Tr = σ′ = GJ	7	Tr = σ′ ≠ GJ	33	7/40	17.5%
Tr = θ′ = GJ	11	Tr = θ′ ≠ GJ	29	11/40	27.5%

In the same way, when Tr shares the renderings with γ′ 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/γ′ and MP

Agreement		Disagreement		Affinity	
Relationship	Occurrence	Relationship	Occurrence	Occurrence	Percentage
Tr = γ′ = MP	8	Tr = γ′ ≠ MP	22	8/30	26.7%
Tr = α′ = MP	8	Tr = α′ ≠ MP	28	8/36	22.2%
Tr = σ′ = MP	8	Tr = σ′ ≠ MP	26	8/34	23.5%
Tr = θ′ = MP	9	Tr = θ′ ≠ MP	25	9/34	26.5%

According to Table 10, when agreeing with Tr, θ′ is closer to MP than the other two. α′ agreeing with Tr is far distant from MP. As a whole, θ′ agreeing with Tr is slightly closer to GJ than to MP, and α′ and σ′ 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 γ′. In 5 entries, Tr shares renderings with α′ and σ′ (74a, 87b, 106b, 149a, 150b). In 3 of them (74a, 149a, 150b), the shared renderings are non-Theodotionic—i.e., θ′ attests a different approach: בעל > παρά in entry

74a, נוח (Hi.) > ἀφίημι in entry 149a, and נתן (Qal Inf.cs.) > δόμα in entry 150b. In 2 entries (87b, 106b), θ′ does not have any extant evidence: דברה > λόγος in entry 87b and חטא (Hi.) > ἐξαμαρτάνω. 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 ענין > περισπασμός in entry 38, spatial מלפני > ἀπό προσώπου in entry 44d, יותר > περισσεία in entry 90b, and סכלות > ἀφροσύνη in entry 92a.

In entry 139, Tr has a rendering agreeing only with σ′ and θ′: שלט > ἐξουσιάζω. Since α′ normally has κυριεύω, 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: מקרה > συνάντημα in entry 31 and חבק > περιλαμβάνω in entry 105a.[188] σ′ has different renderings for these cases, and θ′ has no extant evidence.[189] These equivalences may be considered as Aquilan.

In 5 entries, Tr and σ′ agree, and no extant evidence is found in GJ and MP: שליט > ἐξουσιάζω in entry 53, סכל > ἄφρων in entry 80a, יותר > περισσός in entry 90a, עות > διαστρέφω in entry 121, and שבח > ἐπαινέω 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 יותר, καυχάομαι for שבח, and α′ has σκελίζω for עות with no extant evidence in θ′. For the other 2 cases, Symmachian influence is not obvious

---

[188]Somehow, α′ seems to have construed *ḥibbuq* in Prov 6:10 and 24:33 as verbal forms.

[189]σ′ has σύμβαμα (Eccl 3:19) or συγκυρία (1 Sam 6:9) for מקרה and περιπλέκω (Eccl 4:5, Cant 2:6) for חבק.

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: כשרון > ἀνδρεία in entry 25, עב > νέφος in entry 81a, הוללות > περιφορά in entry 88a, נגע (Ni.) > φθάνω in entry 117, ענה > περισπάω in entry 124, הלך (Qal Impv.) > δεῦρο in entry 145c, and נוח (Hi.) > ἀνίημι in entry 149b. These are probably all Theodotionic since α′ or σ′ attest to different approaches for them. For כשרון, σ′ has γοργότης (Eccl 2:21, 4:4) or ἀνδραγάθημα (Eccl 5:10), and no extant evidence is in α′; for עב, α′ has πάχος (Exod 19:9), and σ′ has νεφέλη (Eccl 12:2); for הוללות, α′ and σ′ have πλάνη (Eccl 2:12); for נגע (Ni.), α′ and σ′ usually have either ἅπτω (Isa 6:7, Ps 88:4) or ἐγγίζω (1 Sam 14:9, Za 14:5); for ענה, σ′ has ἀσχολέω (Eccl 1:13), and no extant evidence of α′ exists; for הלך (Qal Impv.), α′ normally has πορεύομαι, and σ′ has ἀπέρχομαι; and for נוח (Hi.), α′ and σ′ have ἀφίημι.

As a whole, Aquilan renderings are attested in 5 entries, and non-Aquilan renderings in 18 entries.[190] Symmachian renderings are seen in 5 entries, and non-Symmachian renderings in 23 entries.[191] Finally, Theodotionic renderings are found in

---

[190]The 5 Aquilan renderings are: מקרה > συνάντημα in entry 31, חפץ > πρᾶγμα in entry 77a, פעם > κάθοδος in entry 82a, חבק > περιλαμβάνω in entry 105a, and רבה > 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 = σ′ θ′: עב > νεφέλη in entry 81b, שלט > ἐξουσιάζω in entry 139, and שמר > τηρέω in entry 155b.

[191]The 5 Symmachian renderings are: הבל > ματαιοτής in entry 12, יותר > περισσός in entry 90a, מלט > διασῴζω in entry 114, עות > διαστρέφω in entry 121, and שבח > ἐπαινέω 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′: מעשה > ποιήμα in entry 29, ענין > περισπασμός in entry 38, spatial מלפני > ἀπό προσώπου in entry 44d, יותר > περισσεία in entry 90b, and סכלות >

10 entries, and non-Theodotionic renderings in 16 entries.[192]

Table 11: Tr and γ′

Total Agreement		Affinity		Exclusive Agreement	
Relationship	Occurrence	Occurrence	Percentage	Occurrence	Percentage
Tr = γ′	37	37/63[193]	58.7%	N/A	N/A
Tr = α′	61	61/105[194]	58.1%	5/61[195]	9.8%
Tr = σ′	55	55/104[196]	52.9%	5/55[197]	10.9%
Tr = θ′	58	58/100[198]	58%	10/58[199]	17.2%

ἀφροσύνη in entry 92a, חיה (Pi.) > ζωοποιέω in entry 107b, אחז > κρατέω in entry 141c, and בוא > παραγίνομαι in entry 143c.

[192]The 10 Theodotionic renderings are: כשרון > ἀνδρεία in entry 25, מאומה > οὐδείς in entry 64, עב > νέφος in entry 81a, הוללות > περιφορά in entry 88a, נגע (Ni.) > φθάνω in entry 117, ענה > περισπάω in entry 124, תור > κατασκέπτομαι in entry 135, אחז > ἀτέχω in entry 141b, הלך (Qal Impv.) > δεῦρο in entry 145c, and נוח (Hi.) > ἀνίημι 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 לפני > πρὸ προσώπου in entry 44b, בעל > παρά in entry 74a, חלק > μέρος in entry 76b, שלם (Pi.) > ἀποδίδωμι in entry 130, נוח (Hi.) > ἀφίημι in entry 149a, and נתן (Qal Inf. cs.) > δόμα in entry 150b.

[193]63 = (37 occurrences of Tr = γ′) + (26 occurrences of Tr ≠ γ′)

[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).

[195]The exclusive agreement between Tr and α′ occurs 5 times. The 61 is the total occurrence of Tr = α′.

[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).

[197]The exclusive agreement between Tr and σ′ occurs 6 times. The 55 is the total occurrence of Tr = σ′.

[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.[200] 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′.

Table 12: Dependency of the Three

Dependent Equivalents		
Relationship	Occurrence	
Tr = α′ σ′	10	
Tr = α′ θ′	8	
Tr = σ′ θ′	3	
Individual Dependency		
Member of γ′	Occurrence	Percentage
α′	18/21	85.7%
σ′	13/21	61.9%
θ′	11/21	52.4%

In Table 12, the highest dependency is seen in α′ (85.7 percent), and the lowest dependency is in θ′ (52.4 percent). This means, even though α′ has the most equivalents agreeing with Tr, many of those equivalents are shared with another member of γ′. Consequently, the dependency of α′ is highest among the Three, and so, its exclusivity is lowest. On the other hand, θ′ and Tr agree less often than the occurrences of α′ and Tr but share the most exclusive renderings because the dependency of θ′ is the lowest. σ′ stands between α′ and θ′ 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 α′ or total occurrences of agreement between α′ and Tr. Although affinity of α′ to Tr is slightly higher than σ′ or θ′, the affinity itself is not at all significant because α′ has the highest dependency and the lowest exclusivity. The highest exclusivity of θ′ 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 θ′ indicates that, with respect to the Translator's unique renderings, the Translator is closest to θ′ among γ′. This fact may support Gentry's claim that the Translator might have been θ′. Another significant fact is the Symmachian influence on Tr. The exclusivity of σ′ is striking because it is higher than α′.

Table 13. Disagreement between Tr and γ′ (26).

Disagreement (Tr ≠ γ′)			
Relationship	Occurrence	Entry	Total
Tr ≠ γ′≠ GJ = MP	1	143d	26/106 (24.5%)
Tr ≠ γ′≠ GJ ≠ MP	6	48, 72b, 78b, 85b, 114b, 142b	
Tr ≠ γ′≠ GJ	2	99b, 113b	
Tr ≠ γ′= MP	1	125a	
Tr ≠ γ′≠ MP	2	140b, 153b	
Tr ≠ γ′	14	62, 69, 74b, 74c, 80b, 80c, 88b, 88c, 89b, 91b, 92b, 141a, 145e, 147b	

Tr against γ′ 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 Tr ≠ γ′ are now examined.

In 10 entries, equivalences in Tr are regarded as unique: 62, 69, 80b, 80c, 88b, 89b, 91b, 92b, 141a, and 145e. γ′ 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 יתרון > περισσεία in entry 62 is unique to Tr. The word יתרון

occurs only in Ecclesiastes. α′ has πλέον in Eccl 1:3; and σ′ attests various equivalents.[201] α′ normally has περισσεία for יתרת (*yōteret*) (e.g. Lev 8:25); θ′ has περισσεία for מותר (e.g. Prov 21:5, Eccl 3:19); and περισσεία is not attested in σ′. If the Translator was θ′ and used the same consonantal text as MT, he would have rendered מותר in Eccl 3:19 by περισσεία rather than τί ἐπερίσσευσεν.

The equation רעות > προαίρεσις in entry 69 is unique for Tr. רעות only occurs in Ecclesiastes. α′ and θ′ have νομή for רעות in Eccl 1:14, 2:11, 6:9. σ′ has βόσκησις in 1:14 and κακώσις in 4:6 and 6:9 where σ′ presumably understood רעות from the root רע ("evil").

The equations סכל > ἀφροσύνη in entry 80b and סכל > σκληρός in entry 80c are also regarded as unique choices of Tr. The equivalences are never found in other LXX translators as well as γ′. In γ′, ἀφροσύνη is normally used for אולת (e.g. Prov 9:6) and σκληρός for קשה (e.g. Exod 18:26, Isa 27:8).

In entry 88b, הוללות is rendered by περιφέρεια in Tr, and the equivalence is considered as unique for him. הוללות only occurs in Ecclesiastes. γ′ normally has πλάνη (Eccl 2:12); θ′ witnesses παραφορά or περιφορά; and σ′ attests various approaches. α′ and σ′ have περιφέρεια for סחרה in Ps 91(90):4.[202]

The equivalence חשבון > ψῆφος in entry 89b is distinctive for Tr. חשבון occurs in Ecclesiastes and 2 Chr 26:15. γ′ has λογισμός for חשבון in Ecclesiastes and attests

---

[201]πλέον in Eccl 1:3, περισσόν in Eccl 5:15, προέχει in Eccl 10:10, and ὄφελος in Eccl 10:11.

[202]Reider, *Index to Aquila*, 191.

ψῆφος for מספר in Isa 40:26.[203]

The equation כסיל > ἀφροσύνη in entry 91b is attested in Tr but not in γ′. In γ′, ἀφροσύνη appears normally for אולת (e.g. Prov 13:16) while in Tr, it is more contextually and more flexibly used not only for כסיל but also for כסל, סכל, or סכלות.

Entry 92b shows that the word סכלות occurring only in Ecclesiastes is rendered by σκληρία in Tr. α′ and θ′ have ἀφροσύνη for סכלות, and σ′ has ἀμαθία. The equivalence is likely a unique approach of Tr and may be correlated to the equation סכל > σκληρός in entry 80c.

In entry 141a, אחז (Ni., Qal Pass. Ptc.) > θηρεύω (M-P) is only seen in Tr. α′ has κατέχω (M-P) for a Niphal form of אחז 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 ἅπτομαι in Ezek 41:6.

The equivalence הלך (Hi.) > ἀποφέρω in entry 145e is distinctive in Tr since γ′ normally has ἀπάγω 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, בעל is rendered by ὁ παρά or ὅς παρά. The equations seem to be variations of בעל > παρά, which is attested in Tr, α′, and σ′. Thus, it is not a unique rendering by Tr.

The equation הוללות > 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 ילד (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 γέννάω for ילד 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: קץ > περασμός in entry 48, מלט (Ni.) > ἐξαιρέω in entry 114b, and אמר > λογίζομαι in entry 142b for Tr ≠ γ′≠ GJ ≠ MP; בהל (Ni.) > σπουδάζω in entry 99b and מלא (Qal) > πληροφορέω in entry 113b for Tr ≠ γ′≠ GJ; אהב > φιλέω in entry 140b and סבב > ἐπιστρέφω in entry 153b for Tr ≠ γ′≠ MP; and רעות > προαίρεσις in entry 69, סכל > ἀφροσύνη in entry 80b, סכל > σκληρός in entry 80c, הוללות > περιφέρεια in entry 88b, חשבון > ψῆφος in entry 89b, כסיל > ἀφροσύνη in entry 91b, סכלות > σκληρία in entry 92b, אחז (Ni., Qal Pass. Ptc.) > θηρεύω in entry 141a, and הלך (Hi.) > ἀποφέρω in entry 145e 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

---

[204]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 congeners.

Syntactical Comparison: Data

Table 14. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
Nouns					

"Ekklesiastes," 1.

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

Rendering Pattern					
#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
1a	CN	CN (964)		+ 573	
1b		Adj (148)		+ 43	
1c		Adv (7)		+ 7	
1d		Ptc (6)		+ 6	
				Vb 9	
				Prep 1	
2a	Adj	Adj (166)		+ 49	
2b		Ptc (12)		+ 4	
2c		Vb (9)		+ 2	
2d		N (2)		+ 5	
2e		ProN (1)		–	
2f		Adv (1)		–	
Number					
3a	Sg	Sg (759)		+ 446	
3b		Pl (13)		+ 34	
4a	Pl	Pl (138)		+ 114	
4b		Sg (24)		+ 31	
Bound Phrases					
5a	NR	Gen (147)	+	+ 92	
5b		Compound N (1)	–	–	
5c		Dat (1)	+	–	
5d		Acc (1)	+	–	
5e		Ptc (1)	–	+ 4	
				Adj 5, Prep Ph 1	
Attributive Phrase					
6a	Att Adj	Att Adj (45)		+ 5	
6b		Att Ptc (2)		–	
				Gent Adj 4	
Articulation (Common Nouns)					
Free Form					
7a	A	A (206)		+ 8	+ 63
7b		AN (2)		+ 1	
8a	AN	A (5)		+ 13	+ 22
8b		AN (419)		+ 283	+ 8
Indeterminate					
9a	A	A (27)		+ 5	
9b		AN (31)		+ 25	
10a	AN	A (17)		+ 2	+ 16
10b		AN (62)		+ 24	+ 11
nomen regens					
11a	AN	A (15)		+ 7	+ 5

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
11b		AN (150)		+ 97	+ 17
Bound Form with Pronouns					
12a	AN	A (44)		+ 97	+ 54
12b		AN (82)		+ 79	+ 17
nota accusativi את					
13a	+ Bound Form[205]	Art for את (31)	+	+ 4	+ 11
13b	+ Art / כל	σύν for את (33)	+	– 1[206]	– 3[207]
13c	+ אשר	Various (5)			

Pronouns					
Personal Pronouns: Free Forms					
14a	אני	ἐγώ 28	+	+ 1	
14b		Zero 1	–	–	
15	אתה	σύ 4	+	+ 4	
16a	הוא	αὐτός 13	+	+ 7	
16b		εἰμί 9	+	+ 4	
16c		ὅτι 1	–	–	
17a	היא	αὐτός 4	–	–	
17b		εἰμί 8	+	+ 1	
18a	הם	αὐτός 5	–	–	
18b		εἰμί 1	+[208]	+ 1[209]	
Personal Pronouns: Bound Forms					
19a	Personal Pron	Matching GNP 274		+ 290	
19b		Non-Matching G 5			
19c		Non-Matching N 2		+ 2	
19d		Non-Matching P 1		+ 13	
19e		Zero 3		+ 14	
				Refl ProN 8	

[205]Either NR or Pron.

[206]את followed by כל is rendered by zero in j41:26.

[207]את is rendered by an article.

[208]For המה in 1 Sam 12:21, Jer 4:22, and 10:5. See Hyvärinen, *Aquila*, 84.

[209]For המה in 32:4

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
20a	Pseudo-Vb	οὐκ εἰμί 10		+ 2	
20b		Variations 2		–	
		Demonstratives			
21	זה (*zeh*)	οὗτος 35	+	+ 2	
22	זה (*zō*)	οὗτος 11			
23	אלה	οὗτος 3		+ 3	
24a	הוא	οὗτος 2			
24b		ἐκεῖνος 2			
		Interrogatives			
25	מי	τίς 17		+ 12	
26a	מה	τί 16		+ 10	
26b		τίς 6		–	
26c		Problematic 2		+ 1	
				ὅστις 1, οὐ 1	
27a	מה	τί τό 4			
27b		τό 1			
27c		ἐν ᾧ ἐάν 1			
27d		εἴ τις 1			
28a	למה	Ἵνα μή 2			
28b		μήποτε 1			
29	אי זה	ποῖον 2			
30	איך	πῶς 2			
		Relatives			
31a	אשר	ὅς 36	+	+ 5	
31b		ὅσος 8	+	+ 1	
31c		ὅστις 4	–	+ 1	
31d		ὅς εἰμί 1	–	–	
31e		ὅς ἐάν 2	–	–	
31f		ὅς ἄν 1	–	–	
31g		ὅσος ἐάν 1	–	–	
31h		ὅσος ἄν 1	–	–	
31i		ὁ 13	+	–	
31j		ὅτι 7	+	–	
31k		ὡς 1	–	–	
31l		ὅπως 4	–	–	
31m		ὅπου 1	–	–	
31n		Zero 1	+	+ 1	
			οὗ		
32	בשל אשר	ὅσος ἄν 1			
32a	כאשר	καθώς 4			

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
32b		καθώς ἄν 1			
33a	באשר	καθότι 1			
33b		ἐν 4			
34a	תסרחצ	ὅς 20			
34b		ὅς ἐάν 2			
34c		ὅστις 1			
34d		ὁ 19			
34e		ὅτι 11			
34f		Χηρισΐνα 3			
34g		καί 1			
34h		ὅταν 1			
35a	כש	ὅταν 2			
35b		ὡς 2			
36	בש	Καθότι 1			
37a	מה ש	εἰ τις 1			
37b		ὅς ἐάν 1			
37c		ὁ 1			
38	לעמת תסרחצ	ὥσπερ 1			

Finite Verbs					
Tense / Aspect / Modality					
39a	*yqtl*	Fut Ind 114	+	+ 160	+ 38
39b		Aor Subj 32	–	+ 8	+ 12
39c		Pres Ind 12	+	+ 17	–
39d		Ptc 8	–	+ 4	–
39e		Aor Ind 4	+	+ 17	+ 6
39f		Pres Subj 4	–	–	–
39g		Inf 4	–	–	–
39h		Pres Impv 1	–	–	–
				Aor Impv 2, Impf Ind 1	
40a	*w^{e}yqtl*	Aor Subj 5		+ 2	–
40b		Fut Ind 3		+ 16	+ 7
40c		Pres Ind 2		–	–
40d		Aor Ind 2		+ 5	–
40e		Aor Impv 1		–	–
40f		Ptc 1		–	–
				Impf Ind 1	
41	*wayyqtl*	Aor Ind 3	+	+ 16	+ 20
			Impf, Fut, Pres, Ptc	Fut Ind 5, Ptc 2	Fut Ind 5

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
42a	*qtl*	Aor Ind 121	+	+ 87	+ 35
42b		Ptc 18	–	+ 2	–
42c		Pres Ind 6	+	+ 2	–
42d		Pf Ind 5	+	+ 1	+ 2
42e		Impf Ind 3	+	+ 2	–
42f		Aor Subj 2	–	–	–
42g		Fut Ind 2	+	+ 6	+ 4
				Aor Impv 1	
43a	*wqtl*	Aor Ind 25	–	+ 3	+ 1
43b		Aor Subj 9	–	–	–
43c		Fut Ind 7	+	+ 2	+ 29
43d		Pres Ind 2	–	–	–
43e		Pres Subj 1	–	–	–
43f		N 1	–	–	–
			Impf, Impv, τοῦ + Inf	Aor Impv 1	
44a	*waw* + Impv	Aor Impv 7		+ 2	
44b		Pres Impv 1		–	
				Fut Ind 1	
45a	Impv	Aor Impv 14	+	+ 12	
45b		Pres Impv 5			
45c		Adv 2		–	
			Aor Subj	Fut Ind 1	
46a	*waw* + Short *yqtl* / *yqtl* + *â* suffix	Aor Ind 1		–	
46b		Aor Subj 1		–	
46c				Fut Ind 6	
47a	Short *yqtl* / *yqtl* + *â* suffix	Aor Subj 15	+	+ 3	
47b		Pres Impv 5	+	+ 1	
47c		Aor Impv 3			
47d		Fut Ind 3		+ 2	
Number and Person					
48	Agreement	442		382	
49	Sg	Pl 8		+ 4	
50	Pl	Sg 1		+ 7	
Voice					
51a	Qal	Act 191			
51b		M-P 151			
52a	Niph	M-P 40			
52b		Act 3			
53a	Pi	Act 32			
53b		M-P 4			

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
54	Pilpel	Act 1			
55	Poel	Act 1			
56a	Pu	M-P 2			
56b		Act 1			
57a	Hith	Act 1			
57b		M-P 4			
58	Hithpolel	M-P 1			
59a	Hiph	Act 34			
59b		M-P 1			
60	Ho	M-P 1			

Non-Finite Verbs					
Participles					
61a	Ptc	Pres Ptc 62	+	+ 31	
61b		Pf Ptc 9		+ 1	
61c		Aor Ptc 1		+ 1	
61d		Pres Ind 29	+	+ 2	
61e		Aor Ind 9		–	
61f		Pf Ind 6		+ 2	
61g		Fut Ind 2		+ 1	
61h		Pres Subj 1	–	–	
61i		N 8	+	+ 9	
61j		Adj 8	+	+ 6	
61k		Inf 1	–	–	
Infinitive					
Free Infinitive					
62a	Free Inf	Adj / Adv 15	–	–	
62b		Aor Ind 3	–	–	
			Ptc, N	N 2	
Bound Infinitive					
63a	w/o Prep	τοῦ + Inf 4	–	–	
63b		AN Inf 2	+	+ 2	
63c		Nominals 2	+	+ 1	
63d			τό + Inf		
64a	ל +	τοῦ + Inf 87	+	+ 6	+ 8
64b		AN Inf 4	–	+ 1	+ 5
64c		τῷ + Inf 1	+	–	–
64d		τό + Inf 1	–	–	–
64e		ὅτι + Ind 1	–	–	–

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
		[210]	εἰς (τό) + Inf	εἴ πως + Opt 1	
			Ἵνα clause, N	Ptc 1, N 1	
65a	מן +	ἀπό + N 2	+	–	
65b		ὑπέρ + N / Ptc 2	–	–	
65c		η ὅτι + AN Inf 1	–	–	
			ἀπό τοῦ + Inf, τοῦ μή + Inf	τοῦ μή + Inf 1[211]	
66	ב +	ἐν + N 2	+	–	
			ἐν τῷ + Inf, Gen Abs	ἐν τῷ + Inf 1, Ptc 1	

Particles					
Prepositions					
ב					
67a	ב	ἐν 153	+	+ 68	+ 27
67b		εἰς 1	+	+ 1	+ 5
67c		ἐπί 1	–	–	+ 2
67d		πρός 1	–	–	–
			διά	Dat 6	διά 2
			ἀντί	Various 11	
68	Compound Form	Various 5			
כ					
69a	Nominal Modifier	ὡς 1		+ 1	
70a	Verbal Modifier	ὡς 17	+	+ 4	
70b		Others 2	+	+ 6	
71	Compound Form	Various 9			
ל					
72a	Nominal Modifier	Art in Gen 29	+	–	
72b		Art in Dat 47	+	–	
				Dat 2, Gen 1	
73a	Verbal Modifier	Art in Nom 5	–	–	–
73b		Dat Nominals 43	–	+ 31	+ 4
73c		Acc Nominals 1	+	+ 6	–

[210] εἰς is employed only for ל followed by noun in the Greek Ecclesiastes.

[211] For privative מן in 33:28. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 268.

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
73d		εἰς + Acc Nominals 18	+	+ 19	+ 14
73e		ἐν + Dat Nominals 1	–	+ 2	–
73f		Adv 2	–	–	–
73g		Zero 5	–	–	–
			κατά + Acc	Gen Nominals 6,	ProN 6
74a	(+ Inf)	τοῦ + Inf 87	+	+ 6	+ 8
74b		Others 7	+	+ 4	+ 5
75	Compound Form	Various 17		+ 3	
מן					
76a	מן	ἀπό + Gen 33	+	+ 17	+ 7
76b		ὑπέρ + Acc 29	+	+ 1	–
76c		ἐκ + Gen 4	–	+ 19	+ 6
76d		ἐν + Dat 2	–	–	–
76e		παρά + Acc 2	+	–	–
76f		Others 3	–	+ 1	+ 3[212]
				Gen 5, διά + Acc 1	διά + Acc 1
77	Compound Form	Various 4		+ 8	
Separate and Compound Prepositions					
78a	אחרי	μετά + Acc 2		+ 1	
78b		ὀπίσω 5[213]		+ 2	
79a	אל	εἰς + Acc 13	–	+ 1	–
79b		πρός + Acc 8	+	+ 3	+ 9
79c		ἐπί + Acc 2	–	–	+ 1
				ἐπί + Gen 1, Gen 1, Dat 1	
80a	עד	ἕως 4		–	+ 11
80b		μέχρι 1		+ 2	–
				α"χρι οὗ 1	
81a	על	ἐπί + Acc 16	+	+ 24	
81b		ἐπί + Dat 9	–	+ 7	
81c		ἐπί + Gen 4	+	+ 12	
81d		περί + Gen 5	–	+ 3	
81e		ἐν + Dat 2	–	–	

[212]κατέαντι, ἀπέναντι, and -θεν.

[213]מאחרי in 10:14.

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
81f		διά + Acc 1	–	+ 1	
			ὑπέρ	Gen 1, Acc 2, κατά + Gen 2, εἰς 1, ἐνατίον 1	
82	(מעל)	ἐπάνω + Gen 1			
83a	עם	μετά 7		+ 11	
83b		ἐν 1		–	
84a	תחת	ὑπό + Acc 33		+ 1	
84b		ἀντί + Gen 1		+ 2	
				ὑποκάτω + Gen 4	
Semiprepositions					
85a	לפני	πρὸ □ροωσπου 6	+	–	
85b		ἔμπροσθεν 4	–	+ 2	
			εἰς □ροωσπον		
86a	מלפני	ἀπό □ροωσπου 4	+		
86b		ἀπό ἔμπροσθεν 1	–		
87	מפני	ἀπό □ροωσπου 1		+ 3	
				Gen 1	
88a	ביד	ἐν χειρί 3	+	+ 2	
88b	מיד	ἀπὸ Χειρός 2			
Conjunctions and Other Particles					
89	אל (*'al*)	μή 21		+ 1	
				οὐδέν 1[214]	
90a	אם	ἐάν 15	+	+ 7	
90b		ὅσος ἄν 1		–	
90c		εἰ 2	+	+ 8	
90d		εἰ μή 2		+ 2	
90e		ἀλλά η" 1		–	
90f				ἤ 3	
91a	גם	καί γέ 43		+ 4	+ 7
91b		γέ 14		–	+ 3[215]
91c		καί 1		+ 1[216]	

[214]In 24:25, אל follows ל and modifies a noun. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 358.

[215]וגם is rendered by καί γέ.

[216]For וגם in 28:27.

Table 14—Continued. Syntactical Comparison between Tr and His Congeners

#	MT	Tr	Aq	GJ	MP
92a	ה (Question Marker)	εἰ 3		+ 3	
92b		ἤ 1		+ 1	
				μή 8	
				ἢ 1	
93	(הלא)	μή οὐκ 1		–[217]	–[218]
94	הנה	ἰδού 6		+ 1	
				ἐστιν 1	
95a	ו	καί 356	+	+ 198	
95b		Zero 5		+ 4	
			δέ	δέ 2	
			ἀλλά, ὅτι	μή 1	
96a	כבר	ἤδη 8			
96b		Zero 1			
97a	כי	ὅτι 86	+	+ 36	+ 27
97b		γάρ 1	+	+ 5	–
97c		Zero 1		–	–
			ἀλλά		
98a	כן	οὕτως 4		–	
98b		οὗτος 2		+ 2	
99	(בכן)	τότε 1			
100a	לא	οὐ 54		+ 56	
100b		μή 8		+ 3	
100c		Other 1		+ 10	
101	(עדן לא)	οὔπω 1			
102	עוד	ἔτι 6		+ 3	
				Zero 1	
103	שם	ἐκεῖ 7		+ 1	

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 congeners, and the focus will be on major discrepancies between

---

[217] οὐχί in 31:3 and 31:4.

the Translator and the three congeners. 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 כל, GJ has nothing for *nota accusativi*, and MP has the article while Tr and Aq have σύν.

Pronouns

The equation הוא > ὅτι 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] הלא is rendered by οὐ or οὐχί.

in Tr. A peculiarity of GJ is also seen in rendering the interrogative מה. GJ has ὅστις and οὐ in entry 26, which are not found in Tr.

The various syntactical approaches to the relative אשר by Tr in entry 31 are significant since they show how delicately Tr deals with אשר 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 οὗ, which is not seen in Tr.[219] GJ agrees in only four approaches.[220]

Finite Verbs

For *yqtl*, 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, *w^e^yqtl* 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 *wayyqtl* 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 *wayyqtl* as well as the aorist indicative. It may be because the congeners vocalize the forms in question as *w^e^yqtl* in most cases.

---

[219]The 5 approaches of Aq with Tr are ὅς, ὅσος, ὁ, ὅτι clauses, and zero equivalence.

[220]The 4 approaches of GJ with Tr are ὅς, ὅσος, ὅστις, 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* + *â* 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^{e}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* + *â* 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 τοῦ + 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 ל, Tr has five different approaches, but each congener shares only two of them (entry 64). τό + infinitive and ὅτι + indicative are not attested in the three congeners. Aq and GJ have a noun for the bound infinitive following ל, but Tr does not. While Aq uses εἰς for ל followed by infinitive, Tr employs εἰς only for ל followed by a noun not by an infinitive.

The approach of Tr in rendering מן + infinitive in entry 65 may demonstrate a peculiarity of Tr. ὑπέρ + noun / participle and ἢ ὅτι + anarthrous infinitive are unique to Tr and alien to both Aq and GJ. Both Aq and GJ share τοῦ μή + Inf, which is not attested in Tr.

According to entry 66, ἐν τῷ + Infinitive is employed for ב + 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 ב, Tr has ἐπί and πρός, 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, ל 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 ל. For ל 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 76d, the equation מן > ἐν + dative is absent in all three congeners. Additionally, παρά + accusative is lacking in GJ and MP. Their rendering is διά + accusative.

Among separate prepositions, the renderings for אל, עד, and על are noteworthy. In entry 79a, Aq and MP do not have εἰς + accusative for אל. Since it is a major approach by Tr, the absence of this approach in Aq and MP may be significant. For עד in entry 80, ἕως is not seen in GJ, and μέχρι is not in MP. In entry 81, more varied approaches for על are seen in GJ than in Tr.

Finally, גם, הלא, ו, and כן are important conjunctions or particles for a comparison between Tr and the congeners. According to entry 91, Tr's rendering pattern for גם generally follows that of MP. It may be significant that GJ never has γέ. The equation הלא > μή οὐκ in entry 93 shows uniqueness of Tr since GJ and MP have οὐ or οὐχί and never μή οὐκ. Another distinction between Tr and his congeners is seen in entry

95 where Aq and GJ utilize δέ for ו, but Tr does not. Tr consistently employs καί, but Aq and GJ have a variety of approaches. The use of οὕτως for כן 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 כ and מן, and the conjunctions אם and כי. Crucial differences between Tr and Aq are seen in the renderings of אשר, finite verbs *yqtl* and *wqtl*, free and bound infinitives, prepositions ל as verbal modifier and אל, and the conjunction ו.

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 *qtl* and short *yqtl* / *yqtl* + *â* suffix, for participles, for prepositions כ and אחרי, and for the conjunction כי. 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 מה, the relative אשר, imperatives with *waw* or without *waw*, short *yqtl* / *yqtl* + *â* suffix with *waw*, free and bound infinitives, prepositions ל as nominal modifier and אל, and other particles such as גם, הלא, and כן.

With MP, Tr shares renderings of *yqtl*, *qtl*, the preposition ל, and the particle גם 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 *wqtl*, and the particle הלא.

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* trandition. 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 גם 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 אשר are unique to the Translator. This shows how broadly the Translator understands the syntax of אשר 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 *wayyqtl*, and employs the future indicative for all modal forms, the Translator employs the subjunctive for all prefix and suffix forms except *wayyqtl* 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.

CHPAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

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, למה in 7:16b is rendered by μήποτε, but למה in the next verse 7:17b is translated by ἵνα μή 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 ὅσα ἄν is used for בשל אשר in 8:17a and also for אם 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. *yqtl* 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 *yqtl* form ידע is rendered by the future indicative (γνώσεται) in 8:5a but by the present indicative (γινώσκει) in the next line, 8:5b. *w^{e}qtl* is treated as *yqtl*, 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 ל prefixed to the infinitive by the article and never used a Greek preposition for ל. 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 לפני and temporal לפני.

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 congeners 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]

---

[1]Peter J. Gentry, "Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three: The Priority of a New Critical Edition of Hexaplaric Fragments," *AS* 2.2 (2004): 173-74.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993.

_____. *Parataxis in the Septuagint*. Annales Academiae Scientarum Fennicae Diss. Hum. Litt. 31. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1982.

Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

Barthélemy, Dominique. *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 10. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and revised by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. 2nd ed. Edited and revised by F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Blass, Friedrich W., Albert Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Brock, Sebastian P., Charles T. Fritsch, and Sidney Jellicoe. *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint*. Arbeiten zur Literature und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums, 6. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Brockelmann, C. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*. 2 vols. New York: Lemcke & Buechner, 1908-13.

Brooke, A. E., N. McLean, and H. St. John Thackeray, eds. *The Old Testament in Greek*. 9 parts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906-1940.

Brooke, George J., and Barnabas Lindars. *International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings: Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Brooks, James A., and Carlton L. Winbery. *A Morphology of New Testament Greek: A Review and Reference Grammar*. New York: University Press of America, 1994.

Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. Briggs, eds. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.

Conybeare, F. C., and St. George Stock. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Cox, Claude E. *Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion in Armenia*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 42. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Crenshaw, James L. *Ecclesiastes*. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.

_____. *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1989.

de Troyer, Kristin. *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1-17, LXX 8:1-17, and AT 7:14-41*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000.

Dogniez, Cécile. *Bibliography of the Septuagint / Bibliographie de la Septante (1970-1993)*. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 60. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.

Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph et al., eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967/77, 1983.

Evans, Trevor V. *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Even-Shoshan, A. *A New Concordance of the Bible*. Jerusalem: Kiryat-Sefer Publishing House, 1998.

Fanning, Buist M. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Field, Frederick. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875.

Fox, Michael V. *Qoheleth and His Contradictions*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989.

Gentry, Peter John. *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Gesenius, W., and E. Kautzsch. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 28th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Gignac, Francis Thomas. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Vol. 1, *Phonology*. Milan: Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1976.

_____. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Vol 2. *Morphology*. Milan: Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1981.

Givón, T. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1990.

Gordis, Robert. *Koheleth: The Man and His World*. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1955.

Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran*. Jerusalem: Orient Publishing House, 1960.

Hanhart, Robert, and Reinhard Gregor Kratz. *Studien zur Septuaginta und zum Hellenistischen Judentum*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 24. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Hatav, Galia. *The Semantics of Aspect and Modality: Evidence from English and Biblical Hebrew*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. 1997.

Hatch, E., 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.

Horrocks, Geoffrey. *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*. London/New York: Longman, 1997.

Hyvärinen, Kyösti. *Die Übersetzung von Aquila*. Coniectana Biblica. Old Testament Series 10. Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1977.

Jarick, John, ed. *A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance of the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ecclesiastes*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 36. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

_____. *Gregory Thaumaturgos' Paraphrase of Ecclesiastes*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Jobes, Karen H. *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text*. SBL Dissertation Series 153. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.

Joüon, P., *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Subsidia Biblica 14. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1991.

Kidner, Derek. *An Introduction to Wisdom Literature: The Wisdom of Proverbs, Job & Ecclesiastes*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1985.

Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited by M. E. J. Richardson. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Revised by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Lohfink, Norbert. *Qoheleth*. A Continental Commentary. Translated by Sean McEvenue. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.

Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992, 1996.

Martin, Raymond A. *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 3. Cambridge, MA: SBL, 1974.

Moulton, J. H., W. F. Howard, and Nigel Turner. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

Muraoka, T. *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 28. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Murphy, Roland. *Ecclesiastes*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 23A. Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1992.

Niccacci, A. *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*. Translated by W. G. Watson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament—Supplement Series 86. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

O'Connor, M. *Hebrew Verse Structure*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1980.

Olofsson, Staffan. *God Is My Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint*. Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament 31. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.

_____. *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament 30. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wicksell, 1990.

Porter, Stanley E. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

_____. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Qimron, E. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Harvard Semitic Studies 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta, Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.

Reider, J. *An Index to Aquila: Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew-Greek, Latin-Hebrew*. Completed and revised by N. Turner. *Vetus Testamentum* Supplement Series 12. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

_____. *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila*. Philadelphia: Oxford University Press, 1916.

Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.

Rogland, Max. *Alleged Non-Past Uses of Qatal in Classical Hebrew*. Assen, Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003.

Sailhamer, John Herbert. *The Translational Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3-41*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1984.

Schoors, Antoon. *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth*. Leuven: Peeters Press and Department Orientalistiek, 1992.

_____. *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom*. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

Seeligmann, Isaac L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*. Leiden: Brill, 1948.

Segal, M. H. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.

Seow, C. L. *Ecclesiastes*. The Anchor Bible, vol 18c. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Sihler, Andrew L. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*. Annales Academiae Scientarum Fennicae, B/132. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965.

_____. *Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 40. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Sollamo, Raija. *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Dissertations Humanarum Litterarum no. 19. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979.

Smyth, H. W. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by G. M. Messing. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Swete, Henry Barclay. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902. Revised by R. R. Ottley, 1914. Reprint. New York: KTAV, 1968. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989.

Taylor, B. A. *The Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint: A Complete Parsing Guide*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Vol. 1, *Introduction, Orthography and Accidence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Tov, Emanuel. *A Classified Bibliography of Lexical and Grammatical Studies on the Language of the Septuagint*. Jerusalem: Academon, 1980.

_____. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.

_____. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)*. DJD VIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

_____. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Simor, 1997.

_____. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Trebolle Barrera, Julio. *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible*. Translated by W. G. E. Watson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

van der Merwe, Christo H. J., Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996.

Walters, Peter. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Wevers, J. W. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

_____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

_____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Whitley, Charles F. *Koheleth: His Language and Thought*. New York: de Gruyter, 1979.

Williams, R. J. *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob*. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1985.

Articles

Barr, James. "Doubts about Homoeophony in the Septuagint." *Textus* 12 (1985): 1-77.

_____. Review of *An Index to Aquila*, by J. Reider. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 12 (1967): 296-304.

_____. "Translators' Handling of Verb Tense in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts." In *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986,* ed. Claude E. Cox, 481-503. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Brock, Sebastian P. "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979): 69-87.

_____. "The Phenomenon of Biblical Translation in Antiquity." In *Studies in* the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations, ed. Sidney Jellicoe, 541-71. New York: KTAV, 1974

Coats,.George W. "Self-Abasement and Insult Formulas." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89 (1970): 14-26.

Conrad, Carl W. "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb" [on-line]. Accessed 15 June 2004. Available from http://www.greek-language.com/bibliographies; Internet.

Cook, Johann. "Aspects of the Relationship Between the Septuagint Versions of Kohelet and Proverbs." In *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom*, 481-92. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

_____. "Contrasting as a Translation Technique in the LXX of Proverbs." In *Quest for Context and Meaning*, ed. Antoon Schoors, 403-14. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.

Cox, Claude, "The Translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion found in the Margins of Armenian Manuscripts." In *Armenia and the Bible*, 35-45. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Dahood, M. "Canaanite-Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth." *Biblica* 33 (1952): 30-52, 191-221.

_____. "The Phoenician Background of Qoheleth." *Biblica* 47 (1966): 264-82.

DeRouchie, Jason S. "The Translation of Participles in the Greek Ecclesiastes." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA, 24 November 2003.

de Waard, J. "A Greek Translation-Technical Treatment of Amos 1:15." In *On Language, Culture and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida*, ed. M. Black and W. A. Smalley, 111-18. Paris: The Hague, 1974.

_____. "Old Greek Translation Techniques and the Modern Translator." *The Bible Translator* 41 (1990): 311-19.

_____. "Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Amos." *Biblica* 59 (1978): 339-50.

_____. "Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Ruth." *Biblica* 54 (1973): 499-515.

_____. "The Translator and Textual Criticism: with Particular Reference to Eccl 2:25." *Biblica* 60 (1979): 509-29.

Dillmann, August. "Über die griechische Übersetzung des Qoheleth." *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1892): 3-16.

Dobbs-Allsopp, F. W. "Biblical Hebrew Statives and Situation Aspect." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 45.1 (2000): 21-53.

Eynikel, E., and J. Lust. "The Use of δεῦρο and δεῦτε in the LXX." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 67 (1991): 57-68.

Gehman, Henry S. "Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek." *Vetus Testamentum* 1 (1951): 81-90.

Gentry, Peter J. "Ekklesiastes." In *New English Translation of Septuagint*, Provisional Edition [on-line]. Accessed 1 February 2005. Available from http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/ekkl.pdf; Internet.

_____. "The Greek Psalter and the Kaige Tradition: Methodological Questions." In *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, ed. Robert J. V.

Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry, 74-97. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

_____. "Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Role of the Syro-Hexapla." *Aramaic Studies* 1.1 (2003): 5-28.

_____. "The Place of Theodotion-Job in the Textual History of the Septuagint." In *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 119-230. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

_____. "Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three: The Priority of a New Critical Edition of Hexaplaric Fragments." *Aramaic Studies* 2.2 (2004): 145-74.

_____. "The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes in the Marginal Notes in the Syro-hexapla." *Aramaic Studies* 2.1 (2004): 63-84.

_____. "The System of the Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Studies* 39 (1998): 7-39.

_____. "Transitivity and Voice in Hellenistic Greek." Classroom lecture notes, 22430—*Advanced Greek Grammar*, Spring 2002. Photocopy.

Grabbe, L. L. "The Translation Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions?" In *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, ed. George J. Brooke and Banabas Lindars, 505-56. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Gropp, D. M. "The Function of the Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Annual Review* 13 (1991): 45-62.

Haber, Heriberto. "The LXX and the Bible: Matter for Thought." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 24 (1996): 260-61.

Hanhart, R. Review of *An Index to Aquila*, by J. Reider. *Theologische Revue* 64 (1968): 393-94.

Hastoupis, A. P. "The Character of the Translation of the Book of Ecclesiastes in the Alexandrian Bible." *Teologia* 56 (1985): 80-126.

Hendel, R. S. "In the Margins of the Hebrew Verbal System: Situation, Tense, Aspect and Mood." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 9 (1996): 152-81.

Hyvärinen, K. "Die LXX-Übersetzung des Ecclesiastes." In *Die Übersetzung von Aquila*, 88-99. Coniectana Biblica Old Testament 10. Uppsala, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1977.

Jarick, John. "Aquila's Koheleth." *Textus* 15 (1990): 131-39.

_____. "Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Text of Ecclesiastes." In *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Paris 1992*, ed. Leonard Greenspoon and Oliver Munnich, 368-85. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Joosten, Jan. "Elaborate Similes—Hebrew and Greek: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique." *Biblica* 77 (1996): 227-36.

Kraft, Robert A., and Emanuel Tov. "Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 14 (1981): 22-40.

Lee, J. A. L. "Equivocal and Stereotyped Renderings in the LXX." *Revue biblique* 87 (1980): 104-17.

Marquis, Galen. "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel." In *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986,* ed. Claude E. Cox, 405-24. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

_____. "Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel." *Textus* 13 (1986): 59-84.

McKay, K. L. "Time and Aspect in New Testament Greek" *Novum Testamentum* 34.3 (1992): 209-28.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint." Appendix 4 of *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, ed. Hatch and Redpath. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.

_____. "Towards a Septuagint Lexicon." In *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986*, ed. Claude E. Cox, 255-76. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Olofsson, Staffan. "Consistency as a Translation Technique." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 6 (1992): 14-30.

_____. "Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint: Questions and Possibilities." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996): 217-37.

Orlinsky, H. M. "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 46 (1975): 89-114.

Pietersma, Albert. "Articulation in the Greek Psalms: The Evidence of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV." In *Tradition of the Text: Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 109. Edited by G. J. Norton and S. Pisano. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

_____. "The Greek Psalter: A Question of Methodology and Syntax." *Vetus Testamentum* 26 (1976): 60-69.

_____. "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues." *Vetus Testamentum* 35 (1985): 296-311.

Polak, Frank H. "A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint." In *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Paris 1992*, ed. Leonard Greenspoon and Oliver Munnich, 335-47. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Rabin, Chaim. "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint." *Textus* 6 (1968): 1-26.

Rainey, Anson F. "Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation." *Hebrew Studies* 27. 1 (1986): 4-24.

Rubinstein, A. "A Finite Verb Continued by an Infinitive Absolute in Biblical Herbew." *Vetus Testamentum* 2 (1952): 362-67.

Revell, E. J. "The Conditioning of Stress Position in Waw Consecutive Perfect Forms in Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Annual Review* 9 (1985): 277-300.

_____. "The System of the Verb in Standard Biblical Prose." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 55 (1989): 1-37.

Rofé, Alexander. "The Methods of Late Biblical Scribes As Evidenced by the Septuagint Compared with the Other Textual Witnesses." In *Tehillah Le-Moshe*, 259-70. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997.

Salters, R. B. "A Note on the Exegesis of Ecclesiastes 3:15b." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 419-22.

_____. "Notes on the History of the Interpretation of Koh 5:5." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 90 (1978): 95-101.

_____. "Text and Exegesis in Koh 10:19." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 423-26.

Schoors, Antoon. "The Peshitta of Kohelet and Its Relation to the Septuagint." In *After Chalcedon*, 347-57. Leuven: Departement Oriëtalisteik, 1985.

_____. "The Use of Vowel Letters in Qoheleth." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 20 (1988): 277-86.

Schwarzschild, Roger. "The Syntax of אשר in Biblical Hebrew with Special Reference to Qoheleth." *Hebrew Studies* 31 (1990): 7-37.

Silva, Moisés. "Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek." *Biblica* 61 (1980): 198-219.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "ἐν für εἰς in der Septuaginta." *Vetus Testamentum* 32 (April 1982): 190-200.

_____. "Methodologische Fragen der Erforschung der Septuaginta-Syntax." In *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986,* ed. Claude E. Cox, 425-44. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Sollamo, Raija. "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the LXX of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy." In *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Paris 1992.* ed. Leonard J. Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich, 43-62. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Speiser, E. A. "The Durative Hithpa'el: A *tan* Form." In *Oriental and Biblical Studies*, ed. J.J. Finkelstein and Moshe Greenberg, 506-14. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1967.

Tov, Emanuel. "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" In *De Septuaginta Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Albert Pietersma, Claude E. Cox, and John William Wevers, 53-70. Mississauga, Ontario: Benben Publications, 1984.

_____. "The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books." In *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Etudes bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire*, ed. P. Casetti., 577-92. Orbus biblicus et orientalis 38. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires/Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

_____. "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present." In *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986,* ed. Claude E. Cox, 337-59. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

_____. "Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the LXX: Their Nature and Distribution." In *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*, ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John Wm Wevers, 64-73. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

_____. "The Representation of the Causative Aspects of *Hiph'il* in the LXX. A Study in Translation Technique." *Biblica* 63 (1982): 417-24.

_____. "Some Corrections to Reider-Turner's Index to Aquila." *Textus* 8 (1973): 164-74.

_____. "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Septuagint. The Relation between Vocabulary and Translation Technique." *Tarbiz* 47 (1978): 120-38.

_____. "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint." In *Translation of Scripture: Proceedings of a Conference at the Annenberg Research Institute, May 15-16, 1989*, 215-33. Jewish Quarterly Review Supplement. Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1990.

_____. "Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament. A Further Characteristic of the *kaige*-Th. Revision?" *Textus* 8 (1973): 78-92.

Tov, Emanuel, and Benjamin G. Wright. "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX." *Textus* 12 (1985): 149-87.

Treat, Jay Curry. "Aquila, Field, and the Song of Songs." In *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 135-76. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Van der Kooij, Arie. "The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16-25: Translation and Interpretation." In *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986,* ed. Claude E. Cox, 127-66. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Vinel, Françoise. "Le Texte Grec de L'Ecclésiaste Et Ses Caractéristiques: Une Relecture Critique de L'Histoire de la Royauté." In *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom*, ed. Antoon Schoors, 283-302. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

Voitila, Anssi. "What the Translation of Tenses Tells about the Septuagint Translators." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996): 183-96.

Wevers, John W. "Interpretive Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version." In *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, ed. Magne Sæbø, 1: 84-107. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

_____. "The Use of Versions for Text Criticism: The Septuagint." In *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea,* ed. N. F. Marcos, 15-24 Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1985.

Whybray, R. N. "Qoheleth the Immoralist? (Qoh 7:16-17)." In *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien*, ed. John G. Gammie, Walter A. Brueggemann, W. Lee Humphreys, and James M. Ward, 191-204. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.

Wright, Benjamin G. "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism" in the LXX." In *VI Congress of the International Organization for*

Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986, ed. Claude E. Cox, 311-35. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Ziegler, Joseph. "Der Gebrauch des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes." In *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*, ed. D. Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John Wm Wevers, 83-120. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

_____. "Die Wiedergabe der nota accusativi *'et, 'aet-* mit σύν." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* Supplement Series 100 (1988): 222-33.

Dissertations

Dempster, S. G. "Linguistic Features of Hebrew Narrative: Discourse Analysis of Narrative from the Classical Period." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1985.

Eskhult, Mats. "Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose." Ph.D. diss., Uppsala University, 1990.

Holmstedt, Robert D. "The Relative Clause in Biblical Hebrew: A Linguistic Analysis." Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2002.

Marquis, G. "The Translation Technique Reflected in the Septuagint of Ezekiel." M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, 1982.

Nash, P. "The Hebrew Qal Active Participle: A Non-Aspectual Narrative Backgrounding Element." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1992.

Nieuwoudt, B. A. "The Finite Verb in the Septuagint of Deuteronomy: A Survey in the Translation Technique and Grammar of the Septuagint." Ph.D. diss., University of Stellenbosch, 1992.

Salters, R. B. "The Book of Ecclesiastes. Studies in the Versions and the History of Exegesis." Ph.D. diss., St. Andrews University, 1973.

Shulman, Ahouva. "The Use of Modal Verb Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1996.

ABSTRACT

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE OF THE
GREEK ECCLESIASTES

Yun Yeong Yi, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005
Chairperson: Dr. Peter J. Gentry

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.

VITA

Yun Yeong Yi

PERSONAL

Born: January 18, 1969, South Korea
Parents: Yun Sang Yi and Young Ja Sung
Married: Young Shin Oh, January 25, 2003

EDUCATIONAL

B.A., The Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea, 1991.
M.Div., The Methodist Theological Seminary, Seoul, Korea, 1998.
Adv. M.Div. Studies, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY, 1998-1999.

MINISTERIAL

Minister of Education, Hae-Sung Baptist Church, Annyang, Korea, 1987-91.
Minister of Education, Yang-Moon Methodist Church, Seoul, Korea, 1996-97.
Worship Leader, BSU in the University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, 2001-02.
Senior Pastor, Disciple Baptist Church, Evansville, IN, 2002-2005.

ACADEMIC

Garrett Fellow, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY, 2000-2002.