

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

AN INTRODUCTION
TO
ECCLESIASTES

החוט המשלש לא במהרה ינתק

AN INTRODUCTION
TO
ECCLESIASTES
WITH NOTES AND APPENDICES

BY

A. H. McNEILE, B.D.

Tyrwhitt Hebrew Scholar and Crosse Scholar,
Fellow and Theological Lecturer at
Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge

CAMBRIDGE :
at the University Press
1904

**London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.**

Glasgow: 50, WELLINGTON STREET.



Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

[All Rights reserved.]

PREFACE.

THE literature on the book of Ecclesiastes is very large, as may be seen by reference to Ginsburg's commentary, and to Aug. Palm *Die Qohelet-Litteratur* (Mannheim). But of late years it has received comparatively little attention. Palm's list was compiled in 1886, and since that time the following works may be noticed: 1. The commentaries of Cox (*Expositor's Bible*), 1890, Siegfried (in Nowack's *Handkomm. z. A. T.*), 1898, Wildeboer (in Marti's *Kurz. Handkomm. z. A. T.*), 1898. 2. Other studies of the book from various points of view: Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, 1887, Euringer, *Der Masorahstext des Kohelet*, 1890, Leimdorfer, *Kohelet im Lichte der Geschichte*, 1892, Dillon, *Sceptics of the Old Testament*, 1895, Tyler, *Ecclesiastes* (2nd edit.), 1899. 3. To these must be added articles in periodicals—mostly German—on particular points. These are referred to where use is made of them.

The difficulty of the interpretation of the book has been an unending fascination to all who have dwelt upon it. But very few students have analysed it by the critical methods which have opened up a new world of study in the Hexateuch, the historical books and the prophets. The following pages have been written with two chief aims: firstly, to disentangle the strands which go to form the "three-fold cord" of the writing; and secondly, to estimate the position which Koheleth occupied with regard to the religious and philosophical thought of his

day. On these two subjects, treated in §§ 4, 5 and 8, hang the chief interest and value of the book which is called by his name. But neither of these can be accurately studied unless the writing be placed in its historical and literary perspective; and an attempt is made to do this in the rest of the Introduction.

It was thought unnecessary to write a complete commentary on the Hebrew text; but it is hoped that in the Notes on select passages, and in Appendix II., all the principal points of interest or difficulty have been discussed.

The purpose of the Appendices is to re-open the problem of the Greek text. Even to those who may not accept the conclusions reached, they may prove useful in supplying textual matter for further study.

A. H. McNEILE.

CAMBRIDGE.

Ascension Day, 1904.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE	v, vi
INTRODUCTION	1—55
§ 1. The Title	1, 2
2. Canonicity	3—8
3. The circumstances of the writer	8—13
4. An outline of Koheleth's thoughts	13—21
5. The integrity of the book	21—31
6. The style and vocabulary	32, 33
7. The relation of Koheleth to B. Sira and the Book of Wisdom	34—39
8. Greek language and thought	39—55
NOTES ON SELECT PASSAGES	56—94
A TRANSLATION	95—112
APPENDICES	113—168
I. The Greek version	115—134
II. The Greek text	135—168

KOHELETH.

1. INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. *The Title.*

THE title קהלת (xii. 8 קהלת) occurs seven times in the book¹. In xii. 8 it has the article, and probably also in vii. 27 (M.T. אמרה ק). If the emendation אמר הקהל in the latter passage is correct, the word is definitely shewn to be masculine in all the seven passages. The author, therefore, was a man; and, writing under the guise of Solomon, adopted 'Kohēleth' as a *nom de plume*.

The meaning of the word is somewhat uncertain. In form it is the feminine of the Kal participle of קהל. But of this root no other certain instance of the Kal occurs, though the Niphal and the Hiphil are not uncommon, the former = be summoned [i.e. come together] as an assembly—the latter = summon an assembly, for religious or military purposes.

The versions do not afford much help. Ἐκκλησιαστής, whence Hier. and Engl. 'Ecclesiastes,' is an attempt to represent the derivation of the word from קהל 'an assembly,' while Aq. Pesh. Tg. merely transliterate the Hebrew.

The following are the more probable of the explanations which have been suggested:

1. 'One who summons an assembly.' (Gesenius). But this would probably require the Hiphil קהלת.

2. 'One who speaks in an assembly.' (Hier. *concionator*. Luther *Prediger*. A.V. R.V. 'Preacher.' Midr. Koh. "because his words are spoken in a קהל.") So Driver, *Intr. O.T.* 466. König, *Eintl.* 428. Plumptre 'Debater.'

¹ i. 1, 2, 12, vii. 27, xii. 8, 9, 10.

3. 'A convener, or collector, of sentences' (Grotius, Mendelssohn, illustrating this meaning by reference to xii. 10, 11).

Opinions also differ as to the force intended to be conveyed by the feminine form of the word.

1. The fact that it is nearly always accompanied by a verb in the masculine renders improbable the view that the feminine refers to Wisdom (חכמה), who is represented in Prov. i. 20 f., viii. 1-4, as addressing men in places of assembly (Augustine, Rashi, Ibn Ezra: so Hitzig, Kuenen and others). Moreover the contents of the book as a whole are totally unlike the teaching which is usually put into the mouth of Wisdom in the rest of the Wisdom literature.

2. The use of the masculine of the verb is also opposed to Tyler's suggestion that the name denotes "she who is an assembly"—a personification of assemblies of men.

Two other, more probable, suggestions are:

3. That the feminine has an intensive force, as in Arabic,—'one who completely realises the idea of a קהל' (R.V. mg. 'great orator.' W. Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, § 233, rem. c. C. H. H. Wright, *Ecclesiastes*.)

4. That the feminine indicates a title or designation of office, arising from its use to express abstract conceptions (Ges. K. § 122, 4 b). This may be illustrated by the proper names הַפְּקָרָה and הַקְּרָה Ezra ii. 55, 57. Aram.: קְרִינֹה 'colleagues' Ezra iv. 7. Arab.: *ḥalīfa*, 'allāma. Engl.: 'Excellency,' 'Highness' etc. This is adopted by the majority of modern writers (Driver, Delitzsch, Nowack, Cheyne and others)¹.

The meaning, therefore, of the title Kōheleth probably is 'a (recognised and official) speaker in an assembly'—the assembly, no doubt, being all men who give their hearts to wisdom, and who are metaphorically pictured as sitting at the feet of the wise man.

¹ In the art. 'Ecclesiastes' in *Encycl. Bibl.* the startling suggestion is made that הקהלת is a corruption of הכל הכל i. 2, and was interpolated in i. 12, vii. 27, xii. 8, and adopted by the scribe who prefixed i. 1 and by the writer of the epilogue. The writer of the article proposes, further, to read הקהלת in Prov. xxx. 1.

Renan suggests that קהלת is a cryptogram, perhaps for שלמה, arrived at by some method analogous to 'Athbash' and 'Albam.'

§ 2. *Canonicity.*

For the three-fold division of the Jewish Bible—Torah, N^ebi'im, K^ethubim—various explanations have been offered. A Rabbinic explanation, for instance, given by Moses Maimonides and David Kimchi is that the three divisions represent three grades of inspiration; the Torah was given פה אל פה (mouth to mouth), the N^ebi'im by the רוח הנבואה (spirit of prophecy), and the K^ethubim by the רוח הקדש (spirit of holiness). And other suggestions are noted by Wildeboer (*A.T. Kanon* pp. 14–16). But it is now recognised that the divisions were the result of an historical process by which the books were accepted into the Canon in three groups, i.e. (i) from the end of the exile to Ezra, (ii) from Ezra to the time of the Maccabees, (iii) from the Maccabees till shortly before the time of Christ.

The third division consists of (a) the Psalms, Proverbs and Job—a group that was sometimes quoted by the initial letters written in the inverse order, אבט; (b) the five M^egilloth or Rolls, i.e. Song of Songs, Ruth, Kⁱnoth¹ (or Lamentations), K^oheleth and Esther; (c) Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, and 1, 2 Chronicles². The only books among the K^ethubim that were read in the public services of the Synagogue were the 'five Rolls.' The Song of Songs was read on the 8th day of the Passover, Ruth on the 2nd day of Pentecost, Kⁱnoth on the 9th day of Ab³, K^oheleth on the 3rd day of the Feast of Booths, and Esther on the Feast of Purim.

The date of the reception of K^oheleth into the Canon is far from certain. The book is not alluded to in any canonical writing of the Old Testament. But there can be no doubt that it was known, not only in its primary but in its completed form⁴, to Ben Sira⁵ (c. 180 B.C.), and to the author of Wisdom⁶ (c. 130 B.C.). The use made of it, however, by the former writer proves only its existence—not its canonisation—prior to his date. He was well acquainted, as his work shews, with the literature of his country; but it is impossible to insist that his

¹ Also called 'Ēkah from its opening word.

² For varieties of order and grouping see Ryle, *O.T. Canon*, ch. xii. and Excursus C.

The traditional date of the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans.

⁴ See § 5.

⁵ See § 7.

quotations could have been made only from such writings as were recognised as canonical. And the author of 'Wisdom,' so far from treating *Ḳoheleth* as a sacred writing, seems to aim at confuting the advice contained in it with regard to the enjoyment of life.

There are Talmudic stories which, if true, would prove that *Ḳoheleth* was quoted as authoritative scripture in the 1st century B.C. In *Jer. B'rakoth* vii. 2 it is related: "The king [*Jannaeus*'] said to him [*Simon ben Shetach* the king's brother-in-law] 'Why didst thou mock me by saying that nine hundred sacrifices were required, when half would have been sufficient?' Simon answered 'I mocked thee not; thou hast paid thy share and I mine...as it is written בצל החכמה בצל הכסף' (*Ḳoh.* vii. 12 a).

In *Baba Bathra* 4 a there is an account of Herod after he had put to death the members of the Sanhedrin, and deprived *Baba ben Buṭa* of his sight. It relates that he visited the latter *incognito*, and tried to extort from him some unguarded complaint against his own tyranny. But *Baba b. Buṭa* steadily refused to speak a word against the king. In his answers to Herod he quoted, with the formula "it is written," a passage from the Torah (*Ex.* xxii. 27), and one from the *N^ebi'im* (*Is.* ii. 2); and with the same formula he quoted, from the *K^ethubim*, *Prov.* vi. 23 and the three parts of *Ḳoh.* x. 20².

A third narrative from *Shabbath* 30 b is given at length by *Wright*³, in which *Gamaliel* (flor. 44 A.D.) argues on the subject of the Messianic age with a disciple⁴. That disciple (*אורו תלמיד*) three times opposed the great teacher's arguments with the words אין כל חרש הזה השמש (*Ḳoh.* i. 9), each time with 'as it is written.'

If these stories could be accepted as they stand, *Simon b. Shetach* would afford a fixed *terminus ad quem* for the canonicity of *Ḳoheleth*. But since it is impossible to determine what is history in the Talmud, and what legend, the only certain deduction is that the Talmudic compilers accepted as genuine the tradition that *Ḳoheleth* had been quoted as Scripture in the century before Christ.

¹ *Jannaeus* reigned 105-79 B.C.

² See *Wright*, *Ecclesiastes* pp. 19 f.

³ pp. 23 f.

⁴ *Bloch* maintains that this is none other than *S. Paul*.

Little, in fact, can be gathered from verbal quotations¹.

Nor can much help be obtained from pre-Christian evidence other than that of direct quotation.

1. In the often quoted prologue to Ecclesiasticus, B. Sira's grandson clearly recognised a third division of Hebrew writings after the Law and the Prophets. But it is impossible to say with certainty that he included *Ḳoheleth* in this third division, or (if he did) to what extent he considered it as strictly canonical.

2. The 'Septuagint' translation adds no evidence at all. The prologue to Ecclesiasticus shews that some books in the group of the *K^ethubim* had been translated before 132 B.C. But the translation of a book proves nothing as to the date of its canonisation. Indeed, if the theory maintained below² is correct—that the extant Greek version of *Ḳoheleth* is (so far as the true text is attainable) from the pen of Aquila—it is uncertain whether there was a Greek version of it before his time.

3. Philo's evidence is only *e silentio*, and is precarious. He makes no reference to Ezekiel, Daniel, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations and *Ḳoheleth*. If Ezekiel were not in this list, it might be argued with probability that Philo did not quote from the *K^ethubim* because he did not recognise them as canonical³. But seeing that Ezekiel was canonical more than a century and a half before his time, his lack of reference to it invalidates any argument drawn from his non-use of the *K^ethubim*.

¹ There are no verbal quotations from *Ḳoh.* in the N.T., though it is not impossible that S. Paul shews reminiscences of its language.

Compare i. 2 etc. with Rom. viii. 20; xii. 14 with Rom. ii. 16, 2 Cor. v. 10; xii. 3, 5 with 2 Cor. v. 1. See Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, Add. notes pp. 159 f.

But no stress can be laid on the silence of the N.T. Ezra and Nehemiah are not quoted, but they were probably coupled with Chronicles which is. Obadiah and Nahum shew no influence on N.T. writers, because they were short and dealt with special circumstances of the moment; and Esther, Song of Songs and *Ḳoheleth* were scarcely of such a nature as to supply matter for quotation. (In Eph. v. 27 S. Paul may have been thinking of Song of Songs iv. 7: *ἄλλη καλή ἐστὶ πλεονάζουσα μου, καὶ ἡμῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν σοί.*)

² Appendix i.

³ The passage in the *De Vita contemplativa* § 3, which clearly speaks of the three divisions of the Hebrew books, is of very doubtful genuineness.

Although there are no quotations from *Ḳoheleth* in the New Testament, yet it is here that evidence is first forthcoming which is probably trustworthy. The passages which suggest that the tripartite division of the Hebrew books was recognised, afford, it is true, no clearer evidence as to the contents of the Canon than does the prologue to *Ecclesiasticus*¹. But a stronger argument can be drawn from the phrases and titles used in reference to the Old Testament, which convey a strong feeling that the Canon was thought of as a complete whole; e.g. ἡ γραφή occurs in John x. 35, xix. 36, xx. 9, 2 Pet. i. 20. In the first of these, reference is made to a passage in the Psalms which, in the preceding words, is also spoken of as ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν and ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. The second passage is, perhaps, not to the point, since the following verse shews that γραφή may have the meaning of 'a passage in writing,' cf. 1 Pet. ii. 6. In the third, the word implies Old Testament prophecies in general. And in the last, the writer distinctly speaks of a well-defined body of "prophecies which stand in writing" (πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς) for which he claims divine inspiration. And other phrases such as αἱ γραφαὶ Mat. xxii. 29, Acts xviii. 24, γραφαὶ ἁγίαι Rom. i. 2², ἱερὰ γράμματα 2 Tim. iii. 15 (cf. v. 16 πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος), all convey the same impression, that 'Scripture' meant to the Apostolic writers the same body of Old Testament writings that it means to us.

Two further references in the New Testament call for notice. Daniel, the latest book in the Jewish Canon, is expressly quoted by Jesus as an apparently authoritative writing (Mat. xxiv. 15). And His allusion to the death of Zacharias (Mat. xxiii. 35, Luke xi. 51) is usually understood to imply that the book of Chronicles was the last in order in the complete canonical collection. Wildeboer's objection to this is not conclusive. He points out that very few persons, or even synagogues, were rich enough to possess the whole collection, and that in any case the books would be written on separate rolls. And he says that even if Jesus, as the later Jews, held Chronicles to stand last in the order of Old Testament books, Mat. xxiii. 35 affords no evidence as to which books were included at that

¹ See especially Luke xxiv. 44; also Mat. xxii. 40, John vi. 45, Acts vii. 42, xiii. 40, xxvi. 22, xxviii. 23.

² See Sanday and Headlam *in loc.*

time in the third division of which Chronicles formed the close. But the fact that among a number of separate rolls Chronicles was universally reckoned as the last in order, surely goes to shew that the number of the rolls had become a fixed quantity. Wildeboer adds that it is much more probable that the Lord was thinking of the historical books in a narrower sense which excluded Jeremiah. But how could the hearers of Jesus be expected to understand that he was thinking of the 'historical books' which were never reckoned as a distinct group, when the martyrdom of Urijah (Jer. xxvi. 23), which was chronologically later than that of Zacharias, would be well known to all¹?

It seems highly probable, therefore, that all the K^thubim had obtained some sort of recognition by the beginning of the 1st century B.C., and that the three divisions of the Hebrew books were looked upon as one complete body of sacred writings by the beginning of the Christian era. Indeed, as Ryle points out (pp. 174 ff.), it is scarcely conceivable that any new book could have been introduced into the canon during the century in which the nation was divided into the opposite factions of the Pharisees and Sadducees, or during the period in which the great Rabbinic schools of Hillel and Shammai took their rise. "The Doctors whose glory it was 'to make a fence round the law' were not likely to advocate the introduction of fresh writings within the limits of the Canon; nor, if one were bold enough to advise such a step, would he have escaped vehement attacks from rival teachers."

If this conclusion be correct, and K^oheleth had won its acceptance as canonical by c. 100 B.C., it is unnecessary to dwell on the evidence that is available at the close of the 1st century A.D.² 4 Esdras (c. 90 A.D.) and Josephus (c. 100 A.D.) both shew conclusively that K^oheleth had been accepted as canonical before their date. The former (according to the

¹ Wildeboer's statement (p. 47) that "a number of reminiscences and citations from apocryphal writings prove that the N.T. writers acknowledged no canon of the O.T. which corresponds with ours" is tantamount to saying that no N.T. writers were capable of quoting anything but their Bible! They did not use extra-canonical works for the purpose of establishing doctrines; but there is no reason why they should not have used them for purposes of illustration. (See Ryle pp. 153 f.)

² See Ryle (pp. 156-166), and Wildeboer (pp. 37-43).

most probable reading) reckons the sacred books as 24, which is the number borne out by the Talmudic title "the four-and-twenty holy writings" (Jer. Sanh. x. 1). The latter reckons them as 22, Ruth and Lamentations being combined with Judges and Jeremiah respectively. This numbering is also found in Melito's canon (Eus. *H. E.* iv. 26), and in that of Origen (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25).

The official Jewish pronouncement with regard to the Canon was made at, or about the time of, the Synod of Jamnia (Jabne) c. 100 A.D. Some discussion preceded the final agreement, of which the clearest account for English readers is given in Wright's *Ecclesiastes*, Excursus II. The discussion turned on the question whether *Ḳoheleth* did, or did not, "defile the hands." This expression is explained in *Shabbath* 14 a. Copies of the Scriptures had been kept in the same place as the heave-offerings, and some had been thereby injured. As a precaution against this danger in future, the Scriptures were pronounced 'unclean,' i.e. unfit to be included among the offerings to the priests. The principal Talmudic passages which refer to the discussion are *Yadaim* iii. 5, *Eduyoth* v. 3, *Megillah* 7 a¹. The synod was apparently convinced by R. Simon ben 'Azzai, who stated that he had "received by tradition from the mouth of the seventy-two elders in the day when they inducted R. Eliezer b. 'Azariah into the seat of patriarch, that the Song of Songs and *Ḳoheleth* defile the hands." The books under dispute were *Ḳoheleth*, Song of Songs and Esther. And a final decision was arrived at—not that these books were henceforth to be included among the canonical books, but—that those who had for many years received them as canonical had been right in so doing.

§ 3. *The circumstances of the writer.*

A writer in the *Spectator*² has aptly styled the book of *Ḳoheleth* "A Hebrew *Journal intime*." The fascination of it arises from the fact that it advances no theories; it is not a thesis or a study, it is not a sermon or a collection of moral aphorisms. It is the outpouring of the mind of a rich Jew, who

¹ See S. Schiffer, *Das Buch Kohelet, nach der Auffassung der Weisen des Talmud und Midrasch*, Theil i. pp. 1-10.

² Feb. 28, 1903.

has seen much of the sad side of life, and who is intensely in earnest. But while he reveals his mind and character, he tells little of his personal circumstances¹. He states that he was wealthy, and able to provide for himself every possible luxury (ii. 4-10). He seems to have lived in or near Jerusalem², for he clearly implies that he was an eyewitness of facts which occurred at the "holy place" (viii. 10). He must have been an old man at the time of writing; not only because his language seems to have lost the buoyancy of youth (for that is a point on which different students of his book might think, and have thought, differently), but because his feverish attempts (i. 12-ii. 11) to find the *summum bonum* of life in pleasure, and in wisdom, cannot have been abandoned in a few years, while they were now far enough in the past to be looked at as by-gone memories. He had had experience not only of youth but also of manhood's prime, שְׁרִירֹת³ (xi. 10). And apparently he had lived long enough to find himself alone in the world, without son or brother (iv. 8: the following words seem to shew that he is referring to himself). Lastly, he had had private sorrows and disappointments. Here and there—"one of a thousand"—he might find "a man," but he had never found a woman who was worthy of her name;—which probably means (to translate his bitter generalisation into facts) that his life had been saddened by a woman, who had been "more bitter than death," whose heart had been "snares and nets, and her hands fetters" (vii. 26-28).

This is all that can be gathered with any certainty. But it is not unreasonable to suppose that his great wealth might place him in some official position in the country. Winckler⁴ suggests

¹ Plumptre, *Eccles.* pp. 35-52, draws an elaborate, but purely fanciful, biography, which is severely criticised by Bois, *Origines de la Philosophie Judéo-Alexandrine* pp. 83-108.

² The reference to the corn trade (xi. 1), as an illustration of a busy and energetic path of life, does not necessarily point to Alexandria as the place of writing. The mention of the temple and the priesthood (iv. 17, v. 5, E.V. v. 1, 6) appears to be the work of another writer, who also lived at Jerusalem. See § 5.

³ i.e. the age of black hairs, as opposed to שֵׁיבָה the age of grey hairs.

⁴ *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 2nd series, pp. 143-159. The expression in i. 12 "king over Israel in Jerusalem" cannot indicate this official position, for the guise of Solomon is not dropped till ii. 12. See, however, note on i. 16—"all that were before me over Jerusalem."

that he was either king or high-priest, for his writing was so unorthodox that nothing but his high station could have enabled him to disregard public opinion. It is very improbable that he was in any sense a king, in view of the scathing criticisms which he passes on the government. But if he was a member of a high-priestly family, and perhaps himself a religious official, it is easier to account for the zealous care with which his work was annotated, and made more acceptable in religious circles¹. And it is just possible that the feminine form of the pseudonym *Ḳoheleth* points in the same direction².

But if *Ḳoheleth* does not reveal much of his personal surroundings, he paints a lurid picture of the state of his country. Wickedness usurped the place of judgment and righteousness (iii. 16); and, in consequence, the powerful classes who had the law in their hands crushed the common people with an oppression from which there was no escape (iv. 1). And this perversion of justice was due to the irresponsible officialism under which the country groaned; an inferior official was under the thumb of a higher one, and he under a higher still; none of them could make any move in the cause of justice, for the highest of them was a creature of the tyrannous king (v. 7). The king raised slaves and common people, at his caprice, to high positions, while the rich and noble might be degraded (x. 5-7); he was despotic (viii. 2a, 4), and when he was in an angry mood the only prudent course was to pacify him by yielding to his wishes (x. 4). The reason for this tyranny lay in the fact that the king was "a child"—far too young for his responsible position—and his courtiers spent their days in drunken revelry (x. 16). *Ḳoheleth* sadly contrasts the unhappy state of his country with the prosperity that it might enjoy under a good ruler (x. 17). With a young and tyrannous king and corrupt officials, espionage was rife; a word spoken secretly in the bedchamber, nay even a thought, would reach the king's ears through unknown channels (x. 20).

In addition to this general description of the state of the country, two passages must be noticed which appear to contain allusions to contemporary history—(a) iv. 13-16, (b) ix. 13-15³.

¹ See § 5.

² See § 1.

³ viii. 10 has also been usually understood to refer to an historical event. But this is improbable. See note *in loc*.

(a) iv. 13-16. This passage has been variously translated, and the interpretations of it are numerous (see notes), but the following is the simplest rendering and explanation that the words will bear:

v. 13. "Better is a poor and wise youth than an old and foolish king who knew not how to be admonished any more." The perfect וַיִּשְׁמַע shews that Kōheleth is thinking of a king who lived before the time of which he writes, and who, in his old age, would no longer listen to advice.

In v. 14 he substantiates the truth of the two adjectives 'poor' and 'wise.' The youth shewed himself wise—that is clever—"because from the house of prisoners he emerged to be king"; and his previous poverty was well known—"because even in his kingdom [i.e. in the very kingdom that was afterwards his] he was born poor [or perhaps 'became poor']."

In v. 15 Kōheleth, by means of the imperfect עָמַד, places himself in memory at the moment when another youth was joined by multitudes and was about to oust the 'poor and wise youth' from his throne. "I saw all the living who walked under the sun with *the second youth* who was to rise up in his place."

v. 16. But the emptiness of this world's strivings was illustrated by the fact that even this second youth did not long retain his popularity. "There was no end to all the people—to all before whom he was [i.e. at whose head he had placed himself]: moreover those who come after would not rejoice (יִשְׂמְחוּ) in him; surely this also is vanity and a striving after wind."

Attempts have been made to use this historical reference as an evidence for the date of the writing. The alternation of tenses certainly shews that the events were contemporary with Kōheleth. But unfortunately there is no historical period which can be selected to suit all the facts. Delitzsch confidently refers the poor and wise youth to Cyrus, who dispossessed the old Median king Astyages, and who had been in confinement in Persia. But his explanation forces him to treat the passage as though it spoke of one youth only, and thereby to give an unnatural meaning to הַיּוֹלֵךְ הַשֵּׁנִי. Hitzig prefers the period of the Ptolemies¹, and sees in the old and foolish king the High

¹ Nowak, in his revised edition of Hitzig, is inclined to revert to the Persian period.

Priest Onias under Ptolemy Euergetes, and in the poor and wise youth Joseph the son of Tobias who usurped Onias' position in the state. But the same objection applies to this explanation as to the former, that it treats of only one youth instead of two. Moreover it is very doubtful if a High Priest could have been called King at that early date; Aristobulus I. was the first who is known to have assumed the title.

Winckler, again, refers to events in Maccabean times. The old and foolish king is Antiochus IV. Epiphanes; and the expression "who no longer knows how to be admonished" is explained by his obstinate and wayward policy against Judaism. At the time of his death in his Parthian expedition his son Antiochus V. was a minor and Lysias usurped the guardianship. But a youth Demetrius, a son of Seleucus (the brother and predecessor of Antiochus Epiphanes), who was at Rome as a hostage, contrived to escape. He had frequently sought permission from the senate to return home and claim his rights; but though there was no further reason for retaining him as a hostage when his uncle had taken the government, they had refused to release him. He landed at Tripolis, and soon afterwards Lysias and the boy Antiochus fell into his hands (B.C. 162). He thus "came out of prison to become king." His rule, however, lasted scarcely ten years, when "the second youth," Alexander Balas, "rose up in his place," and was courted by nearly everyone.

This is ingenious, and rightly takes account of two youths. But firstly, one detained as a hostage at Rome could hardly be described as being in a 'prison-house'; secondly, there is nothing to shew that Demetrius, the son of a former king, had been 'born poor'; thirdly, Koheleth is alluded to by B. Sira, which makes it impossible to bring down his date below 152, as Winckler's theory requires¹.

(b) ix. 13-15. A different rendering of the words is here offered to that which has usually been given. Commentators have generally treated the passage on the supposition that the poor wise man delivered the little city. But is it not a contradiction to say "he delivered the city by his wisdom," and

¹ Graetz, in the face of still more abundant evidence, places the book in the time of Herod the Great, and finds in the career of that king illustrations of this and other passages.

then "wisdom is better than strength, but the poor man's wisdom is despised, and his words *are not heard*"? Granted that the latter statement is a generalising complaint, it is still a deduction from the particular event. And if the poor man really delivered the city by his wisdom, his wisdom was not despised and his words were heard. It is better to render וְכִלְמָתוֹ "and he would have delivered"—an apodosis of a conditional sentence with the protasis suppressed¹. The poor wise man was in the city, and he suggested wise means of defence, but he was disregarded and his wisdom despised². The passage thus refers, not to the raising of a siege, but to the capture of a small town because the few men in it would not listen to the advice of a poor wise man. If this is so, it is useless to try to determine the particular event, though the circumstances may have been well known to Koheleth's readers.

It is, of course, very probable that if a more detailed knowledge were possible of the circumstances of his time, a large number of Koheleth's statements and complaints would receive illustration—such, for instance, as v. 7, 8, vi. 3, x. 5-7. But as it is, they can be regarded only as side-lights on his troublous life.

§ 4. *An outline of Koheleth's thoughts.*

If this *Journal intime* follows, in their true sequence, the successive phases of thought through which the writer travelled, he is shewn to be very similar to a large number of the thinkers of to-day. For, whatever his early life may have been, it was Nature that first made him think. He was sobered and saddened by the riddle of Nature without her key—the unceasing monotony of change which has no apparent aim or result. With what object does generation succeed generation, and the sun rise and set—only to rise again, and the wind go "circling circling," and the rivers run into the sea which is never full? There is nothing satisfying for the eye to see or the ear to hear; there is nothing new under the sun; the generations that come and go are, each in turn, forgotten by the generations which follow in the endless chain (i. 3-11).

¹ Cf. Ex. ix. 15, 1 Sam. xiii. 13.

² וְכִלְמָתוֹ occurs in v. 19 with somewhat the same force—'take notice of,' 'have regard to.' See also Nah. ii. 6, וְכִלְמָתוֹ אֲדִירָיו.

And this trouble of heart made him ponder over the two great questions—What is life? and What does life lead to? Being a man of means and leisure he had ample opportunities for any investigations, and he used them to the full. He set himself by wisdom to gather as wide an experience as possible of men and things. And he found that there were unalterable wrongs in the world, crooked things which could not be made straight—defects which could not be supplied. The more he learnt, the more wrongs he discovered. In much wisdom was much grief, and increase of knowledge meant increase of sorrow (i. 12–18).

So he adopted a different course. He surrounded himself with all the luxury and elegance of which the times were capable; whatever his eyes desired he kept not from them; he withheld not his heart from any joy (ii. 1–10). And before long he was prepared with an answer to the first question—an answer which sounds through his book at intervals like the clang of a knell—“An empty vapour, a striving after wind” (ii. 11). But it is important to observe what this means to him. It does not mean that the refinements and interests which wealth afforded gave him no pleasure; he distinctly states (ii. 10) that his heart rejoiced in all his labour. He describes his attitude, to these things very clearly in ii. 3, 9. He gave himself up to luxury and frivolity (*v.* 3), and magnificence (*v.* 9), not for the purpose of mere enjoyment but by way of a careful experiment—“my heart still acting with its customary wisdom”¹—“also my wisdom stood firmly by me.” The experiment was for the purpose of finding something that could prove a permanent satisfaction and profit for mankind “throughout the number of the days of his life.” He does not for a moment deny that, intrinsically, wisdom excels folly as light excels darkness (ii. 13); but—and here he approaches the answer to the second question—one event, one chance or mischance, happens to the wise man and the fool alike (ii. 15, 16). On these two answers he rings the changes throughout the book: Life is a profitless vapour; Life ends, for every living creature, in a return to dust.

Before following his detailed complaints of the wrongs of life, it is well to understand his attitude towards religion. The Divine Name JHVH occurs nowhere in his pages, while

¹ See note on *v.* 3.

he uses the title *Elohim* twenty times, in sixteen of which the word has the definite article¹. In all these he speaks of what God *does*—of His government of the world, never of what He *is*, or of man's attitude towards Him. 'The Deity' is to him 'Nature,' the sum-total of the irresistible and inscrutable forces which govern the world. But at the same time he has not quite lost his Semitic belief that God is more than Nature, for His action shews evidence of design. He not only made everything excellent in its time, but He has so arranged that no man can understand or discover the true inwardness of His work (iii. 11, viii. 17, xi. 5). He seems to work with the purpose of shewing men that they are mere beasts (iii. 18), and of preventing them from gaining the slightest glimpse into the future (iii. 22, vi. 12 b, vii. 14). Moreover God's work—the course of Nature—appears in the form of an endless cycle. Events and phenomena are brought upon the stage of life, and banished into the past, only to be recalled and banished again (i. 4–11, iii. 15). And this, for Koheleth, paralyses all real effort; for no amount of labour and travail can produce anything new, or of real profit—no one can add to, or subtract from, the unswerving chain of facts (i. 15, iii. 1–9, 14 a, vii. 13); no one can contend with Him that is mightier than he (vi. 10).

And when Koheleth looks out upon the world he sees that this work of the Deity—this course of Nature—which cannot be fathomed or altered, involves a mass of human misery. It is not only that the righteous often suffer, while the wicked prosper (vii. 15, viii. 14). The whole race of men suffers from an evil sickness, sorrow and trouble, vain labour and disappointment. His mournful observations are not noted in any logical order; he puts them down as they occur to him. And they are mainly valuable from the picture which they give of the writer himself. He has often been called a pessimist; but that is a misnomer, because he has an intense conviction that mankind ought to be, and could be, better, if circumstances were more favourable. His sadness would not be so deep if his estimation of the potentialities of goodness in man were less high. He sees "through a mirror in a riddle," and when he imagines that "that which is crooked" (as seen in the blurred mirror)

¹ i. 13, ii. 24, iii. 10, 11, 13, 14 a, 15, v. 17, 18 *bis*, 19, vi. 2 *bis*, vii. 13, 14, viii. 15, 17, ix. 1, 7, xi. 5. On the other passages in which the title occurs see § 5.

“cannot be made straight,” it is because the compensating thought “then face to face” was impossible for him. And he gains no relief from the expectation of Messianic peace and perfection, which animated the religious mind of the orthodox Jew. Generations had gone by since the prophets had foretold it, and every day the conception of an ideal Israel became more chimerical. There are left him only the shreds of the religious convictions of his fathers, with a species of ‘natural religion’ which has fatalism and altruism among its ingredients.

The section i.-ii. 11, the contents of which have been noticed above, forms a kind of exordium to the book, in which *Ḳoheleth* writes under the guise of Solomon. Solomon had been famous for three things—his study of nature, his wisdom, and his wealthy magnificence. Each of these in turn *Ḳoheleth* claimed for himself, shewing that he was better fitted than most men to pronounce on the two questions—What is life? and What does life lead to? But in ii. 12 he expressly threw aside his Solomonic impersonation¹, and “turned himself” to behold the wisdom and the folly displayed in the whole arena of human life. He proceeds, throughout the rest of the book, to draw a series of pictures illustrating the troubles of men, which may be briefly summarised²:

ii. 13-17. Although wisdom excels folly, fools and wise men die alike, “and why was I then more wise?” In the days to come all are alike forgotten.

ii. 18-21. He who gathers wealth by prudent labour must leave it to another, who has not laboured for it, and who may—for all he knows—be a fool.

ii. 22, 23. A man’s labour fills his nights as well as days with harassing care.

iii. 1-9. All human action is tied by inexorable decree; so that there is no profit to a worker from his labour.

iii. 10, 11. God has given men, by the very nature with which they are endowed, a longing to understand His work, and yet He has not given them the ability to do so.

¹ According to the most probable interpretation of the verse: “what is the man [i.e. what can the man do] that cometh after the king? That which he [the king] hath already done.” (See note *in loc.*)

² All the verses, or parts of verses, which are not cited in this chapter appear to be due to other writers, and are discussed in the following chapter.

iii. 14 a b, 15. God's work is eternal and unalterable, and appears as an unchanging cycle of phenomena.

iii. 16, 18-21. Wickedness and iniquity usurp the place of justice and righteousness. God allows it to shew men that they are but beasts, and will die as the beasts die. And whether there will be the slightest difference between the spirit of man and of beast who knoweth?

iv. 1-3. The weak are oppressed; but their tears avail nothing, for the oppressors have power on their side. This is such a terrible evil that the dead, and still more the unborn, are happier than the living¹.

iv. 4, 6. Successful work makes a man an object of jealousy. Peaceful poverty is better than troubled and profitless wealth.

iv. 7, 8. There is a man that works in mournful solitude, with no one to share his riches. "For whom then do I labour, and deprive my soul of good?"

iv. 13-16. The emptiness of this world's strivings is shewn by a bitter glance at contemporary history.

v. 7, 8. Marvel not at oppression and injustice, when the government is what it is. What a splendid advantage it would be to the country to have a good king!

v. 9-16. Wealth cannot satisfy its possessor, for other people "eat it." The labourer can sleep, but the pampered rich man cannot. Wealth is often kept by the owner to his own hurt; or it perishes and his son is left in poverty. Moreover the owner, when he dies, departs as destitute of his riches as a naked new-born infant, after a life spent in sorrow and trouble.

vi. 1, 2. A man has abundance of wealth, possessions and honour, but he must leave it all to a stranger.

vi. 3-5. A man who has been blessed with a large family, and a long life, and has nevertheless gained no pleasure and dies unhonoured, is in worse case than an untimely birth.

vi. 6, 8. Nay, though he has lived a thousand years twice told, yet he has seen no real good in life. Do not all go to one place? For what advantage has a wise man over a fool, or a poor man who has got on in the world by knowing how to walk prudently and successfully before his fellow-men?

¹ This is an outburst of pity which need not be pressed as a contradiction of such a passage as ix. 4-6, where Kōh. clings to life with the natural grip of one who has no certainty with regard to a future state.

vi. 10-12. Everything that exists was named [i.e. its nature and its place in the universe were fixed and determined] already; it was similarly known [i.e. determined] what man was to be; and he cannot strive against a mightier than he. Since there is a great deal of talking and arguing that only serves to multiply the emptiness of life, what advantage can man gain? For no one can tell him the two things that he wants to know—what is the *summum bonum* of this life, and what will happen to him after this life.

vii. 1 b-3. The day of death is better than the day of birth¹; it is better to take part in a funeral than in festivities, because it reminds men that that is what they all must come to. Sorrow is better than laughter, for a sad countenance is fitting and gratifying to the miserable heart.

vii. 13, 14. God's work is unalterable, even to make crooked things straight. In the day of prosperity enjoy thyself, and in the day of adversity consider; God has given both, in order that man may draw no conclusions as to what will happen in the future.

vii. 15-18 a, 20. The righteous man often perishes in his righteousness, while the wicked man prolongs his days in wickedness. Why, then, spoil your life by being over-righteous or over-wise? At the same time do not bring destruction upon yourself by being over-wicked and foolish. Maintain the comfortable mean between the two, for no righteous man on earth is perfectly good.

vii. 21, 22. And because you cannot always be perfectly good, be judiciously deaf sometimes, lest you hear your servant curse you; for you know that you have sometimes cursed others.

vii. 23-26 a, 27, 28. When I determined to be wise, I found that wisdom was far from me, and unfathomably deep. In my general search after knowledge and the truth of things, I found one thing—the terrible snares of a wicked and designing woman. All my calculations led only to the result that one man in a thousand, and not one woman, was worthy of the name.

viii. 2 a, 3 b, 4. Obey the king, for he is a despot who does whatever pleases him.

¹ See § 5, p. 22, and note *in loc.*

viii. 6 b, 7, 8. The misery of man is great upon him¹, because man cannot know anything about the future. A man can no more hold back the day of death than he can hold back the wind; and there is no granting of leave to depart from the battle.

viii. 9. Sometimes a man has power over another to his hurt.

viii. 10. I have seen the wicked receiving honourable sepulture, who had lived in the holy place; and they used to be courted and flattered in the city because of their wrong-doing.

viii. 14. The wicked get what the righteous deserve, and *vice versâ*.

viii. 16, 17. When I tried to examine all the work of God upon earth—the ceaseless activity of One who sleeps not day or night—I found that no amount of labour or wisdom could discover it.

ix. 1. The righteous and the wise and their works are absolutely in God's hand; man has no idea whether God will deal with him in the future as though He loved, or hated, him. Everything in the future is an empty vapour²;

ix. 2-6. because the righteous and the wicked, the religious and the irreligious, come to the same end—an evil which exists throughout everything under the sun. Men are full of wickedness and mad folly while they live, and then—"to the dead!" But when all is said, to be alive under any circumstances is better than to be dead; for the living have at least the mournful privilege of knowing that they will die, while the dead know nothing; they can earn no more reward by labour; they are forgotten; every kind of feeling ceases; they no longer have part or parcel in anything that is done under the sun.

ix. 11, 12. The swift, the strong, the wise, the clever, the skilful, do not get the success which they deserve; time and chance come to all alike; men are suddenly ensnared in an evil time like fish or birds.

ix. 13-16. An historical instance of a wise man who did not get the success which he deserved.

¹ It is exceedingly difficult to explain this passage except on the supposition that Koheleth's words have been altered by the introduction of other matter. (See § 5, p. 26.)

² Reading: הכל לפניהם: הכל וג' for הכל לפניהם הבל. See Appendix II. p. 149.

x. 4. If a ruler is angry with you, do not leave your place in a rage.

x. 5-7. The caprice of the ruler often exalts fools and slaves to places of dignity, while the rich and noble are degraded.

[x. 14. The fool talks a great deal. Man can have no knowledge of the future'.]

x. 16, 17. The misery of a land whose king is a child, and whose princes are drunken revellers, spending their very mornings in feasting. The happiness of a land whose king is of noble birth and bearing, and whose princes feast at the right time, without drunkenness.

x. 20. The espionage which makes a secret word, or even thought, dangerous.

Such is Koheleth's survey of life. But it is impossible, in a summary, to convey his suppressed passion, the yearning for light, the pity and indignation, the bitter reaction of thought after each fresh outlook, the vain struggles against the cramping fetters by which man is tied to the present.

It remains to notice the conclusion at which he arrives. Since the work of the Deity is inscrutable from beginning to end, and no one has any idea of what the future contains, or whether after this life there is any future for man at all, and since His work is absolutely unalterable, and since, finally, His work involves or allows universal wrong and misery—man can come to no conclusion about life; he can aim at nothing, guide himself by nothing. The only course open to him is to make the most of the present. To this Koheleth returns whenever he finds that the troubles or mysteries of life are beyond his power to solve: ii. 24, 25, iii. 12, 13, 22, v. 17-19, viii. 15, ix. 7-10, xi. 1-10 (exc. 9 b), xii. 1 b-7. It is not a solution of his difficulties; it is far from being a philosophy, or a theory of life. It is a mere *modus vivendi*—a contrivance allowed him by God "whereby he shall not much remember the

¹ This verse has been included, with much hesitation, among the words of Koheleth, on account of the characteristic expressions "man knoweth not...etc." If the words are his, they may have been placed here because the first clause "the fool multiplies words" is similar in thought to the *m'shalim* in *vv.* 12, 13. But the first clause is entirely unconnected with the two which follow; and the verse interrupts the series of complaints against the government with which Koheleth closes his review of the troubles of life.

days of his life" (v. 19). In ix. 10, xi. 1-6 the thought of industry predominates, and in the rest of the above passages the thought of pleasure. But both are commended because life is a vapour which will soon vanish in the murky "days of darkness."

§ 5. *The integrity of the book.*

A. The picture of his own mind which Kōheleth unconsciously draws—his well-nigh dead faith in the God of his fathers, and blind gropings after truth, combined with his pity for suffering men, and despairing indignation at human wrongs—has fascinated thinkers in all subsequent ages.

But that which attracts also repels. Kōheleth's words were so entirely at variance with orthodox Jewish thought, that many were afraid of the book. They shrank from its bold expression of facts all the more timidly because the facts were only too true to experience. And they held up in opposition to it the time-worn utterances of orthodox belief. An instance of this has survived in the Book of Wisdom, in which the writer clearly combats some of Kōheleth's sayings; and as late as the close of the 1st century A.D., doubts were entertained in rabbinic circles as to the advisability of retaining the book in the Canon. It seems probable that it would have been thrust out of sight as altogether heretical, had it not been for the action of an unknown admirer, who 'edited' it, and commended it to the public. He emphasised the Solomonic authorship; the statement in i. 12, "I, Kōheleth, was king over Israel in Jerusalem," enabled him to prefix i. 1, "The words of Kōheleth, *the son of David*, king in Jerusalem." He then summed up the burden of the book in i. 2, xii. 8, speaking editorially of Kōheleth in the third person, and using the strengthened expression "Vanity of vanities," which occurs nowhere in the body of the book. Finally, he added a postscript, xii. 9, 10 (again referring to the writer in the third person), enlarging upon the value and wisdom of Kōheleth-Solomon's proverbial maxims and words of truth by which he taught the people.

was parallel to that of the three following aphorisms of Kōheleth. The play on the words שֵׁן and שָׁן may be compared with הַסִּירִים and הַסִּיר in the next insertion of the 'wise man.'

vii. 4-6. The frivolous laughter and merriment of fools contrasted, in three *m'shalim*, with the conduct of the wise¹. Inserted as an enlargement upon the thought of *vv.* 1 b-3. But the spirit of these *m'shalim* is quite different to Kōheleth's bitterness when he states that sorrow is more fitting than merriment to the miserable heart of man.

vii. 7. "For oppression maketh a wise man mad, and a gift destroyeth the heart." The כִּי has no connexion with what precedes, and shews that the *mashal* was taken from some other source.

vii. 8, 9. Two *m'shalim* on angry quarrelling and fretfulness.

vii. 10. *Mashal* on discontent.

vii. 11, 12. Two *m'shalim* on wisdom and its value. Notice that the thought of 11 b, 12 b is opposed to Kōheleth's conclusion that wisdom can bring no real advantage to its possessors (see ii. 14-16, vi. 8).

vii. 19. *Mashal* on wisdom. This, with 18 b (see below), interrupts the connexion of *v.* 20 with *vv.* 16-18 a.

viii. 1. *Mashal* on wisdom, irrelevant to the context.

ix. 17-x. 3. Five *m'shalim* on wisdom and folly, evidently suggested by Kōheleth's apologue of the poor man whose wisdom was despised.

x. 8-11. Four *m'shalim* which teach that men must suffer the results of their own actions or negligence. There is not the slightest traceable connexion with the preceding words of Kōheleth.

x. 12-15. Four *m'shalim* on fools and their talk. [*v.* 14 may possibly be a remark of Kōheleth. See § 4.]

x. 18. *Mashal* on slothfulness; arising out of Kōheleth's description of nobles feasting in the morning.

x. 19. *Mashal* on the value of money compared with that of feasting.

Having inserted these scattered proverbs into the body of the book, the 'wise man' added at the end a postscript of his own (xii. 11, 12), describing the value of the words of the wise,

¹ וגם זה הבל a gloss. See note on the following page.

which are thrown into the form of short pithy remarks, and are like goads and nails; they are grouped into collections, but proceed ultimately from 'one shepherd,' i.e. Solomon. It is better to learn from these, than to wade through the multitude of books which are constantly being written.

C. These maxims of worldly wisdom, though thoroughly in accord with the religious thought of the time, were not, in any strict sense, religious. They helped to bear out the superscription and the postscript which *Ḳoheleth's* editor, or 'advertiser,' had prefixed to his work; and thus, in supporting the claim to Solomonic authorship, they were of use in preserving the book from oblivion. But far more was needed if it was to be safely used by the orthodox. It must be made to give explicit statements which should fall into line with the accepted tenets of religion. This was done by a pious Jew—one of the *H^asidim* whose spirit afterwards appeared in the Maccabees. He moves in a calm untroubled path of religious conviction, far removed from *Ḳoheleth's* stormy broodings. All the additions which he makes to the book centre round two chief thoughts: (1) the paramount duty of fearing and pleasing God, and (2) the certainty of God's judgment on those who do not fear and please Him. The portions which appear to be due to him are seldom complete in themselves; they are tacked on to *Ḳoheleth's* remarks, sometimes separating clauses that were clearly intended to be joined. In every case but one, they are in direct opposition to *Ḳoheleth's* spirit, if not to his actual words.

ii. 26 a b. *Ḳoheleth* has just fallen back, for the first time, on the statement that there is nothing better for man than to enjoy the present. God allows it, and *Ḳoheleth* himself ought to know, for no one has had a better opportunity of judging than he (24f.). But the *Hasid* strongly objects to this conclusion, and inserts the orthodox remark that God's gift of wisdom and knowledge and enjoyment is a reward of piety; but the sinner is allowed the labour of heaping up riches, only that he may give them to the pious¹.

¹ The addition *וְרַעוּת רַוַּח הַבַּל וְרַעוּת רַוַּח הַבַּל* must be a later gloss. It is meaningless in connexion with the words either of *Ḳoheleth* or of the *Hasid*. This, and the similar addition in vii. 6, appear to be the only instances of glosses introduced after the book had been completed in its triple form.

iii. 14 b. *Qoheleth* is brooding over the eternal and unalterable work of God (14 a), as it shews itself in the cycle of phenomena (15). The *Hasid* feels no difficulty in it. Between the two halves of *Qoheleth's* complaint he inserts the stern dictum "and God hath wrought that men may fear before Him."

iii. 17. *Qoheleth* complains that wickedness usurps the place of judgment and righteousness (16); and his conclusion is that God lets it be, for the purpose of shewing men that they are beasts (18). But the conviction of the *Hasid* is very different. As in v. 14, he anticipates *Qoheleth's* conclusion, catching up his phrase "I said in my heart," and declares that "God will judge the righteous and the wicked, for a time [i.e. of judgment] there is for every occupation and for every work¹."

iv. 17-v. 6 [E.V. v. 1-7]. This is the only section of the *Hasid's* work which does not immediately correct *Qoheleth*. It inculcates sincerity in sacrificing, a reverent reticence in prayer, and the strict performance of vows, ending with the all-important command "fear thou God."

vii. 18 b. *Qoheleth* has complained that the righteous man often perishes in his righteousness, while the wicked man lives a long life in his wickedness (15). Do not, then (he advises), be over-righteous (16), but, at the same time, do not run to the opposite extreme and ruin the chances of the present by being foolishly over-wicked (17). Keep in the safe comfortable mean between the two (18 a). But here the *Hasid* sweeps away this worldly compromise: "for he that feareth God shall be quit [i.e. shall do the right thing] from every point of view."

vii. 26 b. *Qoheleth* is troubled by the badness of women, and their fatal fascination (26 a); and the *Hasid* inserts the religious remark "He that pleaseth God shall escape from her, but a sinner shall be captured by her."

vii. 29. *Qoheleth's* sweeping stricture on men and women (28) appears to the *Hasid* to condemn God's own handiwork. So he maintains (echoing *Qoheleth's* "I have found") that man has deliberately departed from the original purity and uprightness with which God endowed him.

viii. 2 b, 3 ab, 5, 6 a. *Qoheleth* advises submission to the despotism of the king (2 a, 3 b, 4). But the *Hasid*, who knows that the king's service often clashes with God's service, is

¹ Omitting *וְעַל* (see note *in loc.*).

anxious to enter a proviso. "But on account of [your] oath to God be not frightened¹; out of his (the king's) presence shalt thou go²; persist not in an evil thing." And again "Whoso keepeth the [Divine] command, מצוה, will countenance no evil thing." And he continues that a wise man will realise that a time and judgment are coming: for a time and judgment there will be for every occupation.

This is the only passage in which an insertion of the *Hasid* appears to have altered words of *Ḳoheleth*. The words "because the רעה of man is great upon him" may be connected equally well with the foregoing or with the following words. In the former case they belong to the *Hasid*, and רעה means 'wickedness': in the latter they belong to *Ḳoheleth*, and רעה means 'misery.' But in either case *Ḳoheleth's* thought in *vv.* 7, 8 has no connexion whatever with any of the preceding verses, and yet is introduced by כִּי. Perhaps the simplest explanation would be that *Ḳoheleth* originally began a new complaint with the words "the misery of man is great upon him, for he knoweth not...etc." and that the *Hasid* added the first כִּי, adapting the phrase to suit his own statement about the time and judgment.

viii. 11-13. To *Ḳoheleth's* complaint that the wicked are honoured after their death, and courted during their life, the *Hasid* adds that men are wicked because their sentence is long in coming; but however long and prosperous a sinner's life may be, yet he knows that it will be well with those who fear God, and not well with the wicked.

xi. 9 b, xii. 1 a. *Ḳoheleth* falls back, for the last time, on the position "Live for the present, while old age and death draw not nigh" (xi.-xii. 7). And here the *Hasid* throws in his last warnings: "but know that for all these God will bring thee into judgment³"; "but remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth."

This latter clause breaks the connexion of *Ḳoheleth's* thought, xi. 10 a "And remove vexation...thy flesh" is evidently in close connexion with "before the evil days come...etc.," the phrase "for youth and the prime of life are vanity" being a parenthesis.

¹ Making no break between *vv.* 2 and 3.

² Contrast *Ḳoheleth's* advice in x. 4.

³ This judgment is not necessarily for condemnation. In his last fragment the *Hasid* foretells a judgment for good works as well as bad (xii. 14).

The *Hasid*, having thus borne his testimony by pious additions to the book, added (as the first editor and the 'wise man' had done) a postscript of his own (xii. 13, 14): "Fear and obey God, for He will bring into judgment every work, good and bad."

And it may be gladly admitted that, under these successive hands, Koheleth's *Journal* has been not spoilt but enriched. By the annotations and criticisms of two contemporary thinkers its value has been multiplied historically and doctrinally. It became a "three-fold cord" whose drawing and attracting power has been "not quickly broken." It is in this triple form that Jews and Christians alike have counted it inspired. It is (to borrow three terms from a Christian writer) the attempt of a σοφός and of a γραμματεὺς to supply, as far as they were able, the defects of a συνζητητῆς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου¹.

The attempts which have been made to explain the difficulties in the book on the basis of a unity of authorship are innumerable. Among later writers who follow this line of treatment the most noticeable are Ginsburg (who gives a full historical sketch of the commentaries till his day), Wright, Tyler and Plumptre, in English; and Delitzsch, Nowack and Wildeboer in German. The great majority represent the book as depicting different phases of thought through which Koheleth passes—that he alternates between sceptical doubt and religious faith, and that his faith at last proves triumphant.

This is drawn out most attractively by Plumptre, who compares this mental conflict with Tennyson's "Two Voices." It is as though Koheleth is seen passing through a region in which dark clouds of doubt are from time to time broken by fitful gleams of sunshine; and these gleams gradually become brighter, till the clouds are at last chased away, and are succeeded by a sunny calm. But the more the book is read, the more convinced the reader feels that this is not so. It is an unnatural region, in which clouds vanish automatically, and moments of calm suddenly occur, only to give way as suddenly to the same clouds once more. These dissolving views are not pictures of a mind halting between two opinions, and slowly fighting its way towards the light of faith.

¹ See 1 Cor. i. 20-25.

Moreover the theory of the unity of authorship affords no explanation of the miscellaneous proverbs wedged into chaps. iv.-x., which breathe neither doubt nor faith. It is difficult to conceive of any state of mind which could give vent, for example, to the three successive paragraphs iv. 9-12, iv. 13-16 and iv. 17-v. 6. And, lastly, it offers no solution of the difficulties of the epilogue xii. 9-14.

The ingenious theory whereby Bickell maintains the unity of authorship¹ stands by itself. It is accepted entire by Dillon in *Sceptics of the Old Testament*. He re-arranges² the book as follows (the subdivisions of his analysis being omitted):

THE WORTH OF EXISTENCE.

A. *The vanity of its supposed unconditioned good.*

1. Proposition. i. 1-ii. 11.
2. Proof.
 - (i) v. 9-vi. 7, iii. 9, 12, 13. Possession and enjoyment made possible thereby.
 - (ii) iii. 10, 11, 14-22, iv. 1-8. Knowledge; its limited nature and discouraging results.
 - (iii) ii. 12-16, iii. 1-8, viii. 6-14, 16-17 b, ix. 1-3, viii. 15. Wisdom as a religious-moral sentiment.
 - (iv) ix. 11-18, vi. 8, 11-12. Wisdom as prudence and practical ability.

B. *Recommendation of proportional good.*

1. Wisdom.
 - (i) vii. 1-6, vi. 9, vii. 7-10, 13-19, 11, 12, 21, 22, 30, iv. 9-16, as Self-restraint.
 - (ii) iv. 17-v. 6, as the Fear of God.
 - (iii) v. 7, 8, x. 16-20, xi. 1-3, 6, 4, 5, as Industry.
 - (iv) vii. 23-29, viii. 1-4, x. 2-14 a, 15, as Discretion.
2. Pleasures of Life. x. 14 b, ix. 3-10, xi. 7-xii. 8.

¹ He is obliged, however, to assign some words and expressions to redactors; and he does not include the epilogue in his scheme.

² The first writer who suggested dislocations in the book was van der Palm, *Ecclesiastes philologicæ et criticæ illustratus*, Leyden, 1784. Haupt, *Oriental Studies*, pp. 242-278, though his re-arrangement of the book is not of such a wholesale description as that of Bickell, thinks that the original writing was disarranged deliberately, and marred by numerous glosses.

This result is arrived at by the supposition of an accident to a Hebrew manuscript, whereby sheets were placed in a wrong order, and some turned inside out. But the theory is also assisted by arbitrary transpositions of single verses and half verses. Moreover the final result does not come up to expectations, and some passages need force to fit them into the scheme; e.g. viii. 12, 13 occur in a passage which Bickell takes to shew the vanity of Wisdom as a religious-moral sentiment owing to "the want of preference accorded to the righteous in the fate of life and death"! Again, the accident to the manuscript involves the splitting asunder of only a single verse (x. 14), and that exactly at the end of a clause. That is to say that Bickell chooses to transpose 14 b and 15, and says that the present arrangement is due to an editor who re-arranged the book, and thought that "city" should be connected with "land" which occurred in the first verse of the next sheet in the accident-manuscript.

But apart from all such inherent objections, there is the improbability of the existence of a Hebrew manuscript in codex form at the early date at which the accident must have occurred. The codex form came into general use not earlier than the 4th century A.D. and certainly did not exist before the Christian era¹. The book of Koheleth was well known and minutely discussed long before the Christian era; and if it was translated into Greek (at whatever date the translation was made) according to the new 'accidental' order, it is inconceivable that no notice should have been taken of the change.

Other writers, without having recourse to theories of dislocation, have allowed that interpolations have been made in a few isolated passages. For example, Peake (Art. 'Ecclesiastes' in Hastings' *B.D.*) sums up a section on the integrity of the book by saying "It seems on the whole most probable that at least xii. 1 a, 13, 14 are later interpolations (assuming that 'thy Creator' is correctly read in xii. 1 a), and possibly also iii. 17 and xi. 9 c." Similarly A. B. Davidson (Art. 'Ecclesiastes' in *Encycl. Bibl.*) holds that xi. 9 b is probably an addition, and xii. 1 certainly; but that there is less objection to iii. 17; also that viii. 10, 12, 13 "are in some way corrupt." And he admits

¹ See Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, ch. 2 and p. 373. Blau, *Studien zum althebräischen Buchwesen*, Theil 1, ch. 2 and p. 60.

that "in a book such as Ecclesiastes,—the line of thought and (particularly) the tone of which diverge so greatly from the other O.T. writings—it was to be expected that there would be some interpolations: *qualifications* which the reader or scribe felt constrained to add to the author's somewhat strong statements."

This is the (right) principle which underlies the treatment of the book by Siegfried¹. Other writers have condemned one or two verses and phrases; but they have left untouched the mass of contradictions and abrupt transitions of tone of which the book is full. Siegfried, on the other hand, is unnecessarily ruthless in his dissection.

His scheme is as follows:

Ḳoheleth himself (Q¹) was a pessimistic philosopher, whose book would have disappeared, had it not been rescued by Solomon's name at the beginning.

The first interpolator (Q²) was an Epicurean Sadducee; he recommends the pleasures of eating and drinking as the recompense for all men's troubles; life is sweet, and busy work affords real enjoyment; the extravagancies of Pharisaic religion are to be avoided. Kraetzschmar (*Th. LZ.* Sept. 1900), though he questions the rest of Siegfried's analysis, accepts the distinction between Q¹ and Q². But Siegfried himself helps to throw doubt on the distinction. He assigns iii. 22, viii. 15, among other passages, to Q², but ii. 24 a, iii. 12 to Q¹, explaining that Ḳoheleth shews (ii. 3, 10, 17, 18, 20) that his meaning is that there is no genuine pleasure to be had at all. But is it reasonable to say that the advice "there is nothing better than to enjoy life" is from Q¹ in two passages, and from Q² in two others? It has been shewn in the last chapter that this conclusion with regard to the enjoyment of life is an integral portion of his complaints.

The second interpolator (Q³) was a *Hakam*, or 'wise man,' who puts a high value upon wisdom, in opposition to Ḳoheleth.

The interpolations of a 'wise man' have been noted above, pp. 22, 23; but that enumeration agrees with Siegfried's only in respect to iv. 5, vi. 9 a, vii. 11, 12, 19, viii. 1, x. 1-3, 12-15. Some of the passages which Siegfried assigns to him (ii. 13, 14 a, vi. 8, ix. 13-18) are altogether in the style of Ḳoheleth;

¹ In *Handkommentar zum AT.*

they introduce the personal element, the disappointment at the lack of advantage and appreciation accorded to the wise; they form part of Kōheleth's picture of the wrongs of the world.

The third interpolator (Q³) is a *Hasid*—a pious Jew, who was strongly opposed to Kōheleth's statements about the Divine government of the world¹. This is accepted in substance above, pp. 24–26.

Under the designation Q⁵ Siegfried includes several other interpolators, who inculcate general moral maxims of proverbial wisdom. But in this multiplying of interpolators few will follow him. If the *Hakam* could contrast wise men and fools in such proverbs as ii. 14 a, ix. 17, x. 2, 12, why should vii. 5, 6 a be denied him? If he could describe the action of the fool in iv. 5, x. 3, why not in vii. 9? There is nothing improbable in supposing that all the isolated proverbs which do not form part of Kōheleth's complaints are added by one hand, though the *Hakam* may, of course, have collected them from various sources, as, indeed, his postscript implies that he did.

Siegfried adds that the whole writing i. 2–xii. 7 was edited by a redactor, with a heading i. 1, and a closing formula xii. 8; and that xii. 9, 10, xii. 11, 12 and xii. 13, 14 are three further additions. He does not suggest the source of the two former of these couplets; but he makes the strange statement that “xii. 13, 14 betray a Pharisee who believes in a judgment hereafter, which Q⁴ the *Hasid* (iii. 17, xi. 9 b) knows not of.” It is difficult to see how the verses bear out this distinction.

Kraetzschmar, in reviewing Siegfried's work, says “it is questionable whether Siegfried will find many followers in his extreme interpolation theory. It is a right idea overstrained in the endeavour to explain all the difficulties in the book.... But the unravelling is done with energy, and will incite to further investigation from this point of view.” The analysis given above, in this and the preceding chapter, is an attempt at further investigation, incited by Siegfried's interesting commentary.

¹ Lauer (*Das Buch Koh. und die Interpolationshypothese Siegfried's*, Wittenberg, 1900) agrees with all Siegfried's passages except viii. 2–4, xi. 5, which he thinks are from an independent writing. Bickell assigns some passages to R¹, a zealot hostile to the book.

§ 6. *The style and vocabulary.*

The book of *Ḳoheleth* is unlike any other Hebrew writing in its style and subject-matter. It has, indeed, some affinities of thought with the book of Proverbs¹ (there are many in the additions of the 'wise man' and of the *Ḥasid*); and some of the problems which troubled *Ḳoheleth*, troubled the writers of Job and a few of the Psalms such as xxxvii., xlix. and lxxiii. But under the stress of keen disappointment, and indignation at the wrongs of the world, his style has a stinging sarcasm, a tendency to epigram, a *moan* in it, which is unique in Hebrew literature. At the same time he is capable of real poetic feeling, as the opening² and the close of his writing shew, i. 2-11, xii. 1 b-7. This intense originality raised him far above the literary level of his day. The fact that two contemporary writers, totally unlike him in style and tone, were anxious to perpetuate his work, is a proof of the high regard in which it was held. If it is compared with the almost contemporary writing of Ben Sira (which was highly thought of, and may be taken as representative of the literature of the last two centuries B.C.), the strong originality of *Ḳoheleth*'s work stands out in high relief. Schechter³ points out the artificial or Paitanic tendency betrayed by Ben Sira's quotations and adaptations from canonical writings. "His success in producing a work 'the predominant character' of which 'is classical,' is...to be ascribed to the author's knowledge of the Bible, the language and style of which he was constantly copying, whilst his most admired 'boldness and freedom' in employing Biblical phrases is in most cases nothing more than a mere Paitanic artificiality so common in post-Biblical Hebrew poetry. In fact B. S. should rather be described as the first of the Paitanim than as one of the last of the canonical writers." Now although *Ḳoheleth* cannot have been prior to B. Sira by much more than a quarter of a century, he has not a trace of this Paitanic style; there is scarcely a single passage in his own portions of the

¹ Compare vii. 26 with the warnings against women in Prov. vi. 26 b, vii. 6-27; ix. 9 with Prov. v. 18; x. 4 with Prov. xvi. 14; x. 7 with Prov. xix. 10 b.

² For a metrical analysis of ch. i. see H. Grimme, 'Abriss der Biblisch-hebräischen Metrik,' *ZDMG.* 1897, 689 f.

³ In his edition of the Genizah fragments, *Introd.* pp. 12-38.

book which can be called a quotation, or even adaptation, from the Bible¹. The contrast, therefore, between his nervous intensity and independence of thought, and the artificiality of the "many books" which were being composed around him, must have been very pronounced.

But it is not only in regard to quotations that *Ḳoheleth* forms a contrast with B. Sira. Schechter goes on to point out that though B. Sira tried hard to imitate the Scriptures, he failed in the end. "In unguarded moments such phrases, idioms, particles and peculiar constructions escaped him as to furnish us with a sufficiently strong number of criteria, betraying the real character of the language of his time." *Ḳoheleth*, who is no imitator, and who writes the language of his time out of the fulness of his heart, does not make the slightest pretensions to classical Hebrew. The Hebrew language, which had been pure enough for some time after the return from Babylon, began to decay from the time of Nehemiah. The memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, and (in a less degree) the writing of Malachi, shew signs of the change, "which is still more palpable in the Chronicles (end of the 4th cent. B.C.), Esther, and Ecclesiastes....The three books named do not, however, exhibit these peculiarities in equal proportions; Ecclesiastes has the most striking *Mishnic* idioms²." For the Aramaic and Mishnic peculiarities to be found in *Ḳoheleth*, reference should be made to the glossary in Delitzsch's commentary, or to Wright's *Ecclesiastes*, pp. 488 ff. See also Siegfried's commentary, pp. 13-23.

The linguistic peculiarities of *Ḳoheleth* are one of the safest criterions for fixing a date after which the book must have been written. It must be later (probably much later) than Esther, which is usually dated c. 300 B.C. And it will be seen in the next chapter that a *terminus ad quem* is supplied by the use made of the book by Ben Sira.

¹ iii. 20 is a reference to Gen. iii. 19; and v. 14 is possibly a reminiscence of Job i. 21.

² Driver, *Intr. O.T.* pp. 473 f. See also pp. 444 ff.

§ 7. *The relation of Koheleth to B. Sira and the Book of Wisdom.*

1. To former commentators on Koheleth only the versions of B. Sira's work were available, together with a few small fragments of the original preserved by Rabbinic writers. But since the discovery of large portions of the Hebrew text, a more trustworthy comparison between the two books has been made possible. There can be no room for doubt that B. Sira knew not only Koheleth's original writing, but also the later additions made to it. According to his custom he does not quote *verbatim*; but he adapts several phrases, altering them to suit his context. In many cases it is quite evident that it is he who is borrowing from Koheleth, and not *vice versa*. The following list of passages will shew the extent and nature of his indebtedness¹:

	Koheleth.		B. Sira.
iii. 1	לכל זמן ועת	iv. 20	בני עת וזמן שמר
iii. 11	את הכל עשה יפה בעתו	xxxix. 16	מעשי אל כלם טובים
			לכל צורך בעתו יספיק ³
		xxxix. 33	מעשה אל כלם טובים
			לכל צורך בעתו [ים] פוק
iii. 15	והאלהים יבקש את נדף ⁴	v. 3	כי י"י מבקש נרדפים
iii. 20, 21	הכל היה מן העפר ⁵ והכל שב אל העפר: מי יודע רוח בני אדם העולה היא למעלה ורוח הבהמה היורדת היא למטה לארץ:	xl. 11	כל מארץ אל ארץ ישוב ואשר ⁶ ממרום אל מרום:

¹ The references to B. Sira are numbered according to Swete's edition of the LXX.

² Schechter's probable conjecture for חמון, which, however, Peters retains.

³ וכל ?

⁴ Ἐκ καὶ ὁ θεὸς ζητήσει τὸν διωκόμενον, following B. Sira's thought of the avenging of the persecuted, cf. B. Sir. Ἐὶ ὁ γὰρ κύριος ἐκδικῶν ἐκδικήσει σε.

⁵ Cf. xii. 7.

⁶ Ἐκ ἀπὸ ὑδάτων εἰς θάλασσαν = ממים אל ים, cf. Koh. i. 7.

Koheleth.	B. Sira.
vii. 12 כי בצל החכמה בצל הכסף	xiv. 27 וחכמה בצלה מחרב ¹
vii. 16 ואל תתחכם יותר	xxxv. 4 ובל עת מה תתחכם ²
vii. 28 אדם אחד מאלף מצאתי	vi. 6 [אנשי שלומך יהיו רבים] ובעל סודך ³ אחד מאלף: לב אנוש ⁴ ישנא פניו
viii. 1 חכמת אדם תאיר פניו ועז פניו ישנא :	xiii. 25
xii. 14 אם טוב ואם רע	אם לטוב ואם לרע:
viii. 5 שומר מצוה לא ידע דבר רע	xxxvii. 12 אך עם איש מפחד תמיד אשר תדע שומר מצוה ? ?
ix. 10 כל אשר תמצא ירך לעשות בכחך עשה כי אין מעשה וחשבון ודעת וחכמה בשאול אשר אתה הלך שמה :	xiv. 11, 12 ואם יש לך היטיב לך ולאל ירך הרשן זכור כי [לא בשאול תענוג ו] לא מות יתמהמה: וחוק לשאול לא הנד לך
xii. 13 סוף הדבר הכל נשמע את האלהים ירא ואת מצותיו שמור כי זה כל אדם :	xliii. 27 עוד כאלה לא נוסף ⁶ וקץ דבר הוא הכל :

The following may also be noted from passages in B. Sira not yet extant in Hebrew :

iii. 14 עליו אין להוסיף וממנו אין לגרע where עליו refers to "all that God doeth."	xviii. 6 οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλαττώσαι οὐδὲ προσθεῖναι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξίχνιάσαι τὰ θαυμάσια τοῦ κυρίου.
v. 3 כאשר תדר נדר לאלהים אל תאחר לשלמו :	xviii. 22 μὴ ἐμποδισθῆς τοῦ ἀπο- δοῦναι εὐχῆν εὐκαίρως.

¹ This is in connexion with v. 20 יהנה בחכמה אנוש.

² בכל. Syr. בלא ?

³ It is more likely that the reference is to Koheleth than to Job xxxiii. 23.

Sadyah, however, cites B. Sir. as מני אלף, as in Job. See Cowley and Neubauer p. xx.

⁴ Cf. xii. 18.

⁵ Et omits. Cf. v. 16 לבקש תענוג כי אין בשאול לבקש תענוג. But see Peters on the whole passage.

⁶ xlii. 25 mg. has לכל צורך הכל נשמע.

Kohелеth.	B. Sira.
viii. 12 כי גם יודע אני אשר יהיה טוב ליראי האלהים אשר ייראו מלפניו :	i. 13 τῷ φοβουμένῳ τὸν κύριον εὖ ἔσται ἐπ' ἑσχάτων.
x. 8 חפר גומץ בו יפול	xxvii. 26 ὁ ὀρύσσων βόθρον εἰς αὐτὸν ἐμπυσεῖται ¹ .
xii. 9 ויתר שהיה קהלת חכם עוד למד דעת את ² העם :	xxxvii. 23 ἀνὴρ σοφὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λαὸν παιδεύσει.

To the above instances may be appended one from the first 'Alphabet' or Acrostic of B. Sira (given in Cowley and Neubauer, pp. xxviii. f., and Dukes' *Rabbinische Blumenlese*, p. 73). Many of the aphorisms in this collection are undoubtedly spurious: but some have been shewn to be genuine by the discovery of the Hebrew fragments, and this may therefore be genuine also.

xi. 1 שלח לחמך על פני המים כי ברוב הימים תמצאנו :	זרוק לחמך על אפי מיא ³ ואת משכב ליה בסוף יומיא :
---	--

But besides the passages in which there is a more or less close approximation in language, there are not a few in which Ben Sira has echoes of Kohēleth's thoughts. Several of these are noted by Wright (*Ecccl.* pp. 41-46), but a few of his instances must be discarded, B. Sira's meaning having been made clearer by the Hebrew text. The following, however, deserve consideration:

Koh. i. 4. B. S. xiv. 18 (Heb.). "As leaves grow upon a green tree, whereof one withereth and another springeth up—so of the generations of flesh and blood, one perisheth and another ripeneth."

Koh. iii. 7. B. S. xx. 6, 7 (Heb.). "There is one that is silent because he cannot answer, and there is one that is silent

¹ Perhaps from Prov. xxvi. 27, the latter half of which appears to have suggested B. S. xxvii. 27. ☩ Koh. is identical with B. S.

² ☩ τὸν ἀνθρώπων.

³ Dukes + וביבשתא. See also earlier in the Alphabet:

בר דלא בר (סבר) שבקיה על אפי מיא וישם

i.e. let him take to trading.

because he seeth [it is] time (עת). A wise man is silent until the time, but a fool observeth not the time."

Ḳoh. iv. 8 b. B. S. xiv. 4 (Heb.). "He that depriveth (מונע) his soul¹, gathereth for another; and in his good things (בטובתו) shall a stranger revel."

Ḳoh. v. 1 (E. V. v. 2). "Therefore let thy words be few." B. S. vii. 14 (Heb.). "And repeat not (אל תישן) a word in a prayer."

Ḳoh. v. 2, 6 (E. V. v. 3, 7) on the emptiness of dreams, cf. B. S. xxxi. 1-7 (⊕).

Ḳoh. v. 11 b (E. V. v. 12 b). "The abundance of the rich will not suffer him to sleep." B. S. xxxiv. 1 (Heb.). "The wakefulness of the rich wasteth his flesh; his care dissipateth slumber."

Ḳoh. vii. 8 b. B. S. v. 11 (Heb.). "In patience of spirit (ארך רוח) return answer."

Ḳoh. vii. 14. B. S. xxxvi. 14, 15 (⊕). "Over against the evil is the good, and over against death is life; so over against a pious man is a sinner. And thus look at all the works of the Most High, two and two, one over against the other." See also xlii. 24.

Ḳoh. viii. 4 b. B. S. xxxiii. 10 b (Syr. only). "For who shall say unto thee What doest thou?" But cf. Job ix. 12.

Ḳoh. ix. 16. B. S. xiii. 22 c d (Heb.). "A poor man speaketh², and they hoot at him³; though he be wise that speaketh, there is no place for him."

Ḳoh. xi. 10. B. S. xxx. 23 a b (Heb.). "Rejoice thy soul, and make thy heart joyful; and put vexation far from thee."

2. The use made of Ḳoheleth by Ben Sira is important as a landmark for arriving at Ḳoheleth's date.

The allusions to it in Wisdom are also important, but for a different reason. They afford an illustration of the light in which the book was regarded by the pious. As the *Ḥasid* annotator sometimes catches up Ḳoheleth's language in order to oppose him, so (even more strikingly) the writer of Wisdom puts his thoughts, and his very wording, into the mouth of the

¹ Cf. Ḳoh. ii. 10.

² So Syr. נמוט Heb. Ⓢ.

³ ישארו גענע. Cf. Is. xxviii. 10.

ungodly, and raises his protest against them. In Wisdom, unlike Ben Sira, all the allusions are placed together in a continuous passage (ii. 1-9)¹, as follows:—

Kohēleth.	Wisdom.
	v. 1. For they [the ungodly i. 16] said within themselves, reasoning not rightly, Short and sorrowful is our life, And there is no healing at a man's end, And none was ever known who released from Hades.
ii. 23, v. 17.	
viii. 8.	
iii. 19, ix. 11.	v. 2. Because by mere chance (<i>αἰροσχε- δίως</i>) were we born, And hereafter we shall be as though we had never been; Because a smoke is the breath in our nostrils, And reason is a spark in ² the beating of our hearts,
xi. 7.	v. 3. Which being quenched, the body shall be turned into ashes, And the spirit shall be dispersed as thin air.
i. 11, ii. 16, ix. 5.	v. 4. And our name shall be forgotten in time, And no one shall remember our works; And our life shall pass away like the track of a cloud, And shall be scattered as a mist Chased by the beams of the sun And by its heat overcome.
חבל ii. 11 etc.	
vi. 12.	v. 5. For our life is the passing of a shadow, And there is no retreating of our end,
viii. 8.	

¹ Plumptre, pp. 71-74, cites several other passages in Wisdom which are in no sense quotations from Kōheleth, or even allusions to his language, though they are opposed to his spirit.

² i.e. either *during*, or *kindled by*.

Kohleleth.	Wisdom.
viii. 8.	v. 5. Because it is sealed, and none turneth it back.
ii. 24 etc.	v. 6. Come then, and let us enjoy the good things that exist,
xi. 9.	And let us use the created world, as youth ¹ [alone] can, eagerly;
ix. 8.	v. 7. With costly wine and ointments let us be filled, And let no flower of spring pass us by.
	v. 8. Let us crown ourselves with rose buds ere they be withered;
	v. 9. Let none of us be without a share in our wanton revelry, Everywhere let us leave tokens of our mirth,
iii. 22, v. 18, ix. 9 b.	For this is our portion and this is our lot.

§ 8. *Greek language and thought.*

It has been urged as evidence for a late date of writing that the book has a strong Greek colouring—that is, 1st that it contains Greek idioms and expressions, and 2nd that it is saturated with Greek philosophic thought. These two theories are quite distinct and must be treated separately.

1. The presence of a large number of Graecisms in Kohleleth's language was first maintained by D. Zirkel², and he is followed more or less completely by Kleinert, Graetz, Tyler, Plumptre, Siegfried and Wildeboer³. But though Kohleleth has a few expressions which *might* have resulted from the prevailing Greek atmosphere of his time, there are none that *demand* this explanation; and several of the instances offered can be traced to the Greek language only by violence.

i. 3 al. תחת השמש. Plumptre confidently asserts this to be due to Greek influence; but Kleinert admits that it may be a favourite idiom of the author, and need not be Greek. Kohleleth

¹ καὶ χρῆσώμεθα τῇ κρῖσει ὡς νεότητι σπουδαίως. "As in youth" or "as belongs to youth." But the text may be corrupt.

² The subject, however, was broached a few years earlier by van der Palm.

³ See *Literature* at the end of the chapter.

varies it with תחת השמים i. 13, ii. 3, iii. 1 and על הארץ viii. 14, 16, xi. 2. It is interesting to note that the expression occurs in two Sidonian inscriptions of the 3rd century B.C.¹

i. 13. תור, it is said, must be explained by σκέπτεσθαι. But it is good Hebrew for 'explore.' Cf. Num. xiii. 2, 16, 17.

id. הוא ענין רע. Zirkel says that הוא corresponds to the Homeric use of the article as a demonstrative pronoun, and renders the words ἦν ἀσχολίαν ποιηράν! But this has commended itself to no other writer.

ii. 5. פרדם. This, though corresponding to παράδεισος, is not derived from it. Both² are derived from the Persian *pairīdāēza*. פרדם occurs also in S. of S. iv. 13, Neh. ii. 8, both of which books were entirely out of the range of Greek influence.

ii. 14, iii. 19, ix. 2, 3. מקרה. van der Palm connects it with συμφορά, and it is pointed out that Solon's reminder to Croesus³ "Man is altogether συμφορή" is a thought parallel to that of Koheleth. But מקרה in the sense of 'mischance,' 'catastrophe,' is not necessarily Greek. The word, indeed, is colourless in Ruth ii. 3, but it certainly has a bad sense in I Sam. vi. 9⁴.

ii. 15. או יתר. Zirkel renders εἰ μᾶλλον. But או cannot be equivalent to εἰ. It means "in these circumstances," as in Jer. xxii. 15 או טוב לו או.

iii. 12. עשות טוב. Kleinert, Tyler and Siegfried take this to be a literal, and un-Hebrew, rendering of εὖ πράττειν. It is true that the ethical sense 'to lead a good life' is vetoed by the following ראה טוב, and is alien to the context. But though it means (as does εὖ πράττειν) 'to fare well,' 'to be in a prosperous state,' it is not necessary to go to the Greek idiom for an explanation⁵. The verb עשה, as frequently in the book, has the force of 'prepare,' 'acquire,' 'arrange for' (cf. ii. 3); and the expression implies 'to pursue a course of action that will bring prosperity,' as Luther has it *sich gütlich thun*. Moreover the opposite

¹ Inscr. of Tabnith, c. 290 B.C. Constantinople, no. 4 in G. A. Cooke's *North Semitic Inscriptions* :

אל יבן לך זרע בחים תחת שמש

Inscr. of Eshmun-'azar, c. 275 B.C., Louvre, CIS i. 3, no. 5 in Cooke :

אל יבן לם שרש למט ופר למעל וחאר בחים תחת השמש

² *parádeisos* came into the Greek language through Xenophon.

³ Herod. i. 32.

⁴ Cf. קרה Dt. xxiii. 11.

⁵ Still less to read ראות טוב with Graetz, Bickell, Nowack, Cheyne.

expression עשה רעה occurs in 2 Sam. xii. 18 with the corresponding meaning 'be in a bad way'—'vex himself.'

iv. 15. הילך השני. Zirkel's reference to the Greek phrase *δεύτερος τοῦ βασιλέως* is not only unnecessary, but is in conflict with the straightforward meaning of the words, which state that a second youth rose up and took the place of the first youth who had succeeded the old and foolish king. The same questionable interpretation leads Delitzsch (followed by Wright) to seek an explanation in the construction *ἕτερος τῶν μαθητῶν* of Mat. viii. 21¹.

v. 9. אהב כסף. This, says Zirkel, is a rendering of *φιλάργυρος*. It might similarly be maintained that the book of Proverbs contains Graecisms: אהב שמחה (xxi. 17) = *φιλήδονος*. אהב חכמה (xxix. 3) = *φιλόσοφος*!

v. 17. טוב אשר יפה. Graetz and Pfeleiderer strive to maintain that this represents *καλὸν καγαθόν*. So Plumptre, Siegfried and Wildeboer. But it is inconceivable that a writer with this Greek expression in mind should not have written טוב ויפה or rather טוב ויפה. It is very doubtful if אשר can thus couple the adjectives with the meaning "good which is also beautiful," though it is so taken in G, Syr. and Tg.² It seems necessary, with Delitzsch, to depart from the Masoretic accentuation, and make אשר יפה resumptive of טוב אשר ראיתי אֲנִי טוב—"Behold what I have seen is good—what beautiful; namely that one should eat...etc."

v. 19. כי אלהים מענה בשמחת לבו. Zirkel suggests that מענה has the force of *remunerari*, and has borrowed this meaning from *ἀμειβεσθαι* which can mean both *remunerari* and *respondere*. Various explanations of the passage are given in the notes. But a very simple one is available—"God answereth with the joy of his heart"—i.e. God answers his wishes and desires by giving him joy. Ps. lxxv. 6 תענונו נוראות... תענונו illustrates the meaning of the verb; but an exact parallel occurs in 1 K. xviii. 24, האלהים אשר יענה באש.

vi. 9. הלך נפש. Zirkel compares *ὄρμητι τῆς ψυχῆς* in M. Aurel. iii. 15, a very late parallel! But הלך occurs with a similar force in Job xxxi. 7, Ez. xi. 21.

¹ Bickell and Siegfried omit השני as a gloss.

² Hos. xii. 9 עון אשר חטא is quite different. "Guilt which is sin" = Guilt of such a kind as to deserve punishment.

vi. 12. ויעשם. Zirkel and Graetz refer this to ποιῆν χρόνον as its only explanation. See notes.

vii. 14. יום טובה. Kleinert says the connexion between this and the Greek εὐμερία is 'evident'; Siegfried holds it to be 'questionable,' and Menzel condemns it as 'frivolous.' But what other expression could possibly have been chosen as a contrast to יום רעה?

vii. 18. יצא אה בלם. Zirkel thinks that this can only be explained by the Greek μέσσην βαδίζω. But even if that were the meaning (which is improbable), the expression might be quite independent of Greek; and it would, in any case, be a very awkward way of rendering the Greek idiom. יצא is used in the sense, frequent in later Hebrew, of 'being quit of,' or 'discharging,' a duty. Cf. Mish. *B'rak.* ii. 1, *Shabb.* i. 3. If the view taken above (§ 5) on the composition of the book be correct, the clause כִּי יֵרָא... בלם is the work of the God-fearing Jew who introduces such passages as iii. 14 b, 17, v. 6 b. He sweeps away Kōheleth's bitter worldly wisdom with an earnest comment in the interests of true religion—"for he that feareth God shall be quit of them all," i.e. shall fully accomplish his duty with regard to both sides of the question. He thus anticipates his final word in xii. 13 f.: "Fear God...for this is כל האדם."

vii. 24. מה שהיה. Kleinert explains this as "the essence of the thing" = τὸ τί ἐστίν. But the meaning of the expression is clearly shewn in i. 9, iii. 15, vi. 9, where τὸ τί ἐστίν is impossible. The words must have the same force in all the passages, 'that which has come into existence,' i.e. 'that which is.'

vii. 28. אדם. This word is usually distinguished from אִישׁ as *Mensch* from *Mann*. Its use here with the latter meaning is explained by Graetz as being due to the Greek ἀνθρώπος. But in Gen. ii. 22, 23, 25, iii. 8, 12, 17, 20, 21 it is opposed to 'woman' as here; and the Greek influence is entirely imaginary.

viii. 11. פתנם. Zirkel suggests that this is derived from φθέγμα. But the resemblance is accidental. ἐπίταγμα has also been proposed as the source of the Hebrew word! Delitzsch derives it from the Persian *paigam*, Arm. *patgam*, which is derived from the ancient Persian *paiti-gama*—'tidings,' 'news.' It occurs in Esth. i. 20, Dan. iii. 16¹.

xii. 13. הכל. Tyler illustrates this by the Mishnic formula

¹ See Bevan on the latter passage.

זה הכלל—"this is the general rule" or "the universal law." He thinks that there is here "a pretty certain trace" of the influence of Greek philosophical terminology; and he refers to τὸ καθόλου, or τὸ ὄλον, which is used in the same sense in Plato,—'the Universal' deduced from the Particular. So Siegfried.

But הכל probably refers, quite simply, to the teaching which the *Hasid* has inserted in the body of the book,—“All that I wish to say has been said already, and it comes to this: Fear God...etc.”

It is thus, to say the least, very difficult to find any Graecisms in the *language* of the book.

2. But the question whether Koheleth shews traces of the influence of Greek *thought* must now be considered; and it is one of the most interesting that his work affords.

The most divergent views have been held on the subject. On the one hand Renan asserts "Everything in the book can be completely explained by the logical development of Jewish thought. The author is very probably later than Epicurus; he seems, however, not to have received an Hellenic education. His style is purely Semitic. In all his language there is not a single Greek word, not a single characteristic of Hellenism." On the other hand Tyler finds abundant evidence of the clearest kind of the influence of both Stoic and Epicurean philosophy. There is nothing, in the nature of the case, to render the supposition of Greek influence impossible. Alexander's conquests brought Eastern and Western thought into close contact; and during the last century and a half before the Christian era Palestine was saturated with Hellenism. Josephus (*c. Ap.* 1, § 22) witnesses to the esteem in which Jews were held by Greeks. The book of Wisdom is strongly coloured by Greek thought¹, and the writings of Philo. There are allusions to Stoicism in 4 Maccabees, "and more or less probable vestiges of Stoicism have been found in the oldest Jewish sibyl (*c.* 140) and in the Targum of Onkelos²." Greek thought and feeling was thus "in the air," and had profound effects on the whole of Asia Minor³.

¹ See Bois, *Origines de la Philosophie Judéo-Alexandrine*, pp. 211–309.

² Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, p. 264.

³ Moreover in the 1st century A.D. Josephus could say of the sect of the Pharisees ἡ παραπλήσιός ἐστι τῇ παρ' Ἑλλήσι Στωικῇ λεγομένῃ (*Vita* § 2). He describes their attempt to combine fatalism with moral responsibility (*Ant.* xiii. 5, § 9. *B. J.* ii. 8, § 14), and their conduct of life according to the dictates of reason (*Ant.* xviii. 1, § 3).

But when Hellenism met Judaism the effects were not all on one side; there was action and re-action. Greek thought, like the queen of Sheba, not only brought gifts, but gained much by her presence among the Hebrews. The Stoic school, though it arose on Hellenic soil from public lectures at Athens, was not a purely Greek product. Zeno of Citium, the first founder of Stoicism, was of Phoenician descent, and his adherents and successors came from Hellenistic (as distinct from Hellenic) quarters—such as Syria, Cilicia and Pontus, Seleucia on the Tigris, Sidon, Carthage and other towns¹. Stoicism, therefore, had its roots in the Oriental, and especially the Semitic, character. And a careful study of Koheleth's thought and language tends to shew, not that he wrote under the influence of Stoicism or of any other branch of Greek philosophy, but that *as a thinking Jew he had the makings of a Greek philosopher*. For Judaism and Stoicism could not have interpenetrated had there not been a common substratum of thought to render their juncture possible. It is shewn in E. Caird's *Evolution of Religion*² that each of the three religions, Buddhism, Stoicism and Judaism, was the result of a development from the Objective to the Subjective. Buddhism rose from the polytheistic worship of the powers of Nature in the Vedic hymns, through the pantheism of the Upanishads, to the religion of Gautama. The Greeks first 'humanised' their ancient pantheon—the gods who had personified the powers of Nature becoming gods who personified human aspirations and virtues; and thence, through the thought of an abstract fate or law of necessity, they passed to that of Reason, to that ideal of a spiritual principle which is implied in monotheism. And similarly, but on a higher plane, the Hebrew religion passed from primitive nature-worship, through the worship of an anthropomorphic Deity, to a purely spiritual conception of God. And thus it is that affinities can be found between these three religions owing to natural development, more than to any direct influence of one upon another³. But the Hebrew and the Greek religions,

¹ See article 'Stoics' in *Encycl. Brit.*

² Vol. I., Lectures vii., x., xiii., xiv.

³ Dillon, *Sceptics of the O.T.*, pp. 122-129, notes a relationship between Koheleth and Buddhism, though he offers very small ground for his belief that "Koheleth was acquainted, and to some extent imbued, with the doctrines of Gautama Buddha."

having advanced with an analogous development, began, in their later phases, to converge. And thus Koheleth's affinities with Greek thought are close and significant. His book exhibits, more clearly than any other writing in the Old Testament, that observant philosophical side of the Semitic mind from which Stoicism sprang.

It is possible, indeed, to go behind Stoicism, and to compare his thoughts with a phase of Greek philosophy with which it is extremely improbable that he had ever come in contact—the teaching of Xenophanes¹ of Colophon, the reputed founder of the Eleatic school. In the article 'Xenophanes'² in *Encycl. Brit.* the position is summed up as follows: "The wisdom of Xenophanes, like the wisdom of the Hebrew Preacher, showed itself, not in a theory of the universe, but in a sorrowful recognition of the nothingness of things and the futility of endeavour. His theism was a declaration not so much of the greatness of God as rather of the littleness of man. His cosmology was an assertion not so much of the immutability of the One as rather of the mutability of the Many." Of the few utterances of Xenophanes which survive, the following invite comparison with Koheleth: "From earth all things are, and to earth all things return." This recalls not only Koh. iii. 20, but also his manifold complaints as to the nothingness of things, the empty vapour of human life, the uselessness of striving after wisdom, wealth, or true happiness, for "all things go to one place." Again, Xenophanes has no expectation that any man can arrive at certain knowledge of anything. "No man hath certainly known, nor shall certainly know, aught of that which I say about the gods and about all things: for be that which he saith ever so perfect, yet doth he not know it... The gods did not reveal all things to mortals in the beginning: long is the search ere man findeth that which is better." This is a faithful mirror of Koheleth's despair of arriving at wisdom with all his searching (vii. 23 f. and viii. 17); and of the scepticism of his reiterated questions Who knoweth? Who can bring a man to see? Who can tell a man? (iii. 21 and vi. 12). With regard to God, Xenophanes appears to be a theologian rather than a philosopher, a monotheist rather than

¹ flor. c. 520 B.C.

² By Dr H. Jackson.

a pantheist—that is if the surviving fragments of his own words are to be trusted, and not the statements made about him by later writers. He maintains the unity of God by opposing polytheism: but this need not imply the pantheistic unity of Being afterwards taught by his successor Parmenides. And it is exactly on this somewhat colourless monotheism that Kōheleth takes his stand. He has lost the vitality of belief in a personal God, which inspired the earlier prophets. He never uses the personal Name JHVH, but always the descriptive title 'Elohim' or 'the Elohim'—the Deity who manifests Himself in the cosmic forces of Nature. At the same time he never commits himself to any definitely pantheistic statements, though some of his utterances shew that if he had come into immediate contact with any of the later Greek schools he would probably have moved in that direction². Kōheleth thus occupies (what may be called) debateable ground between Semitic and Greek thought. And it is possible that if more of Xenophanes' writings were extant they might afford the closest parallel to that of the Hebrew thinker. But as it is, a more fruitful comparison can be drawn with the teaching of the *Stoics*, of whom a fairly extensive knowledge is available.

At the outset it should be noticed that Kōheleth does not shew the slightest trace of any borrowing from the Stoic terminology³. It is true that for some expressions it would be difficult to find Hebrew equivalents. But had he come into immediate contact with Stoicism, he could not have failed to shew some linguistic traces of its influence. But this does not affect the possibility of his Hebrew mind containing germs of Stoic ideas.

In iii. 10 f. he says that though man cannot discover God's work from beginning to end, yet הַעוֹלָם has been placed in his heart; he is endued with an innate longing to gaze into eternity; he has in him something of the Infinite. This thought, if carefully guarded, would not transgress the monotheism of the Jew. The writer of the 8th Psalm could rejoice that man has been made to lack but little of Divinity—וְהוֹחֲסֵרֵהוּ מֵעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים. And yet there is but a step from this to

¹ See p. 15.

² See below.

³ Cheyne mentions *εἰμαρμένη, πρόνοια, φαντασία, φύσις, φρόνησις, ἀρετή*,—to which might be added *τὸ ὑπακείμενον, ὕλη, ἀξίωμα, τὸ ἡγεμονικόν, κρᾶσις, δύναμις, λόγος (ratio), αἰτία*, and others.

Stoic monism. God or Zeus is for the Stoic the world-soul, the all-pervading principle, the fiery and ethereal Pneuma, which is identical with the Universe; so that man is a limb, a part, of the Universal Being. The Infinite has been placed within him. Thus the Jewish philosopher Kōheleth who had "eternity in his heart" foreshadowed the Jewish philosopher Spinoza who viewed things *sub specie aeternitatis*.

A direct corollary of Pantheism is Determinism. Since everything is derived from—since everything *is*—universal law and reason, every event, action, or phenomenon, is an inevitable result in the changeless causal connexion which governs the universe. There is no room for the free responsible action of any individual. And Kōheleth, though he beats against the bars, feels that escape is impossible from the prison house of Fate. His book is full of this complaint. In iii. 1-9 he shews that every action, lying between the moment of a man's birth and the moment of his death, must occur at a fixed time—fixed not by himself but by the Universal Cause of all things, which is God; man, therefore, can hope for no solid result dependent on himself—"what profit can accrue to a worker from his labours?" This Universal Cause is infinitely stronger than man, so that it is useless to contend with it (vi. 10). "A crooked thing cannot be set right, and a defect cannot be numbered" (i. 15, vii. 13). "Everything which God doeth shall be for ever; to it nothing can be added, and from it nothing can be subtracted" (iii. 14). And as with the smallest events in life, so with the iron necessity of death. No one can restrain the wind, nor can anyone "have power over the day of death, and there is no discharge in the war" (viii. 8). "No man knoweth his time; as fish that are caught in an evil net, and as birds that are caught in a snare—like them are the sons of men entrapped at an evil time when it falleth upon them suddenly" (ix. 12).

But not only are *men* subject to an unalterable destiny. The whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in the same bondage. In the Stoic system this thought grew into an elaborate cosmology, partly derived from the earlier teaching of Heraclitus of Ephesus¹. The infinite Pneuma exists in

¹ E. Pfeleiderer, *Die Philosophie des Heraklit von Ephesus*, tries to shew that Kōheleth borrows not only his teaching but many details of language from Heraclitus. This is ridiculed by Bois, pp. 109-128.

varying degrees of tension; by this variety of tension it brings into being—not outside but within itself—all the countless individual things which make up the universe. But this differentiation will not be for ever. All things will again be resolved into the primary substance; all things will ultimately be re-absorbed into God. Then, in due order, the last cycle of development will be reproduced in its minutest details, and so on for ever. If Kōheleth shewed any trace of this cycle doctrine in its Stoic form, it would be an indisputable proof that he had come under the immediate influence of the school. But though he shews no trace of the doctrine, he has in germ the underlying thought which contributed towards the formation of it. He is burdened with “the flux of all things”; it is the cry of i. 4-11—the unceasing changes in Nature which produce nothing new; in iii. 15 he says “That which is, hath already been: and that which is to be, already is; and God seeketh out that which is driven away,”—i.e. brings again and again on the scene of the present that which has been driven into the past by the lapse of time; in vi. 12 a man’s life is said to be spent “like a shadow,” as in Ps. cxliv. 4¹; and, finally, the lament for the lost strength of youth in xii. 1-6 ends with an assertion (v. 7) which is not far removed from Stoic teaching. Some writers have thought that the latter half of xii. 7—“and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it”—is an orthodox interpolation, and is opposed to iii. 21. But so far from being an interpolation, the words are valuable as shewing how near Hebrew thought could approach to the Stoic tenet of the re-absorption of all beings into the Infinite Being. The meaning may be made clearer by reference to Ps. civ. 29, 30. The Psalmist has been speaking, not of men, but of birds, beasts and fish: and he says “Thou takest away (קִחַתָּהוּ lit. Thou gatherest to Thyself) their breath: they die, and to their dust they return. Thou sendest forth Thy breath: they are created, and Thou renewest the face of the earth.” And what is said in the Psalm of birds, beasts and fish Kōheleth here implies of men; and in iii. 21 he doubts if it is possible to assume that there will, in this respect, be the slightest difference between men and beasts.

¹ Note the difference of thought in viii. 13, where the *Hasid* assigns to the wicked alone short-lived days like a shadow.

As long as the Stoic system confined itself to natural science it was possible for its supporters to maintain their theories. But confronted with the *moral* aspect of life, they were thrust between the horns of a dilemma. Either moral evil is the direct result of natural causes, in which case it is unavoidable, and therefore not really evil—or it is the result of a free-will which makes man's soul in some sense independent of the law of causation. Chrysippus, and at a later time Seneca, strove hard to reconcile the two. The least unsuccessful of their answers to the problem was that Providence, or Causation, or God, works towards the general development and advantage of the Universe as a *whole*; individual men or animals or things are cared for only in that they are parts of the whole, and conditioned by it. So that that which appears to men evil—that which society must condemn and punish—is only part of the universal Providence, leading to a good result for the whole. Evil is not evil *per se*, but only in respect to individuals.

And Koheleth, confronted, as he shews all through the book, with the same problem of evil, is not satisfied with the solution which had sufficed for many of his forefathers, and which was offered by his orthodox annotator in ii. 26, iii. 17, viii. 12, 13, xii. 14—the solution of Psalms i., xxxvii., lxxiii. and many others—that the wicked are bound to suffer for their wrongdoing, and the righteous to be saved and rewarded for their righteousness. He inclines to the Stoic solution. Exactly the same end comes to wise men and fools (ii. 14 b-16), righteous and unrighteous (ix. 2, 3); there is no advantage in being swift or strong, wise or clever or skilful (ix. 11, 12); nay the very beasts are not distinguishable from man, for all have one breath and go to one place (iii. 18-21). All created things are infinitesimal fractions of the Universe. If, therefore, judgment and righteousness are dethroned from their place by wickedness (iii. 16), if the righteous often suffer while the wicked prosper (vii. 15, viii. 14), it is only that men, as individuals, may realise their true insignificance in the eternal order of things.

There is yet another point to which the lines of Hebrew and Greek thought converge—the opposition of wisdom to folly. The Stoics taught that the wise man is he who is governed by

reason: the foolish man is irrational, i.e. mad. There can be no mean between them. *πᾶς ἀφρων μαίνεται*. Those who have rational common-sense (*ἐπιστήμη*), and those who have it not, make up the whole of mankind. This division of the world between the wise and the foolish obtains throughout the whole of the Hebrew *Hokmah* Literature. 'Wisdom' sometimes approached very closely to Piety: "the fear of the Lord is wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding" (Job xxviii. 28, cf. Prov. i. 7, Ps. cxi. 10). But the tendency was towards the philosophical conception of Wisdom as the personification of the Divine Providence which created the world and which governs and preserves it. Thus from one point of view the 'fool' was a sinner. But the nearer the idea of Wisdom approached that of the Greek *Logos*, the more was folly regarded as the senseless rashness of the man who acted contrary to reason and his own interests and destroyed himself—i.e. madness. And it is this aspect that is prominent in *Koheleth*. Folly and madness (*הוֹלָלוּת*) are closely associated in i. 17, ii. 12, vii. 25, ix. 3; and in vii. 17 to be over-wicked is to be foolish and to bring premature destruction upon oneself.

Thus *Koheleth* contains many of the 'seed-thoughts' from which Stoicism sprang. Some of them are found in earlier writings—Job, Proverbs and a few of the Psalms; but *Koheleth*, as one of the latest of the Old Testament writers, has made the furthest advance along the line of philosophical development.

But the truth of the position maintained in this chapter, that he had not come under the immediate influence of Stoicism, has no stronger proof than the *scepticism* which he displays. The Stoic was in the highest degree dogmatic: he left, as he fondly hoped, nothing unexplained. But *Koheleth's* earnestness, the real pain that he feels when he sees wickedness in the place of righteousness, his keen desire for the welfare of his fellow men, all combine to make him dissatisfied with a philosophical dogmatism. Man and beast are equally insignificant and go to the dust together; but have either of them a future? What of the 'hereafter' for which some were beginning to hope? He longs to discover God's work from beginning to end. But he cannot; and he gives expression to doubts which are really more religious than Stoic certainty. His despair of knowledge has been compared above with the temper of Xeno-

phanes. But it may also be compared with that of Pyrrho and the later sceptics. Zeller sums up the teaching of Pyrrho under three heads: (1) the impossibility of knowledge, (2) the withholding of judgment, (3) imperturbability. Of these the first two find a close counterpart in *Koheleth*.

(1) Although he feels that there is a wide gulf fixed between wisdom and folly, yet he discovers that his wisdom leads to nothing. His great experience of wisdom and knowledge proved to be a striving after wind (i. 17). The increase of wisdom and knowledge brings no advantage, but rather sorrow and grief (i. 18). Although wisdom intrinsically excels folly as light excels darkness, yet wise men and fools meet the same end. Why then did he take the trouble to be superlatively wise? It was all mere vapour (ii. 13-15). Nay, God has so arranged the nature of man (iii. 11), and of things in general (vii. 14), that it is impossible for man to discover what he really wants to know. In spite of failures *Koheleth* does not give up the attempt. He says to himself *I will make myself wise*. But it is all of no use; wisdom is far removed from him; the knowledge of what exists is far off, and unfathomably deep (vii. 23, 24). The sole miserable result of his searchings and enquiries and calculations is the discovery that nearly all men, and all women, are unworthy of the name (vii. 25-28). The work of the Deity is as unknowable as the way of the wind, or the growth of the embryo in the mother's womb (xi. 5).

(2) This being so, the only attitude that he can adopt is one of scepticism (viii. 17). Six times he asks "Who knoweth?" or similar questions (i. 19, iii. 21, 22 b, vi. 12, viii. 7, x. 14), not with the gleam of hope with which David asked¹ "Who knoweth whether God will shew me pity, that the child may live?" but with a hopelessness implying that knowledge is impossible; man must give up the attempt to reach it.

(3) But of Pyrrhonic *imperturbability* *Koheleth* has none. Had his question 'Who knoweth what is good for man in life?' (vi. 12), been put to the Greek philosophers, their answers—though arrived at in different ways—would have been very similar.

The *Stoic* would say—It is to obtain peace and happiness by living in conformity to Nature. Man's attitude towards fate

¹ 2 Sam. xii. 22.

must be that of Cleanthes¹. The wise course is to act voluntarily, not to be forced to act involuntarily, according to the dictates of Fate.

The *Epicurean* would reply—The obvious duty laid upon you by Nature is to seek happiness—i.e. pleasure. A certain amount even of self-denial and pain may be advisable, if the result of it is likely to be the prevention of greater suffering or trouble. The *summum bonum* is a serene freedom from physical, and more especially from mental, ills—in a word *ἀραξία*.

The *Sceptic's* answer would be—The impossibility of knowledge makes it foolish to strive after it. By completely withholding his judgment (*ἀφασία—ἐποχή—ἀκαταληψία*) man can arrive at an absolute calmness, unruffled by passion or desire.

The contrast between these answers and Koheleth's state of mind is evident. He flings himself against fate in despair. Every fresh wrong or injustice or inequality which he meets in the world causes a new pang. He "hates life" (ii. 17), and he "hates all his labour" that he has wrought (v. 18), and he "makes his heart despair of all his labour" (v. 20). And each time that his heart is driven back wounded and sore, he cries "there is no good in life except present enjoyment!" It is not the *summum bonum*; that is quite unattainable; he had made every possible attempt to reach it, and had failed (i. 12–ii. 11). It is simply a *minimum malum*, fortunately allowed to man by God, whereby "he shall not much remember the days of his life." (See ii. 24 f., iii. 12 f., 22, v. 18, 19, viii. 15, ix. 7–10, xi. 9 a, 10.)

To sum up. In the mind of Koheleth were germinating thoughts which find striking parallels in the fragments of Xenophanes, in the teaching of the earlier Stoics, and in that of the Sceptics represented by Pyrrho. And this is but a concrete example of the state of mind which must have been wide-spread in the Hebrew race during the last two centuries before Christ. It shews—not that Koheleth came under the immediate influence of any one Greek school, but—that the natural development of the two religions, Hebrew and Greek,

¹ ἄγουν δὲ μὲν ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ σὺ γὰρ ἡ Πεπρωμένη
 ἔποι ποθ' ὑμῖν εἰμι διατεταγμένος·
 ὡς ἔψομαι γὰρ ἄοκνος· ἦν δὲ μὴ θέλω
 κακὸς γενόμενος οὐδὲν ἤττω εἔψομαι.

proceeded (broadly speaking) on the same lines, and produced certain affinities between them. Before Christ came, and proved in His own Person that the Divine Being was not only Infinite but also Personal, it was inevitable that all religious thought which was unrestrained by orthodoxy and ancient tradition should tend towards Pantheism—and its necessary corollary Fatalism. Before Christ rose from the dead, and proved in His own Person the certainty of a 'hereafter,' it was inevitable that, the key to life's problems not yet being found, all knowledge should be only a 'perhaps,' and human judgment should be perforce withheld.

But while the problems were the same to the Greeks and to Koheleth, his Semitic earnestness and his bitter disappointments at the wrongs of the world prevented him from acquiescing in the complacent *ἀραραξία* which the Greek schools accepted as their final aim.

It is unfortunate that Tyler, who points out some of the affinities with Stoicism, has tried to go further, and to shew that Koheleth was not only well acquainted with Stoicism, but that he was no less acquainted with Epicureanism, and that he set the teaching of the two schools over against each other to dissuade his readers from following either¹!

It is exceedingly difficult to find the slightest trace of Epicureanism in the book.

As in the case of Stoicism, Koheleth makes no use of the scholastic terminology².

But the passages on which Tyler, and the writers who follow him, lay great stress are those in which present enjoyment is stated to be the only good thing for man. Siegfried goes so far as to assign all these passages to a Sadducean interpolator with Epicurean tendencies³. It has been shewn above that Koheleth's thought is totally distinct from that of Epicurus. Tyler represents Koheleth as teaching that "there

¹ Jerome, *Comm. on Eccl.*, says on ix. 7-9 that the author appears to reproduce the ideas of some Greek philosophers, in order to refute them. Bar Hebraeus († 1286) thinks that Solomon wished to defend in this book the opinions of Empedocles the Pythagorean.

² e.g. τὸ κανονικόν, πρόληψις, εἰδωλον, σύμπτωμα.

³ See § 5, p. 30.

is no special divine care manifested on man's behalf. *If he is wise*¹, therefore, he will derive the utmost possible enjoyment from the world, during the continuance of his fleeting life." But he misconstrues his meaning. The expression is very different from Kōheleth's repeated complaint—"There is nothing good for a man except to eat and drink and enjoy himself."

In iii. 19-21 Tyler sees the Epicurean denial of the Stoic belief that man is distinguished from the beasts by a rational soul; and he thinks that v. 20 is not inconsistent with the Epicurean theory that the soul is composed of fine ethereal atoms, which are scattered into the ether at the moment of death. If it is not inconsistent with the theory, it is only because it has nothing to do with it. Kōheleth's meaning is perfectly clear: The bodies of men and beasts both return to dust; and what will happen to the spirit of each, no man can possibly say.

In v. 19 Tyler finds another trace of Epicurean doctrine. Since all the universe is composed of atoms, the Gods must also be of the same nature. They are composed of very fine atoms; they live in the empty spaces between the worlds; they have dwellings and nourishment; and they enjoy the pleasures of conversation—in the Greek language, or something like it. They are, in fact, men in an ideally perfect state, immortal and free from pain or want. They may, therefore, be conceived as enjoying life in a manner analogous to that of men. In v. 19 the influence of his religion causes Kōheleth to retain the name האלהים as a singular noun, but otherwise the phrase is strictly Epicurean. God has a joy answering to—antiphonal with—the joy of man.

A startling theory is thus built upon a very narrow foundation. Two or three suggestions have been made for the rendering of מענה בשמחה לבו (see notes). The simplest is that of Ewald and Nowack noticed above, p. 41; "God answers with—by means of—the joy of his heart." This use of the preposition finds an exact parallel in 1 K. xviii. 24: האלהים אשר יענה באש—"the God who shall answer by fire," i.e. by granting the fire for which we pray.

¹ The italics are mine.

LITERATURE. The following are among the principal writings which bear upon the question of Greek influence, either in language, or in philosophic thought.

a. Those who are more or less fully in favour of it:

Zirkel, *Untersuchungen über den Prediger*, Würzburg 1792. Hitzig, *Comm.* 1st Ed. 1847. Kleinert, *Der Prediger Salomo*, Berlin 1864, see *St. Kr.* 1883, 761-782. Graetz, *Comm.* 1871. Tyler, *Comm.* 1st Ed. 1874, 2nd Ed. 1899, see *Modern Review* 1882, 225-251, 614-617. Plumptre, *Comm.* 1881. Aug. Palm, *Q. über die nacharistotel. Philosophie*, Mannheim 1885. Kuenen, *Einl. A. T.* § 105. 9. Cornill, *Einl. A. T.* § 45. 4. E. Pfeiderer, *Die Philosophie des Heraklit von Eph., nebst einem Anhang über heraklitische Einflüsse im alttestamentlichen Koheleth und besonders im Buch der Weisheit*, 1886, see *JprTh.* 1887, 177-180. C. Siegfried, *Prediger u. Hoheslied* (in *Handkomm. z. A. T.*) 1898, see *ZwTh.* 1875, 284-291, 465-489. Wildeboer (in Marti's *Kurz. Handkomm. z. A. T.*) 1898.

b. Those who are opposed to it:

Fr. Delitzsch, *Bibl. Komm.* Vol. 4, 1875, p. 319. Renan, *l'Écclésiaste*, 1882, p. 63. Nowack, in *Kurzgef. Exeget. Handbuch z. A. T.* (2nd Ed. of Hitzig), 1883, pp. 194 f. Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, 1887, pp. 260-272. Menzel, *Der griechische Einfluss auf Prediger u. Weisheit Salomos*, Halle 1889, pp. 8-38. Bois, *Origines de la Philosophie Judéo-Alexandrine*, Paris, 1890, pp. 53-128. Article 'Ecclesiastes' in Hastings' *B.D.* by Peake; do. in *Encycl. Bibl.* by A. B. Davidson. Volz, *Th.LZ.* Feb. 3, 1900, review of Tyler's 2nd Ed.

2. NOTES ON SELECT PASSAGES.

CHAP. I.

Ch. i. v. 4. לעולם 'in perpetuity,' 'continuously,' i.e. as contrasted with the changing generations of men. The expression does not imply the *eternity* of the material world, and is not opposed to the writer's feeling of the 'flux of all things,' which, had he been under the immediate influence of the Stoics, might have led him to their cycle doctrine. See p. 48.

v. 7. שהנחלים. The relative ש cannot mean 'whence,' as Σ Vg. Luth. A. V., but 'whither'—cf. Num. xiii. 27, 1 K. xii. 2; and שם means 'thither'—cf. 1 S. ix. 6, Jer. xxiii. 3. Hier. and Tg. explain the method of circulation—that the waters run back from the sea by hidden channels (*venae*) to their sources. Ibn Ezra prefers evaporation. For both cf. Lucret. v. 261–272.

v. 8. יגעים not 'wearisome,' Σ κοπώδεις, but 'wearied,' as in Dt. xxv. 18, 2 S. xvii. 2, the only other passages in which the word occurs. All creation shares with man the weariness caused by unceasing, but aimless, change.

לדבר 'No man can utter it'—the weariness.

v. 10. יש רבר שיאמר, see App. II. p. 138. שיאמר. Elliptical for ש' עליו. Cf. xii. 1, Ex. xxii. 8.

זה הרש הוא. זה is not governed by ראה. The expression approaches the Mishnic יהי in a predicative sentence. Cf. *Kelim* v. 10, *B^skoroth* vii. 5. It occurs i. 17, ii. 23, iv. 8, v. 18, vi. 2.

כבר 'already.' NH and Aram. In BH only Koh. ii. 12, 16, iii. 15, iv. 2, vi. 10, ix. 6, 7. In Syr. and Tg. sometimes 'perhaps.' היה. Sing. after the collective עולמים, as in ii. 7a. Cf. Ges. K. § 145 u.

v. 14. רעות רוח. The expression occurs seven times in Koh. The derivation of רעות from רעע 'break' may be discarded at once, though it was the favourite derivation in early times. Tg. תבירוהו. Rashi. שבר. Vg. *Afflictio*. A. V. Vexation.

Derived from רעה 'feed,' it may have one of two meanings:

1. Lit. 'feeding on wind'; so Aq. Σ ⊙. In his Comm. on Koh. Jerome says "ROOTH Aquila et Theodotion ενημω, Symmachus βόσθησαν, transtulerunt."

2. From the sense of 'feed on' comes that of 'delight in', and so 'be eager for,' 'strive after'—which is probably קֹחַ's meaning. Cf. Prov. xv. 14 || בקש, and especially Hos. xii. 2 רעה רוח || רדף קדים. The cognate רעיון occurs with the same meaning: i. 17, iv. 16 ר"י; ii. 22 לבו ר".

v. 15. Perhaps, as Renan suggests, an aphorism well known at the time.

לתקן. Dan. iv. 33 and frequently in Syr. Tg. In BH only vii. 13, xii. 9 (both Piel). Siegfried may be right in emending to לְהַתְּקִין, parallel with להמנות, as Ἐπικοσμηθῆναι with ἀρθμηθῆναι.

v. 16. הגדלתי והוספתי. Coordination to express 'I greatly multiplied'; as in iv. 1, 7. Cf. Ges. K. § 120, *d* and *e*.

על ירושלם. Koheleth finds it difficult to wear consistently his Solomonic disguise—which, indeed, he deliberately throws off in ii. 12. The expressions (here and in ii. 7, 9) "all that were before me over J."—"in J."—are unsuitable as referring to David and Saul, and make it probable that he himself really held some high official position in the city. See pp. 9, 10.

v. 17. וואתנה. *Waw* consecutive. iv. 1, 7 are the only other instances in the book. In NH it is unknown.

ודעת. According to the Masoretes it is an infinitive = ודעת, "to know wisdom, and to know madness and folly." But the balance of the verse is better maintained if (with Ḥ Pesh. Tg.) it is treated as a substantive, and pointed וְדַעַת. Koheleth determined to know 'wisdom' and 'knowledge' on the one hand, and their opposites 'madness' and 'folly' on the other.

הוללות, ii. 12, vii. 25. The sing. הוללה nowhere occurs. In this passage Ḥ renders by a plur., but in the other two by a sing. In all three, however, the word should probably be pointed הוֹלְלוֹת, as in x. 13. In each case the form in הוֹלֵל may have been due to סכלות which stands in close connexion with it. See on x. 13.

שכלות for סכלות, here only. Hier. *stultitiam*. But Ḥ Pesh. Tg. Venet. all render 'understanding.' Cf. משמרות xii. 11.

וואתנה... ודעת. On the clause see App. II. p. 156.

v. 18. ויוסף. For the construction cf. Prov. xii. 17, xviii. 22.

¹ Gesenius compares Cicero, *Pis.* 20, "his ego rebus pascor, his delector, his perfruo."

CHAP. II.

Ch. ii. v. 3. למשך. Hitzig endeavours to explain this, in connexion with the following נהג, as a metaphor from a beast of burden drawing a cart. But משך is evidently used in the NH meaning 'refresh.' Delitzsch refers to *Hagigah* 14a: בעלי אנדה מושבין לבו של אדם כמים—"the Haggadists refresh the heart of men like water."

ולבי נהג בחכמה. A circumstantial clause, forming a parenthesis, so that ולאחז is a second infinitive dependent on תרחי. נהג (in BH 'drive') is here used, like משך, with a force peculiar to NH. In the Mishna it has two shades of meaning—1. 'act' or 'behave,' cf. *Abod. Zar.* iii. 4: 2. 'be accustomed,' cf. *P'sah.* iv. 1. These meanings pass into each other; so that the expression here may be rendered 'my heart behaving as usual with wisdom.'

v. 5. פרדסים. See § 8, p. 40. Cant. iv. 13, Neh. ii. 8 only (both in sing.). In the Mishna the plur. is פרדסות.

v. 6. ברכות. In Neh. ii. 14 the 'king's pool' is mentioned, which appears as 'Solomon's pool' in *Jos. B. J.* v. 4. 2.

מהם masc. after ברכות, as Gen. xxxii. 16, Job i. 14 *al.* Cf. Ges. K. § 145 *u.*

עצים. An accusative qualifying, or particularising, an intrans. verb. Cf. Is. v. 6, Prov. xxiv. 31.

v. 7. מקנה. See Baer *Qu. Vol.* p. 61.

v. 8. שרה ושרות. For this collocation of numbers to express a large or indefinite quantity cf. Jud. v. 30 רחם רחמתיים (and Moore's note).

Of the numerous explanations of the ἀπαξ λεγ. שרה the following may be noticed¹:

(1) 'Cup-bearers.' Ⓞ οἰνοχόον καὶ οἰνοχόας. Hier. Comm. *Ministros vini et ministras*, apparently reading the words as שָׂרָה וְשָׂרוֹת, and connecting them with שָׂרָה 'pour.' Hier. transliterates SADDA and SADDOTH.

(2) 'Cups.' Aq. κυλίκιον καὶ κυλίκια. Σ (Hier.) *Mensarum species et appositiones*. Hier. *Scyphos et urceos in ministerio ad vina fundenda*. Tg. "pipes which pour tepid water and pipes which pour hot water" (!).

¹ For others see Delitzsch's commentary *in loc.*

(3) 'Musical instruments.' Kimchi כלי זמר. Luther *allerlei saitenspiel*.

(4) 'Chariot' or 'Litter.' Rashi on *Erub.* 30 b.

(5) 'Lady' or 'concubine.' This meaning is arrived at in various ways: (a) from the meaning 'chariot.' Parallels are suggested in Arab. *z'ynat*, a woman's carriage, and so the woman herself; Turk. *odaliske*, a woman's chamber, and so 'woman.' (b) שירה = שירה from שור 'be violent' (cf. Ps. xci. 6), and so 'be strong or lordly.' Arab. *sayyid* (cf. Span. *cid*) 'a lord,' fem. *sayyidat* 'a lady'; whence the vulgar Arab. *sidi* 'my lord,' *sitti* 'my lady.' Siegfried notes that in the Spanish Arabic of Petro de Alcalá *sitt* denotes 'concubine.'

Whether any of these derivations be correct or not, the meaning 'concubine' seems clearly required by the context; for, firstly, the words appear to be explanatory of תענוות בני האדם, and secondly, an enumeration of the luxuries of a Solomon would be incomplete without a reference to his harem¹.

v. 9. והוסיפתי. Siegfried emends מעשי וה' הנרלתי in accordance with i. 16, ii. 4; but this is unnecessary. The object of the verb is the idea contained in נרלתי—'I grew great and continually greater.' Cf. Ges. K. § 120 d.

v. 11. ופניתני אני בכל. For the pregnant construction 'turn to and fix the attention upon' cf. Job vi. 28 פנו בי.

שעמלתי לעשות. Cf. Gen. ii. 3, Joel ii. 20 f. On the gerund, see Ges. K. § 114 o.

v. 12. הוללות. See on i. 17, x. 13.

Siegfried transposes the two halves of the verse—'there was no profit under the sun (v. 11), for what can men (do) that come after the king? That which they have already done.' This, he says, supplies the reason for v. 11, the reason being 'that Solomon, who is here introduced as speaking, has no certainty that his work, on which he has bestowed such labour, will abide.' But it is difficult to see how this meaning can be derived from the words.

Euringer would read עשוהי (cf. Ex. xviii. 18), which he takes to be the reading which gave rise to עשהי MT, and עשהי Hier. Pesh.,—'that which was long ago his doing.'

But the versions point to a simpler explanation:

¹ Euringer (*Der Masorah-text des Koheleth*) suggests the emendation ערה וקרית, which is simple and attractive, but without support.

Ἐ ὅτι τίς ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐπελεύσεται ὀπίσω τῆς βουλῆς; τὰ ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτήν. [βουλῆ here and in Σ is a rendering of the Aram. מַלְכָּה, cf. Dan. iv. 24.]

©...ὃς ἐλεύσεται ὀπίσω τοῦ βασιλεως, σὺν τὰ ὅσα ἐποίησαν αὐτήν.

Hier. C....qui possit ire post regem atque factorem suum.

Pesh....“after the king in judgment, still more with his Maker.”

B'resh. Rab. אַת אשר כבר עָשָׂהוּ.

Tg. is a loose paraphrase, but apparently followed the MT.

Two points require notice: (1) that עָשָׂהוּ is variously read עָשָׂהוּ (or עָשָׂהוּ) ©, עָשָׂהוּ Pesh. Hier., עָשָׂהוּ Ḙ; (2) that כבר is omitted in all except Tg. and *B'resh. Rabb.* It seems therefore that the reading עָשָׂהוּ explains the others; and the passage will run “What is man [i.e. what can man do] that cometh after the king? That which he [the king] hath done” [or with כבר “hath already done”].

Delitzsch's rendering “him whom they made so long ago” involves an awkwardness in the use of עָשָׂה; and as a description of Solomon the phrase is somewhat pointless; moreover it necessitates the retention of the doubtful כבר.

For the redundant אַת אשר עָשָׂהוּ cf. Zech. xii. 10; but see Ges. K. § 138 e, footnote 1.

v. 15. כַּמְקָרָה. So Baer; but מְקָרָה in the Mantua edition. Cf. v. 7, iii. 19.

גַּם אֲנִי. Cf. Gen. xxiv. 27. Ges. K. § 135 e.

אִז. Cf. Jer. xxii. 15.

v. 16. בַּשֶּׁכֶּבֶר הַיָּמִים הַבָּאִים. Koh. takes his stand at a point in the future, and looks back into the past.

בַּשֶּׁכֶּבֶר. Cf. בִּשְׁל אֲשֶׁר viii. 17, מִשְׁתָּדוֹר v. 4.

הַיָּמִים. *Accus. temporis.* Ges. K. § 118 i.

וְאֵךְ. Winckler's emendation וְאֵךְ is quite unnecessary. Koh. uses the style of the taunting קִינָה. Cf. Is. xiv. 4, Ez. xxvi. 17.

v. 20. לַיָּאֵשׁ. See Baer. In BH elsewhere only in Niphal. Pael occurs in Aram. and Hithp. in NH.

v. 22. הוּוּ. The participle occurs in BH Neh. vi. 6 only.

שָׁהוּ. See Baer. Cf. שָׁהִים iii. 18.

v. 24. שִׂיאֵכֶל. Evidently to be emended מְשִׂיאֵכֶל; it arose either from the dropping of the מ after בָּאֵר, or under the influence of iii. 13.

וַשְׁתָּה וְהָרָא. The best MSS of Ḙ, and Pesh., point to a

reading וישתה ושראה (see App. II. p. 153). If this was the original reading, the similarity of the first two syllables ושיש may have caused one of them to be dropped, forming ושתה, and then והראה would arise to assimilate the constructions; or, as before, the corruption may have been due to iii. 13.

v. 25. יהוש. In NH and Aram. חוש, חוש, means 'feel pain'; Tg. here הששא. Hence it may denote any kind of feeling; here it is one of enjoyment. On ע see App. II. p. 153.

חוי ממני 'apart from—without—me' is meaningless, and the rendering 'more than I' is impossible. There is strong evidence (ע, Pesh., S. H., Hier. C., Copt.) for the emendation ח" ממנו 'apart from Him,' i.e. God. The expression is unique in BH, corresponding to Aram. לכו כן, בר כן.

v. 26. נם זה הכל ורעות רוח. It is meaningless in connexion with the words either of *Koheleth* or the *Hasid*. This, and the similar addition in vii. 6, appear to be the only instances of glosses introduced after the book had been completed in its triple form.

CHAP. III.

Ch. iii. vv. 2-8. It has been suggested that the 14 couplets were not originally in their present haphazard order. The simplest re-arrangement would be to transpose 2 b and 3 a, and to make 5 a precede 4 a. The couplets then fall into groups:— a pair of contrasts whose subject is human life and death (birth and death, killing and healing) are followed by four sets of three: (1) the treatment of landed property, (2) emotions of joy and sorrow, (3) the preservation and loss of property in general, (4) emotions of friendship and enmity. But such artificial arrangements are alien to the temper of *Koheleth*.

v. 5. להשליך אבנים implies the marring of good soil.

כנוס אבנים. Cf. Is. v. 2.

The three hostile actions in 2 b, 3 b, 5 a are found in 2 Kin. iii. 19, 25.

v. 11. יפה. In classical Heb. 'beautiful'; but in NH it has the more general force which belongs to καλός—good, proper, fitting. Cf. v. 17.

אח העלם. This passage is discussed by Hitzig (*Th. St. Kr.* 1839, p. 513), Umbreit (do. 1846, p. 417), and W. Grimm (*ZwTh.*

1880, p. 274). The various methods of treating the words are of three kinds:

(1) Emendations. Hitzig invents a word עֲלָם, to correspond to the Arab. 'ilam 'knowledge.' Bickell proposes הַעֲלָם 'that which is hidden.' Cheyne, הַעֲלָם 'the task.'

(2) The second class of explanations follow Ἐ τὸν αἰῶνα, giving עֲלָם the late meaning 'world' which it bears in Pesh. Tg. Mishn.

Gesenius and others understand it of 'worldliness' (cf. 1 John ii. 16) or of worldly duties considered as good things (Luther): but these are impossible. A favourite explanation has been that God has placed the world in man's heart, so that his heart is "a Microcosm in which the great world is mirrored." So Ewald, and formerly Cheyne. The latter (*Job and Solomon*, p. 210) quotes Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*—"God has framed the mind like a glass, capable of the image of the universe, and desirous to receive it as the eye to receive light."

But not only does עֲלָם occur nowhere else in BH with the NH sense of 'world,' while it is found in six other passages in Kōh. with a temporal force—but it is, in this passage, in evident contrast with the word עת 'time,' which occurs 30 times in the preceding verses of the chapter.

(3) 'Eternity.' Zöckler understands it of man's inborn intuition of God's eternal Being and government. Cf. Rom. i. 19.

Delitzsch gives *desiderium aeternitatis*; man knows that everything has its appointed עת, but there is planted within him an impulse towards that which is beyond time.

But the best explanation is that of Grimm, who is followed by Nowack and Wildeboer. He suggests *notio aeternitatis*. The popular conception of 'eternity' is that of unlimited time—innumerable עתות stretching into the past and future². Man can see that God has made everything excellent in its own proper time—he can understand, that is, individual עתות in which God's working is revealed to him; but God has also placed in his heart (i.e. mind) a conception of the sum-total of the עתות; "but in such a way that" (מבלי אשר) he cannot

¹ See Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, Engl. transl. pp. 162-166.

² Cf. Cicero, *De juvent.* i. 26, "Tempus est pars aeternitatis."

“discover”—understand the true inwardness of—“the work which God doeth from beginning to end.”

סוף. Late Heb. for קץ, vii. 2, xii. 13; Joel ii. 20; 2 Chr. xx. 16 only.

v. 12. וּלְעִשׂוֹת טוֹב. Some have thought that this is a Graecism, representing εὖ πράττειν. But see § 8, p. 40.

v. 15. וְאִשׁר לְהִיֹּחַ. Cf. Ges. K. § 114 *h*, *i*.

יִבְקֹשׂ אֵת נִדְרֵךְ. God seeks out, and brings again on to the scene of the present, that which has been driven into the past by the lapse of time.

But in early times נִדְרֵךְ was universally considered as masculine—*Ἐ* Aq. τὸν διωκόμενον, *Σ* ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκδιωκόμενων, and even B. Sira v. 3 כִּי יִבְקֹשׂ נִדְרֵימִים. So Pesh. Tg. And Lucifer Calar. has *et deus requireret eum qui persecutionem patitur*.

v. 16. הַצִּדִּיק and הַרְשָׁע. *Ἐ* reads them as הַרְשָׁע and הַצִּדִּיק; so Lucifer, *vidi sub sole locum judicii, illic impius, et locum justii, illic impius*¹. The following verse was evidently the cause.

v. 17. שָׁם. (1) This has been explained as referring to a future time; Hier. *in tempore judicii, in futurum judicium*. Tg. בְּיוֹם דִּינָא רַבָּא.

(2) Some writers understand שָׁם to mean ‘with God’; but only one, equally doubtful, expression is adduced to support it—Gen. xlix. 24 מִשָּׁם רָעָה אֲבֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל.

(3) Del. Now. Wildeb. and others read שָׁם ‘he hath appointed,’ cf. Ex. xxi. 13. This makes good sense; but a strong objection to it is the distance at which the word stands from its object עָה. Kōheleth, though his style is not classical, is never awkward or unrhythmical. A verb, especially a monosyllable, in such a position is as unlikely in Hebrew as it would be in English.

(4) *Ἐ*^B omits it (see App. II. p. 141); and it is not impossible that שָׁם was a mere corruption, arising from the accidental doubling either of the last syllable of the foregoing מַעֲשֵׂה or the first of the following אִמְרָתִי.

v. 18. עַל דְּבַרְתָּ with an ellipse of ‘it is’ or ‘it happens,’ referring to the state of things described in v. 16. Siegrf. unnecessarily inserts שָׁם, having omitted it at the end of v. 17. עַל דְּבַרְתָּ occurs vii. 14, viii. 2 only. Classical Heb. עַל דְּבַר or עַל דְּבָרִי.

¹ Reading εὐσεβής as ἀσεβής.

לכרם Inf. Kal, √ ברר, cf. לָרַד Is. xlv. 1, בָּשַׁף Jer. v. 26.

The root meaning is 'purify'; Venet. καθαριεῖν αὐτούς, cf. Ass. *barâru* 'be shining.' ⚡ διακρινεῖ, Hier. C. *separat*, adopt the secondary meaning 'choose,' 'select,' found in 1 Chr. vii. 40, ix. 22, xvi. 41, Neh. v. 18 only (always partep.). BDB (with R.V.) "that God may prove them," as Vg. *ut probaret eos*, and Tg. "that there may come upon them plagues and evil diseases to try them and prove them."

But this is without parallel in BH; and (if the gist of the passage has been rightly explained in § 4, pp. 15, 17) it is not Koheleth's meaning at all.

In NH the word frequently denotes 'make clear,' 'bring to light,' cf. *Shabb.* 74a, 138a; the adj. ברור *Sanh.* 7b; and the Rabbinic על בריו *perspicue*. And this gives the required sense here. The rendering of A.V. is perfectly adequate, "that God might manifest them," i.e. shew them in their true light—as beasts.

ולראות. Tg. למהוי: "that He [God] might see whether they would turn in repentance." But all the other versions express 'to shew,' i.e. וְלִרְאוֹת (= וְלִהְרֹאוֹת), which should probably be read.

שָׁהָם, cf. שְׁהוּא ii. 22. Baer accentuates as follows: שָׁהָם בְּהֵמָה, "that they are beasts—they for their part," the last two words being ironical; "even men who vaunt their superiority over the beasts!" (Ewald *höchstselbst*.) If the text is to stand this is the best explanation of it.

Delitzsch: "they in and of themselves,"—viewed as mere men—reads too much into the words.

But it is probable that the text is corrupt. In ⚡ the following verse begins with *καὶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐ* [ὡς S, om. AC, ? ὄτι] *συνάντημα*... which suggests that נָם לָהֶם is the true reading at the end of v. 18, the corruption הָמָה having been due to the same syllables in the preceding word. נָם לָהֶם "even to themselves" will mean "even in their own estimation."

v. 19. כִּי 1°. It is not improbable that οὐ in ⚡^b may be an intentional corruption of ὄτι for the sake of orthodoxy. Some alterations in ⚡ are undoubtedly of this nature, cf. xi. 9. But since the unorthodox conclusion *συνάντημα ἐν αὐτοῖς* is left untampered with, it is possible that the error was accidental.

בִּי מִקְרָה וְג'. It is clear that מִקְרָה must have the same

meaning throughout the verse; and the words, therefore, cannot be rendered "for a chance are the sons of men and a chance are the beasts, and one chance is unto them." מַקְרָה is in each case the 'mischance,' the 'catastrophe' of death. All the versions treat the first and second מַקְרָה as in the construct state. A proverbial sentence is thus formed, after the manner of Prov. xxv. 20, 25, xxvi. 9, 14, 21 etc., which must be rendered "as the mischance of the sons of men, so is the mischance of the beasts." According to Baer this may be spelt מַקְרָה, cf. ii. 15.

וּמוֹתוֹ. The word is unique in Kōh. It occurs only in Prov. xiv. 23, xxi. 5, in both of which it assumes this hiphilic form in opposition to another hiphilic form מַהְסֹר. Kōh. elsewhere uses יוֹתֵר and יוֹתֵר; and since in this passage 𐤄, 𐤆 and 𐤇 all render the clause as an interrogation, מוֹתֵר should be emended to מַה יוֹתֵר (cf. vi. 8, 11): "what superiority hath the man over the beast? None!"

v. 21. הַעֲלָה...הִירֵדָה. That the ה in these words should be the article (A.V.) is rendered impossible both by the sense of the passage, and by the presence of the pronoun הִיא. Following the versions the words must be pointed interrogatively, הִירֵדָה and הַעֲלָה: "who knoweth with regard to the spirit of the sons of men (*casus pend.* as in v. 13) whether it goeth upwards, and the spirit of the beast whether it goeth downwards to the earth?"

On the connexion of thought between this and xii. 7 see § 8, p. 48.

CHAP. IV.

Ch. iv. v. 1. הַעֲשִׂימִים. Cf. Am. iii. 9, Job xxxv. 9. The pointing here is evidently intentional, to distinguish the abstract subst. 'oppressions' from the pass. particip. in v. 2.

וּמוֹד עֲשִׂיהֶם כֹּחַ. It is possible to supply אֵין from the preceding clause: "and from the hand of their oppressors (there was no) power (of deliverance)." But this is awkward. A.V., R.V. "and on the side of their oppressors was power," making מוֹד equivalent to יָד; but there is no other instance to support this. The same sense, however, can be reached in another way: "and from the hand of their oppressors (went forth) power." Gins., Del., Now., Siegfr. give כֹּחַ the meaning 'violence' (Vg.

violentiae), which it nowhere else bears. Koh. simply means that as the oppressed had no helper, for the oppressors might was right. Pesh. omits the *waw* of **ומיד**.

v. 2. **ושבה**. See Ges. K. § 113 *gg*. Emendations **משבה** (Siegfr.), **ומשבה** (Euringer), are unnecessary.

ערה = **נה**. Cf. **ערה** (v. 3) = **נה**. Mishn. **ערה**.

v. 3. **אח אשר ערה**. The verb is mentally supplied from the foregoing **שבה**.

v. 4. **כשרון**. 'Skill,' 'ability' as in ii. 21. In v. 10 it rather means the success or profit which ability earns. Cf. verb **קל** xi. 6, Hiph. x. 10.

היה. The nearest English equivalent for this predicative construction is: "I saw all the labour and all the skilful work that *it meant* the jealousy etc."—it was both incited by it and resulted in it.

קנאת איש מרעהו. This might mean 'the jealousy felt by a man because of his neighbour' (i.e. because of his neighbour's successes). But since **קנא** is usually followed by **ב** or **את** with the object of jealousy, it is better to take **איש** as an objective acc.: "the jealousy felt for a man by [proceeding from the heart of] his neighbour."

v. 6. **נחת** acc. of the thing measured, cf. **נחמה** 1 Kin. xvii. 12.

v. 10. **יפלו**. Strictly speaking, they do not both fall. The plur. denotes an indefinite singular. Ges. K. § 124 *o*.

ואילו = **לו**, Alas for him! cf. x. 16. For the pleonastic dat. ethic. see Ges. K. § 119 *s*.

v. 12. **יתקפו האחד**. The noun is in apposition to, and further defines, the pron. suffix, cf. Ex. xxxv. 5, Ges. K. § 131 *m*.

The suffix in **נדרו** refers to the unexpressed subj. of **יתקפו**: "if (someone) overpower the solitary man, (yet) two can withstand him" (i.e. the aggressor).

יעמדו נדרו. Cf. Dan. x. 13.

v. 13. **טסכן**, "poor" ix. 15, 16 only. **קספנת** Dt. viii. 9. See BDB s.v.

v. 14. Having described the youth as 'poor and wise,' Koheleth cites two facts, each introduced by **כי**, to justify the two adjectives. He was wise—*for* he managed to escape from prison to be king; he was poor—*for* even in his kingdom (i.e. in the kingdom that he afterwards gained) he was born poor.

This is simpler than (with Del., Now., Siegfr.) to take **כִּי גַם** as meaning 'although,' and the suffix in **מַלְכוּתוֹ** as referring to the old king:—The youth gained the throne, although in his (i.e. the old king's) reign he (the youth) had been born poor. For this use of **כִּי גַם**, viii. 12 is cited.

Σ and Tg.¹ cause still further confusion by referring the **יָצָא** clause to the youth, and the **נִוְלַד** clause to the old king.

הַסּוּרִים is for **הַאֲסוּרִים** 'the prisoners,' cf. **הַרְמִים** 2 Chr. xxii. 5, **מְסוּרַת** Ez. xx. 37 (but text doubtful).

נִוְלַד may possibly have the Mishnic meaning 'became.' Tg. **אֲתַעְבִּיד**, Vg. *inopia consumatur*. So Rashi, Ginsb., A.V.

v. 15. **הַשֵּׁנִי הַיְלֵד** must mean "the second youth." Now., Del. take **הַשֵּׁנִי** as 'the second one' in apposition to **הַיְלֵד** who succeeded the old king who was the first. The only parallels which Del. offers are from N. T. Greek: Mat. viii. 21 *ἕτερος τῶν μαθητῶν*, Lk. xxiii. 32 *ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο*. Even more improbable is Ewald's suggestion that **הַשֵּׁנִי** has the sense of **הַמְשֵׁנָה** in Gen. xli. 43. Bickell and Siegfr. omit the word as a gloss, the former suggesting that it is a reminiscence of the foregoing proverbs!

The imperf. **יִעַמַד**, and **יִשְׁמָחוּ** in v. 16, are explained in § 3, p. 11, where the historical reference is discussed.

v. 16. **לְפָנֵיהֶם**. Ewald strives to give this a temporal sense—"all the people who were before them." Bickell, with the same object, supplements the verse with a long insertion from his own pen.

But it is simpler to render "there was no end to all the people before whom [at whose head] he was," referring to the second youth. Cf. 1 S. xviii. 16. So Tg. **רְהוּה מְרַבֵּר קְרַמִּיהוּן**.

כִּי might mean 'surely'; but Koh. never uses the particle thus. It rather expresses the thought that the historical facts just mentioned are only another illustration of the vanity of human strivings—"for this [popularity and success] also is a vapour."

¹ In Tg. the 'old king' is Nimrod, and the 'youth' Abraham; "for Abraham went forth from the race of idol-worshippers and reigned over the land of the Canaanites; for even in the days of Abraham's reign Nimrod became poor in the world."

CHAP. IV. 17, V.

Ch. iv. 17. וקרוב לשמע "and to draw near to hear is better than..." For the absol. inf. cf. היטיב Jer. x. 5, המשל Job xxv. 2; and for the ellipse of טוב cf. ix. 17. Aq. Pesh. Vg. Tg. take קרוב with an imperatival force, a new sentence beginning with מתת.

מתת הכסילים זב. The only grammatical rendering of these words is "than that fools should give a sacrifice."

Pesh. transposes the substantives: "than the gift of the sacrifice of fools"; and Siegfr. would make this emendation.

The versions are divided between ממתת (Ⲭ ὑπὲρ δόμα. Pesh. ⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲃⲟⲩⲛⲓⲛⲓ) and ממת (Aq. ⲙ ⲁⲓⲛⲁ, Hier. *donum*). The latter is impossible, as the writer cannot have said that "sacrifice is the gift of fools"; but Ⲭ, which also has *θυσία σου*, represents a reading זבחק הכ' זבמתת הכ' וק'—"and draw near to hear; better than the gift of fools is thy sacrifice," i.e. if thou draw near to hear, thy sacrifice is better than the gift of fools. This was perhaps the original reading.

אנים יורעים לעשות רע evidently cannot be rendered on the analogy of v. 13. "They are ignorant, so that they do evil" (Del.) is impossible. Now., Wright follow Renan in adding כִּי אֵם before לעשות. But the simplest emendation is מלעשות (Siegfr.); the מ would easily drop out after יורעים'.

Ch. v. 5. להטיא "to cause thy flesh to incur the penalty of sin," Dt. xxiv. 4, Is. xxix. 21. Tg. "to cause the judgment of Gehenna upon thy flesh." Physical punishment was the usual conception of Divine retribution.

המלאך, i.e. the priest. The use of the word may have been suggested by Mal. ii. 7, but the coincidence cannot be taken as indicating the date of Koh. Compare the use of *ἀγγελος* for 'bishop' in the N. T. Apoc.

But Ⲭ πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ and Pesh. ⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲃⲟⲩⲛⲓ point to an early reading לפני האלהים. This would still mean 'in the presence of the priest,' as God's representative, just as in Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. 7, 8, 27 judges or rulers are called Elohim. The alteration to המלאך may have been made from fear of irreverence.

¹ Ⲭ Pesh. boldly cut the knot by rendering קרע as καλόν, ⲛⲓⲛⲓ.

v. 5. Frequent in the priestly laws in Leviticus and Numbers, for an unintentional misdemeanour for the expiation of which special offerings were commanded. In the present case a man who has failed to pay a vow might be tempted to offer the excuse *כי שגגה היא* because the offering enjoined for such a case was smaller than that which he had vowed.

v. 6. *כי את האלהים ירא* is meaningless in its present position, and *כי* should follow a negative. It is evidently the conclusion of v. 5.

The intervening proverb seems to be corrupt. R.V. renders "for *thus it cometh to pass* through the multitude...etc.," cf. the construction in iii. 18. It is also possible to render "for in the multitude of dreams there are also vanities and many words" (Ewald; so apparently Σ , reading *הבליים* without *waw*). But the proverb appears to be a doublet of that in v. 2; and it seems probable that a slightly varying form of v. 2 was written in the margin, and found its way into the text. In v. 2 *החלום* is a *result* and not a cause; and the emendation suggests itself here: *כי ררב [ענין] חלומות והבליים [ב] דברים הרבה*.

v. 7. *שמר*. Each official 'is watching,' i.e. is jealously on the look out for any action of a subordinate that may hurt his interests.

גבהים may be either a plural *majestatis*, referring to the king, or it may simply describe the numerous grades of officials rising one above another.

Siegfried assigns the passage to the *Hasid*. Emending *שמר* to *ישמר*, he explains it as follows: each official "is on his guard against the other"—each is afraid of opposing a higher one in the interests of the poor; but this state of things will not last, for the 'Highest,' i.e. God, is over all. But as explained above, the passage is entirely consonant with Koheleth's spirit; and the words which follow, whatever their exact meaning may be, shew that it is the action of the king that fills his thoughts.

v. 8. Two points in this verse stand out clearly—that *ארץ* and *שרה* must be translated differently, and cannot refer to the same thing—and that *נעבד* agrees with *שרה*, not with *מלך*. The latter is in accordance with the Mas. punctuation *מלך לשדה נעבד* (see Baer²).

¹ Siegf. reconstructs the words: *כי ררב הבליים חלמות ודברים הרבה שגגה*. Pesh. adds *הקטנת* 'of error' after 'many words.'

² Other editions, however, *מלך לשדה נ*.

Two or three renderings that have been suggested may thus be put out of account at once, such as: "a king made for (i.e. set over) a land" (Ewald); "a king who is served by the land (i.e. his subjects)" (Gesén., Knob., al.); "a king who is subject to (i.e. depends for his sustenance upon) the land" (Tg., Rashi, Ibn Ezr.); "a king given to the arable land"—"agro addictus" (Del., Rosenm.).

Siegfr. thinks the passage corrupt, and does not attempt a translation. It is possible that a word agreeing with מלך has dropped out; but as it stands it may be rendered: "but an advantage to a country in all respects is—a king for [i.e. interested in, devoted to] cultivated land." Koheleth wistfully pictures the good government of a king who (like Uzziah 2 Chr. xxvi. 10) loves husbandry.

For ככל cf. Gen. xxiv. 1. G ἐπὶ παντί ἐστὶ... "over all is a king..." refers to the grades of officials in v. 7, and adopts the כְּרִי הוּא.

The Niphal of עבד occurs only in Dt. xxi. 4, Ezek. xxxvi. 9, 34, in each case with the meaning 'tilled.' And this rendering is borne out by G © Σ Pesh., and is adopted by Nowack.

v. 9. מי אהב. Not a question—"who has joy in wealth which bringeth in no increase?" (Hitz.), which contradicts the thought of the preceding verse. Render "he who loveth wealth (shall have) no profit (from it)." It is not necessary (with Zöckl., Siegfr.) to supply ישבע before תבואה.

הפץ ב אהב is not found elsewhere; but it is analogous with הפץ ב and חשק ב. On the reading לו תבואה see App. II. pp. 143, 159.

v. 12. לבעלו either 'kept by its owner' (Ew., Now., Del. and Hier.C. a *domine*) or 'kept for its owner,' i.e., as Koh. would say, by 'time and chance.'

v. 14. שילך בירו "that he can take with him." For the form cf. יגיר x. 20.

But G Σ Pesh. Hier.C. Tg. read שילך, referring to מאומה—"and nothing shall he carry away by his labour, which can go with him"—which is simpler.

v. 15. כלעמם. Parchon and Kimchi in their lexicons (s.v. עמם) support the division into two words; cf. Aram. כלקבל.

But it is probable that כל is only a combination of כ and ל used as prepositions. (See Lambert, *Rev. d'Études Juives*, xxxi.)

47-51. Rahlfs *Th.LZ.* 1896, p. 587.) לקבל without כ occurs in a causative sense Ezr. iv. 16, vi. 13, and in a locative sense Dan. ii. 31, iii. 3, while קבל occurs nowhere alone; thus קבלקבל arises by metathesis for קבלקבל. And the case of כלעמת is similar. לעמת occurs frequently (esp. in Ezek.), and מלעמת 1 K. vii. 20, but never עמת alone.

The word should therefore be pointed כלעמת, the כ having its counterpart in כן ילך. Ⓔ Pesh. Hier. read כן לעמת.

v. 16. יאכל. It is possible that this is a figurative expression, like 'sit' or 'walk in darkness.' Del. takes it literally: the rich man is miserly, and "does not allow himself table comforts in a well lighted room"! Midr. Koh. reads ילך; so several codd. of Kenn. and De Rossi; adopted by Kraetzschmar. Houbigant יאכל. Böttch. יאכל.

But it is simpler to follow Ⓔ και ἐν πένθει, and read יאכל (Siegfr.).

In the latter half of the verse, the M.T. וקעם and וקליו are untranslatable. It is true that כעם is used intransitively in vii. 9; but in the present passage a substantive is clearly required; all the versions read וקעם 'and vexation'; and for וקליו they read וקלי; M.T. evidently arose from the accidental doubling of the following *waw*.

These emendations give a series of substantives, all governed by the preposition in בחשך: "moreover all his days (are spent) in darkness and mourning, and great vexation, and sickness and wrath."

v. 17. טוב אשר יפה. See § 8, p. 41.

v. 19. מענה בשמחה לבו. This participle may be derived from (1) ענה 'to be occupied,' (2) ענה 'to answer.'

(1) Ⓔ οὗτος ὁ θεὸς περιεπάσθη αὐτὸν ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καρδίας αὐτοῦ. Hier. C. *quia Deus occupat in laetitia cor eius.* This explanation is adopted by Siegfr., Wildeb., al.: "because God keeps him engrossed in the joy of his heart." It makes good sense, but there are two objections to it:—1st, either the object to מענה must be supplied, or (with Hier.) בשמחה must be read; 2nd, this meaning of ענה is confined to i. 13, iii. 10, in both of which it is Kal. inf. followed by the cognate word ענין.

(2) Ibn Ezr., Kimchi, "God causes (all things) to respond with the joy of his heart." Hitz. compares Hos. ii. 23 f. But even if that could be used to illustrate the Hiphil, the omission

of the object is very awkward. Del. al. assume that the Hiphil has the same meaning as the *Kal*:—"God answers to—assents, corresponds to—the joy of his heart." But this use of **ב** is without parallel. On Tyler's use of this explanation, see § 8, p. 54.

Ewald and Nowack have given the simplest solution: "God answers with, by means of, the joy of his heart," i.e. He grants the joy which man desires. Ps. lxxv. 6 is scarcely a complete parallel, because the verb is followed not by **ב** but by a second acc. But no commentator that the present writer has seen refers to 1 K. xviii. 24 "the God that answers with, by means of, fire." Lastly, it is possible that the true reading should be **נה** אלהים, the **מ** which causes the difficulty having been due to dittography.

CHAP. VI.

Ch. vi. v. 3. ילד ממה. Cf. 1 Sam. ii. 5 ילדה שבעה.

"and it is many that the days of his years are." *וְרַב וְנִי* lit. "and it is many that the days of his years are." This looks like a gloss, but it may have been added by *Koh.* to the preceding clause for the sake of emphasis.

Tg. tries to avoid the tautology—"and he is in power and authority (*רבוּתא*) during the days of the years which he hath."

v. 5. נחה. Del. refers to the Mishnic sense of נוח 'better than.' And this seems to underlie Σ *διαφορᾶς*, Tg. ולא ידע בין טוב לביש, and Vg. *distantiam boni et mali*; all of which take נחה as governed by ידע. But נחה must have the meaning which it bears in iv. 6, ix. 17; and the verb נוח is used in the same connexion in Job iii. 11-13.

v. 6. אלו "if"; frequent in Mishna. BH Est. vii. 4 only.

v. 8. Bernstein¹ and Ginsburg supply **מ** before יודע: "what (advantage) hath the poor man *over* him who knoweth...," over a leader or magnate in society. But the passage yields good sense without so harsh an ellipse; "יודע וְנִי" must be a description of the poor man. Del., Now., Siegfr., al., explain it "who understands the right rule of life—how to maintain his proper social position, keeping his desires under control." But the explanation adopted above, § 4, p. 17, is simpler: "[what

¹ *Quaestiones nonnullae Koheletanae*, Breslau, 1854.

advantage has] a poor man who has got on in the world by knowing how to walk prudently and successfully before his fellow men?" In ix. 13-16 an instance is given of a poor wise man who gained no profit from his prudent wisdom.

v. 10. נקרא שמו. Its place in the order of the world was fixed—"like the stars, Ps. cxlvii. 4, Is. xl. 26" (Siegfr.).

ונורע וגו'. אשר is not ὄτι, but (as most modern commentators) ὄτι—"and it was known [predetermined] what man was" or "was to be." Ἐ καὶ ἐγνώσθη ὃ ἔσται ἄνθρωπος.

שהתקף. K^{ri} omits the article, cf. x. 3, 20. The alteration here may have arisen to prevent the word being pronounced as a Hiphil (Euringer). The Hiphil, though not found in BH, is common in Talmudic writings, and the Aphel in Targ. The adj. תקף is a ἄπ. λεγ. in BH. Cf. יתקפו iv. 12.

v. 12. ויעשם "seeing that he spends them"; an extension of the construction of a circumstantial clause. עשה in this sense is not found elsewhere in M.T. But in Prov. xiii. 23, Ἐ seems to point to a reading which contained it or a similar word. It is possible, however, to make בצל complete the thought of the verb—"seeing that he makes them like a shadow"; i.e. he dies so soon that his days are made as evanescent as a shadow. The expression need not be considered a Graecism.

CHAP. VII.

Ch. vii. 1 (2). v. 1 a has no kind of relevancy to the context. The *Mashal* editor appears to have inserted it because it was cast in the same form as the following aphorisms of Koheleth. If it is an independent proverb, v. 1 b is incomplete as it stands. Bickell emends טובה חכמה מכבוד יקר שם משמן טוב, extracting יקר and the last two words from x. 1, which, in his arrangement of the book, stands immediately before vi. 8. In v. 1 b he goes so far as to create half a distich: טוב לא היותו אדם מהיותו, thus supplying a subject for the suffix in הולדו. Some change in the text seems necessary; and the simplest which suggests itself is: טוב שם משמן טוב יום המות מיום הלדו.

הולדו is followed by Ḥ^{ac} S.H. Aq. Hier. The suffix is difficult, and is omitted in Ḥ^{bs} Pesh. Delitzsch compares iv. 12, v. 17; but in both these passages the suffix (in יתקפו and נגרו

and in עמלו) refers quite naturally to the subjects treated of in the context, while here the suffix can be referred to nothing. Either הַלֵּל or perhaps (with Bickell) הַלְלָה, should be read.

v. 2 (3). משחה may be used of birthday festivities, thus connecting v. 2 closely with v. 1 b.

v. 5 (6). מאיש שמע for משמע, the change of construction expressing that the two actions of hearing are performed by different people.

v. 6 (7). For the paronomasia סיר...סירים cf. the Latin proverb *ipsa hollera olla legit* (Catull. 94. 2). 'Nettles' and 'kettle' have been suggested.

Σ (ap. Hier.), *per vocem enim imperitorum vinculis quispiam colligatur*, seems to confuse סירים with כסילים and סיר with אסור.

הל, probably a gloss. See § 5, p. 24, footnote.

v. 7 (8). Ingenuity has been taxed to the utmost to find a connexion of thought suggested by כי. For some of the suggestions which have been made see Delitzsch *in loc.* But the clause is evidently the second half of a *Mashal* taken from some unknown source. The lost half may have resembled Prov. xvi. 8 (Del.).

"העשק וג". The judge instead of being 'a wise man' is rendered 'mad' in his responsible position by the 'extortion' which forces a man to bribe him in order that he may win his case. Ewald's emendation עשר for עשק is unnecessary.

אה לב. Cf. Prov. xiii. 21, Is. l. 4 (Ges. K. § 117 c).

מתנה. For the versions see App. II. p. 161. Midr. Koh. reads מתונה "rebellion." Hier. compares the thought of Dt. xvi. 19.

v. 8 (9). ארך. Elsewhere always with אפים (ארך Jer. xv. 15) exc. Ez. xvii. 3 האבר.

v. 10 (11). *Mashal* on discontent, the spirit of the old man :

*difficilis querulus laudator temporis acti
se puero.*

v. 11 (12). There is no reason for departing from the simple meaning of the words—"Wisdom is good with an inheritance." This need not at all imply that it is not good without an inheritance.

• Wright compares

μακάριος ὅστις οὐσίαν καὶ νοῦν ἔχει.
χρηταὶ γὰρ οὗτος εἰς ἃ δεῖ ταύτη καλῶς. (Menander)

And see Pirke Aboth ii. 2: יפה תלמוד תורה עם דרך ארץ, and 1 Tim. vi. 6.

Some have rendered "W. is as good as an inheritance." But there is no support for *עם טוב* in this sense. Such passages as Job ix. 26, xxxvii. 18, Ps. xxviii. 1 scarcely bear it out.

Pesh. rend. "Wisdom is better than weapons of war," apparently connecting *חיל* with *נהלה*.

בל חזו שמש. Cf. Ps. xlix. 20 לא יראו אור, lviii. 9

v. 12 (13). בצל... בצל. If the text is to stand the clause may be rendered "in the shadow of wisdom *it is as* in the shadow of money"; or the preposition may be the 'ב *essentiae*'—"as a shadow [protection] is wisdom, as a shadow is money," cf. Ps. liv. 6 (Ges. K. § 119 i). But it is probable that the true reading is בצל... בצל, as in Gen. xviii. 25, Hos. iv. 9. See App. II. pp. 145 f. For צל cf. Num. xiv. 9.

v. 14 (15). On the meaning of this verse see § 4, p. 18; and cf. ix. 1.

v. 15 (16). מאריך. Sc. ימים. Prov. xxviii. 2.

v. 18 (19). בזה, i.e. צדק and חכמה from v. 16. מזה, i.e. רשע and סכלות from v. 17. יצא את כלם, see § 8, p. 42. Pesh. נסח "adhering, following close, to" must be a slip for נסח.

v. 25 (26). ולבי. So the versions, exc. Tg. But this is impossible. Siegfr. reads ואתנה לבי from i. 17; but בלבי is simpler, with Tg. and several codd. of Kenn. and De R.

חשבון, "reckoning." A NH and Aram. word; in BH only v. 27, ix. 10.

Here and in v. 27 it means 'the *rationale* of things'—a law by which the perplexing phenomena of life can be explained. Vg. *rationem*'.

רשע...הוללות. As the text stands ככל and הוללות are predicates—"to know that wickedness is folly, and foolishness is madness." But there is evidence for the transposition ככל רשע and the reading והללות "to know the folly of wickedness, and foolishness and madness." (See App. II. p. 146.) ככל with this meaning occurs in Ps. xlix. 14 only, in the form כָּסִיל. It usually means 'confidence.' But כסיל 'a fool' is common. On הוללות see on i. 17, x. 13.

¹ Hier. "Esebon...et numerum possumus, et summam, et rationem, et cogitationem dicere."

² Printed כָּסִיל in some editions.

v. 26 (27). מוצא. "With reference to this passage and Prov. xviii. 22 it was common in Palestine when someone was married to ask מוצא או מוצא = happy or unhappy? Jeb. 63 b." (Delitzsch.)

v. 28 (29). אשר היא מ' "the woman who is nets," cf. ואני תפלה Ps. cix. 4.

v. 29 (30). עוד "again and again," Gen. xlvi. 29, Ruth i. 14.

v. 29 (30). חשבנות "contrivances," 2 Chr. xxvi. 15 only.

The *Hasid* speaks of civilization with the evils that are apt to follow in its train.

CHAP. VIII.

Ch. viii. 1. פשר. Here only in BH. A loan word from Aram. פשרא, cf. פתרון, פתר. only in Gen. xl. xli.

עו. All the versions read the adj. עו, which should probably be adopted. The subst. nowhere has the bad sense here implied, but with the adj. it is not uncommon. Dt. xxviii. 50, Is. lvi. 11, Dan. viii. 23.

Render "he that is bold (impudent, coarse) of countenance."

ישנא K^{thib}. ישנה K^{ri}. For שנה = שנה cf. 2 K. xxv. 29, Lam. iv. 1.

The נ is supported by G Pesh. Hier. (all of which read ישנא? 'is hated'), and by Taanith 7 b: "every man who has ווען פניו ישנא one may hate, as the Scripture saith ישנא"—a note being added that ישנא is not to be read. If עו is adopted, it is natural to read ישנא; but the pointing ישנא can be illustrated by מוצא vii. 26.

In § 7, p. 35, B.S. xiii. 25, xii. 18 are referred to.

vv. 2-6. Koheleth's complaints on the tyranny of the king, interspersed with comments of the *Hasid*. See § 4, pp. 18 f., and § 5, pp. 25 f.

v. 2. אני should probably be omitted. See App. II. p. 155.

Del., Siegfr. al. supply אמרת in accordance with ii. 1, iii. 17 f. But in all the nine passages in which 'I said' occurs, Koh. states the conclusions which he drew from his ponderings on the problems of life: they form no parallel to the present passage¹.

In the explanation of vv. 2-6 given in § 5 the following points should be noticed. אל תבהל is (with G, S) taken with v. 2. מוצא is a Divine command, as nearly always; see BDB s.v.

¹ Jer. Sanh. 21 β, אמי פי מ'... אשמך.

רע לא אדע 4 רע לא אדע. The second ידע, with a different force, finds a parallel in ix. 12. רעת (v. 6 b) means 'trouble' if it is from the pen of Kōheleth, and 'wickedness' if from that of the *Hasid*.

For other explanations of the passage see Delitzsch *in loc.*, and Kraetzschmar *Th.LZ.* Sept. 15, 1900.

v. 9. ונתון. The inf. absol. is a continuation of a preceding finite verb, cf. ix. 11, Gen. xli. 43 (Ges. K. § 113 z).

v. 10. As it stands the M.T. must refer to two sets of people, the description of the second beginning at וממקום: "And then I saw wicked men buried and they came. And from the holy place they who have done rightly¹ must depart and be forgotten in the city."

But ונבאו is impossibly abrupt²; there is no other instance of the Piel נבא being used in the sense of the Kal, 'depart'; the reading וישתבחו is very doubtful; and כן seems as though it should have some connexion with בכך.

Two very slight emendations make the passage much clearer: omit ו before ממקום (it would easily arise by the doubling of the preceding ו), and read וישתבחו. Perhaps also read ויהלכו. The MS. authority for these readings is given in App. II. pp. 147, 155. The passage then refers solely to the wicked, whom Kōheleth watched when they received honourable burial in Jerusalem, and thought of the insolent success of their past life:

"And then [in the face of this glaring wrong] I saw wicked men buried, and they came from a holy place [where they ought never to have been tolerated]; and they used to go about, and be praised in the city because they had so done [i.e. because they had ruled over others to their hurt]."

בכך. "Then," BH Est. iv. 16 only, where it has rather a temporal force.

קדוש ממקום קדוש lit. "From the place of a holy one." Cf. Mat. xxiv. 15 ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ || Mk ὄρον οὐ δεῖ.

יהלכו. For the meaning of the Piel cf. iv. 15, xi. 9, Job xxiv. 10 al.

For שבה cf. iv. 2, viii. 15. The Hithp. may have a reflexive force, like נפשו יברך Ps. xlix. 19.

v. 11. פתנם. On the derivation see § 8, p. 42. It is here

¹ Σ ὡς δίκαια πράξαντες.

² R.V. is obliged to supply 'to the grave.'

treated as feminine, since נעשה must be a participle; and it is a construct depending on מעשה, as the latter is on הרעה.

הרעה obj. acc. "the doing of evil."

v. 12. אשר "forasmuch as," as in vv. 10, 11 (BDB s.v. 8 c). The clause is resumptive of v. 11 a, and practically repeats its thought.

כי נם "surely also." Some render אשר 'although,' and take נם כי in an adversative sense 'yet—nevertheless.' But both these meanings are very doubtful.

מאת should perhaps be read מאת (see BDB s.v.). The omission of פעם or פעמים is harsh; מאה vi. 3 is not parallel, but אחת 'once' is not infrequent. Cf. 2 K. vi. 10, Job xl. 5 al.

The word completely puzzled the early translators, which is strange if מאה were the original reading. It should perhaps be omitted, or read מאד. See App. II. p. 148.

ומאריך לו. אפּו Hier. supply אפּו (cf. Is. xlviii. 9, Prov. xix. 11). So Siegfr. But the introduction of an unconnected participle, whose subject is God, is very abrupt. It is much simpler to supply ימים (cf. v. 13, vii. 15): "and prolongeth unto himself [days]."

v. 13. כצל need not be taken as a predicate with the following words (Hitzig, al.). Siegfried thinks that the words mean that the wicked shall not prolong his days as a shadow lengthens in the evening! But צל, when used to describe man's life, always denotes transitoriness, vi. 12, Job *ter*, Pss. *ter*. The expression is cast into a negative form to make it parallel to טוב לא יהיה; but it is equivalent to "he shall shorten his days like a shadow." Cf. ויעשם כצל as explained above, vi. 12.

v. 16. כי נם...ראה is a parenthesis. Cf. xi. 10.

v. 17. בשל אשר = Talm. בריל ד. Cf. Jon. i. 7, 12 with 8.

CHAP. IX.

Ch. ix. 1. לבור. An unique form, perhaps cognate to בור. Possibly it should be read לבוד, inf. Kal of that verb (cf. iii. 18). Some would read לתור, cf. i. 13, ii. 3, vii. 25. But ט reads ולבי ראה, see App. II. p. 148.

נם אהבה...הארם. For the meaning see § 4, p. 19.

v. 2. הכל. There is strong evidence for reading הכל, and including it in the preceding verse—"all that is before them is

vanity." See App. II. p. 149. If this is done, כִּאֲשֶׁר means 'inasmuch as.'

v. 2. הַנִּשְׁבַּע evidently implies false or wrongful swearing, cf. Zech. v. 3.

v. 3. הוֹלִלוּהוּ. See on i. 17, x. 13.

וְאַחֲרָיו. Either 'after him,' i.e. when he is dead, cf. ii. 12, 18, iii. 22, vi. 12, vii. 14, or 'afterwards,' Hier. *post haec*. The former is the simpler explanation. Siegfried is led by Σ τὰ δὲ τελευταία αὐτῶν εἰς νεκρούς to read וְאַחֲרֵיתוּ. G reads וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם.

אֵל הַמַּתִּים. Cf. the exclamation לְתוֹרָה וְלַחַיִּים Is. viii. 20.

v. 4. מִי אִשֶׁר יִוֶּה. As the text stands the Masoretes appear to have intended the first clause to end with יִבְרַר. "Who is he that chooseth—or is chosen?" But both the punctuation and the consonants of the K^{ethib} are impossible. The Zaqeph Katon must be placed (with Del.) on הַחַיִּים, and the K^{eri} יִבְרַר must be read: "Whosoever is joined unto all the living, there is hope (for him)." See § 4, p. 19.

לְכֹלֵב חַי "as regards a live dog." The ל either introduces the subst., making it equivalent to a *nom. pend.*, or it may perhaps be an emphasizing particle corresponding to the Arab. *lā*, Ass. *lū*—'surely,' cf. 1 Chr. vii. 1, 2 Chr. vii. 21. (See Ges. K. § 143 e. Budde on Is. viii. 1, ZATW ix. 156.)

v. 7. כִּי כִבֵּר יְיָ. "For already God hath consented to thy works," i.e. God determined in the past that man should be allowed to have industry and pleasure to fall back upon as a means of forgetting the sadness and shortness of his life. The thought is parallel to that in v. 19. See § 4, p. 20. For רָצָה cf. Ps. xl. 14.

v. 9. כֹּל יְמֵי הַבְּלָךְ. There is good evidence for the omission of these words in the early text (App. II. p. 150), and they have the appearance of being an accidental repetition from the prec. clause.

v. 10. בְּשֵׂאוֹל here only in the book. But that is not enough to shew that the writer of the passage must be other than the writer of such passages as iii. 20, vi. 6 (Siegfr.). In Ps. xxx. the same writer who speaks of Sheol in v. 4 describes, in v. 10, those who are in Sheol as "the dust" which cannot praise God.

vv. 11, 12. A poetical exposition of the thought of iii. 1-9.

v. 11. וְרָאָה. See on viii. 9.

פִּנֵּעַ. 1 K. v. 18 only. Here (as there) it implies 'mischance,' as is shewn by the following verse.

v. 14. וסבב "surrounded," 2 K. vi. 15, not necessarily 'walked round,' Jos. vi. 4 (Siegfr.).

מצורים must mean 'siege-works,' and is so understood in all the versions; but the word nowhere else occurs with this meaning (contrast vii. 26). מצורים must evidently be read. The ך was probably due to the proximity of מצודה in v. 12. מצורים occurs in two MSS. of de Rossi.

v. 15. מסכן. See iv. 13.

ומלט. This is usually rendered 'and he delivered'; but this is contradicted by v. 16 b: if the poor man was not heard, his wise counsel could not deliver the city. Render "and he would have delivered"—an apodosis with the protasis suppressed, cf. Ex. ix. 15, 1 Sam. xiii. 13. On the whole passage see § 3, pp. 12 f.

v. 17. נחת is the restful quiet which pervades the conversation of the wise; צעקה is the noisy undisciplined talk of fools, among whom the chiefest of them must talk louder than any, in order to be heard.

נשמעים. Bickell unnecessarily omits, and reads וזעקת.

מושלב. One who takes the place of chief among fools—an arch-fool. It is not a Graecism; cf. 2 Sam. xxiii. 3.

CHAP. X.

Ch. x. v. 1. מות זכובי מות must = זכובים מחים (Nowack). Siegfr. says it is against the analogy of חבלי מות מ, מקשי מ, כלי מ; but it is not 'deadly' flies but 'dead' flies that contaminate ointment. On $\text{Ἔ μύλαι θανατόσσαι}$ see App. II, p. 165. Winckler's emendation מות זכובים מה יבאישו creates greater difficulties than it solves. But the plur. יבאישו should probably be read; the omission of the final ו may have been due to the insertion of the gloss יביעו. The latter word is omitted in Ἔ Σ Pesh. Hier. Tg.

מכבור. It is natural to emend ומכבור, which occurs in some editions (Del.). The clause, as it stands, gives a thought *parallel* to that of v. a; but Ἔ suggests an early reading יקר מעט חכמה מכבור סכלות רב, "more valuable is a little wisdom than the great glory of folly," which is *converse* to the thought of v. a. See App. II, pp. 150 f. Siegfr. emends יקר [ה] חכמה כן [א] בר. סכלות מעט.

v. 2. Compare the *Mashal* ii. 14.

לימינו. Not 'at his right hand,' an anatomical statement to which the most unscientific of writers would not commit himself; but "is (directed) towards his right hand" (Del., Now.). Del. notes that השמאל in late Heb. denotes 'to turn to the wrong side'—take a wrong course. Siegfr. understands it to mean that wisdom and folly will not combine; they go in opposite directions.

v. 3. לבו חסר. His understanding is lacking, cf. ix. 8.

ואמר ונ. "And he saith concerning everyone He is a fool," Hitz. Siegfr. after Σ Hier. This gives force to גם בדרך. While he is actually travelling on the wrong course 'leftwards,' he is in such a state of infatuated folly that he says about everyone but himself that he is a fool. The explanation "he declareth (by his actions and behaviour) to everyone that he (himself) is a fool" (Del., Now.) gives an unusual meaning to אמר, and renders גם בדרך pointless. On ע, which reads כָּל for כָּל, see App. II. pp. 151, 165.

v. 4. "do not throw up your post in a rage." Contrast the injunction of the *Hasid*, viii. 3 (note *in loc.*).

מרפה "healing," and so soothing, pacifying; Prov. xii. 18.

Σ curiously σωφροσύνη; ap. Hier. *pudicitiam*.

v. 5. כשגגה "of the nature of an error." Del., Now. describe the preposition as 'כ *veritatis*': but see Ges. K. § 119 *d*, Rem. For שגגה cf. v. 5. The מרפה spirit is shewn by Koheleth in implying that the glaring injustice of the ruler is 'an unintentional error.'

יָצָא. A לִא verb with the form of a לִה. Ges. K. § 75 *qq*.

v. 6. במרומים רבים. If this is not to be read כִּמְ, the adjective must be considered as loosely added in apposition—"In the high positions [among men]—many of them." The passage is not included among analogous instances in Ges. K. § 126 *y, z*. Luzzatto reads גַּמְלָה "folly hath set many in high places"; but the parallelism of v. b forbids this; and it is not folly but the שגגה of the ruler that is responsible.

v. 8. נִמְסָן "a pit." An Aram. loan word, in BH here only. It occurs in Pesh. Tg. of Prov. xxvi. 27 (Heb. שַׁח). The *Mashal* was apparently well known in different forms, since it occurs in Prov. *loc. cit.*, and in B.S. xxvii. 26.

v. 9. יַעֲצֵב. Usually 'be grieved,' Gen. xlv. 5, 1 Sam. xx. 3; only here used of physical pain.

יסכן "endangers himself." A NH word. Del. cites Berach. i. 3, and adds that in Tg. and Talm. the Ithpael אסתכן has the same meaning.

v. 10. "If the axe be blunt, and he hath not sharpened the edge, then he must strengthen his force," i.e. put more force into his strokes.

קחה, Piel in the sense of K̄al. The latter occurs of teeth in Jer. xxxi. 29, 30, Ez. xviii. 2.

הוא is the man already mentioned as endangering himself by cutting logs.

לא. See App. II. p. 151.

פנים "edge," cf. Ez. xxi. 21 (Engl. 16).

נחשה קלל "make smooth," i.e. not notched or rough. Cf. נחשה קלל Ez. i. 7, Dan. x. 6, i.e. smooth (and so shining) bronze.

נבוך חיל, cf. נבוך חיל Job xxi. 7, the frequent נבוך חיל, and נבוך חילים 1 Chr. vii. 5, 7, 11, 40.

For other interpretations see Del. *in loc.*

ויהרין "And wisdom is advantageous for giving success." But the Hiphil occurs nowhere else, and the construction is awkward. Winckler's transposition הכ"ה הכשיר would make it easier. But G, Pesh. Hier. suggest הכשיר the K̄al participle, "an advantage to the successful man is wisdom"—which is attractive. The same construct יהרין occurs in iii. 9, "advantage of (for) העושה."

v. 11. בלא לחש "without enchantment," i.e. because there is no enchantment ready.

וואין וג', i.e. if the charmer come too late.

v. 12. שפחה, plural for dual.

תבלענו "destroys him." The suffix refers to the fool himself, cf. v. 15.

v. 13. הללה. Here only in this form, though it should probably be read for הוללה in i. 17, ii. 12, vii. 25, ix. 3. It is the only instance in which the abstract termination ות is affixed to the form of the K̄al participle. See Barth NB. pp. 414 f.

v. 14. If v. b is a misplaced fragment of K̄ohemoth's writing (see § 4, p. 20), the second half of the *Mashal* beginning v. a may have been lost; and this *Mashal* makes clearer the meaning of v. 15 a.

v. 15. The *Mashal* appears to mean 'The fool worries

himself about a great many matters, whereas he is as ignorant as a child about the simplest things.' So Ibn Ezra, Del.

Siegfr. explains, "The bother *caused by* the fool wearies only him who...etc.," i.e. no one but the most helplessly ignorant would suffer himself to be bothered by a fool.

עמל is elsewhere masc.

אל העיר for אל עיר. A colloquial expression like the Engl. 'to go to town.'

v. 18. בעצלתי, Dual of עָצַלְתָּ. Ew., Hitz. follow Ibn Ezra in explaining it of 'two idle hands.' But this is awkward and improbable. It may be בעצלתים, Dual of עָצַלְתָּ (Prov. xix. 15), with an intensive force; cf. רשעתים (Del.). An emendation seems to be required. Bickell suggests בעצלתי, cf. Prov. xxxi. 27. Siegfr. בעצלת ידים. This is better, and would easily arise from a scribal error. בעצלה is also possible; the ים of ימך having been accidentally doubled, the apparent Dual ending would cause the ה to become ח.

ימך. Ps. cvi. 43, Job xxiv. 24 only; both metaphorical.

המקרה. Dagesh was placed in the מ to distinguish it from the participle, Ps. civ. 3. See Baer, *Qu. Vol.* here, and on xi. 5.

ידלף "drips," i.e. leaks.

v. 19. ישמח. Perhaps read לשמח. See App. II. p. 152.

יענה את הכל "answers everything," i.e. meets all desires (cf. v. 19), Σ εὐαχρηστῆσαι. Ⓔ, Hier. make הכסף the object; "all things answer (obey) money." But there is no exact parallel to this use of ענה, except perhaps the subst. מענה Prov. xxix. 19. In Ⓔ a gloss ταπεινώσει has been added. See App. II. p. 166.

v. 20. במדעך. The pre-formative מ may have a local force (Ges. K. § 85 e)—'the place of knowledge,' and so 'mind,' 'thought.' Elsewhere = 'knowledge,' 2 Chr. i. 10, 11, 12, Dan. i. 4, 17 only.

יגיד for יגיד, Ex. xix. 3 (Ges. K. § 53 n). "The jussive serves to express facts which may happen contingently, or may be expected" (*id.* § 109 i).

CHAP. XI.

Ch. xi. *vv.* 1-6. Koheleth advises prudent industry (cf. ix. 10) combined with pleasures (7-10) as the last resort before old age and death come on (xii. 1-7).

v. 1. Several explanations have been offered, of which the favourite is that the verse inculcates a liberal charity—'Give your bread to any who chance to need it, and you will at some distant time receive a reward.'

Palm's reference to the Greek *σπεύρειν ἕδωρ* = undertake a fruitless task, is of course negated by *v.* b. And other equally impossible explanations are mentioned by Del. *in loc.*

There can be little doubt that the words refer to trading—to those "who do business in great waters." *מִן הַיָּם* may denote literally the corn trade, or it may be a figurative expression for any goods sent out on the sea with hopes of subsequent profit. A parallel proverb is ascribed to B.S. See § 7, p. 36.

"In the course of many days" is suitable, because trading voyages were often long and dangerous.

It is unsafe to assume (as Kleinert, *St. Kr.* 779 ff.) that this proves Alexandria to have been the place of writing. viii. 10 makes Jerusalem much more probable.

v. 2. More advice to business men. 'Do not embark your capital in one enterprise, but in seven, yea in eight.' The explanation which refers this to the giving of charity is forbidden by *v.* b.

On the collocation of numerals to express an indefinite total see Ges. K. § 135 s.

vv. 2-6. Koheleth reverts to the thought of man's helplessness in the face of Necessity. Nature works by invincible and inscrutable laws; so that in all his industry man can only do his little best (*v.* 6) and hope for a successful result.

v. 3. *וְאִם יִפֹּל עֵץ*. Two explanations are possible. 1. By an unchangeable law of Nature a tree that has fallen by a tempest must lie in the direction in which it is impelled. The only objection to this is that, as an illustration of man's helplessness, it seems rather weak. Man cannot prevent the rain from falling or undo its effects, but when a tree has fallen man can alter its direction. The proverb is not concerned with the

falling, but with the subsequent direction of the π —and this is so whether יהוא or הוא is read. 2. It is not impossible that the words refer to a process of divination. If a stick is tossed up in the air, that a man may guide his action by the direction in which it comes to rest, he has no control over the result. Rhabdomancy is referred to in Hos. iv. 12, but it is not known what form it took; and belomancy in Ez. xxi. 26 (Engl. 21), where the king of Babylon shook (perhaps shuffled) arrows. See art. 'Divination' in *Encycl. Bibl.*

יהוא. According to Ges. K. § 23 $\dot{\iota}$, an early scribal error for יהי = יהי (*id.* § 75 s). It is quite as likely to have been a scribal error for הוא, which Bick. and Siegfr. adopt.

v. 4. It is useless to wait until outward conditions are perfect before you pursue your industry; because they are seldom perfect, and you cannot control them.

v. 5. כעצמים "As in the case of bones,"—resumptive of the clause כבשר ונִי: and both are answered by בכה.

v. 6. לערב. Not "in the evening," but "until the evening," cf. Job iv. 20.

אז, with this meaning ii. 3 only.

v. 8. כל שבא הבל. Cf. ix. 1 as emended.

v. 10. הישרות "manhood's prime," i.e. the age of black hairs (שחור) as distinct from שיבה the age of hoary hairs. So Mishn. Midr., see Del. The derivation from שחר "dawn" would imply a period of life even earlier than הילדות, which would be inappropriate.

If the right view is taken in § 5, p. 26, that xii. 1 a is an insertion by the *Hasid*, the clause הבל והש" היל" כי is a parenthesis (cf. viii. 16 b), and the continuation of v. 10 a is xii. 1 b.

CHAP. XII.

Ch. xii. v. 1 a. בוראך. Graetz, followed by Bickell, reads בורך "thy fountain," understanding it of the wife of youth; and Cheyne inclines to it. But this, as Davidson¹ truly says, "strikes a lower note than is heard anywhere in the book."

If the text is retained, but the words are assigned to Kōheleth, they imply, as Cheyne points out, that an old man

¹ Art. 'Ecclesiastes' in *Encycl. Bibl.*

is unable to "remember his Creator." But if the words are by the *Hasid*, all difficulty is removed.

vv. 1 b—6. On these verses there have been *quot homines tot sententiæ*; but the interpretations are mainly five:

(1) The verses are held to describe the failing of an old man's physical powers (early Jewish writers, and many moderns).

(2) They contain a picture of a storm, representing the approach of death (Umbreit, Ginsburg, Plumptre).

(3) They represent the approach of death under the figure of the fall of night (Michaelis, Nachtigal; discussed by Taylor).

(4) They are a literal picture of the gloom and sadness in a household when the master has just died (Taylor¹).

(5) They are to be explained by the seven "days of death," i.e. days of cold and wintry weather, immediately preceding the Palestinian springtime, which are peculiarly dangerous for the aged and weakly (C. H. H. Wright, after Wetzstein).

It is unnecessary to discuss these views in detail. All that is worth knowing about them may be learnt from Taylor, Delitzsch and Wright.

The explanation that is here offered differs from others, in that it does not assume one line of thought to be sustained throughout the verses. The verses divide themselves into distinct paragraphs², indicating changes of thought and metaphor.

(i) *v.* 1 b, introduced by עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא, is (as stated above) merely a continuation of xi. 9 a, 10.

(ii) In *v.* 2, introduced by עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא, the coronach on departed youth begins, with a description of the gloom and frequent sorrows with which old age is overcast.

(iii) In *vv.* 3, 4 the construction changes with בָּיִת שׁ, and seven details are poetically enumerated, figurative of the physical failure of the old man's body.

(iv) In *v.* 5 a נֶמֶס marks another, but slighter change, introducing four further details, describing physical incapacity of other kinds.

(v) *v.* 5 b contains the author's remark, explaining, without metaphor, that the foregoing descriptions refer to old age.

¹ *The Dirge of Coheleth*, London, 1874. He further suggests that the passage was taken from a recognised collection of dirges.

² They are not called stanzas, because they vary so greatly in length.

³ Possibly, however, וּמְנַבָּה is the true reading (App. II. p. 152).

(vi) *vv.* 6, 7 contain an entirely fresh thought, introduced by עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא; the author passes from signs of decay to the moment of death, describing it first under figures (*v.* 6) and then literally (*v.* 7).

v. 2. A general description of gloom. The clouds returning after the rain represent the recurrent sorrows of an old man, as he feels his powers forsaking him, and from time to time mourns the death of relatives and friends.

vv. 3, 4. Those who are opposed to the view that these verses describe the failing powers of the old man's body are apt to argue as though Koheleth could not possibly have allowed himself a mixture of metaphors. But the boldest use of metaphors is found in the sublimest Hebrew poetry; e.g. Is. xxviii. 14-20, xxx. 27-33. Again, this treatment of the verses has been, by more than one writer, severely styled as the "anatomical" interpretation. And no doubt some of the writers who have followed this method have deserved the criticism, both for the absurd and unworthy explanations which they offer, and also because they have run the theory to death in attempting to apply it throughout the whole of the *vv.* 2-6. But the enumeration of parts of the body in order figuratively to describe various weaknesses or excellencies is extremely common in the Old Testament. Oriental notions of poetical fitness often differ widely from our own. In the Song of Songs this feature reaches a point far exceeding what is here claimed for Koheleth. See also the narrative in *Shabb.* 152 a, quoted by Del. (Engl. trans. p. 407 footnote).

v. 3. יָעַז "quake." Est. v. 9, Pilp. Hab. ii. 7. The "keepers of the house" are the hands and arms.

הִתְעוּתוֹ "make themselves crooked, or twisted," i. 15, vii. 13. The "men of might" are the legs and knees, bowed and bent in weakness. Contrast Song of Songs, v. 15.

בָּטְלוּ. Aram. בָּטִיל. As. *batālu*, "cease."

הַטְחָנוֹת "The grinding maids," i.e. the teeth.

מְעַט. Piel here only; intrans. "be (or become) few," cf. הִתְחַהּ Jer. li. 56 (Ges. K. § 52 k). The rendering "when they have wrought a little" would require the Hiphil, and a second verb.

הַשְׁבוּ of the eyes, Ps. lxix. 24, Lam. v. 17. No explanation which refers הַרְאוֹת literally to ladies looking out of windows has satisfactorily accounted for this verb. It cannot mean 'be

in darkness,' or 'be gloomy, or sad'; it must have the same force as in *v.* 2.

It is unnecessary to press the metaphor of ארבות, either as windows latticed by lashes, or as sluices from which tears flow.

v. 4. רלתיים. The connexion in which this stands with המונה ("the mill"—the place of grinding, i.e. the mouth) shews that its meaning is the "lips," cf. Ps. cxli. 3 רל שפתי. Del. understands it of the 'jaws,' comparing Job xli. 6 רלתי פניו, of the jaws of the leviathan; but in that case בשוק loses its force. The lips are the "doors on the street."

בשפל Ges. K. § 45 *c.*

ויקום (Ges. K. § 72 *t.*). The jussive, as in the case of ישב (*v.* 7), seems to be used for the imperfect, with no special force (*id.* § 109 *k.*).

The meaning of the present text is very doubtful. Some of the proposed explanations are: "The bird (of evil omen) rises with a shriek." "He rises (i.e. is roused from sleep) at the sound of a bird," describing the wakefulness of an old man who is roused by the twittering of a sparrow; but the following words seem to describe his deafness. "He (i.e. his voice) rises into a sparrow's voice (a childish treble)." Σ καὶ παύσεται φωνὴ τοῦ σπαραγίου leads Siegfr. to read ויקור קול, "and the twittering of the sparrow sinks down—sounds faint." The same meaning is reached by Kraetzschmar with וקמל קול (following Cornill on Ez. vii. 11 החמס קם למטה רשע). Parallelism with וישחו would suggest ויקמל קול; it is true the imperf. is not found elsewhere, but that, in itself, would be no objection. It is questionable, however, if קמל can mean 'grow faint, or weak'; Is. xix. 6, xxxiii. 9 (the only passages in which it occurs) do not bear it out. But the suggestion is attractive.

בנוח השיר is a general expression for 'songs,' or perhaps 'the individual notes' (Ges. K. § 128 *v.*). For ישחו of the voice cf. Is. xxix. 4. השיר must be human song, as opposed to the song of birds.

The two expressions thus describe the old man's deafness: "and the sound of the sparrow fades, and all the notes of (human) song sink low."

¹ Printed ויקום in some editions.

v. 5 a. Four additional (גם) details of incapacity.

יִירָא. The sudden introduction of the plural is awkward. Perhaps read יִירָא, the ו being a duplication of the following ו.

בָּרֶךְ can hardly mean 'from above' as opposed to מִנְּבֶה, which would require מִמַּעַל or מִמְרוֹם. "They are (or he is) afraid of a high thing," i.e. he shrinks from mounting any high or steep place.

וְהַחַחִים "dreadful terrors." The old man, blind and deaf, is frightened at every turn lest he may be injured on the road.

וְיִנְאֵץ הַשֶּׁקֶר is rendered by many "and the almond tree blossoms," treating the verb as Hiphil of נִצַּץ; and since the almond blossom, which is usually pink, has sometimes been observed by travellers to bleach when about to fade, the expression is taken to refer to the white hair of the old man! The Hiphil is anomalous, whether from נִצַּץ or נִאֵץ, and it is natural to read וְיִנְאֵץ, "and he rejects the almond," i.e. his appetite fails so that he can no longer enjoy luxuries.

וְיִסְחַבֵּל הַחֲנֹב is the crux of the passage; lit. "and the locust carries itself as a burden—drags itself along." A fair sense could be made of it if יִסְחַבֵּל could mean 'is a burden'—is too heavy for him. The light, easily digested locust is food too solid for the old man. This would form a parallel to the preceding and following clauses, and is clearly the kind of meaning that the context suggests. It is possible that both words are corrupt¹. The following are among the varied explanations suggested: "The τέρτιξ is burdensome"—i.e. its lovely chirp fails to give pleasure (Taylor). "The locust creeps out"—in the dangerous cold days which usher in spring (Wright). הַחֲנֹב is a figure of the *coxa*, the hinder region of the *pelvis*, so that the rheumatic old man walks stiffly with failing joints! (Del.). ⚡ Hier. "the locust becomes fat."

הָאֲבִינָה "The caper-berry," so called because it stimulated appetite². ⚡ Aq. ἡ κάππαρις³. Talm. אֲבִינָה. See Moore, in *Journ. Bibl. Lit.* x. (1891), 55-64.

¹ הַחֲנֹב may be the locust tree, the popular name given to the 'carob'—*ceratonia siliqua*; or הַחֲנֹב may be a corruption of הַחֲרִיב. Cf. Lk. xv. 16, Pesh. Syr.^{sin. eur.} See art. 'Husks' in *Encycl. Bibl.*

² Whether it was used, as often supposed, for stimulating sexual desire is uncertain. The thought is quite unsuitable to the context.

³ Σ is doubtful. S.H. suggests ἡ ἐπιγνος or -ση, connecting it in some way with sexual passion. But codd. 248, 252 give ἐπιγνος, pointing to הָאֲבִינָה.

וְתִפֵּר. Prob. read וְתִפֵּר with Θ διασκεδασθῆ, Σ διαλυθῆ. Cf. Is. viii. 10. Δq. derives it from פרה—καρπεύσει. Some render “and the caper-berry bursts”; but even if this were true to natural history (see BDB s.v. פֶּרֶר), it would be very difficult to assign a meaning to the expression.

Render “the caper-berry is made (becomes) ineffectual.”

v. 5 b. The writer indicates the purport of the foregoing verses—“for man is on his way to his perpetual home, and the wailers go about in the street”; i.e. every man is on the way towards Sh^ol (הוֹלֵךְ, cf. i. 4, iii. 20, vi. 6, ix. 10), and hired wailers are constantly going about for one funeral and then another.

The literal use of שוֹק in this verse need not cause any difficulty in the figurative use in v. 4.

v. 6. עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא marks a transition from pictures of old age to pictures of the moment of death, to the thought of which v. 5 b has just led.

ירחק *K^othib* “be removed” (Niphal ἀπ. λεγ.). ירתק *K^ori* “be bound” (Nah. iii. 10 Pual only). Both are meaningless, and most commentators now read יתבק “be broken.” See App. II. pp. 155 f.

חבל הכסף. This is evidently connected with the following גִּלְתָּה הַזֹּהָב, and Nowack is probably right in referring it to the cord or chain which supports a lamp. The גִּלְתָּה of a golden lampstand occurs in Zech. iv. 2, 3¹ (גִּלְתָּה being afterwards transferred to the oil in the bowl, v. 12). The fact that no other instance can be quoted of a lamp hanging by a silver cord, is not of the slightest weight. It is rich Oriental imagery, as e.g. Prov. xxv. 11. The snapping of the cord and the fall of the lamp, by which the bowl would crack and the oil be spilled, is a suitable metaphor for death². This explanation is far more probable than those which refer the cord and lamp to parts of the body—e.g. the cord is the spinal cord (Del.) or the string of the tongue which is tied (ירתק) in death (Cheyne); the bowl is the head, and so on.

וְתִרְוֵן. Either an irregular imperf. Kal from $\sqrt{\text{רצן}}$ with an intransitive force, or, more probably, to be read וְתִרְוֵן. Thus fem. of אַבְיוֹן “the poor soul” = נִשְׁמַתוֹ ה'. Field (Hex. in loc.) suggests that ἐπιγονος was merely a corruption of ἐπιγονος.

¹ M.T. in v. 3 has גִּלְתָּה, but גִּלְתָּה should probably be read.

² Compare the metaphor of spilt water, 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

all four objects in *v. 6* are 'broken,' the same verb being used of the two objects גלה and נלנל from the same root. The verbs are carefully chosen; the 'cord' and the 'pitcher' can be 'snapped' and 'shivered,' while the 'bowl' and the 'bucket' can only be 'crushed' or 'cracked.' See the same contrast between רוצץ and שבר in Is. xlii. 3 (where רוצץ follows in *v. 4*).

v. 6 b. A parallel illustration of collapse in death. "And the pitcher be shivered at the fountain, and the bucket be crushed [and fall] into the cistern." It seems likely that נלנל (which usually means a wheel) is here purposely used for a 'round bucket,' to produce assonance with גלה. But the force of the figure is substantially the same if the meaning 'wheel' be retained; it is then the wheel or pulley from which the bucket hangs, and this being cracked, the whole machinery, bucket and all, falls into the cistern.

v. 7. A literal statement of what has just been described figuratively. ישב Jussive, with the force of an ordinary imperfect; see the following קשיב (Ges. K. § 109 *k*), and cf. *v. 4*.

On the meaning of *v. b* see § 8, p. 48.

v. 8. The editor's closing formula, with the strengthened הכל הבלים, which occurs only in the editorial opening, i. 2.

vv. 9, 10. *First postscript.* The editor commends the teaching and writings of Kōheleth-Solomon. It is worthy of notice that in these two verses he has four words or constructions foreign to Kōheleth.

v. 9. "יורד ש" "Besides the fact that"—a meaning not found in Kōheleth's own writing.

עוד. He did more than live as a חכם; he taught the people besides.

לפני. Cf. ימים ix. 15 (Ges. K. § 52 *a*).

העם. If the true reading is האדם (App. II. p. 152), the editor praises the writer as though he were Solomon, ascribing world-wide effects to his teaching.

ואון "and weighed"; here only in BH (der. מאונים). On א see App. II. p. 153.

וחקר "and searched out"; Piel here only.

תקן "arranged." Kōheleth uses the word only of straightening something that is crooked, i. 15 (see *n.*), vii. 13. The asyndeton perhaps shews that this verb alone governs משלים, the two former loosely governing דעה.

הרבה. & connects with the following verse. Pesh. has it in both verses.

v. 10. ישר is in apposition to כתוב with an adverbial force (Ges. K. § 118 q): "something written in uprightness." יבִּיתִיב would be simpler (with & καὶ γεγραμμένον ἐνθύτης), forming a parallel with the preceding and following דברי. The emendation יבִּיתִיב (Bick., Siegfr.) is unnecessary.

vv. 11, 12. *Second postscript.* The 'wise man' dwells on the value of short incisive *m^sshalim*, such as are found in collections, and are ascribed in general to Solomon.

v. 11. כִּרְבִּנוֹת (Baer, *Qu. Vol.* p. 70) "like goads." Cf. הדרבן 1 S. xiii. 21 (where see Driver). There seems to be an intentional play on the words דברי and דרבנות; two other such plays, vii. 1, 6, have been noticed from the pen of the 'wise man.' The goad is an instrument for driving, and stimulating to action; and *m^sshalim* have that effect on men's minds.

וכמִשְׁמֵרוֹת "and like nails." Not י (Baer, *Qu. Vol.* p. 70), the usual form being מִסְמְרוֹת (Jer. x. 4, 2 Chr. iii. 9) or ים- (Is. xli. 7, 1 Chr. xxii. 3). Cf. שְׂכֵלוֹת i. 17. On the masc. see Albrecht, *ZATW.* xvi. 90 f.

נטועים "planted" and so 'fixed'; ΣΘ πεπηγότες. Cf. Ps. xciv. 9, Dan. xi. 45.

פנות בעלי אספות cannot refer to the "masters of assemblies," i.e. the members of the assemblies of the wise; to say that they are like firmly fixed nails is meaningless, especially when their words have just been described as goads. Siegfried's emendation בבעלי is unnecessary. בעל can be used of things, as in Is. xli. 15; and Del. explains it well, by reference to בעלי ברית (Gen. xiv. 13), בעלי שבאה (Neh. vi. 18), those who are bound together in a covenant or oath. The words of the wise are to a certain extent personified; they are bound together in collections.

מִרְעָה אֶחָד evidently refers to Solomon, who is regarded as the ultimate source of all proverbs. The metaphor of the shepherd (= teacher) has been led up to by the "goads." For כן after נתן cf. 2 K. xxv. 30. Cheyne accepts Klostermann's treatment of the clause: "the members of the assemblies have [in the case of Ecclesiastes] given them forth (נָתַנִּי) from another (אֶחָד) shepherd." But the Mas. text and punctuation yield a perfectly good sense.

v. 12. ויותר מהמה “and besides them,” ויותר having the same force as in v. 9. The expression is somewhat loosely worded. The writer means ‘besides (attending to) those (words of the wise), be warned,’ and be not led away by the multitude of books.

בני. The ‘wise man’ assumes the style of many of the proverbs (Prov. i. 8, ii. 1, iii. 1, etc.).

להנ “devotion to study”; unique in BH. See Nowack, *in loc.*

The words עשות...בשר are divided into two clauses (as in Eng. Vv.), the second depending for its meaning on the first. Hitzig makes יעתה בשר the predicate to all the rest: “making many books without end, and much study, is a weariness of the flesh”—which, as Del. says, is a truism.

Krochmal suggests that the “words of the wise” are the Hagiographa, and the warning against books is a warning against the reception of any others into the Canon (see Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, pp. 233 f.). But besides the fact that the “words of the wise” is quite unsuitable as a description of the Hagiographa as a whole, this explanation relegates v. 12 to a very late date; whereas it is extremely probable that vv. 13, 14 were the latest addition to the book, and that they are alluded to by B. Sira (see § 7, p. 35).

vv. 13, 14. *Third postscript.* The *Hasid* sums up his own teaching.

דבר סוף דבר stands grammatically unconnected with the following words; cf. קץ דבר B. S. xliii. 27, and Engl. ‘to conclude.’

נשמע הכל may be treated in three different ways:

(1) “All has been heard.” The *Hasid* refers to the teaching about the fear of God, that he has already inserted in the book.

(2) “Let us hear all,” i.e. let us sum up the truth in a word—נשמע being the pausal form of the 1st pers. plur. But this colloquial use of the 1st person is unique in the book, and improbable.

It should be noted, however, that B. S. xliii. 27 seems to adopt this view with לא נוסף.

(3) Read נשמע with G MSS. (exc. V 253) Pesh. This is adopted by Siegr., and forms a parallel to ירא and שמר.

If the M.T. is to stand, (1) is the simplest explanation. Two others may be noticed: Del. (following Mendelss.), “The

final result, all having been heard, (is this)—Fear God, etc.” But this is much more awkward than the analogous constructions which he quotes, Dt. xxi. 1, Ezra x. 6. Ewald explains נשמע as *audiendum est*, and Hier., *auditu perfacilis est*, seems to follow the same method.

כל האדם כי זה cannot mean “for this is the whole of man” (Ew., al.), nor “the whole duty of man” (Engl. Vv.), nor “the All of man” (Knobel); כל האדם must mean “every man,” as in iii. 13, v. 18, vii. 2. Del., Now. are undoubtedly right in comparing Ps. cix. 4 “I am prayer,” cx. 3 “thy people are free-will offerings.” And see vii. 26 אשר היא מצודים. The expression “this is every man” means “every man is destined for, and should be wholly absorbed in, this.” To supply יבר (Siegfr.) or הובה (Bick.) is quite unnecessary.

v. 14. על כל נעלם במי “into the judgment (which is passed) upon every hidden thing” (Del., Now., Siegfr.). על cannot mean ‘together with’ after the universal מעשה כל. And see the *Hasid’s* words in xi. 9 which he here echoes.

נעלם. The dagesh is to make distinct the pronunciation of the quiescent guttural, as in 1 K. x. 3, cf. יהסר ix. 8.

על כל נעלם refers to כל מעשה, not to כל נעלם. This was indicated by the position of the Ethnach.

After v. 14 the Masoretes repeated v. 13, to avoid ending the book with a severe thought. The same was done at the end of Isaiah (ישעיה), the group of the Twelve minor prophets (תריסר), and Lamentations (קינוח); and the four books were noted by the mnemonic letters ית'קק.

3. A TRANSLATION¹.

CHAPTER I.

1. The words of Kōheleth son of David, king in Jerusalem.
2. Vapour of vapours, saith Kōheleth; vapour of vapours—all is a vapour.
3. What profit is there to a man in all his toil wherein he toileth under the sun?
4. A generation departeth and a generation cometh, and the earth perpetually abideth.
5. And the sun riseth and the sun setteth, and unto his place he panteth—he riseth there.
6. Going towards the south and circling towards the north, circling circling goeth the wind, and in its circlings returneth the wind.
7. All the streams go their way into the sea, but the sea—it is not full; unto the place whither the streams go, thither they go again.
8. All things are weary—a man cannot utter it; the eye is not satisfied at seeing, and the ear is not filled with hearing.
9. That which is is that which shall be, and that which hath been done is that which shall be done; and there is nothing new under the sun.
10. If there is a thing of which one saith See, this is new! it already existed in the ages which were before us.
11. There is no remembrance of earlier people [now]; and also of later people who shall exist—of them there shall be no remembrance with those who shall exist later [still].
12. I, Kōheleth, was king over Israel in Jerusalem.
13. And I gave my heart to investigate and to explore by wisdom concerning everything that is done under the heavens. It is a miserable task which God hath given to the sons of men to be occupied with.

¹ A variety of type is used for the purpose of exhibiting the results arrived at in §§ 4, 5. Expressions which involve an emendation of the M.T. are placed between asterisks. An obelus denotes that there is an omission of one or more words which occur in the M.T.

14. I saw all the actions which are done under the sun; and lo all is a vapour and a striving after wind.
15. A crooked thing cannot be corrected, and a deficit cannot be reckoned.
16. And I spake with my heart saying As for myself, lo I have greatly multiplied wisdom beyond any man who hath been before me over Jerusalem; and my heart hath seen to a great extent wisdom and knowledge.
17. And I have given my heart to know wisdom *and knowledge*, madness and folly. I know that this also is a striving after wind.

CHAPTER II.

1. I said in my heart Come, let me test thee with gladness, and enjoy thou good. And lo that also was a vapour.
2. Of laughter I said It is mad; and of gladness What doth this accomplish?
3. I explored in my heart to refresh my flesh with wine—my heart behaving as usual with wisdom—and to lay hold upon folly, until I might see what good there is for the sons of men that they may provide [for themselves] under the heavens during the [small] number of the days of their life.
4. I did great things; I built me houses, I planted me vineyards.
5. I made me gardens and parks; and I planted in them fruit trees of every kind.
6. I made me pools of water, to water from them a plantation springing up with trees.
7. I procured men-servants and maid-servants, and I had home-born slaves; I also had property in cattle and sheep in large quantities, more than all who were before me in Jerusalem.
8. I amassed me also silver and gold, and the treasure of kings and the provinces; I prepared me singing men and singing women, and the luxuries of the sons of men—a concubine, yea [many] concubines.
9. And I grew continually greater, beyond anyone who was before me in Jerusalem; yet my wisdom stood firm for my help.

10. And nothing that my eyes asked for did I keep from them: I withheld not my heart from any gladness; for my heart was glad as a result of all my toil; and this was my portion as a result of all my toil.
11. And I turned [to look] at all my works which my hands had wrought, and at the toil which I had toilsomely pursued; and lo all was a vapour and a striving after wind, and there was no profit under the sun.
12. And I turned to see wisdom and madness and folly; for what can the man do that cometh after the king? That which *he hath [? already] done*.
13. And I saw that wisdom hath advantage over folly, as the advantage of light over darkness.
14. As for the wise man his eyes are in his head, but the fool walketh in darkness. But I know, nevertheless, that one mischance will befall them all.
15. And I said in my heart, As the mischance of the fool, me also will it befall; and why was I then superlatively wise? And I said in my heart that this also was a vapour.
16. For there is no remembrance alike of the wise man and of the fool perpetually, because in the days to come all is already forgotten. And how doth the wise man die and the fool alike!
17. And I hated life, because the work was evil unto me which was done under the sun; because all is a vapour and a striving after wind.
18. And I hated all my toil wherein I was toiling under the sun; because I must leave it to the man who shall be after me.
19. And who knoweth whether he will be a wise man or a fool? And he must have control over all my toil wherein I have toiled and wisely wrought under the sun. This also is a vapour.
20. And I turned about to make my heart despair concerning all the toil wherein I had toiled under the sun.
21. For there is a man whose toil is in wisdom and knowledge and skill; and to a man who hath not toiled at it he must give it as his portion. This also is a vapour and a striving after wind.

22. For what doth a man get by all his toil and his striving of heart in which he toileth under the sun?
23. For all his days his task is [full of] sorrows and trouble; even in the night his heart resteth not. This also is a vapour.
24. There is no good thing for man but that he should eat and drink and let himself experience pleasure in all his toil. This also I saw, that it is from the hand of God;
25. for who can eat or who can enjoy *apart from Him*?
26. For to the man that is good before Him, He hath given wisdom and knowledge and gladness; but to the sinner He hath given the task of gathering and amassing to give to him that is good before God.

This also is a vapour and a striving after wind.

CHAPTER III.

1. For everything there is a fixed moment, and a time for every occupation under the heavens:
2. A time to be born, and a time to die;
a time to plant, and a time to uproot what is planted.
3. A time to kill, and a time to heal;
a time to break down, and a time to build.
4. A time to weep, and a time to laugh;
a time to mourn, and a time to dance.
5. A time to cast abroad stones, and a time to gather stones;
a time to embrace, and a time to abstain from embracing.
6. A time to seek, and a time to lose;
a time to preserve, and a time to throw away.
7. A time to tear, and a time to sew;
a time to be silent, and a time to speak.
8. A time to love, and a time to hate;
a time of war, and a time of peace—
9. What profit hath a worker in that wherein he toileth?
10. I saw the task which God hath given to the sons of men to be occupied with.

11. Everything hath He made excellent in its time; also He hath placed eternity in their heart, but in such wise that man cannot discover the work that God doeth from beginning to end.
12. I know that there is no good thing for them, but that a man should be glad and provide well [for himself] in his life.
13. And, moreover, every man who eateth and drinketh and enjoyeth good in all his toil—it is a gift from God.
14. I know that everything which God doeth shall be perpetually; to it nothing can be added, and from it nothing can be subtracted.

And God hath done it that men may fear before Him.

15. That which is, hath already been; and that which is [destined] to be, already is; and God seeketh out that which is driven away [into the past].
16. And further, I saw under the sun the place of judgment—there was wickedness: and the place of righteousness—there was wickedness.
17. **I said in my heart, The righteous and the wicked will God judge; for there is a time [of judgment] for every occupation and concerning every work†.**
18. I said in my heart [It is] for the sake of the sons of men, that God may shew them in their true light, and *make them see* that they are beasts †for their part.
19. For *as the mischance of the sons of men, so is the mischance of the beasts*, and one mischance [happeneth] unto them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other, and all have one spirit; and *what superiority* hath the man over the beast? None! for all is a vapour.
20. Everything goeth to one place; everything hath come into existence from the dust, and everything returneth to the dust.
21. Who knoweth [with regard to] the spirit of the sons of men *whether it goeth upwards*, and the spirit of the beasts *whether it goeth downwards* to the earth?
22. And I saw that there was nothing better than that a man should be glad in his works, for that is his portion; for who shall bring him to look upon that which shall be after him?

CHAPTER IV.

1. And I returned and saw all the oppressions which were wrought under the sun: and lo the tears of the oppressed, and they had no comforter; and from the hand of their oppressors [went forth] power; and they had no comforter.
2. And I congratulated the dead who were already dead, more than the living who were still alive.
3. And better than them both, him who hath not yet come into existence, who hath not seen the evil work that is done under the sun.
4. And I saw all the toil and all the skilful work, that it meant the jealousy felt for a man by his neighbour. This also is a vapour, and a striving after wind.
5. *The fool foldeth his hands and eateth his own flesh.*
6. Better is a handful of quiet than two handfuls of toil and striving after wind.
7. And I turned and saw an empty wretchedness¹ under the sun.
8. There is a solitary man, without a second; moreover he hath no son or brother; and there is no end to all his toil, yea his eye is not sated with wealth. And for whom do I toil, and deprive myself of good? This also is a vapour and an evil task.
9. *Two are better than one, because they have a good reward in their toil.*
10. *For if one fall, the other will raise up his friend; but alas for the solitary man that falleth, and there is not a second to raise him up.*
11. *Also if two lie [together], they have warmth; but the solitary man—how shall he be warm?*
12. *And if [someone] overpower the solitary man, [yet] two can withstand him; and a three-fold cord is not quickly snapped.*

¹ When חַלְחַל occurs outside the usual formula, it requires a variety of renderings according to the context.

13. Better is a youth poor and wise than a king old and a fool, who knoweth not how to be admonished any more.
14. For from the prison house he emerged to become king—for even in his kingdom he was born poor.
15. I saw all the living who were going about under the sun, [that they were] with the second youth who would stand up in place of him.
16. There was no end to all the people—to all at whose head he was. Moreover they who came afterwards would not delight in him. For this also is a vapour and a striving after wind.
17. Guard thy foot when thou goest unto the house of God; and if thou draw near to hearken, *better than the gift of fools is thy sacrifice*; for they know not *except how to do* evil.

CHAPTER V.

1. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter a word before God; for God is in the heavens, and thou art upon the earth; therefore let thy words be few.
2. For a dream cometh with a multitude of business; and the voice of a fool in a multitude of words.
3. When thou vowest a vow to God, delay not to pay it; for there is no pleasure in fools. That which thou vowest, pay.
4. It is better that thou shouldest not vow than that thou shouldest vow and not pay.
5. Let not thy mouth cause thy flesh to incur punishment; and say not before the angel It was an unintentional error. Why should God be angry at thy voice, and destroy the work of thy hands?
6. [[For with a multitude *of business* [come] dreams, and worthless follies *in* many words.]] But fear God.
7. If thou seest the oppression of a poor man, and the wresting of judgment and justice in a province, be not astonished at the matter, for one high official above another is watching, and there are higher ones above them.

8. But an advantage to a country in all respects is a king [devoted] to cultivated land.
9. A lover of money cannot be satisfied with money; and he who loveth wealth [shall have] no profit [from it]. This also is a vapour.
10. When good things increase, many are they that consume them; and what success hath their owner save the looking at them with his eyes?
11. Sweet is the sleep of the labourer, whether he eat little or much; but the satiety [which belongeth] to the rich man doth not let him sleep.
12. There is *an evil sickness* [which] I have seen under the sun—wealth kept for its owner to his hurt.
13. And that wealth hath perished with evil trouble; and [then] he hath begotten a son and there is nothing in his possession.
14. As he came forth from his mother's womb, naked shall he go again as he came; and he shall carry away nothing, by his toil, *which can go with him*.
15. This also is *an evil sickness*; just as he came so will he go; and what profit hath he that he should toil for the wind?
16. Moreover all his days [are spent] in darkness *and mourning and great vexation and sickness* and wrath.
17. Lo! what I have seen to be good and excellent is [for a man] to eat and drink and experience good in all his toil wherein he toileth under the sun, during the [small] number of the days of his life which God hath given him; for that is his portion.
18. Also every man to whom God hath given riches and possessions, and hath granted him the power of using¹ them and of taking his portion and of being glad in his toil—this is a gift from God.
19. For he will not much notice the days of his life, for God answereth by [giving him] the gladness of his heart.

¹ Lit. 'eat.'

CHAPTER VI.

1. There is an evil which I have seen under the sun, and it is great upon men.
2. A man to whom God giveth riches and possessions and splendid wealth, and he lacketh nothing for himself of all that he desireth, but God doth not grant him the power of using¹ it, but a stranger useth¹ it—this is an empty wretchedness² and an evil sickness.
3. If a man beget a hundred [children] and live many years, and many be the days of his years, and his soul be not satisfied with good things, and also if he have had no burial—I say, better than he is an untimely birth.
4. For in empty nothingness² it came, and in darkness it goeth, and in darkness shall its name be covered;
5. yea it hath not seen or known the sun. This hath rest more than the other.
6. And though [a man] have lived a thousand years twice told, and have not experienced good, do not all go to one place?
7. *All the toil of man is for his mouth, and yet the appetite is not filled.*
8. For what advantage hath the wise man over the fool? What [advantage] hath the poor man who knoweth how to walk before the living?
9. *Better is the sight of the eyes than the roaming of the appetite.*
This also is a vapour and a striving after wind.
10. That which is, its name hath already been called, and it was foreknown what man was; and he cannot hold his own against Him that is stronger than he.
11. For there are many things that multiply empty wretchedness²! What profit hath man?
12. For who knoweth what is good for man in his life, during the [small] number of the days of his transient life²?—seeing that he maketh them like a shadow; for who can tell man what shall be after him under the sun?

¹ Lit. 'eat.'² Lit. 'vapour.'

CHAPTER VII.

1. *Better is a name than ointment.*
Better is the day of death than the day of *birth*.
2. It is better to go to a house of mourning than to go to a house of feasting, inasmuch as that is the end of all men; and let the living lay it to heart.
3. Better is sorrow than laughter, for in sadness of countenance it is well with the heart.
4. *The heart of the wise is in the house of mourning, but the heart of fools is in the house of gladness.*
5. *It is better to hear the rebuke of the wise than for a man to hear the song of fools.*
6. *For as the sound of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of a fool.*
And this also is a vapour.
7. *For oppression maketh a wise man mad, and a gift destroyeth the heart.*
8. *Better is the end of a matter than the beginning of it.*
Better is the patient in spirit than the proud in spirit.
9. *Be not hasty in thy spirit to be vexed; for vexation resteth in the heart of fools.*
10. *Say not, Why is it that the former days were better than these?—for thou dost not ask in wisdom concerning this.*
11. *Wisdom is good with an inheritance, and a profit to them that see the sun.*
12. *For *as the defence of wisdom, so is the defence of money* ; and the advantage of knowledge [is]—wisdom keepeth alive them that possess it.*
13. See the work of God; for who can correct that which He hath made crooked?
14. In a day of prosperity be in prosperity, and in a day of evil see—even the one over against the other hath God made, in order that man may discover nothing [which shall be] after him.
15. I saw everything in the days of my transient life¹; there is a righteous man perishing in his righteousness, and there is a wicked man prolonging [his days] in his evil.

¹ Lit. 'my vapour.'

16. Be not very righteous, and make not thyself superlatively wise; why shouldst thou be desolated?
17. Be not very wicked, and be not foolish; why shouldst thou die before thy time?
18. It is good that thou shouldst take hold of the one, and also from the other slack not thine hand,
For he that feareth God shall be quit with regard to them all.
19. *Wisdom strengtheneth the wise man more than ten rulers which are in the city.*
20. for as for man, there is not a righteous one on the earth who doeth good and sinneth not.
21. Also to all the words which men speak apply not thine heart, that thou hear not thy servant cursing thee.
22. For assuredly many times thy heart knoweth that thou also hast cursed others.
23. All this I tested by wisdom. I said I will make myself wise; but it was far from me.
24. Far off is that which exists, and deep deep; who can discover it?
25. I turned about *in* my heart to know and to explore and to search out wisdom and a reckoning; and to know the *folly of wickedness* and foolishness *and* madness.
26. And I find [a thing] more bitter than death—a woman who is nets, and her heart snares, and her hands fetters.
He that is good before God shall escape from her, but a sinner shall be captured by her.
27. See what I have found, saith Koheleth, [adding] one thing to another to find a reckoning,
28. which my soul hath sought again and again, and I have not found: one man out of a thousand I have found, but a woman among all these I have not found.
29. **Only see what I have found, that God made men upright, but they have sought out many contrivances.**

CHAPTER VIII.

1. *Who is as the wise man, and who knoweth the interpretation of a thing? The wisdom of a man lighteth up his countenance, and *he that is bold* in his countenance is changed.*
2. †Observe the commands¹ of a king,
But on account of [thine] oath to God, be not frightened.
3. Out of his presence shalt thou go; persist not in an evil thing.
for he doeth whatever he pleaseth.
4. Forasmuch as the word of a king is authoritative; and who may say unto him, What doest thou?
5. **He that observeth the commandment will countenance no evil thing; and the heart of a wise man knoweth a time and judgment.**
6. **Because for every occupation there is a time and judgment.**
[[For] the misery of man is great upon him,
7. for he knoweth not what shall be; for how it shall be who can tell him?
8. There is no man that hath control over the wind² to restrain the wind², and there is no control over the day of death, and there is no leave of absence in the battle, and wickedness will not help its possessors to escape.
9. All this I saw, and applied my heart to all the work that is done under the sun. There is a time when man hath power over man to his hurt.
10. And then I saw wicked men buried, and they had come † from a holy place; [and] they used to go about and *congratulate themselves*³ in the city because they had so done. This also is a vapour.
11. **Because a sentence on the doing of evil is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men within them is fully given up to doing evil,**

¹ Lit. 'mouth.'

² Perhaps 'the spirit.'

³ Or 'win to themselves flattery.'

12. because a sinner doeth evil a hundred times and
prolongeth [his days]. Surely also I know that
it shall be well with those that fear God, because
they fear before Him.
13. And it shall not be well with the wicked man, and
he shall shorten¹ his days like a shadow, because
he feareth not before God.
14. There is an empty wretchedness² which is done upon the
earth, that there are righteous men to whom it befalleth
according to the work of the wicked, and there are wicked
men to whom it befalleth according to the work of the
righteous. I said that this also was an empty wretched-
ness².
15. And I praised gladness, because there is nothing good for
man under the sun except to eat and drink and be glad ;
and that should accompany him in his toil during the
days of his life which God hath given him under the sun.
16. When I applied my heart to know wisdom, and to see the
task which is done upon the earth—for both by day and
by night He seeth no sleep with His eyes—
17. I saw all the work of God, that no man can discover the
work which is done under the sun ; forasmuch as man
may toil in searching it, but he will not discover it ; and
even if the wise man think that he is about to know it,
he is unable to discover it.

CHAPTER IX.

1. For I laid all this to heart, and *my heart saw all this*—
that the righteous and the wise and their works are in
the hand of God ; men are ignorant of [His] love and
hate alike ; everything before them *is a vapour*,
2. forasmuch as one mischance [happeneth] to them all, to
the righteous and to the wicked, to the good and to the
pure and to the unclean, and to him that sacrificeth and
to him that sacrificeth not ; as with the good so with the
sinner, he that sweareth as he that feareth an oath.

¹ Lit. 'not prolong.'

² Lit. 'vapour.'

3. This is an evil in all that is done under the sun, that one mischance [happeneth] to them all; and moreover the heart of man is full of evil, and madness is in their heart during their life, and after [a man's life]¹—to the dead!
4. For whosoever is joined unto all the living, there is hope [for him]; for a live dog is better than a dead lion.
5. For the living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything, and they have no longer a reward, for their memory is forgotten.
6. Both their love and their hate and their jealousy alike hath already perished; and they have no longer any portion for ever in all that is done under the sun.
7. Go! eat thy bread in gladness, and drink thy wine with a cheerful heart, for already God hath consented to thy works.
8. At all times let thy garments be white, and let not oil on thy head be lacking.
9. Enjoy life with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of thy transient life² which He hath given thee under the sun †; for that is thy portion in life, and in thy toil wherein thou toilest under the sun.
10. All that thy hand findeth to do, do it with [all] thy might; for there is no work or reckoning or knowledge or wisdom in Sh^ol whither thou goest.
11. I returned and saw under the sun that the race was not to the swift, nor the battle to the mighty; and neither was bread to the wise, nor wealth to the clever, nor favour to the skilful; but time and accident befallieth them all.
12. For man knoweth not his time, as fish that are caught in an evil net, or as birds that are caught in a snare—like them are the sons of men entrapped at an evil time, when it falleth upon them suddenly.
13. This also I saw, [an instance of] wisdom under the sun; and it was great to my thinking:
14. A little city, and few men in it; and there came unto it a great king, and surrounded it, and built against it great *siege-works*.
15. And there was found in it a poor wise man; and he would have delivered the city by his wisdom: but men took no notice of that poor wise man.

¹ Lit. 'after him.'

² Lit. 'vapour.'

16. And I said, Wisdom is better than might, but the wisdom of the poor man is despised, and his words are not heard.
17. *The words of the wise heard in quiet [are better] than the shouting of a chief among fools.*
18. *Better is wisdom than weapons of war; but one sinner destroyeth much good.*

CHAPTER X.

1. *Dead flies contaminate[†] a perfumer's ointment; a little folly is more highly esteemed¹ than wisdom *and* honour.*
2. *The heart of a wise man [tends] towards his right hand, but the heart of a fool towards his left.*
3. *And on the very road as the fool is going, his mind is lacking, and he saith concerning everyone, He is a fool.*
4. *If the spirit of the ruler rise against thee, do not throw up² thy place; for soothing pacifieth great sins.*
5. *There is an evil that I have seen under the sun, like an unintentional error which proceedeth from the ruler.*
6. *Folly is set in high places, while the rich sit in a low place.*
7. *I have seen slaves on horses, and princes walking as slaves on the ground.*
8. *He that diggeth a pit shall fall into it; and he that breaketh into a wall a serpent shall bite him.*
9. *He that taketh out stones [from a quarry] shall be hurt by them; he that cleaveth logs shall be endangered by them.*
10. *If the axe be blunt and he have not sharpened the edge, then he must strengthen his force; and an advantage to *the successful man* is wisdom.*
11. *If the serpent bite from lack of enchantment, there is [afterwards] no advantage in the charmer.*
12. *The words of the mouth of the wise man are [full of] grace; but the lips of a fool destroy himself.*
13. *The beginning of the words of his mouth is folly, and the end of his talk³ is evil madness.*

¹ Lit. 'is more valuable.'² Lit. 'let go.'³ Lit. 'his mouth.' Perhaps the word should be omitted.

14. *...but the fool multiplieth words.*
 [[Man knoweth not what shall be; and what shall be after him who can tell him?]]
15. *The toil of fools wearieth them, because [a fool] knoweth not how to go to town.*
16. Alas for thee O land whose king is a child, and thy princes feast in the morning.
17. Happy art thou O land whose king is of noble birth, and thy princes feast at the [right] time, with strength and not with drunkenness.
18. **By idleness* the roof falleth into decay, and by slackness of hands the house leaketh.*
19. *Men prepare a feast for laughter, and wine *to make life glad* ; and money answereth all things.*
20. Even in thy thought curse not a king, and in thy bed-chamber curse not a rich man; for a bird of the heavens may carry the sound, and that which hath wings may declare a matter.

CHAPTER XI.

1. Cast thy bread upon the face of the waters; for in many days thou shalt find it.
2. Give a portion to seven, and also to eight; for thou knowest not what may prove to be an evil upon the earth.
3. If the clouds be filled with rain, they empty it out upon the earth; and if a stick fall northwards or southwards, the place where the stick falleth, there it is.
4. He that watcheth the wind shall not sow, and he that looketh at the clouds shall not reap.
5. As thou knowest not what is the way of the wind, as the bones in the womb of a woman with child, so thou knowest not the work of God Who doeth all things.
6. In the morning sow thy seed, and till evening slack not thine hand; for thou knowest not which shall succeed, whether this or that, or whether both of them may be alike good.

7. And the light is sweet, and it is good for the eyes to see the sun.
8. For if a man live many years, he may be glad throughout them all; but let him remember the days of darkness, for they shall be many. All that cometh is a vapour.
9. Be glad O young man in thy youth, and let thine heart cheer thee in the days of thy young manhood; and walk in the ways of thine heart and in the sight of thine eyes;
10. **But know that concerning all these things God will bring thee into judgment.**
11. and put away sorrow from thine heart, and remove evil from thy flesh—for youth and the prime of life are a vapour—

CHAPTER XII.

1. **But remember thy Creator in the days of thy young manhood.**
ere the days of evil come, and years draw nigh when thou shalt say I have no pleasure in them.
2. Ere the sun and the light and the moon and the stars be darkened, and the clouds return after the rain.
3. In the day when the keepers of the house quake, and the men of might are bent, and the grinding maids cease because they are few, and the ladies that look through the windows be darkened;
4. and the doors on the street be shut when the sound of the mill is low; and *the sound of the sparrow fade*, and all the notes of song sink low.
5. Moreover they are afraid of a high thing, and terrors are on the road; and *he rejecteth* the almond, and the locust-fruit is [too] heavy, and the caper-berry becomes ineffectual. For man is on his way to his perpetual home, and the wailers go about in the street.
6. Ere the silver cord be *snapped*, and the golden bowl be broken; and the pitcher be shivered over the spring, and the bucket¹ be broken into the cistern;

¹ Perhaps 'wheel.'

7. and the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit return unto God who gave it.
8. Vapour of vapours, saith Koheleth ; all is a vapour.
9. And Koheleth, besides being wise, further taught the people knowledge ; and he weighed and searched out, he arranged many proverbs.
10. Koheleth sought to find words of pleasure, and *a writing of* uprightness, words of truth.
11. *The words of wise men are as goads, and as nails firmly planted, gathered in collections ; they are given from one shepherd.*
12. *And besides those, my son, be warned ; of making many books there is no end, and much devotion to study is a weariness of the flesh.*
13. In conclusion : all has been heard—fear God and keep His commandments ; for this is [the duty of] every man.
14. For every work will God bring into the judgment [that is passed] upon every hidden thing, whether good or evil.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I.

THE GREEK VERSION OF KOHELETH.

The close similarity which exists between the Greek version of Koheleth and the extant fragments of Aquila has often been noticed. Other portions of the LXX. exhibit some Aquilean traits, e.g. S. of Songs, and a few MSS. of Ezekiel. But in the case of Koheleth the relationship to Aquila in style and wording is so marked that Graetz¹ suggested an interesting explanation. Jerome twice mentions Aquila's "secundam editionem, quam Hebraei κατ' ἀκριβείαν nominant"²; and Graetz thought that the present Greek version might be in reality Aquila's first edition, and the fragments of Aquila which have survived by Origen's labours would represent the second³. Montfaucon in his *Preliminaria* to the Hexapla, p. 48, supposed that the 'Aquila' column was the *editio secunda*, but he did not make any suggestion with regard to the *editio prima*. Although several writers have inclined to the theory, no one has hitherto upheld it by a detailed examination of the text in conjunction with Aquila's fragments. On the other hand it has been strenuously opposed in a careful article by Dillmann⁴. But

¹ See also, earlier than Graetz, Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 238, note *w*.

² Hier. Opp. T. v. pp. 32, 624.

³ The suggestion commends itself to König, *Einl. A. T.*, Klostermann, *St. Kr.* 1885, and Leimdorfer, *Kohelet im Lichte der Geschichte*, Hamburg, 1892. [Freudenthal, *Hellen. Stud.* p. 46.] Renan admits the probability, *l'Ecclésiaste*, pp. 54-57. On the other hand Salzberger, in Graetz's *Monatsschrift*, 1873, 168-174, holds that the present Greek version is by Aquila, and not the 'Aquila' column of the Hexapla!

⁴ *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1892, vol. i. pp. 3-16.

his arguments do not remove the strong impression produced by fresh study. His conclusion is that an older Greek translation lay as the groundwork of the present text; and that this older translation was corrected by means of a more accurate one, for the most part that of Aquila. But on the one hand it is scarcely conceivable that a reviser would, for purposes of *correction*, alter an old translation so fundamentally as to imbue it with the Aquilean style, both in the order of words and in many of the smallest details of grammar and syntax. On the other hand, if his object was to produce a new translation in *imitation* of Aquila, it is surprising that he was not more thorough; for he has left a large number of words and phrases which, judged by the standard of Aquila's fragments, are not consonant with his style. But if Aquila himself made an earlier translation, and then issued a revision of it, both these features are to be expected. The early translation would be imbued with his style, but would nevertheless contain many words, phrases and grammatical points which would seem to him to require revision. And there are not wanting facts which tend to increase the probability that such a revision was made. Aquila is known to have been a disciple of R. Aq̄iba¹. He lived therefore at an epoch in the literary history of Judaism. The Rabbinic authorities at Jamnia had but recently made a final pronouncement on the Canon; and Ishmael ben Elisha and Aq̄iba each laid down rules which formed the basis of future exegesis². But the system of Aq̄iba, by which every particle and letter was made to give a special meaning, necessitated a clear consensus as to the Hebrew text. And it is in the highest degree probable that under his influence an authoritative recension of the Hebrew Bible was issued. Whether the standard adopted was guided by the agreement of the majority of Rabbis, or of the majority of their extant manuscripts³, cannot be determined. But the result was a text which, being carefully preserved by tradition, remained nearly intact till it was stereotyped centuries later by the Masorettes.

Now Aq̄iba, although the chief exponent, was not the

¹ Hier. *in Isa.* viii. 14 "Scribae et Pharisei quorum suscepit scholam Akybas, quem magistrum Aquilae proselyti autumant."

² See Graetz, *History of the Jews* (Engl. transl.), vol. ii. pp. 358 f.

³ Jer. *Taanith* iv. fol. 68 a.

first promoter of his exegetical method; tradition traces it to Nachum of Gimso (Emmaus). And Aquila was a companion and disciple of the Rabbis before he attached himself to Aqiba. If, then, Aquila issued two editions of his translation, it is reasonable to suppose that the earlier edition was made under the influence of the 'literal' school, but on the basis of an unrevised Hebrew text; and the later edition on the basis of the revised recension, under the direct influence of Aqiba.

And this ceases to be a mere hypothesis when the present Greek MSS. are carefully studied. In the second Appendix it is shewn that B and 68 (Holmes and Parsons), which approach the nearest to the original Greek of Koheleth, presuppose a Hebrew text widely different from the MT. This, which was one of Dillmann's main objections to the Aquila theory, becomes, on the contrary, one of the main factors in the theory.

The following examination of the Greek text is based, to a large extent, on the matter collected in Dillmann's article.

1. Apart from details, the closeness with which the translator adhered to his Hebrew text is remarkably shewn in the extraordinary exactness with which he maintains the *order* of the words; "this order is so strict that, with hardly an exception, it would be possible to print the Greek text as it stands as an interlinear translation¹."

2. To come to details. First to be considered are striking peculiarities of Aquila's style in the treatment of the Hebrew syntax.

תָּא (the sign of the accus.) rendered by σύν.

In M. תָּא occurs 72 times (omitting ix. 14 (תָּא)). In G² it is rendered by σύν 29 times³ (or 32 times, including v. 3, 6, x. 20 where σύν οὖν, σύν and σου must be corruptions of σύν). These 32 include the cases where תָּא is followed by ל, in many of which σύν πᾶς, σύν πάντα etc. have been corrupted into συμπᾶς, σύνπαντα etc. But of the 36 cases in which תָּא is not rendered by σύν, almost all are capable of explanation. Burkitt⁴ remarks as a peculiarity of Aquila: "when תָּא is used without the

¹ Dale, *A Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, London and Cambridge, 1873.

² G² is used throughout the appendix for the Greek text of Koh., LXX. for that of the rest of the O.T.

³ vii. 15 ACS, x. 19 ACS^{ca}.

⁴ *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the translation of Aquila*, p. 12.

article, i.e. before proper names or nouns with suffixes, or in the construct state, the Greek article is used instead of $\sigma\upsilon\nu$, cf. 4 Kings xxiii. 27, 3 Kings xxi. (xx.) 15." This disposes of 31 cases: i. 13, ii. 3, 10, 14, 20, 24, iii. 15, iv. 5 *bis*, 8, 10, v. 5 *ter*, 18, 19, vii. 7 (8), 13 (14), 18 (19) *bis*, 21 (22), viii. 8 b, 9, 16, ix. 7, 12, xi. 5, 6, 8 [cf. Aq.], xii. 1, 13. In 5 cases there seems to be a development of this practice, when $\eta\aleph$ is followed by $\eta\aleph$: ii. 12, iii. 11, iv. 3, vii. 13 (14), viii. 16. But if this is not allowed, there remain 9 instances in which no reason can be offered why $\eta\aleph$ is not rendered by $\sigma\upsilon\nu$: ii. 12¹, iii. 11, iv. 3, vii 13 (14), 14 (15), viii. 16, ix. 15, x. 19, xii. 13. But from the extant fragments of Aquila in other parts of the Old Testament it is clear that his use of $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ is not invariable. See, for example, Gen. i. 28, ii. 6, vi. 6 (7), xxiv. 59, xxv. 34, xxxvii. 2, xliii. 24, l. 2.

Thus, though instances occur of Greek and Syriac MSS. being coloured by this Aquilean use (e.g. Cod. A 3 Kings xii. 24 g-n, Cod. 62 in Ezek., and in the Pesh. Gen. i. 1, I Chr. iv. 41 and 4 times in Cant.), there is no portion of the Greek O. T. in which it occurs with this almost complete regularity.

$\eta\aleph$ and $\eta\aleph$ rendered by $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\epsilon$.

The former occurs 40, the latter 11 times. The only exceptions are $\kappa\alpha\iota = \eta\aleph$ viii. 16, xii. 5 [ACS $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\epsilon$], $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\epsilon = \eta\aleph$ ix. 6, and $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\epsilon = \eta\aleph$ iii. 19. But Aq. himself does not invariably adhere to the usage; for in v. 18 he renders $\eta\aleph$ by $\alpha\lambda\lambda\grave{\alpha}\ \kappa\alpha\iota$. See Job vii. 11 $\tau\omicron\iota\gamma\alpha\rho\upsilon\acute{\nu}$. 1 Sam. xxviii. 22, Job xxiv. 19, Jer. iv. 12, xxxi. (xxxviii.) 37, Mic. vi. 13 $\kappa\alpha\iota$.

$\eta\aleph$ with infinitive rendered by $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ with infinitive.

This occurs not only when it expresses a purpose (as frequently throughout LXX.), but also when it forms simply the complement of a verbal expression:

e.g. after $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ i. 8, viii. 17 [i. 15 AS^{c.a}, vi. 10 AS, vii. 13 (14)

ACS^{c.a}],

after $\gamma\upsilon\omega\acute{\nu}\alpha\iota$ iv. 13, x. 15 [vi. 8 C has $\tau\omicron\upsilon$, either a corruption of $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ or an accidental repetition of the first syllable of $\tau\omicron\upsilon$],

after $\acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\iota}\epsilon\acute{\nu}\alpha\iota$ v. 11,

after $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu$ iii. 12, v. 17, viii. 15, xi. 7,

after $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ iii. 2-8.

¹ In ii. 12 S^{c.a}V read $\sigma\upsilon\nu$.

In i. 16 לאמר is rendered τῷ λέγειν. See Aq. I S. ix. 24.

Connected with this is another peculiarity, not mentioned by Dillmann. Burkitt¹ notes that "where a Hebrew noun is preceded by the preposition ל, [Aquila] freely uses the Greek article to express it in all cases where εἰς would be inappropriate. His aim was consistency, regardless of the niceties of either language. As long as there was something to correspond to the Hebrew preposition in the Greek, it did not matter whether it was an article or a preposition. When Hebrew prepositions coalesce with their nouns, he usually avoids using both article and preposition."

- ii. 16 τοῦ σοφοῦ. לְחָכְמָה.
 ii. 26 τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. לְאָדָם.
 iii. 1 παντὶ πράγματι τῷ ὑπὸ τ. οὐρανόν. לְכָל חַפְצֵי תַחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם.
 iii. 17 τῷ παντὶ πράγματι. לְכָל חַפֵּץ.
 iv. 8 τῷ παντὶ μόνῳ αὐτοῦ. לְכָל עַמְלוֹ.
 iv. 11 καὶ ὁ εἰς. וְלִאֲחָדָה.
 iv. 16 τοῖς πᾶσιν οἱ ἐγένοντο. לְכָל אֲשֶׁר הָיָה.
 vii. 27 (28) μία τῇ μιᾷ. אַחַת לְאַחַת.
 ix. 4 ὁ κύων. לְכָל־בֶּלֶב.
 x. 3 τὰ πάντα. לְכָל probably.
 xi. 2 τοῖς ἑπτά καὶ γε τοῖς ἡ΄. לְשִׁבְעָה וְגַם לְשִׁמוֹנָה.

ἄν of comparison rendered by ὑπὲρ more than 20 times. παρὰ ii. 9, iii. 19 only; ἢ v. 4, vii. 2 (3) only; and the genitive never.

The particles δὲ and γὰρ, elsewhere so common in LXX. (except Cant.), are foreign to the Greek of Koheleth. δὲ is read by Codd. V, 252, and Syr.-Hex. in vii. 4 (5) only; cf. Aq. Gen. vi. 2 (3). γὰρ occurs in v. 15 only. (See App. II. p. 160.)

Among other instances of disregard for the Greek idiom in favour of the Hebrew may be noticed:

The frequent use of the Greek future in gnomic or generalising statements to represent the Hebrew imperfect: i. 8, 15, 18, ii. 14, iii. 15, vii. 9 (10), 12 (13), 20 (21), viii. 1, 17, ix. 5 a, 18, xi. 5.

ב rendered by ἐν: ii. 1, iii. 22, vii. 14 (15) ἰδεῖν ἐν, "ראה ב"; v. 9 ἀγαπᾶν ἐν, "אהב ב"; viii. 9 ἐξουσιάζειν ἐν, "שלט ב"; xi. 9, xii. 14 ἀξεί ἐν κρίσει, "יבא במשפט".

¹ Aquila, p. 13.

The treatment of the Hebrew syntax of the relative :

- ii. 21 ὅτι μόχθος αὐτοῦ. ישׁעמלו.
 iv. 2 ὅσοι αὐτοὶ. אשר המה.
 iv. 9 οἷς ἔστιν αὐτοῖς. ישׁ להם. Similarly v. 18, vi. 2, x. 16.
 viii. 14 ὅτι φθάνει ἐπ' αὐτοῦς. אשר מניע אלהם.
 ix. 10 ὅπου σὺ πορεύῃ ἐκεῖ. אשר אתה הלך שמה.
 xi. 5 ὅσα ποιήσει τὰ σύμπαντα. אשר יעשה את הכל.

Note also : iii. 18, vii. 15 *περὶ λαλίας*, and viii. 2 *περὶ λόγου*, to express על דברת (cf. Ps. cx. (cix.) 4 על דברתי, Aq. *κατὰ λόγον*, but LXX. *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν*) ; i. 10 *ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν* for מלפנינו ; ii. 9 *ἀπὸ ἔμπροσθέν μου* for מלפני ; xii. 5 *εἰς οἶκον αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ* for אל בית עולמו.

3. Besides these syntactical peculiarities there are several words which exhibit Aquila's constant endeavour to express his Hebrew text as literally as possible :

vi. 6, vii. 22 (23)¹ *καθόδους*, פּעמים. So Aq. frequently. Ex. xxxiv. 24, Dt. ix. 19, xvi. 16, 1 Sam. iii. 10 *bis*, 1 K. xxii. 16, Is. xli. 7.

v. 10, 12, vii. 12 (13), viii. 8, xii. 11 *παρὰ* with gen., בעל.

x. 12 *καταποντίζειν*, בלע. So Aq. Job ii. 3, x. 8, Prov. xxi. 20, Is. xxv. 7 [LXX. only in 2 Sam. xx. 19, Ps. liv. (lv.) 10, Lam. ii. 2, 5].

vii. 14 (15) *συμφώνως*, לעמל. So Aq. Ez. iii. 8, xi. 22, Ex. xxviii. 27 (see Field).

iv. 8, v. 10, 17, vi. 3, 6, vii. 14 (15), ix. 18 *ἀγαθωσύνη*, טובה. So Aq. v. 10, Ps. xxxvii. (xxxviii.) 21, and *ἀγαθωσύνη* Ps. xv. (xvi.) 2.

xii. 6 *συντροχάσση*, גרץ.

The above are the most striking in Dillmann's list of the words "which can with most probability be referred to an Aquilean source." His list also includes :

iv. 1, v. 7, vii. 7 (8) *συκοφαντίζειν*, שקע. So Aq. Ps. cxix. (cxviii.) 121, Prov. xxviii. 3. Words from the same stem occur 15 times in Aq. and only 6 times in LXX.

x. 5 *ἀκούσιον*, שנגה. So Aq. v. 5.

iv. 12 *ἐντριτος*, משלש, a *ἄπαξ* λεγ.

vii. 8 (9), x. 13 *ἐσχάτη*, אחרית (cf. i. 11 *εἰς τὴν ἐσχάτην*, לאחרונה). Aq. must have had *ἐσχάτη* in vii. 8 (9).

4. Another consideration, which Dillmann dismisses some-

¹ On the doublet in the latter passage see App. ii. p. 163.

what lightly, is that there are several words or phrases in the fragments of Aquila in *Ḳoheleth* which agree with *Ḓ*:

Aq. alone. i. 7, ii. 11, 15, iii. 15, viii. 8, x. 15, perh. ii. 24, viii. 1 (see note).

Aq. and *Ḓ*. i. 13, ii. 13, 16, 19, iv. 3, 8, v. 13, 19, vi. 8, ix. 11, 12, x. 4, 5, xii. 11, 13, perh. vii. 7 (8), 24 (25).

Aq. and *Σ*. xi. 1, xii. 9, 12.

Aq. *Σ* *Ḓ*. i. 2, iv. 10, v. 1, vi. 2, vii. 18 (19), 26 (27), viii. 12, ix. 7, 8, x. 11, xi. 4, 9, xii. 7.

So far Dillmann's lists are in favour of the conclusion that the Greek text of *Ḳoheleth* was due to the hand of Aquila. But he advances a series of objections which require examination.

1. After citing the above passages in which Aq. agrees with *Ḓ*, he says "the passages are far more numerous where Aq. differs from *Ḓ*." This, in the scattered fragments of Aq. which have survived, is true. But, on the one hand, it is just those passages in which differences occur which would be more likely to survive; commentators and scholiasts might occasionally mention instances of agreement, but only where they considered them interesting or striking. And, on the other hand, a second edition presupposes differences. The reasons for all the alterations are, of course, impossible to trace, though occasionally they seem to be discernible. But to disprove the Aquila theory it would be necessary to shew that the bulk of the words and phrases in *Ḓ* are non-Aquilean. But the opposite is the case. Of the fifty or so which Dillmann collects as the "chief instances of difference," many occur elsewhere in fragments of Aquila, and some are frequent with him and rare in *LXX*.

(a) *Words which occur only, or frequently, in Aquila.*

ii. 8. *Ḓ* περιουσιασμός. Aq. *οὐσία*. H. סגלה.

περιουσιασμός occurs in *LXX*. Ps. cxxxv. (cxxxiv.) 4. But cognate words are found in Aq. *περιούσιον*, סגלה Mal. iii. 17; *περιουσία*, רביש Gen. xiv. 21; *περιουσία*, יתר Ps. xvii. (xvi.) 14.

- x. 9. **Ⲭ** διαπονηθήσεται. Aq. σπασθήσεται. H. **צצ**.
 LXX. nowhere has διαπονηθήναι or cognates for **צצ**; in Aq., on the contrary, they are not infrequent:
 διαπονηθήναι, **צצ**התע Gen. vi. 6, xxxiv. 7, 1 Sam. xx. 3, 34.
 διαπόνημα, **צצ** 2 Sam. v. 21, Ps. xvi. (xv.) 4, cxxvii. (cxxvi.) 2, Is. lviii. 3, Ps. cxv. 4 (cxiii. 12); see Field.
 διαπόνησις **צצ**ה Is. l. 11.
- i. 3. **Ⲭ** μόχθος and -θειν. Aq. κόπος and -πιάζειν. H. **ממ**.
 μόχθος is the invariable rendering of **ממ** in Kōh., occurring 22 times; μοχθεῖν occurs 9 times, and κοπιῶ once, ii. 18. [But AS μοχθῶ.]
 Aq. has μόχθος, -θειν for **ממ** in Ps. lxxiii. (lxxii.) 16, Kōh. ii. 11, 19, 21. But throughout the whole of the LXX. neither the substantive nor the verb is found for **ממ**. Dt. xxvi. 7 μόχθον AF is probably a hexaplaric corruption.
 (Aq. also has μοχθοῦν (a *ἀπ. γεγρ.*) in Is. vii. 13 *bis* for **ממ**הל. His use of κόπος finds a parallel in Ps. xciv. (xciii.) 20, and probably lv. (liv.) 11, Job vii. 3.)
- x. 20. **Ⲭ** ὁ ἔχων [τὰς] πτέρυγας¹. Aq. ὁ κυριεῶν πτέρυγος.
 H. **בעל כנפים** [ה].
 The rendering ὁ ἔχων is foreign to LXX., except in Dan. viii. 6, 20 (LXX. Ⓞ).
 But Aq. has it frequently:
 Hos. ii. 18 (16) ἔχων με (LXX. Βααλείμ).
 Is. xli. 15 ἔχοντα στόμα στομάτων (LXX. πιστηροειδείς).
 Nah. i. 2 ἔχων θυμόν (LXX. μετὰ θυμοῦ).
 Cant. viii. 11 ἔχοντι πλήθη (LXX. Βεελαμών).
 Jer. xxxvii. (xliv.) 13 (acc. to S. H.) ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐπισκέψεις (LXX. ἄνθρωπος παρ' ᾧ κατέλυν).
 Job xxxi. 39 (id.) τῶν ἔχοντων αἰτήν (LXX. entirely astray).
 Nah. iii. 4 (acc. to Hier.) ἐχούσης φάρμακα (LXX. ἡγουμένη φαρμάκων).
 See also Mal. ii. 11 καὶ ἔσχε, **בעל** (LXX. ἐπετίθενσεν).
 Is. lxii. 4 ἐσχημένη, **בעל** (LXX. οἰκουμένη).
- xii. 5. **Ⲭ** θάμβοι. Aq. τρόμω τρομήσουσιν. H. **תתתת**.
 Aq. is nowhere extant where the cognate words **תת**, **תתת**, **תתת**, **תתית** occur; but LXX. renders none of them by θάμβος. As renderings of other Hebrew words θάμβος and cognates

¹ B ὁ τὰς πτέρυγας. ACS ὁ ἔχων πτέρυγας. See App. II. p. 166.

are more frequent in Aq. than in LXX. (12 or 13 times in Aq., 9 times in LXX.).

Field on Jud. ix. 4 (q. v.) says of a variant *θαμβουμένους* "*versio Aquilam sapit.*"

xii. 4. Ⲭ αἱ θυγατέρες τοῦ ἄσματος. Aq. τὰ τῆς ψῶδης. H. בנות השיר.

The construction τὰ τῆς ψῶδης is not found elsewhere in Aq. But the use of *θυγάτηρ* is seen in Mal. ii. 11 τὴν θυγατέρα θεοῦ ἀπηλλοτριωμένον, כּכּ אל בת (LXX. εἰς θεοῦς ἀλλοτρίους). In Mic. iv. 14 נדוד בת תתנודי בת, LXX. renders בת as a vocative, while (acc. to Hier.) Aq., with ΣΘΕ', preserves the construct state of the Hebrew idiom. LXX. similarly in Lam. ii. 18 where Aq. *vacat*. (With regard to ἄσμα and ψῶδη see below, p. 127.)

To the above may be added the two following words, of which Aquila's version has not been preserved:

ii. 14, 15, iii. 19 *ter*, ix. 2, 3. Ⲭ συνάντημα. H. מַקְרָה.

LXX. nowhere renders thus; and it has the verb *συναντάω* only in Num. xxiii. 16 וַיִּקְרָא.

But Aq. has

συνάντημα (prob.) 1 Sam. vi. 9 (LXX. σύμπτωμα).

συνάντησις 1 Sam. xx. 26 (LXX. σύμπτωμα).

συνάντισμα Dt. xxiii. 11 (LXX. ῥύσις, MT מַקְרָה).

συναντάω Is. li. 19, lx. 18, Jer. xxxii. (xxxix.) 23 (also

συνάντημα Is. lvii. 13, H. קָבִיר).

x. 1. Ⲭ σαπριοῦσιν. H. יִבְאִישׁוּ.

LXX. nowhere renders the verb thus; though it has *σαπρία αὐτοῦ* for באישׁוּ in Joel ii. 20.

Aq. ἐσαπρίσατε Ex. v. 21 (LXX. ἐβδελύξατε); and the substantive *σαπρία* Am. iv. 10 (LXX. ἐν πυρὶ), Is. v. 2 (LXX. ἀκάνθας).

Under this heading may also be included some curious instances in which Ⲭ has all the appearance of being Aquilean, while the renderings ascribed to Aquila are foreign to his usual methods:

viii. 11. Ⲭ ἐπληροφορήθη καρδία νιῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is a perfectly literal rendering of מלא לב בני האדם, while Aquila's rendering ἐτόλμησαν οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων is free and inaccurate.

xii. 10. Ⲭ καὶ γεγραμμένον εὐθύτητος as a rendering of וכתוב ישׁר has a strong savour of Aquila, while his own καὶ συνέγραψεν ὀρθῶς is paraphrastic. But in this case Aquila's phrase is also ascribed to Σ, and may be a hexaplaric corruption.

- i. 8. E ἔγκοποι. Aq. κοπιῶσιν. H. ענגג.
 iv. 17. E τοῦ ἀκούειν. Aq. ὥστε ἀκούειν. H. עמשל.
 v. 7. E ἐπ' αὐτούς. Aq. μετ' αὐτούς. H. עהילע.
 v. 18. E καί γε. Aq. ἀλλὰ καὶ. H. עג.
 vii. 10 (11). E τί ἐγένετο. Aq. διὰ τί. H. היה מה.
 vii. 17 (18). E ἐν οὗ καιρῷ σου. Aq. πρὸ τοῦ καιροῦ σου. H. בלא עת.
 viii. 6. E κρίσις. Aq. τρόπος. H. עפשע.
 ix. 13. E πρὸς με. Aq. παρ' ἐμοί. H. עלי.
 ix. 18. E σκευή πολέμου. Aq. σκευή πολεμικά. H. בלי קרב.

(b) *Words which occur elsewhere in Aquila.*

- i. 2 and *passim*. E ματαιότης¹. Aq. ἀτμός or ἀτμός. H. הבל.
 In LXX. ματαιότης is confined to the Psalter exc. Prov. xxii. 8 (H. חס); it is the rendering of הבל in Pss. xxxi. 7, xxxix. 6, lxii. 10, lxxviii. 33, cxliv. 4. Elsewhere mostly μάταιον, -α, εἶδωλον, κενός.
 Aq. has ἀτμός only in Ps. lxxviii. (lxxvii.) 33 exc. in Koh. But he has ματαιότης in Is. lvii. 13, Jon. ii. 9, Job vii. 16, Prov. xiii. 11 and possibly Jer. x. 8. (Also τὰ μάταια Jer. xiv. 22, μάτην Ps. xxxix. (xxxviii.) 12, Job ix. 29.)
 It seems, therefore, that ματαιότης was Aquila's usual rendering of הבל, but in his 2nd edition of Koh. he preferred the more literal ἀτμός, which was afterwards adopted by ΣΘ.
 i. 5. E ἔλκει. Aq. εἰσπνέει. H. עשעשע.
 εἰσπνέει is a ἄπαξ λεγ. But Aq. has εἴλκευεν in Jer. ii. 24 (LXX. ἐπνευματοφορεῖτο), and ἀφειλκύσαντο Job v. 5 (LXX. ἐκσιφωνισθείη).
 i. 18, ii. 23. E ἄλγημα. Aq. βάσανος. H. מכאוב.
 LXX. nowhere renders מכאוב by ἄλγημα, though it occurs once for צאצא Ps. xxxix. 2. Aq. has it for מכאוב Ps. xxxii. (xxxii.) 10 (LXX. μάστιγες). ἄλγος is found 6 times in Aq., and only thrice in LXX.
 The only instance of βάσανος for מכאוב is cited by Field from an unknown translator (perh. Aq.) in 2 Chr. vi. 29.
 ii. 6. E κολυμβήθρα. Aq. λίμνη. H. ברכה.
 Aq. has κολυμβήθρα 2 Sam. ii. 13, iv. 12 (E in both κρήνη).

¹ G^B ἀτμός ix. 9.

- ii. 8. Ἔ ἐντροφήματα. Aq. τρυφαί. H. תַּעֲנַנִּית.
 ἐντροφήματα is a ἀπαξ λεγ. But Aq. has ἐντροφᾶν for
 נַעֲנַנִּית Is. lviii. 14. So LXX. Is. lv. 2, lvii. 4.
 LXX. and Aq. each use τρυφή in 4 passages; and Aq.
 also has τρυφήτης Dt. xxviii. 54, τρυφεία Gen. xviii. 12,
 1 Sam. xv. 32.
- iv. 10. Ἔ μέτοχος. Aq. φίλος. H. חֶבֶר.
 φίλος for words from חֶבֶר occurs nowhere else, except Ⓞ .
 Dan. ii. 13, 17, 18. Aq. has μέτοχος Prov. xxviii. 24, Ps. cxix.
 (cxviii.) 63, and probably Hos. vi. 9 where Hier. translates
 his word *Participatio*.
- v. 5. Ἔ ἄγνοια. Aq. ἀκούσιον (x. 5 Ἔ Aq. ἀκούσιον). H. שִׁנּוּה.
 Aq. nowhere else uses ἀκούσιον, -ως, while it is the almost
 invariable rendering of LXX. in Lev., Num., Josh.
 Aq. has ἄγνοια Lev. iv. 2, 22, v. 15¹; also ἄγνοίαι for
 שִׁנּוּיִּים Ps. xix. (xviii.) 13.
- v. 5. Ἔ διαφθείρειν. Aq. διαλύειν. H. חִבֵּל.
 Aq. elsewhere uses διαλύειν once only, Ez. xix. 12, H.
 הַחֲפֹרֶק. He renders חִבֵּל by διαφθείρειν Cant. viii. 5 (and by
 ἐκφθείρειν Is. liv. 16). LXX. Mic. ii. 10 only.
 Aq., however, uses it 14 times for שִׁחָה.
- v. 12. Ἔ κακία. Aq. πονηρόν. H. רַעָה (subst.) }
 ix. 12. Ἔ κακός. Aq. πονηρός. H. רַעָה (adj.) }
- The reason for Aq.'s alteration in these two passages
 cannot, of course, be known. But no stress can be laid on
 it, since throughout LXX. and Aq. רַעָה (subst. and adj.) are
 rendered by κακία, -κός, πονηρία, -ρός, quite indiscriminately.
- vii. 3. Ἔ κακία. Aq. κάκωσις. H. רָעָה.
 No argument can be based on this, since Aq. is not
 extant in any other passage where רָעָה occurs (LXX. has
 κακία for רָעָה only in 1 Sam. xvii. 28, Hos. ix. 15). But κάκωσις
 is a word confined entirely to Σ , except Aq. Ⓞ here, and
 Ⓞ 1 Sam. xxviii. 10.
- x. 6. Ἔ ὑψή. Aq. ὑψώματα. H. מְרוֹמִים.
 Aq. nowhere else uses ὑψωμα for מְרוֹם, though it is his
 regular word for מְרוֹם. But he frequently renders מְרוֹם by
 ὑψος, Ps. vii. 8, x. 5 (ix. 26) prob., lxxi. (lxx.) 19, xciii. (xcii.) 4,
 Prov. ix. 3, Is. xxxviii. 14, Jer. xlix. 16, Ez. xvii. 23. Of these
 LXX. has ὑψος only in Ps. vii. 8, Is. xxxviii. 14.

¹ In connexion with v. 15 see Field's note on iv. 27.

- xi. 3. $\text{\textcircled{E}}$ ἐκχέουσιν. Aq. ἐκκενώσουσιν. H. ירעו.

This cannot be considered an important variation. Aq. has ἐκκενώσω Ps. xviii. (xvii.) 43, Jer. xlvi. (xxxvi.) 12; but also ἐκχεόμενον Cant. i. 3 (LXX. ἐκκενωθέν). And LXX. has the former 6 times, and the latter twice.

To these may be added some words which find parallels in Aquila, but of which Aquila's equivalents in Koheleth have not survived:

- ii. 21, iv. 4, v. 10. $\text{\textcircled{E}}$ ἀνδρεία. H. כשרון }
 x. 10. $\text{\textcircled{E}}$ τοῦ ἀνδρείου. H. הבשיר }

See Prov. xxxi. 19, Aq. ἀνδρεία, H. כישור (distaff).

- v. 2, 15. $\text{\textcircled{E}}$ παραγίνεται. H. בוא.

See Aq. Jud. ix. 37.

- v. 12, 15, 16, vi. 2. $\text{\textcircled{E}}$ ἀρρωστία. H. חולה and חלי.

See Aq. Dt. xxviii. 16, Ps. xxxv. (xxxiv.) 13, lxxvii. (lxxvi.) 11, Prov. xviii. 14, Is. xxxviii. 9, liii. 3 [1 (3) K. xiv. 1, 5], in each of which (except 1 K.) LXX. has a different rendering. Aq. is not extant in the five (canonical) passages in which LXX. has the word.

- iv. 6, vi. 5, ix. 17. $\text{\textcircled{E}}$ ἀνάπαυσις. H. נחת.

Except in Koh. ἀνάπαυσις is used for נחת only in Σ Is. xxx. 15. But in vi. 5 Field gives "A. Σ. Θ. ἀνάπαυσις" from S.H. $\text{\textcircled{L}}$ $\text{\textcircled{L}}$, and it is Aq.'s usual word for other derivatives of נוח, Ps. xciv. (xciv.) 11, Is. xi. 10, xxxiv. 14, lxvi. 1, Zech. ix. 1; and see Field on Lev. i. 9.

- vii. 5 (6). $\text{\textcircled{E}}$ ἐπιτίμησις. H. נערה.

Aq. has it Ps. lxxvi. (lxxv.) 7, Prov. xiii. 8, xvii. 10, Is. xxx. 17, lxvi. 15, and for נערה Dt. xxviii. 20. LXX. has it for נערה only 5 times, 4 of them being in the Pss.¹

- vii. 17 (16). $\text{\textcircled{E}}$ ἐκπλαγῆς. H. חשטם.

LXX. nowhere uses this as a rendering of a Hebrew word². But it is Aq.'s usual equivalent for חרר, Gen. xxvii. 33, 1 Sam. iv. 13, xiii. 7, xvi. 4, xxi. 2 (1), xxviii. 5.

¹ Ps. xviii. (xvii.) 16 = 2 Sam. xxii. 16.

² It occurs in Wisdom and 2 and 4 Macc.

(c) Instances in which a reason is discernible for Aquila's alterations.

(i) A rare or unique rendering of E was replaced by a commoner word.

iv. 8, 16, xii. 12. E *περασμός*. Aq. τέλος (*vacat* in xii. 12). H. $\gamma\rho$. *περασμός* occurs here only, *πέρας* being the usual LXX. rendering of $\gamma\rho$ (τέλος 5 times).

vii. 15 (16). E *μένων*. Aq. μακρόνων. H. $\gamma\text{ר}א\text{מ}$. *μένω* for $\gamma\text{ר}א\text{מ}$ is a *ἀπαξ λεγ.* E has *μακρόνω* in viii. 13, LXX. Ps. cxxix. (cxxviii.) 3, Is. liv. 2. Both LXX. and Aq. have other renderings.

vii. 25 (26). E *ψήφος*. Aq. λογισμός. H. $\text{ו}נ\text{ש}ב\text{ח}$. *ψήφος* for $\text{ו}נ\text{ש}ב\text{ח}$ is a *ἀπαξ λεγ.*, but *λογισμός* is the regular LXX. rendering of words from $\sqrt{\text{ש}ב\text{ח}}$.

(LXX. has *ψήφος* for $\gamma\text{צ}ח$ Lam. iii. 16, and $\gamma\text{צ}$ Ex. iv. 25, only. Aq. for $\text{מ}ספ\text{ר}$ Dt. xxxii. 8, Is. xl. 26, and see 2 (4) K. xii. 5 (4) in Field.)

xii. 4. E *ἄσμα*. Aq. *פְּדָה*. H. $\text{ר}ש$. *ἄσμα* is found in a few passages in LXX. for $\text{ר}ש$ and $\text{ר}רש$, whereas *פְּדָה* occurs *passim*. Aq. has *ἄσμα* Ps. xxviii. (xxvii.) 7, and *פְּדָה* only for $\text{ו}יג\text{ו}$ Ps. ix. 17.

xii. 6. E *ἀνθέμιον*. Aq. *λύτρωσις*. H. $\text{ת}רָאָה$. *ἀνθέμιον* is a *ἀπαξ λεγ.*, while *λύτρωσις* (which should represent $\text{ת}רָאָה$) is found for $\text{ת}רָאָה$ in LXX. Jud. i. 15, where Aq. in despair transliterates Γολλάθ. In Koh., Aq. was equally puzzled, and took refuge in the meaningless guess of the LXX., because it was clear that a proper name was here impossible.

(ii) Changes for the sake of greater exactness.

i. 1, xii. 8 (i. 2, 12, xii. 10 Aq. *vacat*). E *ἐκκλησιαστής*. Aq. *κωλέθ* or *κωελέθ*.

The word *ἐκκλησιαστής* is a good instance of Aq.'s method of rendering words 'ἐτυμολογικῶς.' But in his 2nd edition he relapsed into a transliteration.

Other instances of such a relapse in his 2nd edition are the following, quoted from Field's list:

Jer. xxi. 13	$\gamma\text{צ}$.	1. στερεά.	2. Τύρος.
xiii. 12	$\text{ב}ב\text{ל}$.	1. ἰδρία.	2. νέβελ.

Jer. xlvi. (xxxix.) 12 וּנְבִלִיהֶם. 1. καὶ τὰ κέρατα αὐτοῦ.

2. καὶ τὰ νέβελ αὐτοῦ.

Ez. viii. 16 האוּלם. 1. τῆς προστάδος. 2. τοῦ αἰλάμ.
xlii. 1 הנורה. 1. (ap. Hier.) *separati*. 2. τοῦ γαζερά.

ii. 19, viii. 9. ⚡ ἐξουσιάζεσθαι. Aq. κυριεύειν. H. שלש.

(In viii. 8 ⚡ ἐξουσιάζων for שלש, ἐξουσία for שלש. Aq. *vacat*.)

The following considerations suggest that Aq. made the change to distinguish the late word שלש from the classical שלש:

(1) ἐξουσιάζειν in LXX. is almost unknown:—for שלש Ezr. vii. 24, Neh. v. 15 only; for שלש Neh. ix. 37 only.

(2) It occurs in ⚡ ix. 17, x. 4 for שלש, and is Aq.'s usual rendering, Gen. i. 16, 18, Jud. viii. 22, 1 K. v. 1 (iv. 21), Is. lii. 5, Ez. xix. 14, Job xxv. 2, Ps. viii. 7, lxvi. (lxv.) 7.

(3) κυριεύειν is ⚡'s rendering of שלש¹ 6 times in Dan. (LXX. Dan. ii. 38, 39 only).

vii. 25 (26). ⚡ ἐκύκλωσα. Aq. περιώδευσα. H. סבתי.

Aq. has κυκλώω for סבב Gen. xxxvii. 7, 1 Sam. xxii. 18.

But he seems to have changed his rendering here to distinguish between gyrating (cf. i. 6) and travelling from one point to another.

vii. 29 (30). ⚡ πλῆν. Aq. μόνον. H. לבד.

Aq. has πλῆν 16 times, but always for א (LXX. has it in none of these passages), while he uses μόνον only in this passage, presumably to adhere more closely to the meaning of the root בדר.

xii. 3. ⚡ διαστραφῶσιν. Aq. (acc. to Hier.) *πλανηθήσονται*.
H. התעתו.

עו is rendered by *πλανῶν* here only. The meaning of the word being quite different from that in i. 15, vii. 13, Aq. distinguished it by a different (though inadequate) rendering.

xii. 5. ⚡ θάμβοι. Aq. τρόμφ τρομήσουσι. H. תחתת.

It has been shewn above that Aq. frequently uses θάμβος. But he here wished to represent more closely the reduplicated form of the Heb. Cf. Is. xviii. 1 σκιά σκιά, H. צלצל; Jer. xlvi. (xxvi.) 20 καλή καὶ κεκαλλωμένη, H. הפהפיה.

¹ κύριος for שלש occurs LXX. ⚡. Dan. iv. 14 only.

(iii) Instances in which Aquila's variations from \mathfrak{C} were probably the result of an altered opinion (derived from his Jewish teacher) as to the derivation or punctuation of Hebrew words. In Field's lists of words in his two editions a dozen or more of such variations occur.

i. 14, 17, ii. 11, vi. 9. \mathfrak{C} προαίρεσις. Aq. νομή. H. תוער.

i. 18. \mathfrak{C} γνώσεως. Aq. θυμοῦ. H. סגב. In his 1st edition Aq. read תוער.

ii. 8. \mathfrak{C} οἰνοχόον καὶ οἰνοχόας. Aq. κυλίκιον καὶ κυλίκια. H. תודש תודש.

In his 1st edition Aq. seems to have understood the words as 'cup-bearers'; in his 2nd, of 'cups.' (κυλίκιον occurs LXX. Est. i. 7.)

ii. 12. \mathfrak{C} βουλῆς. Aq. βασιλεως. H. תלם.

If βουλῆς is not a mere scribal error for βασιλεως, Aq. read, in his 1st edition, תלם, an Aram. and NH word.

ii. 26. \mathfrak{C} προσθεῖναι. Aq. συλλέγειν. H. השבט.

In his 1st edition Aq. mistook השבט for השבט.

It is true that in LXX. προστιθέναι is used for השבט, but (except in one or two cases where Heb. is or should be read השבט) only in the special sense of being 'gathered' to one's fathers—people—grave.

(Aq. renders השבט by συλλέγειν Ps. xxxv. (xxxiv.) 15, xxxix. (xxxviii.) 7, and תשבת by συλλογῆς Ex. xxiii. 16.)

xii. 5. \mathfrak{C} διασκεδάσθη. Aq. καρπέυσει. H. תפר.

Aq. derived the word in his 1st edition from תפר, in his 2nd from תפר.

xii. 6. \mathfrak{C} συντριβῆ. Aq. δράμη. H. גרות.

A change from $\sqrt{\text{גרות}}$ to $\sqrt{\text{גרות}}$, if the text of \mathfrak{C} is correct. But it is very unlikely that תשבת and גרות could have been rendered by the same word. συντριβῆ, v. 20, may be a corruption of συντρέχη (cf. συντροχάση for the following גרות).

xii. 9. \mathfrak{C} καὶ οὗς ἐξιχνιάσεται κόσμιον παραβολῶν.

Aq. καὶ ἠνωτίστατο καὶ ἠρεύνησε καὶ κατεσκευάσε παροιμίας.

H. וואן וואן תתן מלשם.

In his 1st edition Aq. had a reading וואן before him, and pointed the phrase וואן וואן תתן מלשם; in his 2nd he followed the authorised recension¹. The bald literalness of \mathfrak{C} is thoroughly Aquilean.

¹ Still, however, connecting וואן with וואן.

There still remain 17 instances in Dillmann's list not yet examined.

- ii. 25. \mathfrak{G} *πίεται*, Aq. *φείσεται* are probably both corrupted from *πέισεται*. See App. II. p. 158.
- xii. 11. The meaningless *πεπυρώμενοι* $\mathfrak{G}^{\text{ACS}}$ is probably a corruption of *πεφυτεύμενοι*, which Aq. shares with \mathfrak{G}^{B} . The remaining words are:
- i. 3. \mathfrak{G} *περισσεία*. Aq. *πλέον*. H. רתי . (Neither occurs for רתו outside Kohemoth .)
- i. 9. \mathfrak{G} *πρόσφατον*. Aq. *καινόν*. H. שרק . (\mathfrak{G} has *καινόν* in the foll. v.)
- i. 13. \mathfrak{G} *κατασκέψασθαι*. Aq. *ἐξερευνᾶν*. H. רת . (But since Aq. has the variety *νοεῖσθαι* in ii. 3, why should *κατασκέψασθαι* be denied him?)
- i. 17, ii. 2, 12, vii. 7 (8), 25 (26), ix. 3. \mathfrak{G} *παραβολαί, περιφέρειν, -φέρεια, -φορά, παραφορά*. Aq. *πλάναι, -ησις, -ᾶν*. H. ללהק, תללהק .
- iii. 8. \mathfrak{G} *φιλεῖν*. Aq. *ἀγαπᾶν*. H. באב .
- iv. 13. \mathfrak{G} *προσέχειν*. Aq. *φυλάσσεισθαι*. H. רתק . (\mathfrak{G} has *φύλαξαι* in xii. 12.)
- vii. 20 (19). \mathfrak{G} *βοηθήσει*. Aq. *ἐνισχύσει*. H. עת .
- vii. 27 (26). \mathfrak{G} *θήρευμα*. Aq. *παγίδες* (or *παγιδεύματα*). H. מיםצב . (Aq. also has *ἀμψίβληστρον* Ez. xii. 13, and *ὄχρυωμα* Ps. lxvi. (lxv.) 11, as renderings of הצב . LXX. has *θήρευμα* only in Lev. xvii. 13 = 'game'.)
- viii. 10. \mathfrak{G} *καὶ ἐπηνέθησαν*. Aq. *καὶ ἐκαυχήσαντο* = והבחי .
- viii. 15. \mathfrak{G} *συμπρόσεσται*. Aq. *συνεισέρχεται*. H. ונוי . (Aq. also has *προστίθεσθαι* Jer. i. (xxvii.) 5.)
- x. 9. \mathfrak{G} *ἐξαίρων*. Aq. *μετατιθῶν*. H. עסב .
- xi. 6. \mathfrak{G} *στοιχήσει*. Aq. *ἐδθετήσει*. H. כשי .
- xii. 1 (v. 3, xii. 10, Aq. *vacat*). \mathfrak{G} *θέλημα*. Aq. *πᾶγμα*. H. קפ . (There is no reason why Aq. should not have used *θέλημα*, since he has the varieties *χρεία* xii. 10, *βουλή* Prov. xxxi. 13, *βουλήματα* Ps. i. 2. \mathfrak{G} has *πᾶγμα* iii. 1, 17, v. 7, viii. 6, i.e. in 4 of the 7 passages in which קפ occurs.)
- xii. 4. \mathfrak{G} *ταπεινωθήσονται*. Aq. *κλιθήσονται*. H. שי . (Aq. also has *κατακύπτειν* Ps. xlii. (xli.) 6, 12; and for קפ , Ps. xlv. (xliii.) 26.)
- xii. 11. \mathfrak{G}^{BC} *συνθεμάτων*. Aq. *συνταγμάτων*. H. תפסא . ($\mathfrak{G}^{\text{sc.a}}$ has *συνταγμάτων*, and Aq.'s rendering is not quite certain.)

Of these few instances no clear explanations offer themselves. In some passages it is possible that Aquila translated directly from his Hebrew text, without troubling to take account of his 1st edition. But it is only natural that in a 2nd edition the writer should make several small changes of wording, the reasons for which cannot be traced. And this is illustrated by Field's list of Aquila's double renderings; in some cases the reason for a variation is discernible, but frequently it is not.

2. It can now be realised how little weight can be attached to a further series of words in \mathfrak{C} which Dillmann states that "Aquila certainly expressed, or would have expressed, otherwise"! Four of them are repeated from his previous list—*πρόσφατον* i. 9, *μένων* vii. 15 (16), *βοηθήσει* vii. 19 (20), *διασκαδασθῆ* xii. 5.

i. 16. \mathfrak{C} *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου*. H. *עם לבי*. This may have arisen from corruption in the Greek; or *בלבי* may have been a revised reading in the authorised Hebrew recension. But Aq. was not always accurate in his prepositions; see v. 7 *μετ' αὐτοὺς* for *עליהם*, ix. 13 *παρ' ἐμοί* for *אלי*.

In the case of *σκληρὸς* for *סכל* vii. 17 (18), and *ἄχληρία* for *סכליות* vii. 25 (26), it may be said of any other translator, quite as truly as of Aq., that he would "certainly have expressed them otherwise." No trace of such words for *סכל* or *כסל* is to be found in any passage in the LXX. or in the other translations. It is easier to believe that the Greek has been corrupted.

The same may be said of *ἐκπέσῃ* for *קהה* x. 10, unless Aq. misread the word as *קה*, in which case the rendering would be characteristically literal.

On the other hand it is perfectly possible to imagine that Aq. wrote *ἀργεία* for *שפלות* x. 18, and *ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ* for *בישפל* xii. 4. The two words sufficiently represent the meaning of the root in the two passages. *ταπεινῶσις* might have been more literal, but in each case *ταπεινωθήσεται*, *-ονται*, occurs in the verse.

In xi. 9, 10, xii. 1 *νεότης* is used twice to render *ילדות* and twice *בחורות*. This would be strange from the hand of any translator. But the use of *νεανίσκα* for *בחור* in v. 9 suggests that *בחורות* was rendered *νεανιότης* or *νεανικότης*, which could easily be corrupted to *νεότης*. See Ps. ix. 1, xlvi. (xlv.) 1, where Aq. has *νεανιότητος* and *ἐπὶ νεανιοτήτων* for *על מות* and *עלמות* על.

In xii. 3 Dillmann objects to *ὁπῆ* for *ארבה*, because Aq. has

καταρράκτης in Is. lx. 8, Hos. xiii. 3; but he does not note that he also has θυρίδες in Gen. vii. 11 (LXX. καταρράκται). Moreover this is the only passage in the O. T. where ארבה means 'an opening to look through'; and thus Aq. might think ὄπη suitable here and nowhere else.

Lastly, παχύνθη for הסתבל xii. 5 need present no difficulty. In Ps. cxliv. (cxliii.) 14 for מסבלים (LXX. παχείς) Aq. has σιτευτοί or σιτιστοί, shewing that he took the root סבל to imply 'fatness.'

3. Dillmann lays stress on the frequent free renderings of Hebrew expressions, and on many passages badly translated. It might be enough to reply that these would afford Aquila sufficient reason for issuing a new edition. But even in his acknowledged fragments, he is far from being invariably accurate or literal. See, for example:

- ii. 5 πᾶν κάρπιμον, H. כל פרי. ii. 12 ἀφροσύνας, H. סבלות.
 iii. 11 ὡς οὐχ, H. מבלי אשר לא. iv. 3 τὸ πεποιημένον, H. נעשה.
 v. 12 εἰς ποτηρὸν αὐτῶ, H. לרעתו. vii. 7 (8) εὐτονίας αὐτοῦ, H. מתנה.
 vii. 26 (27) πικρότερον, H. מר. x. 1 μύρον, H. [רוקח] שמן. x. 15
 κακώσει αὐτούς, H. חניענו. x. 20 πτέρυγος, H. כנפים [ה]. xii. 6
 λύτρωσις, H. גלה.

To these may be added the eleven instances referred to on pp. 123 f. And a brief study in Field's *Hexapla* of any O.T. book of which Aquila's fragments survive will shew that it is possible to exaggerate his literal exactness. Montfaucon (*Prelim. Hexapl.*, p. 48) rightly says "potuit Aquila etiam in illa κατ' ἀκρίβειαν interpretatione non semper eadem religione in vertendo uti; nec insolitum est Interpretes quoslibet modo litterae haurere, modo elegantiore interpretandi genere procedere."

This examination shews that the Greek text is saturated with the style of Aquila; many of his unique characteristics are found in it; many words and phrases are used in it which can be amply paralleled from his fragments; on the other hand there is not a word or phrase in it that occurs frequently in the LXX. but is foreign to Aquila. No one, at that early date, who tried to revise an old Greek translation on the basis of Aquila, could have possessed the artistic skill and inventive subtlety necessary to do the work as it has been done; to go so far in adopting Aquila's methods, and yet not to go further and *Aquilise* where it would seem obvious to do so. While if

Aquila revised his own translation, the revision need not have resulted from more than Dillmann is willing to allow as possible—"correction or modification in many passages by marginal notes."

4. Dillmann, however, considers conclusive against Aquila the fact that Origen, Jerome and the Syro-Hexaplar all describe the present Greek text as that "according to the LXX." But in an uncritical age it was perfectly possible for a translation to disappear, and another to take its place as part of the LXX. It is probable that this happened in the case of Daniel. Professor Swete (*Introd. to the O. T. in Greek*, pp. 47—49) points out that "Thecodotionic" renderings are quoted by writers earlier than Theodotion, even as early as the New Testament. And the inference seems to be inevitable that "there were two pre-Christian versions of Daniel, both passing as 'LXX.,' one of which is preserved in the Chigi MS.¹, while the other formed the basis of Theodotion's revision."

The reason for the disappearance of the latter of these may have been, as Prof. Swete suggests, that "Thecodotion's revision of Daniel may have differed so little from the stricter Alexandrian version as to have taken its place without remark"; but the reason for the rejection of the Chigi LXX. is sufficiently explained by Jerome's words: "hoc unum affirmare possum quod multum a veritate discordet et recto iudicio repudiata sit."

If, then, an old LXX. version of *Ḳoheleth* was superseded by Aquila's first version, the reason was probably the same—the inaccuracy of the former. It was not till the end of the 1st century A.D. that *Ḳoheleth* gained an undisputed position as inspired Scripture. Many of its expressions were doubtful and unorthodox, and it had seldom been used; and thus a pre-Christian translation of it might well have been careless and inadequate. And when an accurate translation appeared, which, by the nature of the book, could contain no anti-Christian renderings, Christians as well as Greek-speaking Jews would be glad to make use of it; and the older version, which, in any case, probably had a very limited circulation, speedily became obsolete.

But it is no less possible that a 'LXX.' version of *Ḳoheleth*

¹ Cod. 87 (H. and P. 88).

never existed. The recent decision with regard to its canonicity¹ may have led Aquila to undertake its translation for the first time. If there were no other Greek version, a very few years would suffice to give it a place in the 'LXX.' And the very fact that Christians had adopted his first edition might have been one, among other, reasons which led Aquila to issue the second.

Further—Dillmann's objection, that Origen called the present Greek text 'LXX.,' applies with even greater force to his own suggestion that an old text was revised on the basis of Aquila. If, on the one hand, the Greek text was Aquila's first edition, there were about 100 years before Origen compiled his Hexapla in which it could be accepted as 'LXX.' But if, on the other hand, it was a revision of a LXX. text on the basis of Aquila, the LXX. text itself must have existed later than Aquila, and might have survived up to the time of Origen himself. In the latter case, the only remaining solution would be that the present Greek text is *Origen's* re-writing of the old text. This happened, as Burkitt points out, in the case of 3 Kings xii. 24 g-n as given in A and S.H. But the Greek text of Koheleth is not on the same footing as that passage. Not only does the translation differ, in a large number of passages, from Aquila's fragments, but in about 40 per cent. of the readings in which B diverges from MT. it differs also from the Syro-Hexaplar.

¹ See p. 8.

APPENDIX II.

The study of the Greek text in this section is based upon the following authorities:

Hebrew text: Baer, *Quinque Volumina*.

Greek: For the uncials ABCS, Prof. Swete's Camb. manual.

For the uncial V, Holmes and Parsons. (By them it is numbered 23, as though a cursive.)

For the cursives, Holmes and Parsons, 68, 106, 147, 155 (*vac. v. 8-viii. 12*), 157 (*vac. v. 6-16 and viii. 16-ix. 5*), 159, 161, 248, 252, 253, 254, 261, 296, 298, 299 (*vac. i. 1-6, viii.-xii.*).

Syro-Hexaplar: H. Middeldorpf, *Prov., Job, Cant., Threni, Eccles., e Codice Mediolanensi*, Berlin, 1885.

Peshitta: Ed. Lee.

Jerome, *Comm. in Eccles.*: Migne. The text is also collected from the Commentary by Sabatier.

Targum: Walton's Polyglot.

E. Klostermann¹ gives a description of the cursives, and shews that they fall into groups. 68 is very closely related to B, but differs from it occasionally. 106, 261 are closely allied descendants from an uncial. 155 appears to be derived from an uncial. It stands by itself, but has some affinity with 296, which is also unconnected with other groups. 161, 248 are closely related, and abound in hexaplaric readings; 248 is for the most part followed by the Complutensian edition. 147, 157, 159, 298, 299 belong to one family; of these 147, 159 are twins, which with 157 are derived from an uncial; 298, 299 sometimes differ from the former three; 147, 157, 159 are nearly always followed by the Aldine edition, though there are cases in which

¹ *De Libri Coheleth versione Alexandrina*, Kiel, 1892.

that edition follows none of the present cursives; 298 is very closely allied with the commentary of Olympiodorus (Migne, XCIII.), so much so that Klostermann suggests (p. 19) that it is a collection from his comments, and not strictly a codex of the version. 253 is closely allied with V, and also with S^{ca}; these have many hexaplaric readings, and in this they resemble 252, which is chiefly important from the fact that its margin is rich in citations from Aq. Σ and Θ; V, however, sometimes supports B 68. Similarly 254 has a somewhat composite text, frequently siding with B 68, but sometimes with S^{ca} V 253.

It is very unfortunate that so little Old Latin is available. The text of Jerome's commentary is eclectic, but is mainly a translation from the Hebrew, as his own words shew:

"...nullius auctoritatem secutus sum, sed de Hebraeo transferens magis me LXX. interpretum consuetudini coaptavi, in his dumtaxat, quae non multum ab Hebraicis discrepabant. Interdum Aquilae quoque et Symmachi et Theodotionis recordatus sum, ut nec novitate nimia lectoris studium deterrerem, nec rursus contra conscientiam meam fonte veritatis omissio opinionum rivulos consecrarem."

A fragment of Old Latin of the 8th century is published by Berger in *Notices et extraits*. And a stray sentence can here and there be gleaned from Latin writers, such as Lucifer Calar., Priscillian, Cyprian, Optatus and Tyconius.

On the Peshitta see W. Wright, art. 'Syriac literature' in *Enc. Brit.* Originally a translation from the Hebrew, it has undergone numerous alterations to produce accordance with G; so that, as it stands, it has the appearance, in Koheleth, of being almost as eclectic as Jerome.

It is not easy to assign values to the various groupings of the Greek MSS., but it is possible to point out some practical lines of working. (1) A very high place must be accorded to 68; it has the excellencies of B without some of its defects. It is specially valuable when it differs from B, and is perhaps the most important MS. of Koheleth extant. (2) 147-157-159 are frequently in agreement with S, but sometimes with B 68 against S. In the former case they are mostly bad, and in the latter also they sometimes support a wrong reading; but they are usually good when combined with BS 68 or with BC 68.

(3) S^ca V 253 abound both in hexaplaric readings and in deliberate scribal corrections to produce conformity with MT. They are therefore of value when they differ from S.H. and MT. (4) Similarly 161-248 and 252 deserve consideration when they differ from S.H. (5) There is no doubt that in some passages all extant Greek MSS. have been hexaplarised. And when the uncials are divided, S.H. is in most cases found on the side of MT., and the opposing variant is to be preferred. But in a large number of passages all Greek MSS. and S.H. are opposed to MT., Pesh., Hier. In these instances the presumption is that MSS.+ S.H. point to a Hebrew variant at least older than Origen; but since comparatively few alterations or corruptions can have occurred in the Hebrew text after the time of the authorised 'Aqıban' recension, the joint testimony of MSS. and S.H. against MT. must often go back to a pre-Aqıban text. And this is also the case when all MSS. are opposed to Aq. or Σ , and to MT.; in these passages S.H. is of value, or not, according as it agrees with MSS. or with Aq. Σ . Lastly Θ , being based on Γ , cannot, for textual purposes, be classed with Aq. Σ . Its value is high when it sides with Γ against Aq. Σ , or against S.H.

The readings in which B diverges from MT. fall into three classes:

A. Those which seem to imply a Hebrew variant before the 'Aqıban' recension. The Hebrew text must have been in a very unsettled state, especially in a book like *Koheleth* which was in many quarters an *ἀντιλεγόμενον*. It should therefore be carefully borne in mind that to say that Γ points to an early Hebrew variant is not the same as to say that that variant was the true original reading. In many cases, for example, Γ points to a reading which was evidently a mere corruption, and which was rightly corrected in the 'Aqıban' recension. The adoption of emendations is in place only in a commentary; and instances occur in the Notes on select passages. Here, with few exceptions, no preference is expressed for or against the M. reading.

B. There are a few cases in which the evidence seems to shew that changes have been made in the MT. after the time of Origen, and even of Jerome. Variants have occasionally been

preserved along two lines of Hebrew descent, so that even the Tg. differs from M.

C. There remain the large number of instances in which divergencies in **G** are probably the result of corruption in Greek MSS.—arising either from hexaplaric influence, or from mere scribal mistakes.

It remains to say that the results of this study of the text do not depend for their validity on the Aquila theory maintained in the previous section. The present writer believes that a pre-Aq̄iban Hebrew text was used by Aquila for his first edition. But in any case the early Hebrew variants underlying **G** must have been pre-Aq̄iban.

A.

Pre-Aq̄iban readings.

Ch. I. v. 1. ὁ ἐκκλησιαστής MSS. | M. om. article.

vii. 27 (28), xii. 8 shew that the Mas. tradition did not decide uniformly with regard to the article; and it is probable that the early text had תְּהִלָּה.

יִשְׂרָאֵל MSS. O. L. | om. M. Pesh. Tg. S.H. obelises the word. Hier. says "Superfluum quippe est hic *Israel*, quod male in Graecis et Latinis codicibus invenitur."

It had found its way into the pre-Aq̄iban text, perhaps because 'king of Israel' was a common expression, while 'king in Jerusalem' was strange; perhaps it was due to v. 12. Pesh. 'king of Jerusalem.'

v. 8. καὶ 1^o MSS. S.H. Pesh. Some MSS. K. de R. | om. M. Hier.

v. 10. ὃς λαλήσει καὶ ἐρεί = שִׁדְרָבַר וַיֵּאמֶר MSS. [V^o, 106-261 ὃς ἄν] S.H. Pesh. Hier. *quod loquatur* | M. Σ.

ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι MSS. (exc. A), S.H. | M. לְעַלְמִים A [Pesh. חַיִּים חַיִּים]. It is possible, however, that ἐν is only a repetition of the last syllable of γέγονεν.

v. 11. τοῖς γενομένοις = שֶׁהָיוּ MSS. (exc. foll.) S.H. Pesh. one MS. de R. | M. שֶׁהָיוּ V 147-159, Tg.

In the pre-Aq̄iban text רֵאשִׁינִים and אַחֲרֵינִים together formed the subject to which לָהֶם referred.

v. 13. $\delta\tau\iota$ MSS. S.H. | M. הוּא. Hier. *hanc distantiam*. Σ (ap. S.H.) $\circ\sigma$ ~~ⲟⲩ~~ $\circ\sigma$ ~~ⲟⲩ~~. (Pesh. disregards both $\delta\tau\iota$ and $\kappa\alpha\iota$.)

v. 16. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ Ἱερουσαλήμ MSS. S.H. Pesh. Many MSS. K. de R. | M. ~~ⲉⲛ~~ ~~ⲓⲣ~~ ~~ⲉ~~.

v. 17. It is probable that the clause $\kappa\alpha\iota \dots \omega\alpha\eta\eta\eta$ was absent from the original Heb. text. See Sect. C.

v. 18. $\gamma\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ MSS. S.H. Hier. (*c. Pelag.*) | M. כַּעַם Aq. Σ Pesh. Hier. C. But it may be a Greek corruption. See Sect. C.

Ch. II. v. 3. $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ ἡ καρδία μου ἐλκύσει MSS. S.H. | M. בְּלִבִּי לְמִשׁוֹךְ. Aq. Θ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ τῇ καρδίᾳ μ. ἐλκύσαι. Pesh. Hier. Σ has $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ τῇ κ. μου.

It is possible that Θ is simply a corruption of the rendering found in Aq. Θ , Σ . But it is strange that no MS. has been corrected. The evidence is strongly in favour of the originality of Θ . If the original Heb. was $\text{וְהִרְחִי אֲנִי בְּלִבִּי מִשׁוֹךְ}$, it might easily be misread, אֲנִי becoming אִם , and מִשׁוֹךְ becoming יִמְשׁוֹךְ by the doubling of the previous י .

$\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ οἶνον MSS. Θ , S.H. | M. בֵּינָן Pesh. Hier.

בֵּינָן may have arisen merely from a badly written ב ; but if it is original, the construction may be compared with Is. i. 25 $\text{וְאַצְרַף כֶּבֶד סִנִּיךְ}$.

v. 8. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\gamma\epsilon$ $\chi\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\omicron\nu$ = נָם זֶה־ב BA curss. (exc. foll.) one MS. Kenn. | M. זוּהַב. SV 106. 147-157-159 S.H. Pesh. [S.H. om. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\gamma\epsilon$ before ἀργύριον .]

$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\rho\upsilon\phi\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ B 254. 298 [C *vac.*] | M. וְסִנְלָה. AS curss. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier.

v. 10. $\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\phi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$ μου B 155. 253. 254. 296 [C *vac.*] | M. שְׂמַחָה. AS curss. rel.² S.H. Hier. Pesh. Tg.

In this and the foregoing reading B is deserted by 68, and the readings may be scribal corruptions. In the case of μου the occurrence of the word with six other substantives in the verse might lead to its insertion.

¹ It is worthy of remark that in Pesh. Lee's ed. adds ~~ⲉⲛ~~ ~~ⲓⲣ~~ ~~ⲉ~~ after ⲉⲛⲓⲣⲉ , and some codd. give it before the beginning of the verse. It is apparently due to v. 20 where the Urmi ed. has ⲉⲛⲓⲣⲉ for the ⲉⲛⲓⲣⲉ of Lee's ed.

² 261 om. $\text{ἀπὸ πασ. εὐφρ. μου}$.

ἐν παντί MSS. S.H. Pesh. Hier. | M. מכלל Σ.

v. 12. τίς ἄνθρωπος = מן אדם מי אדם MSS. [V 147-157-159 τίς ὁ ἀνθ.]
S.H. Pesh. Hier. *quis est hominum* | M. מה האדם Σ.

Om. כבד MSS. S.H. © Pesh. Hier. | ins. M. Tg.

v. 15. ἐγὼ περίσσειον BCS* 147-157-159. 155. 254. 298 [68. 161-248. 261 ἐγὼ τὸ περ.¹] Pesh. | M. אני אז יתר. AS^{c.a} V curss. rel. S.H. Hier.

The omission of אז in the early Heb. text may have been accidental, owing to its similarity to אן, a scribe's eye passing from the first ' to the second.

ἐλάλησα MSS. S.H. Hier. | M. ודברתי Pesh.

v. 19. καὶ εἰ ἐξουσιάζεται = והשלט.

Ins. εἰ MSS. (exc. 155) | om. M. 155. S.H. Aq. © Pesh. Hier.

ἐξουσιάζεται BASV curss. (exc. foll.) | M. ישלט (= -σεται)
C 106-261. 155. 161-248. 252. Aq. Hier.

S.H. ~~ישלט~~ probably points to ἐξουσιάζεται, and omits εἰ².

v. 20. ἐν BSV 68. 106. 253. 254. 298. 299 | M. על. MSS. rel. S.H. Pesh.

μόχθῳ μου BS 68. 253. 254. 261. 298. 299. S.H. Hier. | M. העמל.
MSS. rel. μόχθῳ [A 252. 296 τῷ μοχ.] Pesh.

v. 22. ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ B 68. 157. 253. 254. 261. 299 | M. לאדם.
MSS. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier.

v. 24. ἀνθρώπῳ BAC curss. [C seven curss. pr. τῷ] Pesh.
Hier. 3 MSS. K. de R. | M. באדם. SV, S.H.

It is possible, however, that the omission of ἐν was accidental between -θον and ἀνθ.

ὁ [A ὁς] φάγεται BAS* 68. 253. 298. S.H. © = M. שיאכל | משיאכל
S.H.^{ms} Pesh. Hier. Tg. So pr. πλὴν S^{c.a} V 106. 254, pr. εἰ μὴ C
curs. rel.

The evidence seems to shew that the pre-Aqīban text had משיאכל, the מ having fallen out after the prec. ם. This was corrected in the 'Aqīban' recension, resulting in two different corrections in Ⓔ MSS. But later even than the Tg. some Heb. MSS. omitted the מ; hence the present MT.

¹ This may be a corruption of τότε περ., but it may, on the other hand, have arisen by dittography from εγω.

² Field's note is misleading, in placing the statement of S.H. that Θ is "similar to the LXX." in connexion with Ⓔ καὶ εἰ ἐξουσιάζεται.

Ch. III. v. 1. ὁ χρόνος MSS. (exc. foll.) | om. art. M. S* 253. Σ.

v. 10. σὺν + πάντα BV 68. 155. 253. 254 | om. M. ACS S.H. Pesh. Hier. Tg.

v. 11. σύμφωνα [σὺν πάντα] τὸν αἰῶνα BCV 68. 253. 254 | M. העלם אה AS curss. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier.

v. 16¹.

v. 17. καὶ εἶπα B 68. 248. 298 Pesh. | M. אמרתי SV curss. rel. (exc. 155). S.H. Hier.

AC 155 confuse καὶ with the ἐκεῖ in the prec. clause, thus indirectly favouring its insertion.

v. 18. καὶ εἶπα | M. אמרתי : שם.

The foll. five readings occur :

(a) Om. שם and read καὶ εἶπα B 68.

(b) Om. שם and read ἐκεῖ εἶπα ACS 106. 155. 159. 161.

(c) ἐκεῖ· εἶπα (or εἶπον) V 147-157. 248. 253. 261. 296. 298 S.H. Pesh.

(d) ἐκεῖ· καὶ εἶπα 254.

(e) ἐκεῖ· ἐκεῖ εἶπα 252. 299.

(c) is Masoretic; but (b) is not quite on the same footing. What was the cause which made three uncials and four cursives (106 being separated from 261 and 161 from 248) include ἐκεῖ in v. 18 instead of v. 17? Probably it was the fact that the scribes had before them the reading καὶ εἶπα. Thus (b) may be a witness for (a). Similarly in (d) the scribe of 254 must have had καὶ before him, and added ἐκεῖ owing to his knowledge of M. שם. (e) is a corruption either of (d) or (c).



The early text, therefore, probably omitted שם and began v. 18 with ואמרתי.

v. 19 [18]. καὶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς = נם להם MSS. S.H. | om. נם M. Pesh. Hier. On המה see sect. B.

v. 19. συνάντημα 1^o. The following readings occur :

(a) συνάντημα AC curss. (exc. foll.) Hier.

(b) οὐ συνάντημα B.

(c) כי מקרה M. S.H. Greg. Agr. ὄτι. Pesh. , evidently corruption of .

(d) ὡς συνάντημα SV 147-159. 253. 254. 299.

(b) is probably an orthodox gloss, and is included in sect. C. If it is, it favours (a). It is remarkable that no Greek MS. has

¹ Ἐ τοῦ δικαίου probably does not represent הצדיק. vii. 15 (16) shews that the translator used the word as neuter.

received $\delta\tau\iota$ from S.H. (d) may either have arisen from a misreading of M. as במקרה , or be a corruption of (a) by dittography from the preceding $-o\iota\varsigma$.

All are explicable if the early Heb. text omitted כי .

v. 20. $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu$ BS*V 68. 147-157-159. 254 | pr. הוֹלֵךְ M. ACS^a curss. rel. S.H. Aq. © (ap. S.H.) Pesh. Hier.

The pre-Akīban text evidently omitted הוֹלֵךְ . Its subsequent insertion may have been due to its presence in vi. 6.

$\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\psi\epsilon\iota = \text{שב}$ B 68. 159. 254. 261. 296 S.H. Hier. | M. שב ACS curss. rel. Pesh. It may, however, be a Greek corruption, since a confusion between ϕ and ψ would be easy.

v. 21. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ MSS. S.H. Pesh. Many MSS. K. de R. | כי M. Hier.

Ch. IV. v. 2. $\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ [$\sigma\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$] BC^{vid} 68. 106. 253. 254. 299. Hier. in Ep. Eph. Ambr. *de fide Resurr.* | אֵת הַמַּחֲיִים M. ASV curss. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier. C. Ambr. in Ps. cxviii.

v. 4. $\delta\tau\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \zeta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\iota}$. Although B is the only MS. which has both $\tau\acute{o}\ \zeta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\iota}$, it has good support for each. And this is probably the true reading, pointing to $\text{כִּי קִנְאָה אֵישׁ}$. The authorities are as follows:

(1) $\tau\acute{o}\ \zeta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ B*CS 147-157-159 ($\delta\ \zeta\eta\lambda$. 253. 261). Pesh. Hier. om. pronoun | M. הֵיא קִנְאָה B^{ab} V curss. rel. S.H.

(2) $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\iota}$ B 106. 155. 254. 296 [C *hiat*] | $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ ASV curss. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\iota}$ need not imply a Heb. variant. It denotes 'the envy felt *by* a man'; it is slightly more difficult than the objective gen. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, hence the latter was a natural alteration.

v. 8. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{o}\varsigma = \text{אָח נָם}$ MSS. (exc. S*¹ 296) S.H. | M. אָח 296. Hier. Pesh. אָחֵךְ אָבִי .

v. 17. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \hat{\psi}\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ (or $\acute{\alpha}\nu$) = בְּאִשֶׁר MSS. (exc. foll.). Several MSS. K. de R. © S^a V 253 $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\hat{\psi}\ \rho\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ | M בְּאִשֶׁר .

$\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \delta\acute{o}\mu\alpha$ [- $\mu\alpha\tau\omega\nu$ 106, - $\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ 296. 299] = מִמֶּתֶךָ . MSS. (exc. foll.) S.H. Pesh. | M. מִתֶּךָ S^a V 253 $\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{o}\ \delta\omicron\acute{o}\nu\alpha\iota$. Aq. © $\delta\acute{o}\mu\alpha = \text{מִתֶּךָ}$.

$\theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ [S - $\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, 253 - $\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$] $\sigma\omicron\nu = \text{זְבֹחֶךָ}$. MSS. (exc. V) S.H. | M. זְבַח V Aq. ©. Pesh. $\text{זְבֹחֶךָ הַשָּׁמַיְמִי}$.

V has $\theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$, and the omission of the pronoun may have been accidental, for 253 has $\theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \sigma\omicron\nu$.

¹ S* om. $\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\epsilon$, supplied by S^a.

Ch. V. *v.* 5. τοῦ θεοῦ MSS. S.H. Pesh. | M. המלאך. Aq. ΣΘ Hier. Tg.

An interesting example of rabbinic revision. To avoid irreverence the excuse is represented as being offered, not in the presence of God, but of the priest, His "angel." Cf. Mal. ii. 7¹.

v. 9. αὐτῶν [or αὐτοῦ] MSS. See sect. C.

The evidence seems to shew that an original לוא had been corrupted in the pre-Akiban text to לו, and this was corrected in MT.

v. 10. ἐν πλῆθει = ברב MSS. (exc. 253) S.H. Pesh. Hier. | M. ברבות 253.

ἀγαθωσύνης = טובה MSS. (exc. foll.) | M. pr. art. 161-248. 253.

ὅτι ἀρχὴ τοῦ ὁρᾶν BACS* curss. (exc. foll.) S.H. | M. כי אם (ראות ראית) ראיית. ὅτι ἀλλ' ἦ τ. ὁρ. S^{c.a} V 253. 254. Pesh. < < <.
Θ εἰ μὴ. 252. Σ εἰ μὴ μόνον. Hier. nisi ut.

Thus all Greek MSS. (exc. 252) preserve ὅτι, which must have been part of an expression equivalent to כי אם, perhaps ὅτι ἄν. If, then, ἀλλ' ἦ was a later correction = כי אם, the reading of S^{c.a} etc. is a conflation, in which AN was ousted by the following ΑΔ. This portion of the evidence, therefore, belongs to sect. C.

With regard to ἀρχὴ, Euringer suggests that it may be a corruption of ἀλλ' ἦ. But this is very doubtful. It is easier to suppose that in a pre-Akiban MS. the K^eri ראית had found its way into the text side by side with the K^ethib ראית, and that the translator misread the latter as ראשית. Σ θεωρία points to the K^ethib.

The orig. Θ would thus be ὅτι ἄν ἀρχὴ τοῦ ὁρᾶν = כי אם ראשית ראית.

v. 12. ἀρρωστία MSS. S.H. | M. רעה חולה. Tg. בישוחא מרעיתא. Σ Pesh. Hier. all attest the presence of רעה, but they render 'an evil sickness.' And in *v.* 15, Θ S.H. Pesh. Hier. render 'an evil sickness' [Σ vac.].

But it is in the highest degree improbable that, were רעה חולה original, ποτηρὰ ἀρρωστία could have been the rendering of it. Such an ignorance of the construction of the Heb. participle is

¹ No argument, therefore, can be drawn (as has sometimes been done) with regard to the date of Kōbeleth, from this reminiscence of Malachi.

beyond anything of which the translator is elsewhere guilty; and he can render רעה רבה (ii. 21) correctly—*πονηρία μεγάλη*.

In v. 12 the early Heb. text may have run יש רעה חלי (read רעה חלי)—“there is an evil, a sickness” (cf. vi. 1, x. 5); and similarly in v. 15—“moreover this is an evil, a sickness” (cf. זה רע ix. 3). In the former verse רעה had accidentally disappeared before the time of \mathfrak{C} ; hence \mathfrak{C} *ἔστιν ἀρρωστία*. In the latter verse \mathfrak{C} probably ran *καί γε τοῦτο πονηρία ἀρρωστία*, which a scribe, perhaps influenced by vi. 2, would easily corrupt into *πονηρὰ ἀρρωστία*.

v. 15. *περισσειά αὐτοῦ* = יתרונו BV curss. S.H. Ambr. *de Nativit.* c. 6 *abundantia ejus* | M. יתרון לו ACS Σ Pesh.

v. 18. *πᾶς ἄνθρωπος* = כל אדם MSS. (exc. V) | M. כל האדם V.

In the ‘Aḳiban’ recension the article was added to אדם almost uniformly throughout the book, cf. vi. 7, vii. 2 (3), viii. 17 *bis*, x. 14.

v. 19. *περισσῆ αὐτὸν* MSS. S.H. Pesh. | M. מענה Hier.¹

\mathfrak{C} seems to point to ענהו [אלהים].

Ch. VI. v. 4. *πορεύεται* = הילך MSS. (exc. foll.) Hier. | M. ילך. 147-157-159. 253. 299. S.H. Pesh.

v. 6. (a) *εἰς τόπον ἕνα πορεύεται* B (299 *πορεύεται*).

(b) *ἔ. τ. ἕ. τὰ πάντα πορ.* M. 248. 252. 254. 296. 298 (106 *-ονται*, 161 *-σεται*) S.H. Hier.

(c) *ἔ. τ. ἕ. πορ. τὰ πάντα* ACSV 68. 253. 261 (147-157-159 *-σεται*) Pesh.

The isolation of B, and intrinsic evidence, both condemn (a); and of the other readings (c) has far the stronger support, and points to a pre-Aḳiban הולך הכל.

v. 7. *ἀνθρώπου* B 68. 296. 298 | M. pr. art. ACS curss. rel. See on v. 18.

v. 8. *ὅτι περισσειά* BS* 68. 147-157-159. 254. 299 [V 253 *περισσεύει*] Pesh. S.H. * A Θ *τίς* \mathcal{L} | M. מה יותר. ACS^{ca} curss. rel. Aq. Θ Hier.

It is probable that מה יותר (perh. written מיתר) had been corrupted in a pre-Aḳiban text to מותר; cf. iii. 19. And this corruption may have been either accidental or polemical.

¹ Hier. C. *quia Deus occupat in laetitia cor ejus* would require “א” מ. כי א” מ. But his rendering is probably an attempt to make the best of the MT. as it stands. Vg. *eo quod Deus occupet deliciis cor ejus* may mean that he afterwards adopted the pronunciation שִׁמְחָה.

But it is possible, of course, that the omission of $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ was an error of a Greek scribe.

$\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\tau\iota \delta \pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma \omicron\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\upsilon$ MSS. (157 $\delta\iota\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}$, 299 om. δ) S.H. Pesh. | M. מה לעני . Hier. *quid pauperi nisi ut vadat.*

There seems to have been an early corrupt reading למההעני , probably due in part to the preceding ל in הבסיל . In Ed. Saphetana 1578 there is an interesting emendation מה לעני יוחר .

v. 12 [C vii. 1]. $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu$ BV 68. 106–261. 296. 299 [C vac.] | M. מה טוב . pr. $\tau\acute{\iota}$ AS^a [S* $\tau\iota\varsigma$] curss. rel. S.H. Σ Pesh. Hier.

$\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha} = \text{ועשם}$ MSS. [C vac.] S.H. Pesh. סבבוס (סבבוס being a corruption of סבב) favours C | M. ועשם Hier.

$\acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\kappa\iota\acute{\alpha} = \text{בצל}$ MSS. (exc. foll.) S.H. | M. בצל V 253. 106–261 Pesh. Hier.

Ch. VII. v. 1 (2). $\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\eta\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ¹ BS* 68. 147–157–159. 161. 299 Pesh. S.H. * A $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ A | M. הולרו ACS^a V curss. rel. Aq. Hier.

This points to an early reading הגלר [Bickell הגלרת].

v. 2 (3). $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\tau\iota = \text{כאשר}$ MSS. | M. באשר Hier. [S.H. and Pesh. ה באשר .]

$\alpha\lambda\theta\rho\acute{\omicron}\pi\omicron\upsilon$ BA curss. (exc. foll.) | M. pr. art. CSV 157. 161–248. 252. 299. See on v. 18.

v. 6 (7). $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \phi\omega\nu\eta$ BS 68. 147–157–159. 296. 299. S.H. * $\delta\tau\iota$ A | M. pr. כ AC curss. rel. Pesh. Hier. Tg.

$\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$ B 68. 248. 254. 296 | M. pr. art. ACSV curss. rel.

The art. is more likely to have been inserted in the 'Aḳiban' recension to complete the parallelism with הסר , than omitted if it was already present².

v. 8 (9). $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omega\nu$ MSS. (exc. foll.) | M. דבר V 253. 298 S.H. Σ Pesh. Hier.

The foll. ב may have been accidentally doubled, forming דברם .

v. 10 (11). $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\omicron\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha = \text{בהכמה}$ MSS. S.H. Pesh. | M. מחכמה . [Tg. העל ה .]

v. 12 (13). $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ 1^o MSS. S.H. | om. pron. M. Σ Pesh. Hier.

In the pre-Aḳiban text the ה of החכ had been accidentally doubled.

$\acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\kappa\iota\acute{\alpha}$, κ.τ.λ.

(a) $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\kappa\iota\acute{\alpha} \dots \acute{\omega}\varsigma \sigma\kappa\iota\acute{\alpha}$ MSS. S.H.

(b) $\text{בצל} \dots \text{בצל}$ app. Σ Pesh. Hier.

(c) $\text{בצל} \dots \text{בצל}$ M.

¹ ACSV 252. 296 $\gamma\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$.

² Σ (ap. S.H.) $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \phi\omega\nu\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\nu$ cannot be used as evidence.

The corrupt reading בצל...בצל evidently stood in the pre-Akiban text. This was corrected to (b), which is idiomatic, and makes good sense; but afterwards corrupted again to בצל...בצל.

ἀργυρίου BV 68. 254. 298 | pr. art. M. ACS curss. rel. Σ.

v. 13 (14). ὁ θεός MSS. S.H. Hier. | om. M. Σ Pesh. (pass. ptep. "him that is made crooked")¹.

v. 24 (25). ὑπὲρ ὃ ἦν = משהיה MSS. S.H. Hier. Pesh. (in the order משהיה רחוק | M. מה שהיה. In the early Heb. text the word was probably understood as מ'שהיה, cf. vi. 8 מיתר 8.

v. 25 (26). ἀσεβοῦς ἀφροσύνην MSS. | M. רשע כסל. Pesh. אֲסֵבִיבִי אֲסֵבִיבִי. Hier. *impietatem stulti*. It is impossible not to think that the translator would have rendered MT. by ἀσεβείαν ἀφροσύνης. S.H. transposes the words—~~אֲסֵבִיבִי אֲסֵבִיבִי~~ = כסל רשע. It is, therefore, probable that the pre-Akiban text had רשע כסל, and that when the words were transposed, ⚡ was similarly treated to produce correspondence.

ὁγληρίαν MSS. | M. pr. art.

καὶ περιφορὰν MSS. S.H. | M. הוללות. Aq. Σ Hier.

The similar passages, i. 17, ii. 12, are in favour of the coordination with סכלות by "and."

v. 26 (27). θήρευμα = מצוד BC curss. (exc. foll.) ⊙ Hier. | M. מצודים ASV 106. 161-248. 252. 253. 296 Aq.

δεσμὸς εἰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς MSS. (253 δεσμοὶ) | M. אסורים ידיה Pesh. Hier. Aq. (ap. Hier.) *Vinctae sunt manus ejus*.

It is difficult to suppose ⚡ to be a corruption of δεσμοὶ αἱ [or εἰσι Ed. Alex.] χεῖρες αὐτῆς. Aq. suggests another solution. If אסורים were spelt אסורם in an early text, the expression might easily be corrupted into אסור בידיה 'a chain is on her hands.' And with the revised Heb. text Aq. still expressed the same thought.

v. 27 (28). ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής MSS. (exc. 252) | om. art. M. 252 Tg.

v. 28 (29). καὶ ἄνθρωπον MSS. S.H. O.L. (Berger) | M. אדם Pesh. Hier.

¹ By means of the masc. ὃν and αὐτόν the translator expresses a thought afterwards found in Σ and in Tg.—that עותו refers to man being made crooked (Σ "punished") by God. This was evidently the Rabbinic view of the passage, and the rendering favours the Aquilean authorship.

Ch. VIII. v. 4. καθώς = כַּשֵׁי MSS. Pesh. Some MSS. K. de R. | M. כַּשֵׁי.

Om. דבר BS*V 68. 147-157-159. 248 S.H.^{ms} | ins. M. ACS^{c.a} curs. rel. S.H. Aq. Σ ⊙ Pesh. Hier.

Of the cursives which read λαλεῖ, 253, 254 with S.H. Hier. have it before βασιλεὺς; the rest, with ACS^{c.a}, after ἐξουσιάζων.

Aq. ⊙ Pesh. Hier. all render as a verb; Σ only λόγον.

S.H.^{ms} notes that Origen τοῦ λαλεῖ οὐκ ἐμνήσθη ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστήν (Field).

v. 5. ὁ φυλάσσω MSS. (exc. 253) | M. om. art. 253. The η prob. arose from the doubling of η in the prec. word.

κρίσεως MSS. S.H. Some MSS. K. de R. | M. כִּרְשָׁוַי Pesh. Hier. The reading in the 'Akiban' recension must have been due to the foll. verse.

v. 6. γνώσις = תַּעַד MSS. S.H. ⊙. Six MSS. K. de R. | M. תַּעַד Σ Pesh. Hier.

v. 8. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πολέμου MSS. [A θανάτου] S.H. Pesh. | M. בְּמַלְחָמָה Σ Hier.

It is possible that בָּיִת in an early text was the result of a doubling of בַּמ in בְּמַלְחָמָה.

v. 9. καὶ 1^o MSS. S.H. Pesh. | om. M. Hier. Tg.

τὰ ὅσα = אֲשֶׁר תֵּא מֵא one MS. Kenn. MSS. [πάντα ὅσα 147-157-159 S.H. ὅσα S^{c.a}] | M. אֲשֶׁר תַּע Aq. Σ Pesh. Tg.

It is more probable that תֵּא was an early variant, than that (as Euring. suggests) a Greek scribe, who knew just enough Hebrew to understand תֵּא, stumbled at תַּע and deliberately changed his text.

v. 10. εἰς τάφους εἰσαχθέντας = קַבְרִים מוֹבְאִים MSS. S.H. | M. קַבְרִים וּבְאִי Aq. Σ (vid.) Pesh. Hier.

καὶ ἐκ τ. ἀγ. MSS. S.H. Pesh. Hier. with M. | om. καὶ Aq. Σ (vid.).

καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν MSS. (exc. foll.) S.H. Aq. ⊙ | M. יִהְיוּ S^{c.a} V 253. Σ Pesh. Hier. (254 confl. ἐπορ. καὶ ἐπορ.).

The first of the above readings is clear. The doubling of the מ from קַבְרִים led to the corruption of וּבְאִי into מוֹבְאִים.

In the two latter readings the evidence is divided, so that it is difficult to say whether M. originally stood as at present, or whether it was corrupted after its first publication. But the balance seems to favour pre-Akiban readings מִמְקוֹם and וַיְהִי לָנוּ. (On τοῦ ἀγίου see sect. C.)

v. 11. ἀπὸ τῶν ποιούντων = מַעֲשֵׂי MSS. S.H. Pesh. Hier. | M. מַעֲשֵׂי Tg., cf. v. 5.

v. 12. τὸ πονηρόν MSS. | M. om. art. A corruption due to the prec. η; either it was doubled in the early text, or the second η was omitted in the MT. by homoeoteleuton.

ἀπὸ τότε = מאז MSS. S.H. | Aq. Σ ⊕ ἀπέθανεν = מת | M. מאה Pesh. Hier. strives to find a suitable meaning both in *ex tunc* and in *mortuus est*. None of these three readings is satisfactory¹. The ellipse of פעם after מאה is very harsh, and מאה is nowhere else used as an indefinite expression for a large number. A solution is required which will account both for the τ and for the η at the end of the word. And two are possible:

1. A scribe began to write ומאריך, but having accidentally omitted the ו discovered his mistake when he had written מאר, and wrote the word again. Then מארומאריך was written "מאז ומ", and, later, "מאה ומ".

2. The original text had מאר, which would similarly give rise to the two variants.

ἀπὸ μακρότητος = מאריך MSS. S.H. (misreading Ⲅ as ἀπὸ ματαιότητος) | M. מאריך Pesh. Hier.

v. 13. ἐν σκαῖφ MSS. (exc. S*) S.H. | M. כצל Pesh. Hier. S* has confl. ὡς ἐν σκαῖφ (S^a om. ὡς). Σ (ap. Hier.) om. כצל altogether.

v. 14. ἐπ' αὐτοὺς = עלהם B 68. 147-157-159. 298 | M. אלהם. πρὸς αὐτοὺς ACVS curss. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier. The alteration was made to conform to אלהם below.

v. 16. ἐν οἷς = באשר MSS. (exc. 252) S.H. two MSS. K. de R. | M. באשר.

(Σ 252 διὸ. Pesh. ⲛⲏⲏⲏ. Hier. *quapropter*.)

τὴν σοφίαν MSS. (exc. foll.) | om. art. M. 147-159.

v. 17. ἄνθρωπος 1^o MSS. | M. pr. art. See v. 18.

ἄνθρωπος 2^o BACV curss. (exc. foll.) | pr. art. M. S. 161-248. 252. 254. 296.

σοφὸς BV 68. 157. 252. 253. 254. 296 | pr. art. M. ACS curss. rel.

Ch. IX. v. 1 [Ⲅ viii. 17]. καὶ καρδία μου σύμπαν εἶδεν τοῦτο MSS. (with small variations²). S.H. = κ. κ. μ. τοῦτο σύμπαν εἶδεν. Pesh. = κ. κ. μ. εἶδεν σύμπαν τοῦτο | M. זלבור את כל זה Σ (ap. Hier.). Hier. Tg.

The early text ran זלבור את כל זה. The transposition σύμπαν εἶδεν seems to have been hexaplaric.

¹ מאז is adopted by Bickell and Siegfried.

² B* καρδία...ιδον.

v. 1, 2 [G v. 1]. τὰ πάντα πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν ματαιότης ἐν τοῖς πᾶσιν. MSS. S.H. This points to a pre-Akĭban reading "באשר לכל וג' הכל לפניהם הכל: באשר לכל וג'" all that is before them is vanity; inasmuch as to all there is one mischance...etc." In this case ἐν τοῖς πᾶσιν must be an early Greek corruption of ἐν οἷς τοῖς π. (cf. viii. 16, xi. 5; and in viii. 4 MT. has באשר).

In the 'Akĭban' recension the only change made was to read באשר for באשר. So Σ τὰ πάντα ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ ἄδηλα, *propterea quod omnibus eveniunt similia* (see Field). And the Vg., though free, is evidence for this: *omnia in futurum servantur incerta, eo quod universa aequae eveniant...* etc.

But in a line of Heb. MSS. which did not affect the Vg., but which produced the present MT., הכל was corrupted to הכל, necessitating its inclusion in the second, instead of the first, clause.

Lastly Pesh. has a conflation, reading הכל at the end of the first clause, and הכל באשר לכל at the beginning of the second.

v. 2. καὶ τῷ κακῷ MSS. S.H. Pesh. Hier. | om. M. Tg.

This is placed here because Pesh. Hier. may have adopted the words from G. But if they knew a Heb. reading ולרע, the omission was a corruption at a later stage in the MT.

τὸν ὄρκον MSS. | M. om. art.

v. 3. καὶ ὀπίσω αὐτῶν = ואחריהם MSS. S.H. Pesh. Σ (vid.) | M. ואחרי Hier. Tg. (vid.).

(Hier. *et post haec*. Σ τὰ δὲ τελευταῖα αὐτῶν.)

v. 4. ὁ ζῶν = החי MSS. Did. *de Trin.* κύων ὁ ζῶν | M. החי. Σ κινὴ ζῶντι.

It is possible, however, that this does not point to a Heb. variant, but that the article was instinctively inserted by a scribe, making the expression parallel to τὸν λέοντα τὸν νεκρόν. On the Aquilean ὁ κύων for לכלב see App. I. p. 119.

v. 5. γνώσκονται = ירעו MSS. (exc. foll.) | M. יודעים. V. 253 γνώσκουσιν. Pesh. Hier.

The alteration in MT. was probably due to the foll. יודעים.

αὐτοῖς ἔτι MSS. S.H. Pesh. Hier. | M. transp.

The agreement of MSS. and versions points to an early reading עור להם. But it is possible that the transposition occurred in a Greek MS. owing to αὐτοῖς ἔτι in the foll. verse.

v. 6. καὶ γε μερίς = גם חלק BS* curss. (exc. foll.). Hier. *sed et* | M. וחלק ACS^a 161-248. 252. 253. 296 S.H. Pesh.

v. 9. καὶ ἴδε MSS. S.H. Pesh. | M. ראה Σ Hier.

τὰς δοθείσας...ἀτμοῦ σου. It is probable that the two clauses (a) השמש "ה ל"ה אשר נ"ה, and (b) כל ימי הבלך, were absent from the pre-Akiban text used by the translator. In the case of (b) this amounts to a certainty. For

(i) B (alone) has *πάσαι ἡμέραι ἡμέραι* (*sic*) ἀτμοῦ σου, which is clearly a corruption of Aq. *πάσαι αἱ ἡμέραι α. σ.*

(ii) In CSV 147-157-159. 161-248. 296 S.H. a literal rendering has been supplied from the earlier similar clause in the verse—*πάσας [τὰς] ἡμέρας [τῆς] ματαιότητός σου.*

(iii) The clause is omitted in A curss. rel. Pesh. Hier. Tg. and in some Heb. MSS. K. and de R.

Clause (a) is found in all Greek MSS. (exc. 106-261) and in S.H. But Pesh. om. The rendering *τὰς δοθείσας* is foreign to the style of the translation, and may have been supplied from Σ or Θ , as clause (b) was from Aq. It is omitted, together with the first clause, in ten MSS. K. de R.

ἐν τῇ ζώῃ σου MSS. S.H. | om. pron. M. Pesh. Hier. (om. pron. with μόχθῳ also).

This may, however, be a mistake of a Greek scribe, owing to the occurrence of σου with nine other words in vv. 7-9.

v. 10. ὡς ἡ δύναμις σου = כחך MSS.¹ S.H. | M. בכוחך Pesh. Hier. Tg.

v. 14. ἐπ' αὐτήν ¹ = עליה MSS. S.H. Pesh. | M. אליה Hier.

v. 17. ἐξουσιαζόντων = מושלים MSS. S.H. | M. מושל Σ Pesh. Hier.

The σ may have arisen from a doubling of the foll. β , cf. vii. 8 (9).

ἐν ἀφροσύναις = בכקלים MSS. (157. 298 S.H. -*uv*η. 147. 159 ἐν εὐφρ.). Pesh. "a foolish ruler." | M. בכסילים Σ Hier.

The plural of כסל is elsewhere used only for 'loins.' It is probable that the word was written without the ι in the early text, but was intended to be read בכסילים.

Ch. X. v. 1. τίμιον ὀλίγον [B* ὁ λόγος². 252 λόγος] σοφίας [106-261 ὀλίγη σοφία] ὑπὲρ δόξαν ἀφροσύνης μεγάλης [-ην] MSS. Θ (ap. S.H.) ended the clause with *μεγάλην*, if he did not follow Θ throughout. This points to a pre-Akiban reading

יקר מעט חכמה מכבוד סכלות רב

¹ 106. 253. 254 ὅση δύν.

² The *lappus calami* is corrected in B*.

This makes good sense, forming the converse to the thought of *v. a.*

On the other hand the Rabbinic revisers produced a thought synthetically parallel to *v. a.* Three forms of their reading have survived:

- (i) Pesh. = יקר מחכמה ומכבוד רב סבלות מעט,
- (ii) Hier. the same, but omitting רב, and
- (iii) MT. the same, omitting רב, and ו (before מכבוד). But מכבוד in many MSS. K. de R.

v. 3. ὑστερήσει = יחסר MSS. S.H. | M. חסר Pesh. Hier.

The early reading probably arose from a doubling of the prec. ו.

πάντα. If τὰ πάντα is the true reading (see sect. C) it points to הכל. So Hier. *et dicit omnis insipiens est.*

v. 5. ἐξῆλθε = יצא MSS. | M. יצא S.H. Pesh. (Σ ἐξελθόν, Hier. *egrediens* are uncertain¹).

ἐξουσιάζοντος BS 68. 161–248. 253 | M. pr. art. ACV curss. rel. S.H. Σ.

v. 10. καὶ αὐτὸς πρόσωπον = והוא פנים MSS. (exc. V 253) S.H. Pesh. | V κ. αὐ. ἐαυτῷ πρόσ. 253 κ. αὐ. αὐτοῦ πρόσ. = לו פ' | M. לו' Tg. (vid.).

It seems probable that לו' had fallen out of the pre-Akiban text, and was restored in the revised text. This was corrupted in Eastern copies to לו. Hier. reflects the uncertainty as to לו' and לו. He first has *et faciem ejus turbaverit*, and then *et hoc non ut prius* (so Vg.).

Euringer's suggestion that *αυτος* is a corruption of *αυτος αυτο* [= αὐτῷ] is unlikely.

v. 11. ὄφθις BAS curss. (exc. foll.) | M. pr. art. CV 161–248. 252. 296.

It is very rare to find C supporting M. against BAS; and the addition of *o* in C may have been due, not to M., but to the accidental doubling of the following *o*.

But of course it is possible that the omission in the former group may have been accidental.

v. 13. ἐσχάτη αὐτοῦ = אחריתו B 68. 106–261 | M. אחרית פיהו MSS. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier.

¹ Euringer cites Aq. Θ as omitting the relative. But Hier. only states that Aq. Θ and Ⓔ *interpretati sunt Quasi non spontaneum, id est ὡς ἀκούσιον, a facie principis*—thus passing over the question of יצא.

Internal evidence favours the reading of B, since a scribe would be more likely to add *στόματος* owing to the prec. clause, than to omit it. It was the desire for parallelism which probably caused the insertion of פיהו in the 'Akiban' recension. But if פיהו was the original reading it may have been omitted in an early text owing to its similarity to דיתו.

v. 14. ἄνθρωπος BV 68. 106-261. 253. 296. 298 | pr. art. M. ACS curss. rel. See on v. 18.

v. 17. πρὸς καιρὸν = לעת MSS. (exc. 253)¹ S.H. | M. בעת 253. Pesh.

αἰσχυθῆσονται probably points to a corrupt בשה in the pre-Akiban text. See sect. C.

v. 19. οἶνον τοῦ εὐφρανθῆναι = לשמח B 68. 147-157-159. 254². Pesh. Hier. *ut epulentur viventes* | M. ישמח ACVS curss. rel. οἶνος εὐφραίνει (or εὐφρανεῖ) S.H.

τὰ πάντα = הכל BS* 68. 147-157-159. 254 S.H. | M. pr. אה. ACV curss. rel. סὺν τὰ πάντα³.

v. 20. κοιτώνων = משכבין MSS. (exc. foll.) | M. משכבך. 155. 248. 252. 298 S.H. Pesh. Hier.

λόγον σου MSS. S.H. Pesh.

Ch. XI. v. 1. ἡμερῶν B. 68. 254. 298 | M. pr. art. ACS curss. rel. (exc. foll.)... τῶν ἡμ. σου V 106-261. 252.

v. 5. κνοφορούσης BV 68. 155 | M. pr. art. MSS. rel.

v. 6. καὶ ἐν ἐσπέρα perhaps points to an early ובערב. So Ed. Saphetana. But see sect. C.

ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ = יחדיו MSS. S.H. | M. כאחד Pesh. Hier.

Ch. XII. v. 5. καὶ 1°. B 68. 147. 155. 252^{ms} | M נם ACS curss. rel.⁴ S.H. Pesh. Hier.

καὶ may point to a reading ומנכה, which became נם through the doubling of the מ. But re might easily fall out from καιρειεic.

v. 6. καὶ συντροχάσῃ = וירץ MSS. (exc. 253) S.H. Pesh. | M. ונרץ. 253 καὶ συντριβῆ. Hier. *et confringatur*.

¹ 155 πρὸς καιρῶ.

² 261 οἶνος εὐφρανθῆναι.

³ S^{ca} τὰ σύμπαντα.

⁴ Hier. also omits pron. with *vocem* in prec. clause.

⁵ 248 καὶ τι, which must be a corruption of καὶ γε.

v. 9. τὸν ἄνθρωπον = האדם MSS. (exc. foll.) S.H. | M. העם V 253 Pesh. Hier. Copt.

ἐξιχνιάσεται = יחקר MSS. (exc. S^{c.a}) S.H. | M. חקר [S^{c.a.1}] Aq. Pesh. Hier.

This is the only variation in the consonants as read by the translator: but he followed a different pronunciation to that adopted afterwards; Ⲭ = "אֵן יִחְקֵר חֲקֵן מ". Aq. has καὶ ἠνωτίσαστο καὶ ἠρμήνευσε καὶ² κατεσκεύασε παρομίας. 106-261 have a complete conflation of Aq. and Ⲭ.

v. 11. τῶν συνθεμάτων [συναγμάτων, συνταγμάτων] MSS. | M. om. art.

v. 13. ἀκούε = שמע MSS. (exc. foll.) Pesh. | M. נשמע V 253. S.H. reads ἀκούετε which is probably a corruption of ἀκούεται, and in marg. "Aⓐ similar to O'." Hier., *auditu perfacilis est*, seems to follow M.

v. 14. ἐν παντί MSS. (exc. 252) S.H. | M. על. 252 Σ περί Pesh. Hier.

(In xi. 9 Ⲭ has ἐπι with M.)

B.

'Akiban' readings which suffered later alteration in the Hebrew text.

Ch. I. v. 13. τὸν οὐρανὸν = השמים BACS* 68. 106-261. 155. 161-248. 254 S.H. and M. | τὸν ἥλιον = השמש S^{c.a} V. curss. rel. Pesh. Hier. Tg. The former reading is found in a cod. of Pesh., and the latter in several Heb. MSS. (Kenn. and de R.). The variant is thus found preserved till a late date.

Ch. II. v. 3. καὶ κατεσκευάμην MSS. S.H. Aq. Σ ⓐ | M. תרתי Pesh. Hier.

v. 24. καὶ ὁ πίνεται BCS 68. 161-248. 254. 298 Pesh. | M. ושתה AV curss. rel. S.H.

καὶ ὁ δείξει BACS curss. (exc. foll.) Aq. Pesh. | M. והראה V 147-157-159. 253. 299. S.H.

The evidence is strong for an early reading ושתה והראה.

v. 25. παρ᾽ ἐξ αὐτοῦ = ממנו חוץ MSS. S.H. Pesh. Hier. Copt. eight MSS. K. de R. | M. ממני ח"ה Vg. Tg.

¹ S^{c.a} καὶ οὗς αὐτοῦ ἐξιχνιάσαστο = חקרו וחקר.

² Ten MSS. K. de R. have וחקן.

Ch. III. *vv.* 4, 5. τοῦ κόψασθαι. τοῦ ὀρχήσασθαι. τοῦ συναγαγεῖν
MSS. Pesh. | M. om. ל.

v. 18. om. המה MSS. | ins. M. S.H. Pesh. Evidently a repetition of the last syllables in בהמה.

v. 19. συνάντημα 3°. MSS. S.H. Pesh. Hier. Tg. Several MSS. K. de R. | M. pr. א.

καὶ τί ἐπερίσσευσεν = ומה יותר (? written ומיתר) MSS. (exc. foll.)
S.H. Σ τί πλέον. S^{c.a} V 253 © τίς περισσειά | M. ומותר Pesh.
Hier.

Ch. IV. *v.* 3. σὺν πάν = כל אה BC vid. [S* vac.] 68. 254. Aq.
©¹ Hier. in *Ep. Eph.* | M. אה AS^{c.a} curs. rel.² S.H. Pesh.
Hier. C.

v. 12. ἐπικραταιώθη = תִּקְרָא MSS. (exc. 253) S.H. The same consonants are attested by 253 ὑπερισχύσει, Σ -χύση, Pesh. = תִּקְרָא | M. תִּקְרָא Hier.

Ch. V. *v.* 2. ἐνύπνιον MSS. Σ | M. pr. art. It is possible, however, that Ⓔ represents בָּאָה הַלִּיָּם; but the word is nowhere distinctly feminine, though the plural is always הַלִּיָּמוֹת.

v. 5. τὰ ποιήματα = מעשה MSS. Hier. Vg. eight MSS. K. de R. | M. מעשה³. Cf. vii. 13 (14), viii. 17, xi. 5.

v. 16. καὶ ἐν πένθει = וְאֵבֶל MSS. [V om. ἐν] S.H. Copt. | M. וְאֵבֶל Pesh. Hier.

The extreme difficulty of וְאֵבֶל makes it improbable that it was adopted instead of וְאֵבֶל in the 'Aḳiban' revision. (Seven MSS. K. de R. have יֵלֶךְ.)

καὶ ἀρρωστία MSS. S.H. Pesh. | M. וְהַלִּיָּו Hier. Tg.

As in the preceding instance, it is the difficulty of the Mas. reading which makes it probable that it is a later corruption. It could easily arise from the doubling of the following ו in וְקָצַף.

Ch. VII. *v.* 12 (13). ὡς σκιά = כַּעֲלֵ MSS. S.H. Σ (vid.⁴) Pesh. | M. כַּעֲלֵ. See sect. A.

v. 13 (14). τὰ ποιήματα MSS. Σ Hier. Vg. | M. מעשה. See *v.* 5.

v. 14 (15). ζῆθι = היה MSS. S.H. Aq. © Copt. | M. היה Σ Pesh. Hier. Tg.

¹ Σ τὰ κακὰ ἔργα τὰ γινόμενα. The plural may imply the presence of כל.

² 253 ουπω (sic).

³ S.H. and Pesh. are uncertain, since their reading depends on the presence or absence of the *ribbui*.

⁴ ὡς (252^{ms}) or ὁμοίως (S.H.) σκέπει τὸ ἀργύριον.

Ch. VIII. v. 2. στόμα om. אני MSS. (exc. 253¹) S.H. O.L. (Berger), Pesh. Tg. | M. 253 pr. אני.

אני is evidently corrupt, but it is not easy to account for its insertion. Possibly פי was written twice, and then by some confusion with the foregoing נ in ישנא the corrupt פיפי became אניפי.

v. 10. καὶ ἐπηνέθησαν = וישחכחו MSS. S.H. Aq. Σ © (see Field) Hier. some MSS. K. de R. | M. וישחכחו Tg. Pesh. = λαθον.

v. 17. τὰ ποιήματα MSS. Σ Hier. Vg. | M. מעשה. See v. 5.

Ch. IX. v. 2 (1). ματαιότης = הבל | M. הכל. See sect. A.

v. 2. ὡς ὁ δμνών = כנשבע MSS. S.H. Pesh.² Hier. Vg. | M. הנשבע.

v. 4. κοινωνεῖ = ק"רי יחבר MSS. [106-261. 296 Hier. -נהשי] S.H. Σ Pesh. Hier. Tg. | M. יבחר.

Ch. X. v. 1. σαπριοῦσιν MSS. (exc. 253). Σ 253 σήψει. © S.H. Σ Pesh. Hier. Tg. have one verb only | M. יבאיש יביע.

[On σκευασίαν see sect. C.]

v. 10. τοῦ ἀνδρ[ε]ίου = ת"ק א"ר ACS 248. 252. 253. 254. 296. 298. S.H. Pesh. Hier. fortitudinis | M. הכשר.

This reading yields good sense: "and an advantage to the successful man is wisdom," and it explains the following corruptions:

τωανδριον B, interpreted as τῷ ἀνδρὶ οὐ 68, τῷ ἀνδρὶ (om. οὐ) 248, τοῦ ἀνδρὸς 147-157-159. 161, τῷ ἀνδρείῳ 106-261.

v. 14. τί τὸ γεγόμενον = מה שהיה MSS. (exc. foll.) S.H. Σ Pesh. Hier. four MSS. K. de R. | M. מה שיהיה. S 147-157-159. 298 τί τὸ γενησόμενον.

The former reading yields good sense, and the contrast between היה and יהיה is in accord with i. 9. The latter reading was probably due to viii. 7.

Ch. XI. v. 5. ἐν οἷς = באשר MSS. S.H. Aq. ἐν φ̄ three MSS. K. de R. | M. באשר Hier.

Cf. viii. 16 and for M. באשר viii. 4.

τὰ ποιήματα = מעשי MSS. Hier. Vg. | M. מעשה. See v. 5.

¹ 253 ἐγὼ παραινὼ ῥήσιν βασιλεως φυλάσσειν.

² Pesh., however, has both for καθὼς and ὡς [ὁ ἀμαρτάνων].

Ch. XII. v. 6. ἀνατραπή MSS. If the suggestion made in sect. C is right, that this is a corruption of ἀνατραγή or, perhaps, of ἀποτραγή, the commonly adopted reading ינתק (for קתק K^cthib or קתק K^ri) gains additional force. Σ Hier. both render “be broken,” Pesh. ~~כחכח~~ “be cut off”; and ינתק is used in iv. 12 (Ⲙ ἀποτραγήσεται) of a thread or cord, where Pesh. has the same word as here.

v. 12. τοῦ ποιῆσαι = חושב^ל BACSc^a curs. (exc. foll.) S.H. Aq. Σ | M. חושב S* ποιῆσαι βιβ. 147-157-159 βιβ. ποιῆσαι.

C.

Greek Corruptions.

Ch. I. v. 5. αὐτὸς ἀνατέλλων B 68. 147-157-159. 261 | M. tr. MSS. rel. S.H. Hier.

It is scarcely possible that a reading וזרר הוּא could have existed.

v. 7. οἱ χεῖμαρροι 2^o B | M. pr. ש. pr. οῦ MSS. rel. S.H. Hier.

v. 11. αὐτῶν BAS 155. 254. 296 | M. מְהָל. αὐτοῖς CV curs. rel. S.H. Hier.

αὐτῶν cannot represent a Heb. variant, and is foreign to the style of the translation.

v. 17. καὶ ἔδωκα... γνῶσιν.

Om. 68. 106. 161-248. 253. 261. 296. 298. S.H. has it with *. Clem. Al. Olymp. Copt.

Add after γνῶσιν M. ABSV 252. 254. Pesh. Hier. [C vac.].

Add after Ἱεροουσαλήμ 147-157-159 ed. Rom.

The evidence is strongly in favour of the omission of the clause. If the pre-Origenian Greek text omitted it, two solutions are possible: 1. At an early stage in the Greek transmission a scribe's eye passed accidentally from γνῶσιν to γνῶσιν. But, being included in the other hexaplar translations, it found its way back into the Greek text. 2. The original Heb. text omitted, and it arose as a doublet. The latter is the more probable, and the insertion is on that account placed here as a Greek corruption.

v. 18. γνώσεως | M. כַּעַם. The words σοφία and γνώσις occur twice (or once) in the prec. verse, which might lead to the mistake. See sect. A.

Ch. II. v. 3. ἐπ' εὐφροσύνη (-ην) MSS.¹ Pesh. | M. חכלות Hier.

The use of חכלות ('folly') in i. 17 for סכלות, where all G MSS. have ἐπιστήμην (foll. by Pesh.), shews that in the early Heb. text the two words were sometimes confused, and it is possible that some MSS. of that text read חכלות here. But the present reading is more probably a corruption of ἐπ' ἀφροσύνη. εὐφρ. is usually the rendering of חכמות (cf. vv. 1, 2, 10 al.), and ἀφρ. stands for εὐφρ. in other passages where there can be little doubt that it is a scribal error².

v. 6. Om. ξύλα B. Evidently a slip, followed by no other MS.³ [C vac.]

v. 15. διότι [δ] ἄφρων ἐκ περισσεύματος λαλεῖ. Inserted after ματαιότης in BC 155. 254. 298 Pesh. Copt., and after ἐν καρδιά μου in ASV curss. rel. (exc. 253) S.H. Hier. | om. M. 253⁴.

It is evidently a gloss, possibly from a Christian source; cf. Mat. xii. 34 || Lk. vi. 45.

The alteration of the clauses by which περισσὸν (or ἐγὼ περ.) was connected with ἐλάλησα seems to have been due to polemical reasons, and is perhaps from the same source.

v. 16. αἱ ἡμέραι ἐρχόμεναι. The article before the participle is omitted in BCS* 155. 252. 254. 299 | ins. M. AS^{c.a} curss. rel. S.H. Hier.

The reading ταῖς ἡμ. ταῖς ἐρχ. is found in AS^{c.a} and several cursives, and seems clearly a grammatical correction. 147-157-159 have αἱ ἡμ. διερχ. which must be derived from an uncial in which αἱ was mistaken for δι, and they are therefore reckoned among the MSS. which preserve the article. The omission of αἱ in B and C was easy after ἡμέραι, and cannot point to a Heb. variant.

v. 19. καὶ ἐσοφισάμην B*S* 106-261. 147-157-159. 155. 299 | M. חכמות. B^{ab} ACS^{c.a} curss. rel. καὶ ᾧ ἔσοφ. S.H. Pesh. Hier.

v. 21. ἄνθρωπος ᾧ BS. S.H. © | M. 'ש אדם. C curss. (exc. 106) -πφ ὅς Aq. Pesh. Hier.⁵

¹ Except 253 ἐπιστήμη.

² εὐφρ. for ἀφρ. ii. 12 cod. V, vii. 25 (26) codd. 147-159. ἀφρ. for εὐφρ. ii. 2 cod. 253, vii. 5 cod. 106.


³ Pesh. <Δ><α>.

⁴ The confusion arising from its variation in position is shewn in S.H., which adds after the interpolation <α>, καὶ ἴδε καὶ γε τοῦτο ματαιότης ἰ.

⁵ -πος ὅς S^{c.a} V 106. 161^{ms}. A om. ὅς.

v. 22. ὅτι γίνεται MSS. (exc. 157) S.H. | M. כי מה הוה 157. Σ Pesh. Hier.

A Heb. variant is impossible. טי was accidentally omitted between סוי and טי.

v. 25. πίεται MSS. © Pesh.  | φείσεται S.H. Aq. Σ. Hier. *parcet* | M. חישא Tg. חישא.

Ewald defends πίεται, referring to the Arab. *ḥasa* 'drink'; but there is no corresponding Heb. root. Both Greek readings appear to be corruptions of *πίσεται*. On the one hand the occurrence of *φάγεται* and *πίεται* in the prec. verse caused the slip in a primitive MS.; hence *πίεται* is found in all © MSS. and ©. On the other hand *חישא* would easily be read *חישא* = חוש, as was done by Aq. Σ (ap. S.H.), and hence *ωωω* = *φείσεται* found its way into S.H. text.

Both readings are explained by *πίσεται*. In NH. and Aram. *חישא*, *ω* = feel pain. So Tg. here. Hence it may be used for any kind of strong feeling—here one of enjoyment.

Ch. III. v. 11. *σύμπαντα* + *ā* MSS.¹ (exc. 155) S.H. Pesh. | M. om. rel. 155 Hier. The reading *שעשה* would yield good sense; but the *a* would so easily be doubled that it is safer to regard it as a Greek corruption.

v. 16. *εὐσεβής* MSS. S.H. | M. הרשע Pesh. Hier. It is improbable that this was a slip for *ἀσεβής*. It must have been a deliberate alteration in the cause of orthodoxy.

v. 18. *ὅτι διακρινεῖ* [6 curss. *κρινεῖ*] MSS.² S.H. | M. לברם Pesh.

Hier. has both *quia separat* and *ut eligeret*. No explanation can be offered of this difficult reading, except that it may have been a primitive corruption of *τοῦ διακρίναι*. It seems to have been due to a scribe who did not understand the ellipse before *על דברת*.

v. 19. *οὐ συνάντημα* B. Probably an orthodox gloss. See sect. A.

Ch. IV. v. 1. *ἰδὸν* B | M. והנה, pr. *καὶ* AC^{vid}. SV curss. S.H. Pesh. Hier.

v. 9. *δύο* B 252. 254 S.H. Pesh.³ | M. pr. art. ACSV curss. rel. ©. The omission of *οἱ* was easy after *ἀγαθοί*.

¹ 261 *δσα*.

² 252^{ms} has *τοῦ ἐλέγξαι αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς, καὶ τοῦ δεῖξαι αὐτοὺς*, which may be a more or less accurate citation of Aq.

³ Pesh. om. art. also with *ἔνα*.

Ch. V. v. 1. *ἀνω* BC 68. 147-159. 253. 254. 298 | om. M. ASV curss. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier. Clearly a repetition of the same syllables in *οὐρανῶ*¹.

v. 3. οὐκ ἔστιν B | M. pr. ܒ ACSV curss. S.H. Pesh. Hier. Σ οὐ γάρ ἐστι.

σὺ οὖν ὄσα MSS. Pesh. σὺ ὄσα S.H. Aq. | M. ܪܫܢ ܩܢ. © ὄσα. Hier. *quascumque*.

The particle *οὖν* is foreign to the translation. Both *σὺ οὖν* and *σὺ* are corruptions of *σύν*.

v. 5. *ἴνα μὴ* MSS. S.H. Hier. | M. ܩܒܠ. Pesh. ܩܒܠܐ.

Ⓔ is a loose rendering which cannot point to a Heb. variant. The corruption is probably hexaplaric, perh. from Σ, for *ἴνα τί*.

v. 6. σὺ BS curss. (exc. foll.) S.H. Pesh. | M. ܩܢ. σὺν AC 147-155-159. 299. Om. σὺ 298 Σ. Om. ὅτι σὺ 68.

v. 7. ὑψηλός B 68 | M. pr. ܒ ACSV curss. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier. στί would easily fall out after the prec. ατί.

v. 8. ἐπὶ παντὶ MSS. (exc. V) Σ | M. ܒܒܠ V S.H. © Pesh. Athan. Hier. A scribe was apparently influenced by the foregoing *ἐπάνω* and *ἐπὶ*, and thought of the king as the climax in the series of officials.

v. 9. αὐτῶν BS* 68. 147-159. 298. 299. [261]. S.H. | αὐτοῦ ACS^a curss. rel. [V 106]. (V has αὐτοῦ corrected to αὐτω. 261, 106 have conflation, the former αὐτῶν...οὐκ, the latter αὐτοῦ...οὐκ.) | M. ܟܠ Pesh. Hier. Both the Greek readings appear to be corruptions of αὐτῶ = ἰλ. See sect. A.

v. 10. ὅτι probably a corruption of ὅτι ἀν. See sect. A. *δφβαλμόν* B* | M. ܝܢܓ. The plural is read by B^{ab} and all other MSS. and the versions.

-μοις B^{ab} ACSV curss. (exc. foll.) S.H. © Hier.

-μοι 161-248.

-μων Σ Pesh.

It is scarcely possible that *-μον* could be a corruption of *-μοις*. It is far more likely to be corrupted from *-μων*², and *-μοις* would be a natural correction adopted from ©.

v. 15. *πονηρὰ ἀρρωστία*. It is suggested in sect. A that this is a corruption of *πονηρία ἀρρωστία*.

¹ In consequence of the insertion of *ἀνω*, the word *κάτω* is found after *ἐπι τῆς γῆς* in S, 6 curss., Orig., Ath., Greg. Nyss. Both insertions may have been due to Exod. xx. 4.

² See Montef. *Pal. Graec.* pp. 131 f.

ὡσπερ γὰρ παρεγένετο οὕτως καὶ ἀπελεύσεται MSS.¹ S.H. Hier.

The whole clause savours of Σ, though παραγίνεται = κβ occurs in Ε v. 2; the use of γὰρ is foreign to the translation; οὕτως καὶ is loose; ἀπέρχεσθαι occurs nowhere in this book in Ε for ἴηη (which is normally rendered πορεύεσθαι), while Σ has it in x. 15, and συναπελεύσεται in v. 14; and lastly in vii. 14 (15) Ε renders חמגל by the Aquilean συμφώνως.

καὶ ἡ περισσεία B 68 | M. חמגל חמג. καὶ τίς ἡ π. MSS. rel. S.H. Σ Pesh. Hier.

v. 17. εἶδον ἐγὼ BS^{c.a} 68. 253. 261. 296. 298 [S.H.²] | M. חמגל חמג, pr. ם ACS* Pesh. Hier. ם would easily drop out in Ε, while a Heb. variant is improbable.

v. 18. ἐξουσίασεν αὐτῶν B | M. חמגל חמג. ἐξουσ. αὐτῶ C 68. 161-248. 254. 261. 296 [106. 252. 298³]. Hier. concessitque ei... ἐξουσ. αὐτὸν ASV curss. rel. vi. 2 shews that αὐτῶ is right. αὐτὸν is a correction.

v. 19. οὐκ ἄλλα B | M. חמגל חמג. οὐ πολλά B^{ab} V 68 [147-159 om. οὐ] 253. 261. S.H. Aq. © Pesh. Hier. ... οὐ πολλὰς ACS curss. rel.

πολλὰς is an attempted improvement, to make the word agree with ἡμέρας.

Ch. VI. v. 1. ὑπὸ τὸν ἄνθρ. BS* 253 | M. חמגל חמג. ἐπὶ τ. א. S^{c.a} MSS. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier. ὑπὸ is a slip, probably due to the foregoing ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον.

v. 5. ἀναπαύσεις BASV 68. 161-248. 253. 254 | M. חמג. -סוּס C 106. 252. 261. 298 Pesh. Hier. ... -סוּס curss. rel. Aq. © [Σ⁴], from the idea that the word was governed by ἐγὼ. -סוּס was a case of itacism in an early MS.

v. 6. πορεύεται B. Accidental omission of τὰ πάντα. See sect. A.

¹ 106 om. γὰρ. 299 καὶ πορεύσεται.

² חמגל חמג חמג = ἰδὼν εἶδον ἐγώ. Σ ἐμοὶ οὖν ἐφάνη is too loose to be used as evidence.

³ Those in brackets read ἐν αὐτῶ, repeating the last syllable of the verb.

⁴ S.H. cites Σ not only as ἀνάπαυσι, but also καὶ οὐκ ἐπειρήθη διαφορὰς ἐτέρου πράγματος πρὸς ἕτερον. So 254 after ἀναπαύσεις, and V 253 after ὑπὲρ τούτου. In this, and in S.H. text and Tg., חמג is given the meaning of the NH חמג 'better than.' And from this arose the punctuation by which ἐγὼ gov. ἀνάπαυσι. The stichometrical arrangement in B has the same effect. But there is no reason to depart from the meaning which חמג bears in iv. 6, ix. 17.

Ch. VII. v. 2 (3). ἡ ὅτι πορευθῆναι BACS* 68. 161-248. 252. 254 | M. מלכת. παρὰ πορευθ. S^{ca} V 253 (clearly a correction). ... ἡ πορευθ. curs. rel. S.H. Pesh. ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ Chrys. Thdt.

ὅτι is a primitive corruption somewhat difficult to account for. The only explanation that suggests itself is that either η or the π of πορευθ. was accidentally doubled, and read as τι, which a later scribe wrote as ὄτι¹.

δώσει + ἀγαθὸν MSS. Pesh. | om. M. S.H. Σ Hier.

A striking instance of the freedom with which early scribes treated the Greek text. The insertion was probably caused by the influence of the six-fold recurrence of ἀγαθὸν in vv. 1-8.

v. 3 (4). ἀγαθυνθήσεται om. καρδία B S.H. * A[⊙] καρδία √ | M. ACSV curs. Aq. Σ[⊙] Pesh. Hier.

The Heb. sentence would be awkwardly abrupt if it closed with ייטב. The omission must have been due to the foll. καρδία.

v. 7 (8). εὐγενείας αὐτοῦ BC 68. 147-157-159 | M. מתנה. εὐτονίας [-αν S*] αὐτοῦ AS^{ca} curs. rel. (exc. foll.) S.H. Aq. ⊙ Hier. ... τὴν εὐτονίαν τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ V 106-261. 253. The last reading is a deliberate alteration of the second, to produce some sense.

εὐγενείας is clearly a corruption of εὐτονίας, the latter being probably the true reading. The translator derived the word מתנה from √ מתן 'be strong' (whence מתנים 'loins'), perhaps assuming a sing. מְתָן and reading קְתִינָה. The care with which (acc. to Hier.) Σ transliterates MAT[⊙]ANA, and adds the explanation τοῦτ' ἔστι δῶρον, would suggest that he was the first translator to give the true Masoretic meaning.

v. 8 (9). πνεῦμα τιμῆς BS* 68, the μηс of μὴ σπεύσῃς being doubled. | M. רוח. πνεύματι MSS. rel. versions.

v. 13 (14). ὁ θεὸς MSS. S. H. Hier. | om. M. Σ Pesh.

It is very unlikely that האלהים would have been omitted had it stood in the pre-Akiban text².

¹ Isid. Pel. ὅτι πορευθ. Cyr. Al. ἡ τὸ πορευθ. Hier. om. the verb: *quam ad domum convivii*.

² By means of the masc. δὲ and αὐτὸν the translator expresses a thought afterwards found in Σ and Tg., i.e. that יְיָ refers to man being made crooked (Σ "punished") by God. This was evidently the view taken of the passage in the Rabbinic schools; and the rendering is so far in favour of the Aquilean authorship.

v. 14 (15). *καὶ ἴδε ἐν ἡμ. κακ. ἴδε* MSS. (exc. foll.) | M. *וביום רעה ראה*. Om. *ἴδε* 1° S.H. Pesh. Hier. Om. *ἴδε* 2° S^{ca} V 106-261.

The original \mathfrak{E} was evidently in accordance with M., *κ. ἐν ἡμ. κ. ἴδε*. But when a stichometrical arrangement was adopted by which *ἴδε* was connected with *καὶ γε σὺν...κ.τ.λ.*, a scribe supplied *ἴδε* as a verb for *ἐν ἡμ. κακ.* The omission of the second *ἴδε* in S^{ca} etc. was a supposed improvement on this.

καὶ γε σὺν τούτῳ B 68.

καὶ γε τούτῳ 159.

καὶ γε τοῦτο ACS curss. rel. Hier.

συμφώνως τοῦτο B 68.

-ον τοῦτο AV 253.

-ον τούτῳ S curss. rel. Hier.

-ει τούτῳ C.

Σ *καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο ἀνάλογον τούτου.*

These varieties can best be explained if \mathfrak{E} originally ran *καὶ γε σὺν τοῦτο συμφώνως* [or *-ον*] *τούτῳ*, in strict accordance with M.

v. 16 (17), 17 (18). These verses seem to have suffered some corruptions which cannot now be traced. *μηδὲ* is foreign to the style of the translation, and savours rather of Σ ; and no less strange are *μή ποτε* and *ἵνα μὴ* for M. *מב...מב*. For the former Σ has *ἵνα μὴ*, but for the latter he is not extant.

Pesh. \leftarrow and \leftarrow . S.H. \leftarrow and \leftarrow . Hier. *ne* and *ne*. And for the second *מב* 147-157-159. 299 have *μή ποτε*.

It seems probable that the early Heb. text had two different words, and that \mathfrak{E} has been corrupted.

v. 18 (19). *μὴ μίανης* MSS. (exc. 253). The result of ditto-graphy—*μημηδανης*. *μὴ ἀνῆς* © 161^{ms}. *μὴ ἀφῆς* Aq Σ 253.

φοβουμένοις BS 68. 106. 157. 161-248. 252 [254 *τοῖς φοβ.*] | M. *אב*. *-vos* CV 147-159. 261. 296. *ὁ φοβ.* A 253. 298. 299. Aq. Σ ©.

The reading of B etc. was probably a corruption of *-vos* by a scribe who did not understand the construction *ἐξελεύσεται τὰ πάντα*¹.

v. 21 (22). *ἀσεβείς* BS* curss. (exc. foll.) Pesh. Tg. | om. M. ACS^{ca} V 248. 252. 253. 296. S.H. Σ Hier.

It is improbable that *אשער* would have been omitted, had it stood in the pre-Akiban text. *ἀσεβείς* must have been added

¹ Was he influenced by Rom. viii. 28?

by an early scribe, partly from a wish to supply *λαλήσουσιν* with a subject, and partly, perhaps, influenced by the thought of the prec. verse. This same cause must have affected the Tg. independently.

v. 22 (23). On this verse Field quotes a note of Montef. to the effect that two versions are here combined—the former that of \mathfrak{E} : *ὅτι πλειστάκις πονηρεύσεται σε καρδιά σου*, the latter that of Aq.: *ὅτι καθόδους πολλὰς κακώσει καρδίαν σου*. But the evidence suggests another explanation:

πονηρεύσεται MSS. Σ .

σε MSS. | om. M. S.H.

καρδία B Σ | *καρδίαν* MSS. rel.

ὡς καί γε MSS. (exc. foll.) S.H. | *ὡς καί γε ὡς* S*. *καί γε* S^{c.a}.
καί γε ὡς 254.

It is probable that \mathfrak{E} originally ran *ὅτι καί γε καθόδ. πολλ. κακ. καρδίαν σου*, which is certainly Aquilean; while the first clause seems to be made up from other sources. *πονηρεύσεται* and *καρδία* are from Σ (see Field). *πλειστάκις*¹ may be from Θ (see Field on Ps. cxix. (cxviii.) 64); and if he also had *κακώσει, σε* would easily arise from the doubling of the *σε*.

The foll. words *ὅτι ὡς* are a doublet. *ὅτι καί γε* was apparently ousted from the prec. line by the *καί* which was placed before *καθόδους* to combine the two renderings.

Pesh. alone follows M. 77.

v. 25 (26). *ἀσεβοῦς ἀφροσύνην*. It is probable that the words have been transposed. See sect. A.

v. 26 (27). *αὐτήν* MSS. S.H. ⇄ | om. M. Pesh.² Hier.

A primitive corruption by a scribe who thought that *εἰρίσκω* referred to Koheleth's search after the five things mentioned in the prec. verse, and felt it necessary to supply an object to the verb.

καί ἐρῶ BS* 68 [*καί εἶπα* S^{c.a}, *καί εἶπον* V 253. 254] | om. M. AC curss. rel. Pesh. Hier.

This may have been a gloss added to supply a verb to govern *σὺν τὴν γυναικα*, since *εἰρίσκω* was already occupied by *αὐτήν*. But the readings of S^{c.a} etc. rather suggest that there was some confusion in a Heb. MS., which caused — *אנימר* to be read *מראמר* [אנימר].

¹ After *πλειστάκις* V 253. 254 add *καιροῦ* from Σ .

² Pesh. reads *אני מצאני* for *אני מצאני*.

v. 28 (29). ἐπέζητησεν MSS. (exc. 147-159 ἐζήτ., 157 ἐξεζήτ.). S.H. "sought," om. τῷ | M. השקב טו Pesh. Hier. ἐπ̄ was a mistake for εἶπ̄.

Ch. VIII. v. 1 [C vii. 30]. τίς οἶδε(ν) σοφούς MSS. [147-157. 161 σοφίαν. 248 -φον] S.H. | M. כהכה כמ Pesh. Hier. But Aq. τίς ὠδε σοφός = כה כה כמ, which helps to explain C. If ὠδε σοφός was written ολεσοφος, it would easily be corrupted to οἶδε σοφούς¹, owing to the foll. τίς οἶδεν λύσιν.

v. 10. ἐκ τοῦ ἀγίου MSS. [V 253 ἀπὸ τ. ἀγ.] | M. שיוק מוקמ Aq. Σ Pesh. Hier. τόπου was perhaps abbreviated τῶν. On the rest of the verse see sect. A.

v. 12. αὐτῶν MSS. S.H. | M. ול Σ Pesh. Hier.

A corruption of ἀγτωί².

ἴστι(ν) BV 68. 161-248. 252. 253. 254 | M. יהיה AC[S εστε] curs. rel. Σ Pesh. Hier. A case of itacism. ἴσται is preserved in the contrasted clause 13 a.

v. 15. ὡς δ' B* | ὅτι B^{ab} MSS. rel. (exc. foll.) ... 161 ὡστε, 254 ὡς are attempted improvements.

v. 16. μου γνῶναι B | μου τοῦ γνῶναι MSS. rel.

v. 17. ὅσα ἂν 2^o MSS. S.H.³ Pesh. ה לדו | M. מס, Hier. *siquidem et si*. Evidently due to the prec. ὅσα ἂν μοχθήσῃ.

Ch. IX. v. 1 [C viii. 17]. σύμπαν ἴδον [εἶδεν]. A transposition, found in all MSS., of εἶδεν σύμπαν. See sect. A.

v. 1. ὁ ἄνθρωπος MSS. (exc. foll.) Aq. Σ Hier. M. S 147-159 ἄνθρωπος before εἰδώς. Ed. Ald. ὁ ἄνθρ. before εἰδώς.

But S.H. ascribes ὁ ἄνθρωπος with * to Aq. It is thus a reading in which all extant MSS. have received a hexaplaric corruption, although Origen's critical mark has survived.

ἐν τοῖς πάσιν. Probably a corruption of ἐν οἷς τ. πασ. See sect. A.

v. 9. ἐν τῇ ζώῃ + σου. Perhaps a scribe's slip owing to the occurrence of σου with nine other words in vv. 7-9. See sect. A.

v. 11. δρόμος, πόλεμος B | M. pr. art. MSS. rel.

The scribe was led astray by the instinct to preserve symmetry with ἄρτος, πλοῦτος, χάρις⁴.

¹ Montef. *Pal. Graec.* pp. 131 f.

² 252^{ms} has the same slip in citing Σ.

³ 106-261 ὅσα ἐάν. 253 S.H. δ ἐάν.

⁴ The art. is suitable with γῆρας and μακροί, but not with the other three

τῷ σοφῷ B 68. 147-157-159 | M. מִכְּכִימִי MSS. rel. Pesh. Hier.

Internal evidence favours M. τοῖσσοφοῖς might easily be misread τοῖσσοφοί. See viii. 1 in this section.

καὶ 4°. B 254. S.H. | M. נָם. MSS. rel. καὶ γε.

v. 12. καὶ γε καὶ B 68. 254. 296. 298 | om. καὶ 2° M. MSS. rel. S.H. Hier.

It is probable that καὶ was written without γε in an ancestor of B, and καὶ γε was a marginal correction which found its way into the text, forming a doublet.

καλῶ B | M. קָעָ. κακῶ MSS. rel. [C om.] S.H. Aq. © Pesh. Hier.

S has the same slip in iv. 17. The omission in C was probably due to the similarity of κακῶ to the foll. καὶ ω[ς].

v. 16. οὐκ εἰσακούμενοι BV 68. 155. 261 | M. אִינָם נִשְׁמָעִים. οὐκ εἰσι(ν) ἀκούμενοι MSS. rel.

Ch. X. v. 1. μῦλαι θανατοῦσαι MSS. (exc. foll.) S.H. 161-248 μ. θανόσαι, so Optat. *muscae moriturae*. 253. Σ μύλων θάνατος | M. מוֹת זְבוּבֵי Pesh. Hier.

It is difficult to think that the translator rendered מוֹת זְבוּבֵי “flies that cause death.” Ⓔ is probably a corruption of μῦλαι θανάτου, the σαι arising from the doubling of the foll. σαπ.

σκεασίαν MSS. (exc. 253) S.H. | om. M. 253 = Σ Pesh. Hier.

In Ez. xxiv. 10 σκεασία is ©'s word for מְרַקַח, and is probably his rendering of רִוְקָה here, which has found its way into Ⓔ through the Hexapla.

v. 3. καὶ ἅ λογεῖται πάντα MSS. S.H. Pesh. | M. וְאָמַר לְכֹל.

The true reading was probably καὶ λέγει τὰ πάντα, corrupted first to καὶ ἅ λ. τ. π., and then to the present text.

v. 8. ὁ ὀρύσσω MSS. S.H. | M. om. art.

All MSS. render the parallel פָּרַץ without an art., and the ο of ὀρύσσω would easily be doubled. Perhaps due to the same cause as the foll. εἰς αὐτόν.

εἰς αὐτόν B 68. 106-261. 147-157-159. 254 | M. בּו. ἐν αὐτῷ MSS. rel. S.H.

A Heb. variant is impossible. εἰς αὐτόν may have been due to the Greek of Prov. xxvi. 27, B.S. xxvii. 26.

words. But the same desire for symmetry led scribes to insert it throughout: before ἄργος MSS. (exc. B 68. 253. 254. 298); before πλοῦτος MSS. (exc. BV 68. 155. 161. 253. 254. 298); before χάρις ACS 147-157-159.

v. 11. τῷ ἐπάδοντι MSS. [V 253 + γλώσση] Pesh. | M. וְשִׁלְהָ בְעַבְלִי.

It is inconceivable that this could have been the work of a translator who renders שִׁלְהָ בְעַבְלִי ἐν οὐ ψιθυρισμῷ. S.H. gives ~~כְּוַל~~ for שִׁלְהָ, and ~~כְּוַל~~ ~~וּסְוַל~~ for וְשִׁלְהָ בְעַבְלִי. Since, then, Σ has ἐποφθῆς for שִׁלְהָ it is probable that τῷ ἐπάδοντι was also his, and entered Ⲭ through the Hexapla. On the other hand Hier. *habenti linguam* suggests that Ⲭ had τῷ ἔχοντι τὴν γλῶσσαν. Cf. v. 20 ὁ ἔχων περὺγας.

v. 14. τί ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ B 147-157-159. ... ὅτι ὀπ. αὐτ. MSS. rel. (exc. 254) S.H. ... διότι ὀπ. αὐτ. 254 | M. וְרִיב אֶק. Σ © Pesh. Hier.

B is in bad company; and וְרִיב אֶק with relative omitted is not in Koheleth's style. ὅτι must be a doubling of the foll. ὀπ., and τί is an attempted improvement: while διότι is probably the result of the conflation τι οτι.

v. 16. πόλις MSS. S.H. Pesh. | M. עָרָא Σ Hier.

The parallelism of v. 17 makes it probable that γῆ was the original reading. Either there were special contemporary circumstances which induced a scribe to alter the word, or it was the result of pure carelessness owing to πόλις in the prec. clause.

v. 17. αἰσχυνθήσονται MSS. S.H. | M. בְּשִׁתִּי Pesh.

If Hier. *in confusione* was based on Ⲭ, the present reading must be a corruption of αἰσχύνῃ—either hexaplaric, or due to the foregoing φάγονται. This points to an early corrupt reading תַּשֵּׁב.

v. 19. καὶ ἔλαιον BSV curss. (exc. foll.) Pesh. | om. M. AC 155. 252. 296. 298. S.H. © Hier.

Perhaps a reminiscence of Ps. civ. (ciii.) 15, or of the similar interpolation in Ps. iv. 8 (7).

ταπεινώσει ἐπακούσεται BS* 68. 254. Pesh. ~~כְּבִרְוֹ~~ ~~חַבְבִּי~~ | om. ταπεινώσει M. ACVS^{s.a} V curss. rel. S.H. Σ εὐχρησθήσει. Hier. *obediunt*.

A doublet formed from a marginal gloss.

v. 20. σου τὴν φωνήν BS^{s.a} 254 | M. וְלִקְוִל אֶק Hier.

τὴν φ. S* 68. τ. φ. σου AC curss. rel. S.H. Σ © Pesh.

An unusual distribution of MSS. The reading of B etc. explains the others, and is itself a corruption of σὺν τ. φ.

¹ ? corruption of ~~כְּבִרְוֹ~~.

ὁ τὰς πτέρυγας B 68. 296. S.H. ...ὁ ἔχων πτέρυγας MSS. rel. [exc. V 253 ὁ τὰς πτέρυγας ἔχων]. Hier. *habens pennas*. M. על כנפיהם.

The presence of the article is attested by the K^ethib. But it is difficult to believe that any translator could render by such an expression as ὁ τὰς πτέρυγας. Field refers to Chrys. *in Pauli Ep.* T. I. p. 553 as an instance in point. I cannot find the passage; but even if Chrysostom allowed himself such a construction, the frequent use of ἔχων by Aq. in similar phrases (see App. I. p. 122) renders it certain that it should be retained here.

Ch. XI. v. 5. οὐκ ἔστιν MSS. S.H. | M. אין. ישה Aq. Σ Pesh. Hier.

A scribe mistook εσθ for εστι.

v. 6. ἐν ἑσπέρα MSS. (exc. foll.) S.H. Pesh. Ed. Saphet. | M. לערב. εις ἑσ. S. 147-157-159 Hier.

Intrinsic evidence favours M., since the tendency would be to assimilate the prep. to the foregoing. The Hexapla may have been the source of the corruption; but the reading is doubtful.

v. 9. ἄμωμος MSS. S.H. with ⇄ | om. M. Pesh. Hier.

An orthodox gloss, inserted on account of the prejudice with which the verse was regarded¹.

In B 68 the insertion ousted καρδίας σου, which is preserved in all other MSS. and the versions.

μη̄ BS* 68. 147-157-159. 254 | om. M. ACS^{c.a} V curss. rel. S.H. Pesh. Hier.

Another orthodox gloss.

Ch. XII. v. 5. καὶ εἰς τὸ ὕψος B 68. 147. 155. 252^{ms} | M. גם מנבה. καὶ γε ἀπὸ ὕψους MSS. rel.² S.H. Σ Pesh. Hier.

εἰς τ. ὕψ. was evidently an intentional alteration to produce some sort of meaning with ὄψονται. And since 252^{ms} is so rich in hexapl. readings, it may well be from Θ.

The γε might easily fall out from καιγεεic, or on the other hand καὶ may point to an original ומנבה.

¹ See Midr. Koh. quoted by C. H. H. Wright, p. 12.

² 252. 254 καὶ γε ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕψ. 248 καὶ τί ἀπὸ ὕψ.

v. 6. ἀναπραγῆ MSS. | M. K^ethib ירתק, ...K^eri ירתק.

Σ has κοπήναι. Pesh. ~~κοπήναι~~. Hier. *rumpatur*. It is probable therefore that Ⲭ is a corruption of either ἀναπραγῆ or ἀποπραγῆ. In iv. 12 ἀποπραγήσεται stands for ינתק, where Pesh. has the same word as here. See sect. B.

v. 9. ὅτι 2^o MSS. [296 ὅτε, 298 ὅτι ὅτε] S.H. Pesh. | M. עור Hier.

A slip for ז'טי¹.

¹ All mss. (exc. B 68. 155. 254 and S.H., Pesh.) have suffered from a scribal 'correction,' καὶ being inserted before ὅτι, probably to make the clause a parallel statement to ὅτι ἐγέν. Ἐκκ. σοφ. [V 253 καὶ, om. ὅτι].

INDEX TO THE INTRODUCTION

- Alexander 43
 Alexander Balas 12
 Alexandria 9 n. 2
 Alphabet of B. Sira 36
 Antiochus IV. 12
 Antiochus V. 12
 Aristobulus I. 12
 Astyages 11
ἀταραξία 52 f.
- Baba ben Butā 4
 Ben Sira 3, 5 f., 12, 32 f., 34—37, 38
 Bickell, arrangement of the book by 28 f.
 Buddhism 44 and n. 3
- Christ 53
 Chrysippus 49
 Cleanthes 52
 Codex-form of books 29
 Cyrus 11
- "Defile the hands" 8
 Demetrius 12
 Determinism 47
- Ἐκκλησιαστικός* 1
 Ecclesiasticus. *See* Ben Sira
 Elohim 15, 46
 Empedocles 53 n. 1
 Epicureanism 43, 52—54
 Esdras, 4th book of 7
- Fatalism 53
- Gamaliel 4
 Gracisms in *Koheleth* 39—43
- Hasid*, additions by the 24—27, 31 f., 37, 48 n.
 Heraclitus 47 and n.
 Herod 4, 12 n.
- Inscriptions, Sidonian 40 and n. 1
- Jamnia (Jabne), synod of 8
 Jannaeus 4
 Jesus 6 f.
 JHVH 14, 46
 Joseph son of Tobias 12
 Josephus 7, 43 and n. 3
- K^thubim 3—5, 7
- Literature on the effect of Greek influence on *Koh.* 55
Logos 50
Lysias 12
- Maccabees, 4th book of 43
 M^gilloth 3
 Melito, Canon of 8
- Nature 15, 44
 N^b'im 3 f.
 New Testament evidence for the canonicity of *Koh.* 5 n. 1, 6
- Onias 12
 Onkelos, Targum of 43
 Origen 8
- Pantheism 47, 53
 Paul, St 4 n. 4, 5 n. 1
 Pharisees 7, 43 n. 3
 Philo 5
Pneuma 47
 Preacher (*Prediger*) 1
 Ptolemy Evergetes 12
 Pyrrho 51 f.
- Sadducees 7
 Scepticism 50, 52
 Seleucus 12
 Seneca 49
 Sibyl 43
 Siegfried, analysis of the book by 30 f.
 Simon ben Shetach 4
 Solomon 1, 16, 21 f., 53 n. 1
 Spinoza 47
 Stoicism 43—53
- Torah 3 f.
 Tyler's view of *Koh.*'s philosophy 42 f., 53 f.
- Urijah 7 f.
- Wisdom 2, 22 n. 2, 28 f., 50
 Wisdom, Book of 3 f., 21, 37—39, 43
 "Wise man", additions by the 22 f., 30 f.
 Wisdom Literature 2, 22 n. 2, 50
- Xenophanes 45 f., 52
- Zacharias 6
 Zeno 44
 Zeus 47, 52 n.

INDEX OF PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN THE INTRODUCTION

		PAGE			PAGE	
Gen.	ii 22 f., 25	42	Jer.	xxii 15	40	
	iii 8, 12, 17, 20, 21	42		xxvi 23	7	
	iii 19	33 n. 1		Ezek.	xi 21	41
Exod.	ix 15	13 n. 1	Dan.	iii 16	42	
	xxii 27	4	Hos.	xii 9	41 n. 2	
Num.	xiii 2, 16 f.	40	Mat.	viii 21	41	
Deut.	xxiii 11	40 n. 4		xxii 29	6	
Ruth	ii 3	40		xxii 40	6 n.	
1 Sam.	vi 9	40		xxiii 35	6	
2 Sam.	xiii 13	13 n. 1	xxiv 15	6		
	xii 18	41	Lk.	xi 51	6	
	xii 22	51 n.	xxiv 44	6 n.		
1 Kings	xviii 24	41, 54	John	vi 45	6 n.	
Ezra	ii 55, 57	2	x 35	6		
	iv 7	2	xix 36	6		
	ii 8	40	xx 9	6		
Neh.	i 20	42	Acts	vii 42	6 n.	
Est.	i 21	33 n. 1		xiii 40	6 n.	
Job	ix 12	37		xviii 24	6	
	xxviii 28	50		xxvi 22	6 n.	
	xxx 7	41	xxviii 23	6 n.		
Ps.	xxxiii 23	35 n. 3	Rom.	i 2	6	
	viii 6	46	ii 16	5 n. 1		
	lxv 6	41	viii 20	5 n. 1		
	civ 29 f.	48	1 Cor.	i 20—25	27 n.	
Prov.	cxi 10	50	2 Cor.	v 1, 10	5 n. 1	
	cxliv 4	48	Eph.	v 27	5 n. 1	
	i 7	50	2 Tim.	iii 15 f.	6	
	i 20 f.	2	1 Pet.	ii 6	6	
	v 18	32 n. 1	2 Pet.	i 20	6	
	vi 23	4	B. Sir.		34—37	
	vi 26 b	32 n. 1		Wisd.	ii 1—9	38 f.
	vii 6—27	32 n. 1	B'rakoth	ii 1	42	
	viii 1—4	2		vii 2	4	
	xvi 14	32 n. 1		i 3	42	
	xix 10 b	32 n. 1		Sanhedrin	x 1	8
	xxi 17	41		'Eduyoth	v 3	8
	xxvi 27	36 n. 1		Yadaim	iii 5	8
	xxix 3	41		Shabbath	14 a	8
xxx 1	2 n.			30 b	4	
S. of S.	iv 7	5 n. 1		M'gillah	7 a	8
Is.	iv 13	40		Baba Bathra	4 a	4
	ii 2	4				
	xxviii 10	37 n. 3				