

A RE-EVALUATION OF QOHELETH'S LANGUAGE AND ITS
BEARING ON THE DATE OF THE BOOK :
A GRAMMATICAL, LEXICAL, AND
METHODOLOGICAL RECONSIDERATION.

Thesis submitted in accordance with the
requirements of the University of
Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in
Philosophy by Daniel Carl Fredericks.

December 1982

ABSTRACT

A Re-evaluation of Qoheleth's Language and its Bearing on the Date of the Book - Daniel Carl Fredericks - December 1982

The most reliable method to date the book of Qoheleth is to assess its unique language to see where in the history of the ancient Hebrew language it is the most similar. Three main schools of thought have developed around Qoheleth's language: the Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic Influence Theory, the Translation Theory (from an Aramaic original), and the Phoenician-Canaanite Influence Theory. The Introduction tests these theories as presented by certain scholars, pointing out the fallacies in their method and in their quoting of evidence. The result leaves a large question whether any approach so far has dealt with the complexities of Qoheleth's language and style. This study seeks to offer a sound alternate method, and to re-evaluate the language of Qoheleth.

In the second chapter, General Methodological Concerns, it is pointed out that Qoheleth's philosophical genre is unique to BH and should receive careful comparative analysis with differing styles in BH. In addition, the book has 90% of the relevant grammatical features of North Israelite that scholars have extracted previously from BH, along with many characteristics that indicate a pervasive vernacular element in Qoheleth. These considerations play a major role in identifying the language and in comparing the book with other literature.

The third chapter, Grammatical Comparisons, compares Qoheleth with three eras of the Hebrew language: Mishnaic Hebrew, Second Temple Hebrew, and Late Biblical Hebrew. The results from these comparisons show that Qoheleth is very distinct from each, and where a few apparent similarities arise, the better reasons are those apart from the influence of any of these types or eras of the language. These reasons would fall under the categories used to help identify the peculiar properties of Qoheleth's language that were discussed in Chapter Two, i.e. dialectical or stylistic.

In the fourth chapter, Lexical Comparisons, all words alleged at one time or another to contribute to the evidence for a late date for Qoheleth's language are discussed. These are individually handled under "Mishnaisms", "Late Biblical Words", "Aramaisms", "Persianisms", and "Greek Words". Applying specific principles in methodology to each of these categories ends in much reduced lists of these words. These reduced lists have the same number (if not less) than do some incontrovertably early Biblical books.

As a conclusion, this study decides that the grammatical-syntactical structure of Qoheleth is fully in the realm of the pre-exilic language once one studiously respects the complex nature of the book's style and dialectical idiosyncracies. It concludes further that the vocabulary of the book is pre-exilic as a whole. If some of the words that are found only in Imperial Aramaic, and the Persianisms are not tolerable for a pre-exilic book, the possibility of a later editor's lexical influence still maintains the fundamental pre-exilic nature of Qoheleth's grammar and remaining vocabulary. A suggested date for the book on the basis of linguistic evidence alone therefore is that Qoheleth was written as we have it sometime in the eight or seventh century B.C.

Dedicated to those with great patience:

Mari, Autumn, Ryan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	xx
Chapter One - Introduction	
I. General Arguments for a Post-Exilic Date for Qoheleth	1
A. Signs of Greek Philosophical Influence	2
B. Theological Developments	2
C. Historical Allusions	3
D. Relationship to Ecclesiasticus	3
II. Previous Approaches to the Language of Qoheleth	
A. Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic Influence	4
B. Translation Theory	9
C. Canaanite-Phoenician Influence	14
III. Purpose of this Study	22
Chapter Two - General Methodological Concerns	25
I. The Priority of Grammatical Comparisons in a Linguistic Approach to Dating	26
II. The Effect of Genre on Grammatical-Lexical Comparisons	26
III. The Effect of Dialect on Grammatical-Lexical Comparisons	32
A. North Israelite	
1. North Israelite as Described Previous to this Study	32
2. The North Israelite Features in Qoheleth	35
B. A Vernacular Element in Qoheleth?	38
C. Mishnaic Hebrew - Basically a Vernacular	48

Chapter Three - Grammatical Comparisons	52
I. Mishnaic Hebrew and Qoheleth	52
A. Method	54
1. Exclusively MH	54
2. Equally BH and MH	54
3. More Characteristic of MH	54
a. Independent of MH	54
b. Dependent on MH	55
4. More Characteristic of BH	55
5. Neither BH nor MH	55
B. Evidence	56
1. Verbs	56
a. Stems	56
1) Qal: Orthography	56
2) Piel: Orthography	57
3) Pual	57
a) Orthography	57
b) Frequency	58
i) Over-all Frequency	58
ii) Finite Aspects' Frequency	58
4) Po'e1: Frequency	59
5) Po'a1: Frequency	59
6) Hithpo'e1: Frequency	59
7) Pilpel: Frequency	59
8) Hophal: Frequency	60

9) Niphal	60
a) Infinitive with Lamed	60
b) ץ"ע Morphology	61
10) Hithpael	61
a) Frequency	62
b) Passive	62
11) Nithpael	63
b. Aspects	63
1) Perfect	63
a) As a Present Tense	63
b) Waw Consecutive Perfect	64
2) Imperfect	66
a) Expression of Tenses	66
i) Frequentative	66
ii) Present	66
iii) Future	67
b) Cohortative	67
c) Waw Consecutive Imperfect	68
i) The Problem Considered	68
ii) Two Further Literary Considerations	71
aa) Reflection in Qoheleth	71
bb) Logical Progression in Qoheleth	74
iii) Two Suggestions	76
aa) The "Simple Past" Construction	77
bb) Avoiding Ambiguity	84

3) Infinitive	90
a) Infinitive Construct	90
i) Without Prepositional Lamed	90
ii) With Lamed	91
aa) פִּיִן Verbs	91
bb) פִּיִי Verbs	91
iii) Used Substantively	92
iv) With Beth	93
b) Infinitive Absolute	94
i) As Finite Verb	94
ii) As an Imperative	95
iii) As an Emphatic Cognate with the Finite Verb	95
4) Participle	96
a) Plus הִיָּה	96
b) As a Present Tense	97
c) With Pronominal Subject, and Related Forms	100
i) Participle with Pronominal Subject	100
ii) Verbal Adjectives with Pronominal Subject	102
iii) Participle with Pronominal Subject and אֵינוֹ	104
d) Semi-Conditional Clause	105
e) Orthography - Masculine Plural	105
c. Other Verbal Comparisons	105
1) Concord - Gender of Subjects and Verb	105
2) Interchange of לִיָּה and לִיָּה Forms	106
3) Verbal Nouns	108

2. Nouns	109
a. Morphology	109
1) Duplication	109
2) Mutual Substitution of Masculine and Feminine Nouns	109
3) Plural Termination	111
b. Genitive Expression	112
1) של	112
2) ל	112
3) Anticipatory Suffix	113
3. Pronouns	113
a. Personal	113
1) אני	113
2) Copular Third Person	113
3) הן - הנה	115
4) המה	116
b. Demonstrative	116
1) זה	116
2) זה: Without Article	117
3) אלה	118
c. Reflexive	118
1) Preposition and Suffix	118
2) עצם and Suffix	118
3) נפש and Suffix	119

d. Relative Pronoun	119
1) את אשר	119
2) ש' - Relative	120
a) Frequency	120
b) Compounded	121
e. Interrogative as the Indefinite Pronoun	122
4. Preposition: The Frequency of אל	124
C. Summary	125
1. Exclusively MH	125
2. Equally BH and MH	126
3. More Characteristic of MH	126
a. Independent of MH	126
b. Dependent on MH	127
4. More Characteristic of BH	128
5. Neither BH nor MH	128
II. Second Temple Hebrew and Qoheleth	130
A. Ben Sira	131
1. Whitley's Grammatical Comparisons	
a. Parallel Phrases	131
1) Qoh 3:21 : BS 40:11	131
2) Qoh 8:4 : Dn 4:32	133
3) Qoh 8:1 : BS 13:24	134

b. Waw Consecutive Constructions	134
c. ׀ - Relative	135
2. Further Grammatical Comparisons between Qoh and BS	136
a. Morphology	136
1) Mutual Substitution of Masculine and Feminine Nouns	136
2) Mutual Substitution of Singular and Plural Nouns	137
3) Verbal Nouns	138
b. Infinitive Construct with Preposition : פ"י Verbs	139
c. Preposition - Lamed as Accusative	139
B. Copper Scroll and the Hebrew Bar Kosiba Letters	139
1. Verbs	139
a. Infinitive Construct with Preposition	139
b. Participle	140
1) As Present Tense	140
2) Masculine Plural Orthography	140
c. Verbal Nouns	141
2. Nouns	141
a. Genitive - לׁ	141
b. Masculine Plural Orthography	142
3. Pronoun: ׀ - Relative	142
4. Preposition: ל for לֵ	142

C. Qumran Sectarian Scrolls	143
1. General	144
2. Verb Stems	145
a. Qal	145
b. Pual	146
3. Personal Pronouns	146
a. Independent	146
b. Suffixed	147
D. Summary	147
1. Ben Sira	147
2. Copper Scroll and Hebrew Bar Kosiba Letters	148
3. Qumran Sectarian Scrolls	148
III. Late Biblical Hebrew and Qoheleth	150
A. Method	150
1. Exclusively LBH	150
2. Equally EBH and LBH	152
3. More Characteristic of LBH	152
a. Independent of LBH	153
b. Dependent on LBH	153
4. More Characteristic of EBH	153
5. Neither EBH nor LBH	154

B. Evidence	154
1. Verbs	154
a. Imperfect	154
1) Waw Consecutive	154
2) Cohortative	156
b. Infinitive	156
1) Infinitive Construct	156
a) With Prepositional Lamed	156
b) With Beth	157
c) Consecutive	158
2) Infinitive Absolute	159
a) As a Finite Verb	159
i) With Conjunctive Waw	159
ii) With Nominative Independent Pronoun	160
b) As an Imperative	162
c) As an Emphatic Cognate of the Finite Verb	162
c. Participle as a Present Tense	163
d. Interchange of ל"א and ל"ה Forms	163
2. Nouns	164
a. Morphology: -ôn and -ûth Forms	164
b. Plurality	168
1) Quivis, or, Singular-Plural Combination	168
2) Conjunctive Waw Patterns	168
3) Numbered Substantives	169
c. Definiteness: Non-assimilated Article	170
d. Nominative with -תא	171

3. Pronouns	172
a. Personal	172
1) אני	172
2) Anticipatory Genitive Suffix	178
b. Demonstrative: Feminine Singular	178
c. Relative	179
1) Subordinating an Entire Clause	179
2) שׁ: Frequency	181
d. Pronoun with את-	183
4. Prepositions	186
a. ב with Relative Pronoun	186
b. ל	187
1) As Sign of the Accusative	187
2) With עד	188
c. על	189
1) For Directional לְ	189
2) In Phrases Denoting a State of Being	191
d. Compounded Prepositions	192
5. Phonology.- שׁ for ב	193
C. Summary	194
1. Exclusively LBH	194
2. Equally EBH and LBH	195
3. More Characteristic of LBH	196
a. Independent from LBH	196
b. Dependent on LBH	197

4. More Characteristic of EBH	197
a. Independent from EBH	198
b. Perhaps Dependent on EBH	198
1) Negative Evidence	198
2) Positive Evidence	199
a) Esther-Nehemiah as Well	199
b) Exclusively EBH	200
5. Neither EBH nor LBH	200
Chapter Four - Lexical Comparisons	201
I. Mishnaisms	201
A. Method	201
1. Mhe ¹ and Mhe ²	202
2. Equally BH	202
3. Homonymous to MH	203
4. BH Cognates Exist	203
5. Semitic Cognates Exist	204
6. Identical Forms	204
7. Frequency in MH	205
8. "Mishnaisms"	205
9. Number of "Mishnaisms"	206

B. Evidence		208
1. אבד	-	208
2. אביונה	-	209
3. אי	-	209
4. אי זה	-	210
5. אלו	-	211
6. בור	-	211
7. בטחון	-	212
8. בטל	-	213
9. בית עולם	-	213
10. הוה	-	214
11. חוץ מן	-	215
12. חסרון	-	216
13. חפץ	-	217
14. לאש	-	217
15. לגעת	-	218
16. ללד	-	218
17. לותר	-	219
18. לפה	-	219
19. לצא	-	220
20. כבר	-	220
21. כשר	-	220
22. לזה	-	221
23. מלאה	-	222
24. מראה	-	223
25. משך	-	223

26.	מתנה	-	224
27.	נהג	-	225
28.	נחת	-	225
29.	סכן	-	226
30.	עדנה : עדן	-	227
31.	עלם	-	228
32.	ראית	-	229
33.	שמאל	-	229
34.	שחרות	-	229
35.	שכח	-	230
36.	שפלות	-	230
C. Summary			231
II. Late Biblical Hebrew Words			232
A. Method			232
1.	Equally EBH		232
2.	EBH Cognates Exist		232
3.	Semitic Cognates Exist		232
4.	Identical Forms		232
5.	Frequency in LBH		233
6.	"Late Words"		233
7.	Number of "Late Words"		233

B. Evidence			235
1.	אלו	-	235
2.	אספה	-	236
3.	זוע	-	237
4.	זמן	-	237
5.	חשבון	-	237
6.	יותר	-	238
7.	ילדות	-	239
8.	כאחד	-	239
9.	כנס	-	239
10.	כשר	-	240
11.	מלאך	-	240
12.	מלכות	-	241
13.	מלפני	-	242
14.	מעטים	-	242
15.	מרפא	-	243
16.	נגע אל	-	245
17.	נטע	-	246
18.	סוף	-	246
19.	על דברת	-	247
20.	עמל	-	247
21.	עשה לחם	-	248
22.	קהלת	-	249
23.	תקף	-	249
C. Summary			250

III. Aramaisms		251	
A. Method		251	
1. General Concerns		251	
a. Genre		251	
1) Wisdom Literature		251	
2) Poetry		252	
b. Dialect		253	
2. Specific Concerns		256	
a. Vocalization		256	
b. Homonymous to Aramaic		258	
c. Biblical Hebrew Cognates		258	
d. Semitic Cognates		259	
e. Internal Hebrew Development		260	
f. Hebraisms		261	
g. Circular Argument		263	
h. Pre-Exilic Aramaisms		263	
i. Aramaism		264	
j. Number of Aramaisms		264	
B. Evidence		265	
1.	אלו	-	265
2.	אריה	-	265
3.	בהל	-	266
4.	בטל	-	267
5.	בכך	-	268
6.	בשל אשר	-	269

7.	גומץ	-	270
8.	דרבונות	-	272
9.	הבל	-	272
10.	הוא	-	273
11.	הוללות	-	274
12.	זמן	-	275
13.	חוץ מן	-	276
14.	חור	-	276
15.	חוש	-	277
16.	חפץ	-	278
17.	יקר	-	279
18.	יתרון	-	280
19.	כאחד	-	280
20.	כבר	-	281
21.	כל עמת שׁי	-	282
22.	כשר	-	283
23.	כשרון	-	283
24.	מדינה	-	284
25.	מדע	-	285
26.	מותר	-	286
27.	מכך	-	286
28.	מלך	-	287
29.	מסכן	-	287
30.	משלחת	-	288
31.	נכסים	-	288
32.	סוף	-	289

33.	סכך	-	290
34.	עבד	-	290
35.	על דברת נְשִׁי	-	291
36.	ענה	-	292
37.	ענין	-	293
38.	פֶּשֶׁר	-	294
39.	קרב	-	294
40.	רעות	-	295
41.	רעיון	-	296
42.	שִׁבַּח	-	297
43.	שֵׁהם	-	297
44.	שוק	-	298
45.	שִׁלַּט	-	298
46.	שִׁלְטוֹן	-	300
47.	שִׁלִּיט	-	300
48.	תקו	-	301
49.	תקף	-	301
C. Summary			302
IV. Persianisms			303
A. Method			303
B. Evidence			306
1.	פרדס	-	306
2.	פתגם	-	307
C. Summary			307

V. Greek Words and Phrases	307
A. Method	308
B. Evidence	308
1. טוב אשר יפה	- 308
2. טוב לפני אלהים	- 308
3. לעשות טוב	- 309
4. עשה	- 310
5. תור	- 310
6. תחת השמש	- 311
C. Summary	311
 Chapter Five - Conclusion	 312
I. Introduction	312
II. General Methodological Concerns	312
III. Grammatical Comparisons	315
A. Mishnaic Hebrew	315
B. Second Temple Hebrew	316
C. Late Biblical Hebrew	317
IV. Lexical Comparisons	318
A. Mishnaisms	318
B. Late Biblical Hebrew Words	319
C. Aramaisms	319
D. Persianisms	322
E. Greek Words	322
V. A Preliminary Conclusion	322

VI. Some Objections Answered	324
VII. One Final Consideration	327
VIII. The Result of This Study	329
Abbreviations	331
Bibliography: Literature Cited in this Study	333

PREFACE

Various modes of assistance have been fundamental to the completion of this dissertation. I sincerely thank you, Alan R. Millard, for the impact you have made on my approach for searching for truth, for the example and instruction which will certainly extend beyond the period spent on this present task. Thank you also for your hospitality and personal concern in the whole of my life.

Thank you Thomas L. Warner and Robert D. Schultz for your generous roles in my employment during the preparation and completion of this paper.

Tyndale House Fellowship, you too are well appreciated for your financial assistance, given in an exceptional situation.

Most importantly, thank you Mari, for your patience and unremitting love and encouragement as my wife, especially exemplified by your attitude and actions during the length of this study.

Two notes are appropriate at this point. First, all documentation will be elaborated in the bibliography, with adequate reference made in the footnotes or in parentheses in the body of the work. Second, references made to the Pentateuch generally carry the tags of the documentary hypothesis

(J,E,D,P); this has no bearing on whether this student supports such divisions, they are included for those who find them helpful for dating comparative texts.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally the statement of Qoh 1:1, "The words of Qoheleth, son of David, King in Jerusalem", has pointed to Solomonic authorship of Qoh for both Jewish and Christian faiths. Consequently, the date of composition for the book fell in the mid-tenth century B.C.¹ Although some early rabbis questioned the canonicity of the book, they did not doubt that Solomon was its author (Shabbath 30b; Megillah 7a). Beginning with Luther's doubts however, the momentum increased through subsequent centuries in the denial of Solomon's hand in the book.²

Today the majority of scholars and commentators of all schools of thought consider the book to have been written during the Second Temple Period, the dates ranging from the fourth to the second centuries B.C.

I. General Arguments for a Post-Exilic Date

The most prominent arguments in favour of a date in the post-exilic period are easy to summarize. Primarily six commentators are used in the following summary since:

- They sufficiently show their individual mixtures of these arguments;

¹ Solomon's dates vary slightly: J. Bright (211) c. 961-922; M. Noth/1960:225 c. 965-926/5; J. B. Payne (111) 970-930.

² See Barton (18-31) for an outline of this development.

- Delitzsch, Barton, and Gordis represent the most thorough works and provide a Christian and Jewish perspective;
- Lys (1977), Lauha (1978) and Whitley (1978) are the most recent.

A. Signs of Greek Philosophical¹ Influence

Arguments for the presence of Greek influence in the thought of Qoh were developed by a number of commentators in the last half of the nineteenth century: Graetz (1871), Tyler (1874), Plumtre (1881), Wildeboer (1898) and Siegfried (1898). Volumes devoted solely to delineating Greek influence were written by Ranston (1925) and Braun (1973). Recently Gordis (1968:63f) and Whitley (165f) support the Greek influence theory. Opposing views have been voiced by others including Delitzsch (210) who believed that Qoh "shows not a trace of Greek influence", and by Barton (34), Lauha (11), Albright (1957:352), and Loretz (56).

B. Theological Developments

Barton (49) believed Qoh had outgrown the older faith of Israel in that it never uses יהוה in speaking of God, only אלהים. Whitley (135f) likewise believes this preference indicates a Hellenistic influence. Gordis (1968:63) thinks the book reflects the climax of Wisdom Literature's develop-

¹ Greek lexical influence is discussed later, p . 307ff.

ment to an "emphasis upon the individual and his destiny," found in post-exilic Israel.

C. Historical Allusions

Delitzsch (214f) felt the book presupposed the political situation of the Persian era, Qoh 4:13-16 specifically dealing with Cyrus, and 6:3 with Artaxerxes II. Barton (61f) on the other hand saw 4:13-16 as indicative of Ptolemy IV. Gordis (1968:69) differs from these views, denying there are any specific references in 4:13-16 to historical figures, but sees Qoh generally testifying to a post-Alexandrian (but pre-Maccabean) age, when there ruled "a powerful and despotic ruler, whose whims must be obeyed without the illusory hope of change for the better." However, the most recent commentators dispose of such evidences:

Lys (59) "Les exemples historiques sont stéréotypés."

Lauha (3) "Auf Grund dieser Aussagen ist es unmöglich, sichere Schlüsse auf die Entstehungszeit des Buches zu ziehen."

Whitley (134) "The tenor of such passages is thus too general to enable us to identify particular persons in them."

D. Relationship to Ecclesiasticus

Contrary to the common opinion, Whitley (122ff) holds that Qoh is dependent upon Ecclesiasticus and thus arrives at a mid-second century B.C. date for the book. His evidence is primarily linguistic and is dealt with

specifically in this study (see p.131ff). Barton (60) and Gordis (1968:46ff) represent the majority view however, placing Qoh prior to Ben Sira, c. 180 B.C.

None of these arguments for a post-exilic date can claim to be conclusive, and as mentioned, all face counter-arguments.

Far more weight rests upon the linguistic phenomena, which give the principal arguments in favour of a post-exilic date of the book. Although they may find very different expressions, the consensus is that the language of Qoh stands very late indeed in the history of BH.

II. Previous Approaches to the Language of Qoheleth

A. Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic Influence

Previous analysts of Qoh's language have held that significant similarities exist between it and Mishnaic Hebrew (MH), the language having passed the stage of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) and approaching the linguistic structure of the Mishnaic literature. Delitzsch (197) boldly claimed that Qoh

"...is connected, yet loosely, with the old language, but at the same time it is in full accord with that new Hebrew we meet in the Mishna..."

More guarded statements come from Gordis (1968:59) and

Whitley (141,144) respectively -

"The language and style of Koheleth represent the latest stage in the development of Hebrew to be found in the Bible and the closest approximation to MH."

"...Mishnaisms in Koheleth...[suggest] that it was composed in a period when the Mishnaic tongue was beginning to be widely used...it still retains too many of the characteristics of biblical Hebrew to suggest that it was composed in a period which was likely to be predominantly Mishnaic."

The standard presentation of this view is still F. Delitzsch, given in his commentary published in 1875. Over a century ago he crystallized the grammatical and lexical evidence (Mishnaisms and Aramaisms) that many have cited as the basic argument for Qoh's late date. He (190ff) listed 95 words or phrases that are either *hapax legomena*, or words and forms that belong to "a more recent period of the language."¹ Delitzsch' general approach is varied little in the commentaries of Barton and Gordis; though of course they are not identical with Delitzsch, they follow his lead in the linguistic realm. The difference in these commentators' date of Qoh's composition depends on other than linguistic reasons: i.e. Delitzsch, mid-fourth century; Barton, early second century; Gordis, mid-third.

The recent work by C. F. Whitley, Koheleth: his language and thought (1978), takes a more extreme view along the same lines, placing Qoh *after* Ben Sira and c. 152 B.C. He claims that along with other evidence, the *language* of the book demands such a date. Since the book is the most recent attempt at "a fresh examination

1. It should be noted that no less than 23 words are listed because of their rarity rather than lateness:

אדם	גבר	טחנה	סבל	עמד	שכלות
אזן	חיל	מסמר	סבל	עצלתים	שמם
בד	חלה	מקרה	סכל	קלקל	שתי
בחורות	חתחת	מרוץ	עות	רדף	

of the language of the book" (3), we subject it to a short critique at this point. As will be apparent, errors of both factual and methodological nature punctuate the work.

1. Factual errors can be of an incidental sort, where the bearing is insignificant. If any error is found in this study, it is hoped it will be of this sort. Yet factual error in important premises of an argument can weaken the conclusion. The following are evident in Whitley's study:

- a. Whitley (1) fails to recognize that numerous waw consecutive perfects occur in Qoh, and consequently errs in stating, "the Waw Consecutive occurs but three times..." alluding only to the waw consecutive imperfects. Elsewhere (129) he claims that "the perfect with waw consecutive is not found at all in Koheleth."¹ This error is important, since the number of waw consecutive constructions has been a significant basis for comparing Qoh with MH.
- b. In order to show Qoh to be later than Ben Sira, Whitley compares the former's 67 uses of the ψ -relative with Ben Sira, where, according to Whitley (129) it "does not occur." But it does occur there 15-20 times (Milik 1962:226).

¹ This is a misstatement that occurs often e.g. Blake 75; DeVries 1965:76; Dahood 1958:305. This error appears to arise from inadequate acquaintance with the text. B. Johnson (90) for example does recognize the form. See p.68ff for a full discussion.

- c. In trying to demonstrate a similarity between Qoh's morphology and MH, he says (97) the nominal duplicating pattern such as nnnn (Qoh 12:5), is found more often in MH. He refers to Segal's grammar p. 112, but the list there is smaller than the BH instances (see p. 109 in this study).
2. Methodological errors of significance also severely weaken Whitley's conclusions. For one interested in dating Qoh on a linguistic basis, his approach is inadequate. Frequently, when trying to prove that a linguistic feature in Qoh is late, he cites only LBH or MH evidence when earlier Hebrew examples could have been cited as well. Five examples demonstrate this erroneous approach:
- a. He (51) draws upon the MH use of the niphal for a "middle" voice to show a possible similarity with Qoh's use of the niphal in 5:8: נַעֲבֹד may have the meaning 'is served, benefits.' " However the link with MH here is not compelling, for the niphal is used as a "middle" voice in BH also (GK s. 51c; Williams s. 136).
- b. The preposition עַל is used in Qoh 2:17 (רַע עָלַי) to indicate a state of being, i.e., "grievous to me." Whitley (26) notes that it is used in the same way in BH (Dn 6:15), LBH (I Chr 13:2), and MH (Ab 2:10). But he disregarded the equivalent uses in EBH listed by BDB 753b (Ex 5:9J; 2 Sm 15:33; Is 1:14; see p. 191f of this study).

- c. By referring to the Aramaic use of ל where BH might use אָל, he (128) wishes to show that Qoh's use of ל in 3:21 (לארץ) is from a later time than Ben Sira 40:11 which uses אַל ארץ. Similarly he hopes to demonstrate Qoh to be close to the time of Daniel's composition by citing Qoh's use of ל instead of אַל in 8:4, יאמר לו. The fallacy here is that ל is used with both ארץ (Am 3:14, Is 14:12, 21:9, 25:12, 28:2) and אַמר (Gn 41:55E; Ex 3:14E, 2 Sm 7:8) in parallel pre-exilic texts.
- d. He (138) compares Qoh exclusively with MH in the combination of independent pronoun subjects with participles, and with these constructions further combined with אֵינוּ. However BH precedent for these constructions is extensive and negates such an exclusive association with MH (see p.100f,104).
- e. He (80) draws attention to the phraseology of Qoh 9:5, וְהַמְתִּים אֵינָם יֹדְעִים, where the pronominal suffix on אֵינוּ resumes the subject. This may be "characteristic of MH", but it is also found in BH, where a resumption of the *casus pendens* is acceptable BH grammar (S. R. Driver 1892:s. 197:[2])

Criticism can be levelled also at Whitley's citation of Talmudic evidence for alleged affinities in vocabulary between Qoh and MH (e.g. pp. 59f, 84, 90, 100). Kutscher (1967:162) had already explained the insignificance of these repetitions in the

Talmud (mhe²). He argued that such parallels with BH probably indicate BH influence on the language of the Talmud, written as it was by men steeped in the Bible. No case can be made for a late dating of words in BH that otherwise occur only in rabbinic literature on the basis of that distribution (see p. 202).

The value of Whitley's volume does not lie in his conclusions, or his method of argument, but instead in his accurate comparisons and contrasts of the competing views of the most important and recent students of Qoh's language, particularly when dealing with individual texts, phrases and words. This provides a helpful resource, condensing the widespread literature on a given linguistic topic into a manageable and intelligible paragraph.

B. "Translation" Theory

F. C. Burkitt sowed the seeds for an altogether different view of Qoh's language in his article of 1922, "Is Ecclesiastes a Translation?". As the title suggests, he felt that an Aramaic original was behind Qoh and that the Hebrew we have now in all its "baldness" (23) and "crabbed and unnatural lingo" (26)¹ could be ascribed only to some translator's attempt at a Hebrew rendering. Not until 23 years had passed did the idea germinate, producing a distinctive school of thought. Its most notable representatives are:

¹ Subjective literary criticism of this sort, is as Gordis (1946: 69) describes it, "completely unscientific and would best be abandoned altogether." See a brief comparison of opinions on Qoh's quality of language in Rankin (13).

Zimmermann (1945/46; 1949; 1973:98-122; 1975:5), Torrey (1948), and Ginsberg (1950:16-39; 1952:59-62). Three main reasons are given for this theory:

1. A high density of alleged Aramaisms.
2. Unexpected absence or presence of the definite article.
3. Supposed improvements in the text obtained by restoring "obscure" passages to the "original" Aramaic.

These three arguments are overstated however:

- #1. As we shall see later in this study, careful analysis of Qoh's vocabulary guided by strict methodological procedure, may significantly reduce the number of possible Aramaisms in Qoh.
- #2. The absence or presence of the article, in a number of instances where many would prefer to see the opposite, has been attributed to a translator. When dealing with a noun terminated by alef, he is supposed to have rendered it inaccurately definite or indefinite since these categories had lost their specific functions in later Aramaic dialects. But it is instructive to note that until Zimmermann's 1945/46 article, commentators had little problem with Qoh's use of the article, apart from its absence with אֵלֶף in 3:15 and 7:7. This is because the instances cited by Zimmermann do not contradict acceptable grammatical principles about the definite article in BH.¹

¹ Gordis (1946:81ff; 1968:60, 218) and Whitley (109f) have commented on this topic, only in comparing Qoh and MH. They fail to supply BH parallels as well however.

No grammatical or exegetical necessity exists for Zimmermann's alleged "inexact" translations. All of his examples are covered in the following summary.

- a. Poetic Examples - In addition to not being grammatically or exegetically necessary in 12:4, 6, 11:3, the absence or presence of the article in poetry "probably often rests on rhythmical grounds" (GKs.126). This is the case apparently in 12:4 and 12:6 where an article attached to דלתים or כד respectively would have added an extra syllable in the very phrase that was *already* the longest, resulting in an imbalance; i.e. 12:4-its four phrases have a syllable sequence of 10-8-8-9; 12:6-its four phrases have 8-8-10-9. The proverb in 11:3 is an 8-9 sequence. Zimmermann's opinion that the article should be present in these phrases, is rhythmically unsound since in each case the phrase involved was already slightly imbalanced.
- b. General Truths - Hebrew statements of a universal truth may articulate their nouns when ordinary statements would not (GK s. 126m, n). Since Qoh is basically made up of conclusions drawn from life's experiences, one would expect some applications of this grammatical principle. After Gordis (1946:82) objected to some of Zimmermann's examples on these grounds, the latter was forced to concede at one point (1949:99) that Gordis'

objection was sound (5:18, האדם). The same objection is just as applicable to the presence of the article in 10:19, הכסף.

- c. Parallel Words - GK s: 126K 2, notices that "sometimes the article is used with only one of two parallel words." Hence it should not be surprising to see examples of this in Qoh where parallel constructions abound. So 7:25 has such a combination in

לדעת רשע כסל והסכלות הוללות

Other instances where this principle is not honored by Zimmermann are in 3:17 (חפץ, המעשה), 10:20 (דבר, הקול), 12:1 (שנים, ימי הרעה).

- d. כל with את - Since כל has an implicit definiteness i.e. "entirety" GK s. 117c notes that it is unnecessary to articulate it after את. Other examples appear in Gn 1:21P, 8:21J. Zimmermann however cites three instances of this situation in Qoh (4:4, 8:9, 12:14) as examples of "when it should be present" (1949:98). His error is multiplied by citing 8:9 (את-כל-זה) where the demonstrative pronoun is determinate in itself and thus כל need not be articulated (A. M. Wilson 212).
- e. Remaining Cases - Evidence contrary to Zimmermann's hypothesis lies within his own examples. He suggests that since in the 4:9-12 section the שנים-אחד pair is articulated in 4:9, 12 and אחד itself in 4:10, the *indefinite* pair in 4:11 constitutes an error in

translation. It seems reasonable that this inconsistency would not have occurred if a translator was involved since he could well have striven to depend on the surrounding examples for his model and so rendered all of them the same.

שמע is indefinite 30 times in BH, so its indefinite state in 6:5 is understandable.

Other equally weak examples are given in 2:8 (המדִינֹת), 8:1 (כהחכם), 6:3 (הטובה), 9:3 (רע), 9:9 (אשה), 10:5 (השליט).

Qoh presents a comprehensive picture of the way the article may be used, included or omitted. Although not all of the principles illustrated above are given in elementary Hebrew grammars, they are points recognized and accepted by the reference works (GK etc.) They render Zimmermann's argument void.

- #3. The improvements in the text that Zimmermann, Torrey and Ginsberg suggest can be gained by postulating an Aramaic original to the difficult passages in Qoh have all been adequately refuted by Gordis (1946:70-81; 1949:107-112; 1952:95-106; 1968:ad loc) and Whitley (ad loc; 107f). The suggestions are not substantial improvements on the Hebrew, and are often subjective in expressing an exegetical preference, rather than a proof of a mistranslation.

C. Canaanite-Phoenician Influence

In 1952¹ Dahood offered another suggestion for the unique character of Qoh's language, "The book of Ecclesiastes was originally composed by an author who wrote in Hebrew but who employed Phoenician orthography [defective], and whose composition shows heavy Canaanite-Phoenician literary influence" (1952:32). Once again Gordis (1955) defended the Hebraic essence of Qoh, arguing that since no accurate history of Hebrew's movement from defective to plene orthography can be traced, it is futile to ascribe a supposed defective text to a Phoenician influence for it could well have been an acceptable Hebrew mode of spelling as well, at the time of composition.

In further support of Canaanite-Phoenician influence on Qoh, Dahood has listed grammatical and lexical similarities between the language of the book and the languages of Phoenician and Ugaritic. However as Whitley (114) responds, "considering adequate parallels may be cited from the Old Testament, this is doubtful methodology."²

A brief analysis of Dahood's basic argument now follows. The evidence of his 1952 article is assessed here as a representation of his complete argument which changed little in form or quality through subsequent defenses.

1 Main articles in defense of this thesis appeared subsequently: 1958; 1962; 1965; 1966; 1968; 1971; 1972.

2 An apt objection for Whitley's own study, which frequently ignores BH and EBH evidence.

1. He (43) "hazards a plausible suggestion" which "must necessarily be most tentative" that when Qoh uses the masculine pronoun הֵם for the feminine הֵן in five cases, it is similar to Phoenician. Evidence so qualified by its proponent makes a weak impression. For a different explanation as a Hebrew vernacular characteristic, see pp. 42f, 115f.
2. He contends (45) that the phrase -ש מה in Qoh is identical to Phoenician שא , and thus supportive of his theory. Yet the phrase is equally parallel to BH where the interrogative pronouns are used as indefinite pronouns with the relative. The use of the ש -relative itself (44) is indicative of North Israelite and says nothing of Phoenician influence, see p. 122ff.
3. He presents (46) מְשַׁלְחָה as a pattern of noun paralleled only in Phoenician. Gordis (1955:109) responds by listing 7 other roots patterned this way in BH (see p. 288). Dahood also implies Phoenician influence on Qoh's use of the tau-terminated words מתה and נתה even though they are found in BH elsewhere (1 Kg 13:7, Pr 25:14, Ezk 46:5, 11, and, Jb 17:16, 36:16, Pr 29:9, Is 30:15, 30 respectively).
4. He reasons (47) that the tau terminations of דברת and even עמת are signs of Phoenician, despite the latter's use nearly 30 times in BH.
5. In a helpful vein, Dahood (49) sees the infinitive absolute with a pronominal subject in Qoh 4:2 and Est 9:1

as paralleled only in non-Hebraic languages, particularly the Karatepe inscription (also Amarna, Moran 1950:169ff). This may indicate some northern influence on the language (see p. 35). However his employment of the rest of the infinitive absolutes (plus two he invents: כְּתוּב 12:10 and מִלֵּט 9:15) to support his theory is unacceptable. These uses of the infinitive absolutes in Qoh are all found to be good BH (see pp. 94ff,159ff).

6. The "periphrastic future" he admits (51) to being accepted BH. Why he includes it in his study is curious. The same mystery lies in his citing על as a comparative preposition (191) which he admits is good BH grammar.
7. Typical of Dahood, much of his argument depends on his preference for one English translation of the prepositions over another. Thus he prefers (191) to translate prepositional beth as "from" at 5:14, and 6:4 (1972:20), 10:16 and 11:6 (1966:265, 281) rather than "in" or "into." However this is only an exegetical or translational preference and does not qualify as supportive evidence, since the regular BH meanings suffice. He also associates the causal nuance of beth in 7:15 בצדק with Phoenician and Aramaic inscriptions, which is interesting but does not buttress his theory since BDB already lists such a function for beth (90).

Emphatic lamed is seen by Dahood (192) in Qoh 3:17, 9:4 and 10:3. Though the case in 9:4 is commonly agreed

to be emphatic, the other two are not at all certain. Besides, this function of the lamed is not distinctive to Qoh, but many times elsewhere in BH (Watson 200). In a later article (1962:349f) he believes lamed to mean "from" as in Ugaritic, an opinion that is not superior to taking the lamed in the common BH function of introducing the infinitive.

8. He (194) also discovers the enclitic mem in 10:15 כסילים , 10:18 בעצלתים, and later in 4:6 חפנים (1962:355). But as Gordis (1955:110) explains, this is an authentic Hebrew trait (Hummel 1957). Furthermore, none of these are certain cases of this mem termination, and the latter two are attempts to rectify the dual forms that Dahood says cannot exist because they do not anywhere else. Certainly the Hebrew language deserves more respect than this reductionist approach would offer.

9. There is no need for Dahood (195) to look to Phoenician for the use of the interrogatives as indefinites. The practice is frequent in BH as he concedes (see p.122ff). The same is true for his association of the following BH grammatical traits with Phoenician:

- Omission of the relative pronoun (196: see Gordis 1955: 112).
- Relative clause with copular pronoun (196f; GK s. 141 g,h):
- Nominal sentence with pronoun (197; see p.113ff in this study).

- Erratic use of the article (197ff; see p. 10ff in this study.
10. Three suggestions of Dahood's are not so much evidence of Phoenician influence as they are of North Israelite, and will be discussed in this present study at various locations:
 - זָה for זֹאת (44)
 - שׁ for אֲשֶׁר (44)
 - Unassimilated article following inseparable particles (45f)
 11. He (48) gives a useful etymology of עֲדֹנָה 4:2, and עֲדֹן 4:3, but errs in seeing only the Ugaritic cognate of עֲדֹן (see p. 227 in this study). It is probably *gemeinsemitisch*.
 - Other lexical associations between Qoh and Phoenician are even less compelling -
 12. אִם אֵם in Qoh 8:17 ("even though") is not dependent on Phoenician אִם אֵם, as Dahood contends (48), since as Gordis instructs (1955:109f) the BH parallel אִם אֵם is an adequate source, if one is needed.
 13. The appearance of אֵלֵי in Qoh 6:6 is not as much an indication of Phoenician influence (49) as much as it is of Aramaic influence on both Phoenician and Hebrew (see p.265 in this study).
 14. Dahood suggests (195) that לֵמָּה (Qoh 5:5, 7:16-17) not be considered the interrogative "why", rather the counterpart to Phoenician לֵם, "lest." However, as he concedes, "no

semantic difference results", and his preference is based on a very subjective element of style.

15. Qoh's preference for אדם over איש (202) is due to the book's genre (see p. 25).
16. תחת השמש, used 27 times in Qoh owes nothing to Phoenician (203); it parallels BH תחת השמים of Ex 17:14, Dt 7:24 etc. (see p.311).
17. רעות, despite its occurrence in Phoenician, is probably Aramaic and shows that Aramaisms may occur in both Phoenician and Hebrew, but does not prove Phoenician influence on Hebrew (see p. 295).
18. Many of Dahood's vocabulary parallels with Phoenician and Ugaritic (p. 202ff) have BH precedent and are not any indication of Phoenician-Canaanite influence, i.e.
 - על כל אשר היה לפני - Qoh 1:16 and similarly I Chr 29:25
 - כעס - 1:18 etc.
 - אצל - 2:10
 - כסיל - 2:15
 - שליט - 2:19 (see p. 300)
 - שם - 7:1; this word does not have the *connotation* "good name", the text is explicitly טוב שם.
 - ארך רוח - 7:8; paralleled by קצר רוח in Ex 6:9
 - לחש - 10:11
 - בעל הכנפים - 10:20
 - לשמרנה... לשבעה - 11:2
 - ביום - 12:3

טחן - 12:3

שוק - 12:4 (see p. 298)

גלת הזהב - 12:6

כד - 12:6

גלגל - 12:6

19. Words and phrases that are adequate as they stand are changed unnecessarily in their vowels and consonants by Dahood to strengthen an association with Phoenician or Ugaritic, i.e.

אז יותר 2:15

אשר הוא 6:10

מלחמה 8:8

להג 12:12

20. Some words are probably *gemeinsemitisch* and need not be aligned exclusively with Phoenician or Ugaritic, i.e.

כשר 2:21 (see pp. 220,240,283)

מסכן 4:13 (see p. 287)

בית עולמו 12:5 (see p. 213)

21. Other words have more than one possible meaning in BH, some of which have been actually debated. Some variations of these are equally intelligible if not better than Dahood's suggestions. These then are matters of exegetical preference and so not demonstrative of Canaanite-Phoenician influence, i.e.

עלם 3:11 (see p. 228)

מלאך 5:5 (see p. 240)

תשומם 7:16

אשה 9:9

תפר 12:5

22. In one case Dahood compares a Hebrew phrase with a

picture in Cyprus i.e. הראות בארבות.

23. In a few cases he has found parallels in Ugaritic, for which no Hebrew parallels exist, i.e.

שמן. רוקח 10:1

ימך... ידלף 10:18

בנות... השיר 12:4

But Whitley has correctly assessed this type of parallel in respect to Qoh,

"Nor would it be surprising that Koheleth should be acquainted with Ugaritic material. His work reflects an awareness of ancient Near Eastern thought as a whole, and as a native of Jerusalem he would hardly be indifferent to the cultural remains of relatively neighboring, though ancient Ugarit. Indeed it would be unscientific exegesis as well as unfair to the curiosity and initiative of this engaging Hebrew figure if we were to deny him an acquaintance with the traditions of a remarkable Canaanite culture."¹

24. Finally, Dahood claims that a substantial number of "commercial" words appear in Qoh that show the book was written in a "commercializing Phoenician culture". He lists 29

¹ Koheleth and Ugaritic Parallels UF 11 (1979) 824. This quote alone is not from Whitley's commentary (1978). All other references to Whitley in this study are to his commentary.

of these words, but includes words that give no such indication, e.g. מעט, רעה, און. Kroeber (46) objects, the list "ist allerdings nicht überzeugend, da fast die Hälfte diese Wörter nicht spezifisch kaufmännisch ist sondern dem allgemeinen Wortgut zugerechnet werden kann." Kroeber (42) speaks of the other half of the words also,

"Auffallend häufig aber ist sie neben allen Teilen des Jesaja im Bereich der Weisheitsliteratur (Proverbien, Hiob), wo sie die gleiche Nähe des Denkens und der Sprache zum praktischen Leben zeigt."

Though Gordis (1955:11d) voices criticism specifically about a Phoenician influence, he aptly objects to Dahood's theory in saying,

"His study has revealed some interesting parallels between Phoenician and Punic on the one hand, and biblical Hebrew in general, on the other. This is a situation to be expected in view of the close kinship of both languages and literatures...on the other hand, we do not find evidence of specific *influence* from Phoenician on the orthography, morphology and syntax of Koheleth."

Some of Dahood's evidence may indicate a Northern element in the language but need not be as northern as Phoenicia or Ugarit, rather merely northern *Israel*, e.g. ׀, ה׀ (see pp.32ff for a full discussion of North Israelite and Qoh).

III. Purpose of this Study

The three main schools of thought about Qoh's language are then,

- A. Qoh is a Hebrew composition with many LBH, Aramaic and Mishnaic elements.
- B. Qoh is a translation from an Aramaic original.
- C. Qoh is heavily influenced by Phoenician and Ugaritic.

Each in their own way arrive at a post-exilic date for Qoh's language, and this one conclusion finds a consensus in nearly all modern assessments. Though the approaches are very diverse, still they conclude a 4th-2nd century date. This would seem to demonstrate an extreme stability to this conclusion. Nonetheless, the aim of this study is to re-examine the evidence for this common conclusion, and the underlying premises, because there are obvious superficialities and inadequacies at various points. Further, growing knowledge of ancient near eastern languages shows that some often repeated claims can no longer be upheld. The concern of the following study therefore is with the age of the language in Qoh as a contribution to the history of Hebrew as well as to the debate on the date of Qoh. This study is consequently devoted exclusively to the linguistic aspects of dating Qoh, hence the purpose is not to "settle" the question of Qoh's date, but to contribute to a decision process that includes the nature of its language as a primary datum.

The value of an investigation so limited has been stressed by the Israeli scholar Avi Hurvitz (1973:74) who has already worked in this way on other parts of the Old Testament:

"Unfortunately, the theological, historical and literary¹ criteria which have been used for establishing the date of chronologically problematic texts are very often subjective...however, we believe that it is [the] linguistic aspect which should be primarily studied in order to gain objective criteria for solving chronological issues."

¹ This term "literary" remains vague, especially since Hurvitz himself sees the need to distinguish for example, wisdom literature from other genre in assessing the significance of Aramaisms in a text (1968:236, 240).

CHAPTER TWO

GENERAL METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

- I. The Priority of Grammatical Comparisons in a Linguistic Approach to Dating
- II. The Effect of Genre on Grammatical-Lexical Comparisons
- III. The Effect of Dialect on Grammatical-Lexical Comparisons

The following outline of the general methodological concerns involved in this study is presented at the outset in order to both indicate the direction of the argument, and to provide a framework for the detailed data that follows in the third and fourth chapters. One such concern has already been presented in the Introduction, i.e. the priority of linguistic evidence in dating texts. Specific methodological principles will be found at the beginning of each appropriate section of the grammatical and lexical studies in Chapters Three and Four. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss possible reasons for the unique nature of Qoh's Hebrew.

I. The Priority of Grammatical Comparisons in a Linguistic Approach to Dating

Understanding the nature of a language depends on an accurate description of its grammar and vocabulary, however it is the grammatical properties that are the more significant.

W. Chomsky (199) explains that

"It is a well-established principle in linguistics that the nature of the language is not determined by its words, but by its grammar and structure."

Others concur, for example, Gelb (16f),

" . . . limiting ourselves to linguistic considerations, we must recognize that certain levels have precedence over others: grammar over lexicon . . . "

and Polzin (2)

" . . . grammar and syntax provide a more objective and reliable basis for chronological analysis than do lexical features . . . "

Consequently, linguistic comparison of literature primarily entails the grammar and syntax of a text, its lexical character only secondarily. Accordingly, this study of Qoh which purposes to compare its language with other texts will emphasize both the similarities and differences in each linguistic category, but will cover the grammatical area first in Chapter Three, and then the lexical evidence in Chapter Four.

II. The Effect of Genre on Grammatical-Lexical Comparisons

Surely no better attitude can be taken before embarking on a linguistic study of Qoh than that expressed by Gordis (1968:400):

"All too often, modern Biblical scholarship is guilty of violating basic canons of scientific research. This is particularly true in dealing with a work as unique as Koheleth . . . Biblical scholars sometimes forget that the phenomena with which the literary and historical disciplines are concerned, are far more complex than those of the natural world, and that unilinear explanations can therefore rarely be true. Dogmatism is therefore particularly unjustified in these fields, and humility is more than a moral virtue - it is an indispensable trait of the truly scientific spirit."

This study is undertaken in this spirit. It will soon be evident that there needs to be substantial reconsideration of the data presented in the last century, and of the conclusions based on it. To handle both the material and the methodological principles that develop that material into a working theory is a task that should not be devalued by a doctrinaire presentation. The need therefore, is to submit to the material, rather than forcing the material to submit to comparisons where the comparands are not suitable for simplistic juxtaposition. Qoh has been compared linguistically with LBH and MH without adequate attention to the issues of literary style, content, and dialect. Hence the sensible and appropriate adjustments that this attention would entail for the comparative procedure have not been made.

Scott (1965:196) correctly identifies Qoh as "primarily a philosophical work". Segal (1910:81) and Gordis express the linguistic implications of this. They have seen Qoh as a new pioneering effort in Hebrew literature, where the language was custom-built by the author since he had no patterns from

which to construct a philosophical essay, Gordis (1955:104) claims,

"He is a pioneer in the attempt to use Hebrew for quasi-philosophic purposes, to express such ideas as 'past', 'present', 'future', 'recurrence', 'moderation', etc."

Apart from the dangerous supposition that all Hebrew or Semitic literature types of this sort have been discovered, thus Qoh is a "first",¹ their appreciation of the linguistic ramifications of Qoh's genre are good; Qoh is the only extant Hebrew work of its kind, though its contents are firmly in the wisdom literature tradition.

The following examples show clearly how an awareness of the genre of Qoh is essential for there to be an accurate assessment of the book's language.

- A. Dahood has suggested that the preference of Qoh for אדם over איש is due to the influence of Phoenician, where the former word is also favoured.² Gordis replied fittingly that this is not due to Phoenician influence, but to the nature of Qoh's discussion of man generically as "mankind".³ Thus Gordis has

1 Kroeber (41) aptly doubts whether a theory of personal innovation regarding Qoh's unique language is tenable when in respect to the abstract terminations -ûth and -ôn he states, "Diese Theorie der persönlichen Neubildung ist zunächst bedenklich angesichts der zugleich mit einer besseren Kenntnis der Sprachgeschichte des Hebräischen gewachsenen, dass trotz des beträchtlichen Umfanges des Alten Testaments die Quellenlage viel zu ungünstig ist, als dass eine solche Behauptung gerechtfertigt wäre."

2 1952:202f; also Harris 1939:52.

3 1955:112. Dahood anticipated this response in his 1952 article but his argument is not adequate. He points to only two cases where an individual man is denoted by אדם (2:18,21). The total ratio of אדם to איש is 49:7 in Qoh.

made use of the fact that Qoh's genre, dealing universally with reality, will affect its language in its vocabulary.

- B. The sparse use of the waw consecutive imperfect in Qoh (1:17, 4:1,7, at most) has led the majority of scholars commenting on Qoh's language to conclude that MH has influenced Qoh in this way. This is because this verbal construction is virtually extinct in MH (see full relevant discussion on p. 68).

The Manual of Discipline likewise uses this form only three times, though the perfect waw consecutive is used much more often, i.e. 53 times. In presenting and explaining this deviation from the Manual's general imitation of the style of the Biblical law-codes, Gordis (1960:406) offers the most reasonable cause:

" . . . the most characteristic trait of Biblical narrative style, the imperfect with Vav consecutive is 'strikingly rare in the Manual of Discipline, occurring only three times.' The reason is obvious - the Manual is not narrative in character."

The reason for the sparse use in Qoh is equally obvious - Qoh is not representative of BH narrative either.¹ As Gordis has said, the book is quasi-philosophic, with the need to adjust its language to its stylistic needs. The book is reflective, poetic, and proverbial. S. R. Driver (1892:163) similarly excused Song of Songs for its paucity of waw consecutive imperfects, present only in 6:9,9. He did so because "there

¹ Though Gordis does not apply this reasoning to Qoh.

is very little occasion" for it to appear in this book, a literary consideration suitable for Qoh as well. Lloyd's (VIII) observation of over a century ago is lucid and correct:

"The non-usage of this idiom is doubtless characteristic of the later Hebrew, but, as so very small a portion of Qoheleth is narrative, its absence determines nothing as to the period at which the Book was written. Had the Book been an historical Book, the case would have clearly been different."

More recently, Loretz (1964:26 n.34) agrees:

"Es ist jedoch zu berücksichtigen, dass das w-consecutivum in einem Werk wie Qohelet ohnehin nicht so oft wie in einer Prosaerzählung zu erwarten ist."

- C. Qoh is said to be like MH in its use of the participle for the present tense (see full relevant discussion p. 97ff). It is true, Qoh does use the participle extensively for that purpose. But no recent commentator has considered that another reason may explain this use. As will be shown later, the use of the participle in stating *universal concepts* is well attested in BH, and not only in "Wisdom" books. This use is extensive in Qoh because the book is largely concerned with statements of general truth. The participle in Qoh cannot simply be equated with the participle in MH; the appearance may be similar, but the causes are not necessarily the same.
- D. Nouns with -ôn and -ûth terminations are frequent in Qoh and have been cited as examples of the late nature of its language (see full relevant discussion p.164ff). Apart from the

fact that these terminations are found in all eras of BH, a more important consideration is again that of genre. These endings are indicative of the abstract, developed from the roots that bear them. Both are used to express abstract concepts rather than concrete objects. Qoh is by its nature abstract, presenting universal truths, ethics, and the deepest of theological issues. It is expected then that the book would use abstract terminations more than would a historical book for example. Herzfeld (15) made this observation in 1838, yet it has gone unheeded for nearly a century and a half:

" . . . deswegen unser Buch nicht jung oder gar das jüngste in der Bibel zu sein braucht, sondern dass bei seiner Abfassung dem philosophischen Inhalt desselben entsprechende Abstracta geschaffen werden müssten . . . "

Lately, Kroeber (41) has also seen the importance of looking at Qoh's genre in this regard:

"Zweifellos bedient sich Qohleth dieses Vocabulars, um seine eigenständigen Gedanken ausdrücken zu können, und es ist typisch für den konkreten, auf Gegenständlichkeit gerichteten Ausdruckcharakter des klassischen Hebräisch, dass diese notwendige Ergänzung vor allem Abstrakta umfasst."

E. Zimmermann (1945/46:21) tried to employ the presence of the article in Qoh 5:18 as an example of the sporadic use of it in Qoh over-all. In the phrase $\text{גַּם־כִּלְלֵה־אָדָם}$, he sees the hand of an inept translator since the article is "unnecessary". This is a mistake allegedly committed because the translator was not familiar with Hebrew grammar at this point. However

Zimmermann(1949:99) is later forced to concede to Gordis' objection (1946:82), that this is because, it is involved in a statement of fundamental truth. A function of the article is to articulate nouns in general statements (GK s.126m). Gordis' objection and Zimmermann's concession is therefore a caution against divorcing Qoh's style from its grammar, since "Many of the passages in Qoheleth are general statements, expressing some fundamental truth. In that event, Hebrew may use a noun in either the determinate or indeterminate state." (Gordis:ibid.).

These few examples indicate how apparent similarities may have truly different literary causes, showing that grammatical and lexical studies entail more than hasty glances at simplistic comparisons.

III. The Effect of Dialect on Grammatical-Lexical Comparisons

A. North Israelite

1. North Israelite as Described Previous to this Study

Many have claimed to find traces of a North Israelite dialect in BH.¹ The evidence is often of a lexical nature, i.e. Aramaisms², yet certain grammatical traits are included.

1 e.g. Stade 11f; S. R. Driver 1913:448; Burney 1903:208f; 1918:172f; Nyberg 12; Harris 1939:22,98; Gordis 1968:200; Isserlin 200.

2 For this significant feature of North Israelite, see the fuller discussion on p. 253ff.

The following list shows how some think North Israelite diverges from BH.

- a. Unassimilated Article after an Inseparable Particle
(S. R. Driver 1913:188; Burney 1903:208)

בְּהַשְׂדָּה 2 Kg 7:12 kethib

שֶׁהַמֶּלֶךְ SS 1:12¹

- b. Anticipatory Accusative Pronominal Suffix (Burney 1903:209) - Here the suffix is defined by the next word.

בְּשָׁלֹם הַבָּשָׂר 1 Kg 19:21

וְיַעֲדֶהוּ...
אֶת-נַבְוֹת

- c. ש as a Relative Pronoun (Stade 12; Burney 1903:209; BDB 979a; Segal s.78; Albright 1963:1; Rabin 1974:27; Williams s.129)²

e.g. שְׁקִמְתִּי Ju 5:7,7; also in 2 Kg 6:11, and Ju 6:17,
7:12, 8:26 involving a North Israelite hero.
SS, 32 times.

- d. זֹה as the Feminine Demonstrative Pronoun (Burney 1903:208
Segal s.72)

1 Many consider Song of Songs to be North Israelite literature, e.g. Segal s.78; Albright 1963:1; Hurvitz 1968:236.

2 Bergsträsser (41ff) challenges the North Israelite instances of the *š*in relative, but with arguments that depend on subjective criteria and offer no solution to the plain *š*in in the text with no variants. Fitting to his argument, no subsequent scholar concurring with Bergsträsser's total rejection of the form in North Israelite passages has been found by the present writer.

e.g. ולא זה העיר 2 Kg 6:19; also Hos 7:16 (זו).

e. אַת plus Nominative (Polzin 35,37)

e.g. ואת-הברזל נפל אל-המים 2 Kg 6:5; also 9:25, 10:15.

f. קְטִילָה as a Verbal Noun Form (Segal s.228)

שְׁרָקוֹת Ju 5:16, defective orthography

אֲכִילָה 1 Kg 19:8

g. יֵי as second feminine singular suffix, 2 Kg 4:2,7

(Burney 1903:208)

יֵי as second feminine plural suffix, 2 Kg 4:3,7, 8:1

h. אַתְּ as second feminine singular pronoun, 2 Kg 4:16,23, 8:1,

14:2 (ibid.)

i. קְטִי as Infinitive Construct of לִי Verbs (Nyberg 43,79)

וּכְתַבְתִּי Hos. 6:9; also 10:10.

j. Construction of Typically BH Masculine Plurals as Feminine Plurals (Nyberg 35)

זבחות Hos 4:19

Two further examples come from non-Biblical sources -

k. Reduced Diphthong

It is suggested by some that North Israelite reduced its diphthongs that involved waw or yod. Cross and Freedman thereby consider 2 Sm 22 to be a North Israelite composition.

Compared with the parallel passage in Ps 18, the 2 Sm

rendition has these spelling reductions.¹ Furthermore, Gibson (1971:2f,8) notes the reduction in certain inscriptions that indicate non-Judean dialects or North Israelite, e.g. כל for כָּל, קַץ for קָץ, יו for יָו.²

1. Infinitive Absolute plus Nominative Pronoun

This is an accepted construction in Semitic languages found north of Palestine, i.e. Phoenician and Ugaritic (see full relevant discussion on p.160f). For this reason Gordon (1949:133; 1955:85) considers this a North Israelite trait in BH passages such as Est 9:1 וְנִהְפֹךְ הוּא.

It should be recognized that these possible North Israelite features occur in some North Israelite texts and not in others, and that few texts use any one feature exclusively. These are generally grammatical exceptions that surface an adequate amount for them to be considered by students of Hebrew as North Israelite.

2. The North Israelite Features in Qoh

The intriguing aspect of this list compiled from previous studies related to North Israelite, is that Qoh has instances of nearly all the relevant traits to differing degrees. Letters 'g' and 'h' are irrelevant since Qoh does not use the second feminine singular or plural pronoun in any form.

1 1953:16f; also Freedman 1962:198f

2 Also Baumgartner 1959:227.

Of the remaining ten, Qoh has at least eight, and possibly nine.

a. Unassimilated Article

שְׁהַנְחִלִים	Qoh 1:7
שְׁהַתְקִיף	6:10 kethib
כְּהַחֲכֵם	8:1
כְּשֶׁהַכְּסֵל	10:3 kethib

b. Anticipatory Accusative Pronominal Suffix

יִתְנַנּוּ חִלְקוֹ	Qoh 2:21
יִתְקַפּוּ הָאֶחָד	4:12

c. שׁ as a Relative Pronoun

68 of 157 relative pronouns, i.e. 89 cases of אשר.

d. זֶה as the Feminine Demonstrative Pronoun

All six occasions for the feminine demonstrative are זֶה rather than the classical זֵאת, 2:2,24, 5:15,18, 7:23, 9:13.

e. אַתּ plus Nominative

וְטוֹב מִשְׁנִיָּהֶם אַתְּ-אֲשֶׁר עִדּוֹן לֹאֲהַחֲזִיקָה Qoh 4:3

f. קָטְלָה as a Verbal Noun Form

יִגְעַת Qoh 12:12 In the bound state and written defectively.

(BDB 388a; Segal s.228)

g. Not Relevant

h. Not Relevant

i. קָטַי as Infinitive Construct of לִיָּה Verbs

None in Qoh

j. Construction of Typically BH Masculine Plurals as Feminine Plurals

תַּעֲנִינִי Qoh 2:8 - BH תַּעֲנִינִים Mi 1:16, 2:9, SS 7:7

בַּחֲרוֹת 11:9, 12:1 - BH בַּחֲרוֹתֵי Nu 11:28 - JE

k. Reduced Diphthong

אֵי Qoh 4:10, 10:16 - BH אֵי e.g. 1 Sm 4:7,8

l. Infinitive Absolute plus Nominative Pronoun

וְשָׁבַתְּ אֲנִי אֶת-הַמַּתִּים Qoh 4:2

In summary, Qoh has cases of 9 of the relevant characteristics (a,b,c,d,e,f,j,k,l). The only feature that Qoh does not share with North Israelite as outlined above is the לִיָּה form of קָטַי infinitive constructs. Qoh also has a quantity of Aramaisms that would serve to further support a parallel between it and North Israelite (see p. 253ff).

These grammatical and lexical (Aramaisms) parallels with North Israelite take on even greater importance to this study since all but one of them (b) have been associated with LBH or MH in previous studies, resulting in judgements that the language of Qoh is late. These will be discussed separately at the proper time later in this paper. Given that these individual traits have been isolated by earlier writers without any reference to Qoh, the fact that Qoh aligns with nearly

all the grammatical traits, and includes Aramaisms in its vocabulary, shows the importance of comparing the book with the varieties of ancient Hebrew, including an inquiry into possible dialectical distinctions. The value of these features for supplying evidence for the late character of Qoh's language obviously needs re-examination.

B. A Vernacular Element in Qoh?

In addition to the *regional* dialectical parallels with North Israelite in Qoh, some interesting aspects of the book's language might be best answered by entertaining a *vernacular* dialectical element as well. G. R. Driver (1970) relies on Qoh for instances of his "colloquialisms" in BH, and a number of other linguistic peculiarities also suggest a possible vernacular hue.¹

1. Anticipatory Pronominal Suffix

Qoh has two of these constructions:

ותַּנְּנִי חֶלְקִי 2:21

ותַּקְּפוּ אַחֲרַי 4:12

G. R. Driver (1970:236) surmises that, "In such cases the writer, having used a pronoun, suddenly feels that it does not give the sense clearly enough and decides *currente calamo* to add as a postscript a word or phrase for which

¹ Jastrow (1919) gives the following as colloquialisms in Qoh: ראה בטוב, 2:1 (p.205); יתרו, passim (p.207); כשריו, 2:21, 4:4, 5:10 (p. 208).

the pronoun has been substituted." Segal (1909:85) also considered it "a colloquialism, one might say, a vulgarism", since it is apparently an after-thought to repeat the object.

2. Discordant Subject and Predicate

G. R. Driver (1970:234) mentioned that, "The commonest of all colloquialisms is the disregard of the congruence of gender and number" He gives one example of the incongruence of number in Qoh 1:10, and another occurs in 2:7:

לעלמים אשר־היה 1:10

ובני בית היה לי 2:7

3. Missing Article

He also believed the inarticulated אל-עיר in Qoh to be a colloquialism, since a place-noun may drop or retain the article in the vernacular (1970:235). This omission is unlike the article's deletion found in Qoh where grammatical rules are followed (see p. 10ff).

4. Subject and Predicate Expressed in Prepositional Phrases

Driver (1970:237) has cited further the sentence form "which seems at bottom to be colloquial . . . in which both subject and predicate are prepositional expressions:". He includes the instance in Qoh 7:12 בצל החכמה בצל הכסף (In the shade of wisdom is [as] in the shade of silver.) in his list of this type. He gives English examples such as, "to know all is to forgive all", "out of sight, out of mind".

5. Proverbial Material

His 1970 article (238) also considers the proverbial phrase in itself an element of popular speech since it derives from the every-day speech and experience of society. This is of course relevant to Qoh's language since the book is composed of proverbial content to a large degree, especially in the last half of the book, chapters 7-12.

Additional properties to those of G. R. Driver's should also be noted -

6. First Person Delivery in Qoh

The material of Qoh is presented as an address to an assembly of some kind. This in itself does not necessitate a vernacular language, since the prophetic literature is also thus presented, but it would be highly suitable for the popular language to be used. In addition to being a public address, it is reflective in character, and has an element therefore which possibly was best expressed through a colloquial style. One commentator (Johnston:288) defends this point by explaining that Qoh is "a soliloquy largely characterised by the conversational style of discourse, freely used by the Preacher in communing with his own heart."

The following considerations are concerned with the many cases where Qoh deviates from standard BH in its simpler grammar. In other languages this is evidence of a separate

regional or sociological dialect (Ferguson 1971:11f). It appears to be true in Hebrew as well, since North Israelite differs in this way (reduced diphthong, ψ , η), and the unique language of Qoh does also. This is true when one looks at the following evidence.

7. Waw Consecutive Construction

Segal (s.157) and Blake (1951:77f) have believed that these complicated forms had no role in the common speech of Biblical times, and if any at all were to appear, they were simply options to the simple conjunctive waw plus verb.¹ Delitzsch (198) also thought that the consecutive imperfect "probably belonged more to the written than to the spoken language of the people."² The sparse use of this construction in the Lachish Letters suggested to Baumgartner (1959:227) that the waw consecutive imperfect "in der Volkssprache offenbar schon im Rückgang war, wie ja auch das Mittelhebräische and bereits Phönizische dasselbe ganz verloren haben."

Qoh uses the waw consecutive imperfect three times at most (1:7; 4:1,7). And though the number of waw consecutive perfects is higher (about 16 times, see p. 64ff), they are generally clustered within only a few contexts, i.e. 2:24, 24; 3:13,13; 12:1,2,3,3,3,4,6; otherwise only, 4:11, 5:5, 13?,13?,16; 9:14; 10:3.

1 Isserlin (1972:201), believing the Yavneh-Yam document to be in the vernacular, questions this statement of Segal's. However, the document appears as much to be a legal *formal* document.

2 Also Rendsburg 1980:102ff.

8. Infinitive Absolute with Waw

Rubinstein (1952:362-7) proposed that the use of the infinitive absolute with the waw, instead of the waw consecutive finite constructions, was drawn from the vernacular. This would be an appropriate surmise if the waw consecutive constructions truly were too complicated for widespread popular preference. The non-conjugated infinitive absolute adequately but simply continues the predication more efficiently. Qoh employs the infinitive absolute twice in this way:

8:9 את-כל-זה ראיִתי וְנִתּוֹן אֶת-לְבִי לְכָל-מַעֲשֵׂהָ

9:11 שְׁבַתִּי וְרָאֵה תַחַת-הַשָּׁמֶשׁ

(See more on this trait, p. 159f).

9. Absence of the Hophal

Apart from the irregular וּנְכַל , Qoh uses no passive causatives in this stem, when one would expect at least 4, given its relative size. This may be simply an accidental situation unrelated to any dialectical cause. But it may in turn indicate a simpler approach to the language. (See more on this trait, p. 60).

10. Third Masculine Plural Pronoun - הֵם

GK s.1350 attributes the weakening of the distinction in gender in many BH grammatical areas to a surfacing of the colloquial language. This occurs in Qoh's use of the masculine plural pronoun הֵם for the feminine הֵן , in all 5

pertinent instances (2:6,10; 10:9; 11:8; 12:1), a degree unparalleled elsewhere in BH. . (See more on this trait, p. 115f; Rendsburg 1980: 40ff also considers this vernacular).

11. First Singular Pronoun - אני

Harris (1939:74) concludes that "We must judge . . . that אני became the more frequent word for 'I' during the tenth century, and that by the eighth or seventh century אני was rare in the language." Qoh shows this morphological simplification in using only אני 29 times. It is of interest to note that in those passages Burney (1903:207) considers to be North Israelite, אני is favored 27 to 2, whereas the rest of 1 and 2 Kings favors it only 19 times compared to 8 cases of אנכי (Mandelkern 1254ff). (See more on this trait, p.172ff; also, vernacular to Rendsburg 1980:28).

12. Pronouns with - את

The paucity of this formation in Qoh (only once in 22 opportunities) could be due to its more complex and unnecessary structure compared with simply attaching the pronominal suffix directly to the preceding verb, e.g.

5:18 והשליטו לאכל ממנו

not, והשליט אתו לאכל ממנו

The first would be more efficient for everyday speech.

(See more on this trait, p. 183ff).

13. Feminine Singular Demonstrative - זֹה

The shorter form of the feminine, זֹה, for the regular

BH תאז, may have been the preference in the popular speech since it occurs at times in an idiom one might expect in the vernacular. This idiom, כָּזֶה וְכַזֵּה, "thus and thus", occurs in Ju 18:4, 2 Sm 11:25, 1 Kg 14:5.¹ Apart from this idiom, and outside Qoh, the short form is used in direct speech contexts. only, i.e. Ps 132:12, Ezk 40:45, Ho 7:16 (יִזֵּי), and 2 Kg 6:19. Since the latter two texts are North Israelite, it has been used by some to identify such a dialect. Qoh only uses this short form, 2:2,24; 5:15,18; 7:23; 9:13. (See more on this trait, pp. 116,178).

14. Relative Pronoun - שְׁ

Some have considered this more simple relative to be a colloquialism.² Its shorter form than the regular אשר would possibly be preferred in the common language.³ This form is often used as an example of a North Israelite dialect. (See more on this trait, pp.120f, 181ff).

15. Contractions

Contracted forms in Qoh could indicate a vernacular as well. For instance, אֶלַי (אֵלַי לִי) 6:6, and עֲדָנָה 4:3, עֲדָנָה

1 An approximate form, כזאת וכזאת, is found at Jos 7:20, 2 Sm 17:15,15, 2 Kg 5:4, 9:12, using the full feminine forms only.

2 e.g. Bergsträsser 44; Segal s.78; Albright 1963:1; Margain 41.

3 Johnston (287) observes that "while in Jonah 1:7 שְׁ was used by the sailors in their conversation with one another, they used the full form אשר in their more deliberate and formal interrogation of the fugitive passenger . . .". Hurvitz (1972:4 n.94) says the shorter and more convenient form was the vernacular form, the longer form used in literature only.

4:2, both perhaps contractions from $\eta\eta$ and γ (BDB 725b), might be preferred forms in the popular speech since they more efficiently express the same idea than their longer equivalents. (See more on these words, pp.227).

16. North Israelite or Vernacular?

Qoh has shown many grammatical points that others have seen as North Israelite peculiarities. The evidence suggests however that some of these features are not to be exclusively associated with that dialect, since they exist both inside and outside North Israelite passages. Consequently, further explanation is required. These traits are as follows:

a. Unassimilated Article after an Inseparable Particle

This trait in 2 Kg 7:12 appeared to S. R. Driver (1913:188) and Burney (1903:208) to be North Israelite. It occurs also in SS 1:12, a book that some have considered of that dialect. Yet the additional instances in 1 Sm 13:21, 2 Sm 21:20, Ezk 40:22, 25, 2 Chr 10:7, 25:10, 29:27, Neh 9:19, 12:38, speak against such an exclusive regional use.

b. Feminine Singular Demonstrative - $\eta\tau$

This shorter form of the feminine demonstrative occurs in four texts outside of Qoh. Two of these are in North Israelite sections, Hos 7:16, 2 Kg 6:19, the others in Ezk 40:45 and Ps 132:12. The idiomatic use of $\eta\tau$ is also in three non-North Israelite passages, as discussed earlier.

c. Anticipatory Pronominal Suffix

Burney (1903:209) thought this to be North Israelite, but instances in Ex 2:6(E), 2 Kg 16:15 (kethib), Jer 19:14, Ps 63:12 show this to be narrow-sighted. The case for its vernacular nature is stated on p.38f.

d. ׀ plus Nominative

Polzin (35) cites this as a possible North Israelite trait since it occurs relatively often there. Its use in 39 other places however, obviously does not limit its use to that geographic area.

e. ׁ-Relative

Segal (s.78) argues for a North Israelite origin of this pronoun, believing its "confinement in the earlier books to North Israelitish documents would prove that its use must have been common in the colloquial speech of Northern Palestine." He suggests that the use then gradually extended to Southern Palestine. Yet the instances of this form in Nu 24:3,15(JE) (Albright 1944:207ff) and in the name מְאִשֵּׁר in Gn 4:18(J) suggest another explanation, one given by Margain (41):

"Ces textes, qui s'échelonnent sur une période de quelque cinq cents ans, nous invitent à penser que ׁ - a probablement toujours existé en hébreu, mais que la langue littéraire, a prédominance judéenne, lui préférerait 'ašer."

These 5 "North Israelite" features might be better explained as general vernacular Hebrew since they occur in

texts that are *not* North Israelite as well as those that are. This would not detract however from indicating a North Israelite text, but it would suggest another cause for such an identity. It may not be because the trait is primarily a North Israelite peculiarity, but that instead, as Margain suggests, because North Israelite was less stringent in its literary style than its southern counterpart, and thus its sources allowed more of the popular language to surface. This is a reasonable way to explain the higher proportion of these grammatical properties in North Israelite, yet still allowing further isolated cases in texts not of that dialect.

Qoh has at least one instance of each of these 5 traits; it has 4 of the 5 to a degree that points to a North Israelite origin, i.e. *v*-relative 68 times, unassimilated article 4 times, *n*^h used exclusively 6 times, and the anticipatory suffix twice. However, additionally, there is good reason to expect that these reveal a vernacular style.

**

**

**

The numerous properties of Qoh's grammar that would indicate a vernacular element in the book should be considered in any comprehensive survey of the language, and should be given due attention as a main cause for its unique linguistic character.

C. Mishnaic Hebrew - Basically a Vernacular

The last two centuries of Hebrew studies have seen a development from a belief that Aramaic was the sole vernacular of the Second Commonwealth, to the present opinion that Hebrew was at least a collateral vernacular. Qumran research appears to have confirmed the objections of Luzzatto, Graetz, Segal, Klausner and others, who for varying reasons saw Hebrew extending at least into the Maccabean period and beyond.¹

It is this vernacular that many now consider to be the substance of MH.² Milik feels it so strongly that he says (1961:70),

"La thèse de savants comme Segal, Ben Iehuda et Klausner, d'après lesquels l'hébreu mishnique a été une langue parlée . . . n'est plus une hypothèse, elle est un fait établi."

Emerton (1973:2) gives a moderated but similar view,

" . . . the main thesis argued by Segal has been securely established: Mishnaic Hebrew is essentially a vernacular, or at least, closely related to a vernacular."

The reasons for seeing MH as a colloquial language have been accumulating through the years. Graetz and Luzzatto both thought it was obvious given the conciseness, flexibility, simplicity and directness of MH.³ Segal (1910:81) saw a combination of three factors: MH's popular grammar, its

1 For a full discussion of this development in opinion see, Chomsky 193-212, Rabin 1970:317, Klausner 1-5, Greenfield 1956: viii-xii, Hruby 109-20, Rendsburg 1980:5-19.

2 e.g. Chomsky op. cit., Greenfield 1958:204, Milik 1959:130, Rabin 1970:318, 1957:67, 1974:38f, Segal 1910:81, Ullendorf 1971:241ff.

3 As Chomsky summarizes their position, op. cit.

preservation of ancient non-Biblical vocabulary, and a wealth of expressions displaying secular vocations of everyday life. Chomsky (200) believed the proverbs and prayers could only be "products of an indigenous, Hebrew speaking population and civilization." Grintz (47) reasons Hebrew was a vital medium since both Josephus and Paul spoke Hebrew to crowds. Milik (1959:131) believes the Hebrew ossuary inscriptions of the Roman period are evidence of the middle-class vernacular. And of course, as Rabin (1958:156) points out, the Bar Kosiba letters and the Copper Scroll reveal a MH vernacular.

What has been said so far does not diminish the likelihood of an Aramaic vernacular current beside MH, certainly in Galilee, and probably in Judea. Scholars who agree on the existence of a MH vernacular during the Second Commonwealth vary in their opinions of the relation between Hebrew and the Aramaic. Kutscher (1974:11) and Freedman (1966) have believed Aramaic to be a coextensive but dominant vernacular. Barr (1968:41) feels the two were consciously distinguished, while Chomsky (207) thought any shift from one vernacular to the next was probably unconscious. Rabin (1958:152) suggests a trilingual situation where Aramaic was used for diplomacy, BH for literary purposes, and probably an older form of MH as the spoken vernacular.

Now if MH was basically the vernacular "raised to a literary language" (Greenfield 1958:204), it would be natural

to expect it to resemble a vernacular of an earlier age rather than the literary form of BH. This is the opinion of Chomsky (197) and Ullendorf (1971:255) for instance, who feel that the divergence of MH from classical Hebrew would be greater than the colloquial Hebrew, since MH developed from the popular speech, the speech curbed and repressed under the "formal and elevated diction of the OT" (Ullendorf:ibid)¹. Segal believed that MH would find its source as early as before the exile, and that it was only the later books, of Jeremiah and on, that began admitting the popular forms into the literary deposit of acceptable grammar and terminology.² He summarized (1910:81),

" . . . the Mishnaic dialect was evolved by a gradual and natural process, and by the people themselves, out of the popular Hebrew of pre-exilic times."

The reason for pondering this aspect of MH is to point out the alternate cause for any given text and MH to appear similar in their grammars. The usual explanation in regard to Qoh and MH has been to postulate MH influence on Qoh. However, a text may not actually show MH influence, but instead it may reveal a vernacular element that is at the root of both itself and MH. If a colloquial character is evident in a text, it may highlight areas of vernacular influence on the later MH dialect. Consequently, even if the language of a book under question has elements that are

1 Also, Rendsburg 1980:23f

2 ss. 15,71,117,228,387,431

found elsewhere or primarily in MH, if those traits are probably vernacular, the relation with MH should be considered carefully. A text that is compared with MH and where affinities can be shown, could well have been influenced by the vernacular long before the vernacular became the normal written language that we know as MH. Grammarians and linguists agree that "it is in speaking that the germ of all change is found."¹

1 F. de Saussure 98; cf. p.27 "language is constantly evolving, where writing tends to remain stable." (of phonology).

CHAPTER THREE

GRAMMATICAL COMPARISONS

- I. Mishnaic Hebrew and Qoheleth
- II. Second Temple Hebrew and Qoheleth
- III. Late Biblical Hebrew and Qoheleth

I. MISHNAIC HEBREW AND QOHELETH

- A. Method
- B. Evidence
- C. Summary

This study will now compare Qoh's grammar with that of MH. Using Segal's *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (1927) involves a necessary explanation. A deficiency lies in its depending on printed texts from the Middle Ages as opposed to more accurate manuscripts of MH. As Kutscher (1971:1593) explains, "it can be shown that during the Middle Ages the copyists, and later the printers, tried to harmonize MH with BH . . . This 'correcting' tendency led to a complete distortion of the linguistic structure of MH."¹ However, since sufficient information is unavailable as to how MH would be reconstructed in its entirety, we have used Segal's volume which has been the standard work. This has been the type of MH that Qoh has been compared with in the past.

Furthermore, a helpful deduction can come from this objection

1 See also Kutscher 1964:35f; 1967:160; Greenfield 1969:137.

to Segal's grammatical presentation. Where MH, represented by Segal's 1927 volume, and BH agree linguistically, BH could only deviate from a reconstructed MH. This is because the latter would only distinguish the two, since the pseudo-harmony Kutscher draws attention to would be diminished. Since all areas of alleged affinity between Qoh and MH are covered in this chapter and Chapter Four Part I, the remainder of Qoh's language which is essentially BH would be expected only to differ from a new MH grammar. In other words, there is no reason to believe that a reconstructed grammar of MH would be any more similar to Qoh's language than it is now believed to be. In fact, if this new MH structure is in many ways distinct from the BH with which it was harmonized in the Middle Ages, then where these grammatical areas are relevant to Qoh, the same degree of diversity would appear between Qoh and MH. For example, MSS show that true MH frequently spelled the BH and Qoh word אדם, as אדן. Furthermore, the BH and Qoh form of the second masculine possessive and objective pronominal suffix is ה-, distinct from the true MH form הַ (Kutscher 1971:1593).

Sixty-one areas will be discussed in Part I, either because they are said to be grammatical properties which show Qoh's dependence on MH, or because they offer differences between BH and MH that allow Qoh to align with BH or MH in a given category. To facilitate this comparative process, the following specific principles of methodological concern will govern the conclusions

in each case (see Chapter Two for the general principles).

A. Method

1. Exclusively MH

If a grammatical trait is found in BH only in Qoh, yet it is seen again repeatedly in MH, then tentatively the feature can be termed a Mishnaism.

2. Equally BH and MH

If a grammatical feature is found both in BH and MH, then that feature should not be considered a Mishnaism since it occurs throughout a large stretch of the history of the language.

3. More Characteristic of MH

If a trait is preponderantly a MH trait, occurring only seldom in BH, then these points should be considered:

a. Independent of MH

The question must be asked, "Is there any reason why there should be a heavy use of this trait in Qoh outside of any dependence on MH grammar?". For instance do the genre or dialectical peculiarities of the book suggest another cause than MH influence? (see Chapter Two).

b. Dependent on MH

If there is no other viable reason, then tentatively the feature could be termed a Mishnaism.

4. More Characteristic of BH

If a feature is more characteristic of BH, including Qoh, than it is of MH (because MH has a different means to achieve the same end), then that feature indicates an independence of Qoh's grammar from MH. This would be true provided there are no alternate causes for such alignment with BH such as genre or dialect.

5. Neither BH nor MH

If a grammatical property appears disproportionately in Qoh, in contrast to both BH and MH, its effect will be to distinguish Qoh from both equally and is of no chronological significance.

The reason for using the proviso "tentatively" (#1 and 3b) is that a final decision can not be made until all the linguistic evidence (grammar and lexicon) has been assessed. The number of grammatical traits that apply to each of these categories should indicate to what degree Qoh is Mishnaic in its grammar. If an adequate number of "Exclusively MH" traits surface, and also enough features appear that are "More Characteristic of MH" (without any alternate cause), this

would demonstrate a dependence of Qoh on MH, and would substantially confirm the views on Qoh's language of the vast majority of commentators of the last century.

B. Evidence

1. Verbs
2. Nouns
3. Pronouns
4. Prepositions

1. Verbs

a. Stems

1) Qal: Orthography

Qal imperfects and imperatives in Qoh are written defectively in most cases:

	Imperfect (roots)	Imperative
Defective:	אחז 7:18	אכל 9:7
	דלף 10:18	זכר 12:1
	זכר 5:19; 11:8	שמר 4:17
	בדר 5:3,3,4	
	נפל 4:10	
	נשף 10:11	
	עמד 4:15; 8:3	
	עמל 1:3; 5:7,15; 8:17	
	קצר 5:5	
	שפט 3:17	

	Imperfect		Imperative
Plene:	נדר 5:4		שמר 8:2; 12:13
	נפל 4:10; 9:12; 10:8; 11:3,3		
	קצר 11:4		

MH on the other hand, uses the plene spelling exclusively (Segal s.154). Since the MT is usually written defectively (GK ss.46c, 47f), one sees that Qoh is more in accord with BH. The irregular frequency of the plene spelling of the root נפל in Qoh is explained by its general inconsistency in BH as a whole where 23 of 56 occurrences are plene.¹ Therefore these plene spellings are within the BH style.

Conclusion: #4 of the specific methodological principles -
More Characteristic of BH

2) Piel: Orthography

MH builds its piel form with yod in its first syllable, i.e. קיטל, (Segal s.122). Qoh however uses the normal BH spelling exclusively (Radday), e.g. בקטש, 12:10.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

3) Pual

a. Orthography

As in the piel, MH uses the plene spelling in the first syllable of the pual, i.e. קוטל, (Segal s.122 n.2). Again, Qoh disagrees on the whole, 6 of 7 times: 1:15; 4:12; 6:4; 8:1; 9:4; 12:4. The one exception is יוקטשם, 9:12. This one

¹ Mandelkern 755f. This does not include the 4 instances where the shorter form נפל occurs necessarily due to its attachment to the next word by maqqeph, Ps 35:8; Pr 11:14; Jer 37:20; 42:2.

exceptional plene writing has precedents in BH where "it is merely an orthographic license" (GK s.52q), e.g. **לִיגִלְךָ**, Ju 18:29.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b) Pual: Frequency

i) Over-all Frequency

Qoh has 7 puals as seen above (Pual: Orthography). This is slightly more than expected. Qoh makes up 1.1% of the Hebrew Bible, and assuming a proportionate distribution of puals of the 464 in BH (our own count), Qoh would be expected to have around five. Qoh is therefore inconsistent with MH where Kutscher (1974:42) observes the pual "began to go out of fashion . . . "

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

ii) Finite Aspects' Frequency

When one distinguishes Qoh's puals as finite or participial, important ratios emerge. In its 220 verses Qoh has 4 finite puals (**לְכַסֶּה** 6:4; **לְשַׁנֵּא** 8:1; **לְבַחֵר** 9:4; **וּלְסַגְרֵי** 12:4). This is half the number found in all the Mishna where except for eight clear examples, these constructions are dropped while the participle is common.¹

Furthermore, Qoh has only 3 pual participles (**מֵעֲנִית** 1:15;

¹ Segal s.131, 126 and Addenda p.xxxix "Sect. 126"; Albrecht (106) says finite puals are "fast verschwunden".

הַמְשֻׁלָּם 4:12; יִגְקְשִׁים 9:12). This 4:3 ratio in favor of the finite aspects is disproportionate to that of MH, but parallel with BH, generally speaking (273 finite puals to 189 participles).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

4) Po'e1: Frequency

יְהוֹלֵל 7:7 - Qoh's one instance of the po'e1 is acceptable in BH terms, but since it is so rare in MH, only six times, it would constitute a contrast with MH (Segal s.191).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

5) Po'al: Frequency

מְהוֹלֵל 2:2 - In Qoh's only chance to express a passive mood in an ע"י intensive stem, it uses a po'al, a non-existent stem in MH (Segal s.141).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

6) Hithpo'e1: Frequency

תְּשׁוּמָם 7:16 - Likewise, in Qoh's only instance of an ע"י verb used in the reflexive mood, it uses the hithpo'e1, which is not found in MH (Segal s.141; its counterpart, nithpo'e1, occurs only 4 times in the Mishna).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

7) Pilpel: Frequency

קְלָקַל 10:10 - Of Qoh's 7 opportunities to express the pilpel

(piel y"y verbs), it does so this once. The other 6 are divided as 5 piels and one po'e1.¹ MH though uses the pilpel more often than the piel according to Segal (1909:55). Here again is an inverted ratio between the stem frequency in Qoh and MH.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

8) Hophal : Frequency

Apart from the anomalous root יכּל (יּוּכּל), the hophal is absent in Qoh. MH, in which the "hophal is extremely common" (Segal s.147) presents a contrast.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH - Though the hophal is more regular in BH than represented by Qoh, the book does resemble other BH books in its paucity, e.g. Joshua has only 4, Amos 1, Nehemiah none. This may also indicate a simpler thus popular grammar (see p.42).

9) Niphal

a) Infinitive with Lamed

Usually the niphal infinitive deletes the preformative Hē in MH when the prepositional Lamed is used (Segal s.115; Albrecht p.105). Only isolated cases of this occur in BH (GK s.51h). Qoh complies with BH morphology in both its

1 Piels: קהה 10:10 (on pilpels from weak verbs see GK s.55f) קלל 10:20,20; 7:21,22; Po'e1: הלל 7:7.

relevant instances:

1:15 לְהַמְנוֹת

4:13 לְהַזְהִיר

Weak verbs such as מנה do commonly have the full form in MH, but זהר would appear to be a point of departure between Qoh and MH.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b) ע"ע Morphology

The tendency of MH to strengthen ע"ע verbs to trilateral forms renders many imperfects and nearly all perfects trilateral. This is particularly true of the qal and niph'al stems (Segal s.188). Qoh's qals are not helpful for comparison since those specific roots that are biliteral are so in MH as well (9:14; 12:5) is usually trilateral in BH as well as MH. (9:14; 12:5) is usually trilateral in BH as well as MH. Therefore, it is only the niph'al stem that is of value here since all cases are biliteral in Qoh, including a perfect, the aspect most affected in MH. The niph'al ע"ע verbs are,

לְמַד 10:18

נָרַץ 12:6

תָּרַץ 12:6

לְשַׁחַד 12:4

Consequently, Qoh does not participate in any new strengthening of ע"ע verbs as seen in MH. Rather, it maintains the biliteral form as do BH ע"ע niphals (a personal count of all ע"ע roots

in BH occurring over 25 times yields this BH rule).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

10) Hithpael

a) Frequency

The hithpael is used seldom in MH, being replaced by the nithpael (Segal s.132; Albrecht p. 108). The latter's morphology is identical to the hithpael in all aspects but the perfect. This then is the test of the use of Qoh - how is the perfect formed? Qoh 12:3 uses the perfect **התעוה**, not **נתעוה**, so one can safely assume that Qoh reflexive stem is that of the BH pattern, not MH.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b) Passive

There is a hithpael that is used passively in Qoh 8:10 - **לְשִׁטְכָּחָהּ**. Since MH uses its nithpael frequently as a passive, it has been suggested that Qoh displays a Mishnaic element here.¹ Yet a consideration of the BH occurrences (Mi 6:16; Pr 31:30) will show that though rare, this use of the hithpael is represented there. Furthermore the MH nithpael is a different stem from the BH hithpael, hence such a comparison is not direct, but misleading.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

1 Segal s.140; S. R. Driver 1913:475; Siegfried 15.

11) Nithpael

Though BH has at least two instances of this stem (Dt 21:9; Ezk 23:48; Pr 27:15?; GK s.55k; Joüon 1965:s.59f), Qoh uses it at no time for the function of the hithpael or pual as in MH (Segal ss. 132,140). Instead, these latter stems play a proportionate role in Qoh commensurate with regular BH.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b. Aspects

1) Perfect

a) As Present Tense

The perfect aspect in MH is not used to express present conditions because of its relegation mainly to past events (Segal s.306). Though it is used to indicate simple past, perfective, pluperfect, and the prophetic tenses, there is no longer the representation of states such as ידעתי (I know), זקנתי (I am old) (Segal ss.307,309,313). Qoh on the other hand does use the perfect in this function:

3:12 ידעתי כל-אשר יעשה האלהים
I know that all which God does . . . (Gordis 1955:146)

6:3 ידעתי טוב ממנו הנפל
I say, "Better than the miscarriage . . . (Ibid.:160)

8:14 אמרתי שגם זה הבל
I say that this also is vanity. (Ibid.:174)

Taking ידע as an example, one notices that this use spans BH

history: Gn 4:9JE; 1 Sm 17:28; 1 Chr 29:17 (non-synoptic).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b) Waw Consecutive Perfect

Much is said of Qoh's sparse use of the waw consecutive. The infrequent waw consecutive *imperfect* however is more of an issue. This will be thoroughly discussed later (see p. 68f). The neglected area of discussion in this regard is the waw consecutive *perfect*. Yet worse than its neglect is its frequent misrepresentation. Consider the following claims:

Whitley (129) - ". . . the perfect with waw consecutive . . . is not found at all in Koheleth."

Dahood (1958:305) - "In Qoheleth . . . there is not a single clear example of a converted perfect with waw."

Blake (75) - "It is perfectly certain that the type (perfect) in Ecclesiastes and the Mishna has only a past meaning, there are no converted perfects at this later period."

De Vries (1965:76) - "We observe that in the late book, Qoheleth, the consecutives have faded away to virtual extinction, being found in no more than three passages."

Statements such as these are particularly disappointing from Whitley and Dahood since they have written extensively on Qoh's language specifically, and would be expected to note the following waw consecutive perfects:¹

¹ B. Johnson (1979:90) does not make this error (if support is needed for these obvious cases) and recognizes the waw consecutive perfects.

	Perfect		Imperfect or Participle	
With previous imperfect:	ושתה	2:24	יאכל	
	והראה	2:24	יאכל	
	ושתה	3:13	יאכל	
	וראה	3:13	יאכל	
	וחם	4:11	ישכבו	
	וחבל	5:5	יקצף	
	וכעס	5:16	יאכל	
	והגיעו	12:1	זבאו	
	ושבו	12:2	תחשך	
	והתעוּתוּ	12:3	יזעו	
	ובטל	12:3	יזעו	
	וחשכוּ	12:3	יזעו	
	וסגרוּ	12:4	יזעו	12:3
	ונרץ	12:6	תשבר	
With previous participle. ¹	ואמר	10:3	הלך	
	וסבבו	12:5	הלך	
	ואבד	5:13?	שמור	5:12
	והוליד	5:13?	שמור	5:12

Consequently Qoh has at least 16 waw consecutive perfects.

Many more would be added if as GK s.112pp allows, frequentatives were seen in the waw plus perfect constructions in 1:13; 2:5,9,11,13,15; 5:18, e.g. 2:9 וּגְדַלְתִּי וְהוֹסַפְתִּי מִכֹּל.

¹ This type of antecedent acknowledged by S. R. Driver 1892:ss. 113:1, 4B, 117; Brockelmann s.41f; Davidson s.55c.

However this study decides against such a view (see p.68ff).

In MH however, "the consecutive tenses have practically disappeared . . . In the few cases they occur, they are conscious imitations of BH." (Segal s.156). In fact Segal's list of consecutive tenses contains no waw consecutive perfects in the whole Mishna. Here Qoh is clearly outside MH grammar.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

2) Imperfect

a) Expression of Tenses

In MH the imperfect is allowed only the subjunctive (modal) function (Kutscher 1971:1600; 1974:42). In Qoh it is employed in the fuller range of the BH imperfect, including the subjunctive.

Subjunctive: וגם כל-אדם שיאכל ושתה 3:13

טוב אשר תאחז בזה 7:18

i) Frequentative (S. R. Driver 1892:s.30ff) e.g.

גם עיניו לא-תשבע עשר 4:8

ובאו וממקדם קדוש יהלכו 8:10

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

ii) Present (Ibid.;s.28) e.g.

כל-אשר יעשה ואלהים 1:9 also, 3:14

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

iii) Future (Ibid.:s.22ff) e.g.

מה שהיה הוא שהיה 1:9 also, 2:15

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b) Cohortative

MH has completely lost the use of the cohortative (Segal s.155). Qoh however uses it in 7:23 -

אמרתי אחכמה והיא רחוקה ממני .

When one considers the uses of Qoh's first singular imperfect, this one instance is a relatively frequent use. The only other uses of the first singular imperfects are -

- לכה נא אנסכה 2:1
'Come let me test you . . . '

Once the decision was made to use the elongated second masculine objective suffix, the possibility of a cohortative from the root נסה, was precluded, though the phrase has a cohortative force of a strong statement of the will.

- ולאחז בסכלות עד אשר-אראה 2:3
taking hold of folly so that I might see . . .

This imperfect is used as a modal verb, a purposive complement to the initial infinitive.

- שאניחנו לאדם שיהיה אחרי 2:18
which I must leave to the man who will follow me

S. R. Driver (1892:s.51) rejected the possibility of any statement of necessity (such as this) to be expressed by the cohortative.

- וּשְׁבַתִּי אֵינִי-וָאֵרָאָה 4:1,7
And again I saw . . .

This waw consecutive construction is not suitable for the cohortative because it expresses a past act, not a personal resolve.

- וְאֶתְנָה לְבִי לְדַעַת חִכְמָה 1:17
and I gave my heart to know wisdom

As pointed, this also is a consecutive construction, thus not suitable for the cohortative. It is the exegetical preference of this study however, to vocalize as a simple waw with the cohortative, though the reason is admittedly subjective (see p.80).

These additional instances of the first singular imperfect prove to be either morphologically or syntactically ineligible for the cohortative form. Therefore Qoh's one occurrence (possibly two, 1:17; 7:23) intensifies the contrast with MH in this area since 7:23 is the only opportunity for the cohortative to surface, as the MT points the above imperfects.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

c) Waw Consecutive Imperfect

i) The Problem Considered

Both the waw consecutive perfect and imperfect are lost in MH (Segal s.156). The fact that Qoh uses the latter only

three times at the most (1:17; 4:1,7) has led many scholars to see an influence of MH.¹ But three considerations that have been covered already cause one to doubt this conclusion.

First, this judgement usually ignores or denies the 16 waw consecutive perfects in Qoh (see p. 64ff). The total of at least 19 waw consecutives therefore indicates a contrast with MH.

Second, Qoh can not be limited to express its thought via the waw consecutive imperfect, since the book is not historic narrative. As this study pointed out earlier (p.29f) Qoh's genre should be considered adequately before one decides on its linguistic affinities, especially concerning the waw consecutive imperfect. Though it is true that not only the historic books use the waw consecutive imperfect, the familiarity with the construction by Qoh (to the extent of contrasting with MH) suggests an intentional limitation of its use. These intentions are postulated in the next few pages.

Third, the numerous indications of a vernacular element in Qoh, and preference for the simple waw plus perfect in Biblical times, forms an alternate explanation to MH influence (see p. 41). Any apparent contradiction that may lie in the presence of 16 consecutive perfects in a vernacular

¹ e.g. Segal s.157; Whitley 129; Gordis 1960:409. Others consider it merely "late": Barton 53; S. R. Driver 1892:s.133; GK s.112pp; Hertzberg 28.

text is dissolved when one sees that they are often concentrated within separate sections of the book: 2:24,24;3:13,13; 12:1,2,3,3,3,4,5,6,; 5:13?,13?.

One important concern has not yet been touched. Until now, no function has been found for the so-called "pleonastic" אני, found posterior to its conjugated verb, e.g. in 1:16 דברתי אני, found posterior to its conjugated verb, e.g. in 1:16 דברתי אני. CHH Wright (488) and Delitzsch (198) discount any emphatic or contrastive purpose for this redundancy. Barton (53) thought it pleonastic as well. Whitley (138) gives two examples of what he thinks to be pleonastic uses in MH, but these are misleading since they are not posterior pronouns, they are anterior, a construction paralleled in BH.¹ Also, they are probably emphatic not pleonastic.² This sequence in Qoh occurs twenty times³ and consequently should not be dismissed as merely pleonastic, especially since it is often involved with the simple conjunctive waw perfect which is unique in itself in regard to its frequency.⁴ One is directed to a new suggestion that respects the nature of Qoh's genre and linguistic idiosyncracies.

1 An important distinction maintained by others, e.g. Wright 488, Delitzsch 198. BH examples: Hos 8:13; 12:11; Ps 39:11; 82:6.

2 אני פסקתי לעצמי Kethu 13:5: this reflective statement is inherently contrastive to someone else "assigning" the subject, "If I assigned myself . . .", thus the pronoun could well be emphatic. אני לא אמרתי, Taan 1:1 - Apart from the pronoun's separation from its verb (hence even less like Qoh's form), the emphatic particle אף, could easily render the following אני as emphatic: "Indeed, I (!) did not say . . .".

3 1:15; 2:11,12,13,14,15,15,18,20,24; 3:17,18; 4:1,4,7; 5:17; 7:25; 8:15; 9:16.

4 2:11,12,13,14,15,15,18,20; 4:1,4,7; 8:15; 9:16

ii) Two Further Literary Considerations

aa) Reflection in Qoh

Translating Hebrew verbs accurately is sometimes difficult since the same aspect, e.g. perfect, imperfect, can express various tenses and moods that are explicitly differentiated in the Germanic languages for example. This is no less the case in Qoh; in fact the nature of the book's aims and the presentation of its material further complicates the problem. The book presents the person 'Qoheleth' as one who often looks back at life's experiences and pronounces conclusions on their basis. Much of the material therefore is presented in the mode of "past" language. Qoh presents a reflective examination of reality and thus its language is characterized by verbs designating elapsed time. However, even in the scope of the past, Qoh demands a distinction in time, best described as two separate perspectives.

First, there is a *special investigation* that 'Qoheleth' made previous to, and subsumed in the written composition. This is clearly stated in 2:1 -

אמרתי אני בלבי לכה-נא אנסכה בשמחה
I said to myself, "Come, I will test you with pleasure."

There are two periods of time when conclusions could have been pronounced on the basis of this previous quest, they could have been made either *during* that prior investigation or, at the *later* time of writing the account as we have it. An

example of the first pronouncement, during the investigation might be 2:12,13 -

ופניתי אני לראות חכמה
So I turned to consider wisdom,

Here the investigation is explicitly introduced, then the conclusion made during the quest follows -

וראיתי אני שיש יתרון לחכמה
And I saw that there was an advantage in wisdom . . .

An example of the case where a conclusion was stated only at the later time of the composition, but on the basis of the special search could be found in 7:25 -28 - the investigation is introduced,

סבותי אני ולבי לדעת
So I turned my thoughts to know (7:25)

then a later conclusion is made at the time of composition,

ראה זה מצאתי...אדם אחד מאלף מצאתי
Look, this is what I have discovered . . . one man
of a thousand I have found (7:28).

These are subtle differences, yet differences that make helpful and interesting distinctions in the report of past events.

Second, there appear to be conclusions and observations pronounced at the time of this report of 'Qoheleth' which he made on the basis of his life experience *outside* of his special investigation. Examples would be 6:1 and 8:15 respectively -

יש רעה אשר ראיתי תחת השמש
There is an evil that I have seen under the sun . . .

אמרתי שגם-זה הכל
 I say that this too is breath.

Certainly these are not the only possible translations of the Hebrew given the flexibility in function of the language's aspects, but they are just as possible as any other at this point. In other translations the only criteria for rendering a perfect in Qoh as preterite, perfective, or present was that of subjective exegesis. For example, the following translations are given for the same passages:

	RSV	NEB	JB	Gordis:1968
1:12	I . . . was king	I ruled as king	I have reigned	I . . . was king
2:14	I perceived	I saw	I know	I know
3:22	I saw	I saw	I see	I saw
4:2	I thought more fortunate	I counted happy	I salute	I praise
8:14	I said	I maintain	I say	I say
9:1	I laid to heart	I applied my mind	I have reflected	I grasped

Even though little agreement has been reached by different translators, no one translates the perfect in Qoh always in the preterite or always in the perfective tense. A common supposition is behind each rendition that Qoh is speaking in a manner, and about a matter best stated in a differentiation in tense. For instance, most would prefer to distinguish 'Qoheleth's' life-long perception of reality through the medium of wine recounted in 2:3, i.e.

ראיתי את-כל-המעשים שנועשו תחת השמש
 I have seen all the works that have been done under
 the sun

from the specific quest referred to by

חרתי בלבי למשוך ביין את-בשרי

I explored how to stimulate my body with wine

The former is an extended process of observation, whereas the latter is a particular and temporary procedure. Again, a distinction in tense is usually expressed between the punctiliar utterance of 1:16 and the general conclusion in 8:14, i.e.

דברתי אני עם-לבי לאמר אני הנה יגדלתי והוספתי חכמה

I said to myself, "Behold, I have magnified and increased wisdom

יש-הבל אשר נעשה על-הארץ. אמרתי שגם-זה הבל

There is a temporary matter done on this earth . . .

I say this too is breath.

In other words, there are variations among translations, and within the same translation in how to deal with the perfect aspect in Qoh. With only one aspect, i.e. the perfect, an important distinction in Qoh's presentation of past reflection is obscured. The distinction between tenses and times at this point can only be made subjectively by the exegete.

It would be a great advantage if somehow this ambiguity was reduced to a degree, especially in Qoh where the oration incorporates reflections and conclusions from different periods in 'Qoheleth's' life. Qoh could well have used a verbal system as in Akkadian if one were available, a system which had separate morphological properties differentiating perfective from preterite verbs.

bb) Logical Progression in Qoh

Translations also recognize that Qoh proceeds on a logical track, using words to denote result, cause, and antithesis.

Again, though unanimity is lacking as to how each and every phrase should be logically related to a prior statement, the various translations at best note that Qoh does not mainly progress temporally (as historic narrative does with connectives like "then such and such" or "and then"). In other words, the impression given is that 'Qoheleth' reasons from observation to inductive conclusion, and that he is not recounting merely a number of experiences and conclusions about reality without forming any logical relationship between them. For example, 2:14 begins with the maxim,

החכם עיניו בראשו והכסיל בחשך הולך
The wise man has eyes in his head, but the fool
walks in the dark.

This needless to say, notes the superiority of the wise man over the fool. The next phrase continues,

וידעתי גם-אני שמקרה אחד יקרה את-כלם
But I knew also that one fate occurs to both.

As the translations show, the sensible rendering of the initial waw in this clause is the antithetic idea, "but". The relation is thus logical, not merely additional (and I knew) or sequential (then I knew); thus RSV, NEB, JB and Gordis use "yet" or "but", emphasizing the apparent irony in retribution and death. Another example is in 3:21,22. 'Qoheleth' asks a rhetorical question.

מי יודע רוח בני האדם העלה היא למעלה
ורוח הבהמה הירדת היא למטה לארץ
Who knows whether the breath of the sons of man
ascends and the breath of the beast descends to
the earth?

He then concludes from this uncertainty,

ראיתי כי אין טוב מאשר ישמח האדם במעשיו
'So I have seen that there is nothing better than
that man should enjoy his activities.

This logical result then is best rendered by the connective "So" (NEB, Gordis; "Wherefore" RSV). The unnecessarily dry translation of the New American Standard Version, "And I have seen that nothing is better", is disruptive to the flow of reason obvious in the text.

The need in Qoh was a clear means of denoting logical relationship, a need understood by those translating Qoh's mode and process of expression. This is demonstrated by their renderings made according to their exegetical judgement of 'Qoheleth's' line of argument.

iii) Two Suggestions

Four concerns have surfaced in this section dealing with the waw consecutive imperfect:

- 1 The ambiguity in tense that comes from only one aspect for past expression in Qoh.
- 2 Addition of the independent personal pronoun to a conjugated verb.
- 3 Meagre use of the waw consecutive imperfect, and the frequent use of the conjunctive waw plus perfect.
- 4 The logical function of the conjunctive waw.

The following two suggestions intend to explain these features in respect to Qoh's mode of presenting its material.

aa) The "Simple Past" Construction

Suggestion: When 'Qoheleth' wished to describe an act or thought as simple past (preterite), he added אני to the already conjugated perfect.

This principle shows very plausibly how 'Qoheleth' tried to avoid a confusion in describing past and present acts and thoughts with only one aspect, when a distinction was necessary. The implication for those first singular perfects without subsequent אני,¹ is that they are allowed any tense within the normal scope of the BH perfect, i.e. perfective, pluperfective,² present, and simple past (though only once at most³).

With this suggestion comes an intelligible translation with more direct means of determining the time 'Qoheleth' refers to when speaking of matters involving his past. Thereby he has expanded the options with which he may clearly indicate his intentions. A complete defense of this hypothesis could only be offered through a comprehensive commentary on the sections involved, but an exemplary translation and a brief hypothesis of the appropriate sections will suffice.

1 1:12,13,14; 2:3,4,4,4,5,5,6,7,8,8,9,9,10,10,11,15,17,19,19,20; 3:10,12,14,16,22; 4:15; 6:1,3; 7:15,23,23,27,28,28,28,29; 8:9,10,14,16,17; 9:1,11,13; 10:5,7.

2 GK s.106f

3 i.e. 2:17 - וְשָׂאֵתִי אֶת-הַחַיִּים; Yet this one instance does not confuse the issue since it does not affect those definite simple pasts with the independent pronoun.

- אני קהלת הייתי מלך...
 1:12 I, Qoheleth, have been king over Israel in Jerusalem.
- ונתתי את-לבי...
 13 I have set my heart to seek and explore by wisdom all that has been done under heaven . . .
- ראיתי את-כל-המעשים...
 14 I have seen all the works that have been done under the sun, and all is breath . . .
- דברתי אני עם-לבי לאמר אני הנה הגדלתי והוספתי חכמה...
 16 I said to myself, "Behold, I have magnified and increased wisdom more than all who were before me, and my heart has observed a wealth of wisdom and knowledge.
- ואתנה לבי לדעת חכמה...
 17 So I shall set my heart to know wisdom and knowledge, madness and folly." I know that even this is as the desire of the wind.
- אמרתי אני בלבי...
 2:1 I said to my heart, "Come, I will test you with pleasure, so enjoy yourself." But behold, it also is breath.
- לשחוק אמרתי מולל...
 2 For I say, "Laughter is foolishness, and pleasure, what does this accomplish?"
- חרתי בלבי...
 3 I have explored with my heart how to stimulate my body with wine . . .
- הגדלתי גמעשי בניתי לי בתים
 4 I have magnified my works, I have built houses for myself.
 I have planted vineyards for myself.
- ונטעתי בהם עץ.עץ עשיתי לי גנות...
 5 I have made gardens and parks, and I have planted trees of all kinds in them.

- עשיתי לי ברכות מים
2:6 I formed - reservoirs . . .
- קניתי עבדים ושפחות
7 I have bought male and female slaves . . .
- כנסתי לי גם-כסף וזהב עשיתי
8 I have also accumulated silver and gold . . .
לי שרים ושרות
acquired men and women singers . . .
- וגגלתי והוספתי מכל...
9 So I have increased and become greater than all in
Jerusalem before me . . .
- לא-אצלתי מהם...
10 Therefore I have not denied my eyes anything they desired,
את-מנעתי את-לבי
I have not refused my heart any pleasure . . .
- ופניתי אני בכל-מעשלי...
11 But I turned to all my deeds which my hands had done, and
the toil I had labored at, and behold, all was breath . . .
- ופניתי אני לראות חכמה
12 So I turned to consider wisdom . . .
- וראיתי אני שיש יתרון לחכמה
13 And I saw that there is advantage to wisdom . . .
- וידעתי גם-אני שמקרה אחד יקרה את-כלם
14 But I knew also that one fate occurs to both.
- ואמרתי אני בלבי
15 So I said in my heart, "As the fate of the fool, it will
even occur to me, why was I extremely wise?"
ודברתי בלבי
So I say in my heart that this also is breath . . .
- ושנאתי את-החיים
17 So I hated life . . .
- ושנאתי אני את-כל-עמלי...
18 And I hated all my labor, for I must leave it to the man
who succeeds me.

- 2:19 And who knows whether he will be a wise man or a fool?
 Yet he will control all my labor which I have labored and
 ושחכמתי תחת השמש
 in which I have been wise . . .
- 20 So I turned my heart to despair over all the labor I had
 וסבותי אני לראש את-לבי
 exerted . . .

Comments:

- 1:12,16 Both verses contain an anterior אני, and do not apply to the suggested principle that deals only with the posterior pronoun. These are then rendered perfective, with a probable emphatic state that is usually signalled by this syntax (GK s.135a).
- 1:12-17 By applying the principle to this passage the result is for 'Qoheleth' to first outline his credentials for an investigation of reality (1:12-16), then a resolve to undertake such an investigation (1:17). Here in 1:17, what is commonly translated as a waw consecutive imperfect, וַאֲתָנָה, has been rendered a cohortative with a *conjunctive* waw in the above translation. This seems reasonable given that the parallel verse which reiterates this introductory section is undisputably the cohortative, i.e. 7:23 אמרתי אחכמה.
- 2:1,2 'Qoheleth' begins with the simple past to describe his procedure (2:1a), and then gives his conclusions (2:1b,2).
- 2:3-20 Parallel to the structure of 1:12-17, 'Qoheleth' begins

this section with his experiences (2:3-10), then describes his reaction to these accomplishments at the time of his investigation (2:11-20). Accordingly he begins with the perfective construction in verses 3-10 (without אני), and then concludes with the preterite sequence of perfect plus pronoun in verses 11-20. This is because the inductions in these latter verses were made during the investigation he resolved to pursue in 1:17.

Similar presentations of 'Qoheleth's' thoughts are found in the remaining relevant sections.

ראיתי את-הענין...
 3:10 I have seen the affliction God has given to man . . .

ידעתי כי אין טוב בם...
 12 I know that there is nothing better for them than to be glad and to do good . . .

ידעתי כי כל-אשר יעשה אלהים...
 14 I know that all that God does, it is forever . . .

These verses do not pertain to the special investigation of 'Qoheleth's', but instead recount an observation throughout his life (3:10) and two fitting conclusions (3:12,14). Consequently no simple past construction occurs in this part, i.e. no perfect plus אני.

ועוד ראיתי תחת השמש...
 3:16 Now I have seen something else under the sun - In the place of judgement, wickedness is there; and in the place of righteousness, wickedness is there.

אמרתי אני בלבי...
 17 I said in my heart, "God will judge the righteous and

the wicked . . .

אמרתני אני בלבי...
3:18 I said in my heart concerning the sons of men, "God tests them so that they see that they are beasts . . .

This section, though much shorter, parallels 2:3-20 where the life-long observations and experiences (3:16) are commented on during the special and subsumed investigation. So a perfective is followed by two simple

past sequences - perfect plus pronoun.

ושבתני אני ואראה...
4:1 Again I looked and saw all the oppression . . . under the sun . . .

וראיתני אני את-כל-עמל...
4 And I saw that all labor and skilled work was of envy, one man of his neighbor . . .

ושבתני אני ואראה...
7 Again I looked and saw a temporary matter under the sun . . .

These observations, all simple past (with אני), are made in the midst of the investigation begun in 2:1

and introduced in 1:17.

יש רעה חולה ראיתני...
5:12 There is a sore evil I have seen under the sun . . .

(Transience of wealth and life)

הנה אשר-ראיתני אני טוב...
17 Here is what I saw to be good and fine: to eat, to drink, and enjoy one's labor . . .

Here again an experience in life (5:12) is commented on from the perspective of the specific investigation 'Qoheleth' purposed for himself. Thus a perfective, then the preterite.

8:14 There is a temporary matter which occurs on earth . . .
...אמרתי שגם-זה הבל.
I say that this indeed is temporary.

15 ושבתתי אני את-השמחה...
So I commended pleasure . . .

Likewise, here a universal comment on retribution is voiced in the present (8:14), but is also an observation that led to a commendation at the time of 'Qoheleth's' specified quest for wisdom, so it is stated in the preterite (8:15). The same arrangement appears at 9:13-16.

9:13 גם-זה ראיתי חכמה...
This also I have seen to be wisdom under the sun . . .
(Parable of the besieged city)

16 ואמרתי אני טובה חכמה...
So I said, "Wisdom is better than strength . . . "

The remaining first singular verbs do not have an appended pronoun, therefore, are intelligibly translated in the perfective or present tenses (4:15; 7:15,23, 23;¹ 7:29; 8:9,10,14,16,17; 9:1,11,13; 10:5,7). Consequently they are observations or conclusions made from experiences ranging over a period of time greater than the announced investigation of 1:17.

The subjective element in translating Hebrew aspects is admitted, yet this first suggestion does not disturb any coherency of 'Qoheleth's' presentation. On the contrary, it serves to give greater clarity, and

1 7:25-28 is discussed on p. 72.

employs the otherwise 'pleonastic' אַנִּי in a constructive and feasible manner.

bb) Avoiding Ambiguity

Suggestion: 'Qoheleth' avoids the consecutive imperfect with waw since its use would only have led to temporal and logical ambiguity

At this point, more detailed reasons are given for the inappropriateness of the waw consecutive imperfect for a work such as Qoh (see p.29f).

Temporal clarity is attained by avoiding the waw consecutive imperfect. "The imperfect with waw consecutive serves to express actions, events, or states, which are to be regarded as the temporal or logical sequence of actions, events or states mentioned immediately before" (GK s.111a). This natural property of the construction which S. R. Driver (1892:71) describes as "continuation or development", should meet a need in Qoh if it is to be used. However, there is much less need for sequential expression in Qoh than in historic books. For instance, where Qoh recounts the accomplishments of 'Qoheleth' (2:4-10), a sequential narration is not intended. It would be impossible to prove that each effort of 'Qoheleth' described here was chronological. It seems more reasonable to regard these efforts as simultaneous, and 'Qoheleth's'

description of them as a summary. The waw consecutive imperfect therefore, typical of historic narration, would not be needed in Qoh.

That a Semite was able to make a linguistic discernment and choice of this sort is evident from the Moabite Stone. The consecutive efforts of Mesha to free his country from Israel are recorded in lines 1-21a with the aid of the 29 waw consecutive imperfects. Yet when the following lines, 21b-30, describe Mesha's reconstruction of his cities, the perfect is used 12 times and the waw consecutive imperfect only *twice* (lines 24,30). This last section is very similar to Qoh 2:4-10 in that it too is an account of simultaneous action. This analogy was noticed over a century ago by Johnston (283). Speaking of the Moabite Inscription he observes,

"The first part narrates a series of events detailed in historic sequence, according to the order in which they occurred; whereas the facts recorded in the second part were neatly separate from, or coordinate with one another, and are therefore enumerated as so many different achievements, requiring the conjunctive vau to be used not in the conversive, but in its simple capacity."

This principle of aggregate description as opposed to sequential narration is not limited to Qoh 2:4-10 however. The entire book is characteristically a collection of observations and conclusions that are not necessarily, in fact not very probably, intended to be sequential. If

one took the first singular perfect verbs that are not accompanied by a posterior אַנִי, (since these already have a defined function) and that introduce verses, one finds that there is no need for consecutive narration (1:13,14; 2:3; 3:10,12,14,16,22; 4:15; 6:1,3; 7:15,23; 8:9,10,16,17; 9:1,11,13; 10:5,7). It is apparent that Qoh does not record historic narrative in a sequential fashion, chronology is irrelevant in these portions.

Temporal clarity is attained secondly by maintaining the distinction in tense made by the presence or absence of the posterior pronoun with the perfect. This distinction would have been obliterated by using the waw consecutive imperfect rather than the perfect. This is because in the cases where the "simple past construction" (perfect plus independent pronoun) expressed *during* the special investigation that which was a *life-long* observation the effect was regressive. That is, it moved from the perfective tense which includes the *present* as a part of the time involved, to the simple *past* (see this regression described for 2:3-20; 3:16-18; 5:12-17; 8:14,15; 9:13-16, on pp. 80ff). It is contrary to the nature of the waw consecutive imperfect to be retrogressive since its design is to be progressive. If the independent pronoun אַנִי were added to a waw consecutive imperfect, it would cause the latter to contradict its progressive character. The addition of the pronoun to the perfect on the other hand,

does not contradict the perfect's original function, it only limits it to the simple past.

This second "suggestion" not only leads to temporal clarity, but to *logical* clearness as well. Logical clarity ensues the use of the simple perfect, whether it be with or without a conjunctive waw, whereas a waw consecutive imperfect would be confusing. If the waw consecutive imperfect were to be used where Qoh does not use any waw with the perfect, a waw would be present automatically and consequently strongly suggest a notable relation with the preceding material. So when 7:15 presents a phrase without waw, it may be for good reason, i.e. it has no logical bearing on the previous section; וראיתי את-הכל ראיתי, begins its own paragraph. A waw consecutive imperfect at this point would have been both temporally and logically misleading since it would supply an unnecessary waw.

On the other hand, perfects *with* waw in Qoh maintain a primarily logical relation to the prior material, a relationship which is strengthened by avoiding the temporal sequence that the waw consecutive imperfect might suggest. For example, when 3:22 begins,

וראיתי כי אין טוב מאשר
So I have seen that there is nothing better
than that . . .

it is clearly a logical result from the prior observations and question (3:19-21), rather than merely an observation made subsequent but otherwise unrelated to the previous

section.

Six cases of the simple waw plus perfect do not submit to the two "suggestions", and fall outside the explanations just provided. Qoh's parable in 9:14,15 is composed of four simple conjunctive perfects with waw, following an initial perfect or participle (ובא). Two others are found in 5:18 (והשליטו), and 12:9 (והקרו).¹ These are of no significance in dating the language of Qoh however; other BH books have similar if not greater frequencies: 1 Kgs has 11, 1 Sam has 7, 2 Sam has six, Ju has 5, and Is 1-40 has 16 while 41-66 has 6. (S. R. Driver 1892: 159-62). (Huesman, 1956:410-34, reconstrues many of Driver's examples to be originally infinitive absolutes, changed to perfects by post-Biblical and Aramaic scribes. Though the number may appear to be "considerably reduced", no need for such a reduction exists apart from Huesman's own presupposition. Though he admits that many of these perfects remain, still the result is to force BH into unnecessarily strict categories, virtually eliminating the conjunctive waw perfect. Furthermore, as Polzin (44)

1 וּבֹא 8:10 - This verse is a crux with variations in both text and interpretation.

וּזְרָח 1:5 - This is probably a metathetical error given both the parallel וּזְרָח in 1:5, and the otherwise complete predication of this poem by participles.

claims, "the use of the infinitive absolute is very common in Aramaic, e.g. in Syriac and in the Targumim where it is almost always present when the Hebrew has it."

Therefore, if the infinitive absolute was originally in these texts, the Aramaic was equipped and even disposed to maintain it.)

These literary considerations and the two "suggestions" show why the waw consecutive imperfect was probably intentionally avoided since it was not necessary nor desirable for extensive use in Qoh. They show how the simpler constructions convey the thought more clearly. Whether these simpler modes of expression were used in the vernacular and thus supplement the other vernacular elements in Qoh, or whether they conform to a practice which is perhaps characteristic of this particular genre, or whether it is a personal innovation, is quite beyond discovery in this study. However Delitzsch (95) substantiated the former option when he believed the posterior אַנִּי, to be a sign of the colloquial nature of the Song of Songs (5:5). Since the posterior pronoun is added to the perfect there, it is an exact parallel to the extensive use of the form in Qoh, which would likewise be a popular form. In SS 5:5, 2 Sam 17:15, Dan 10:7 and 12:5, the perfect plus אַנִּי occurs, and nowhere else outside of Qoheleth (König 1900:167). All are capable of the preterite translation, and are best rendered as such.

None of these need a perfective or present translation. This would serve to substantiate the first "suggestion".

This general explanation of Qoh's peculiar approach to verbal construction considers the problem of the few waw consecutive imperfects in Qoh in a comprehensive way, and offers solutions that a mere numerical comparison with MH cannot provide. It would help to recall Gordis' (1968:104) comments on the unique character of Qoh's language.

"He is a pioneer in the attempt to use Hebrew for quasi-philosophic purposes to express such ideas as 'past', 'present', 'future' . . . "

Conclusion: More Characteristic of MH, but, Independent of MH Influence.

3) Infinitive

a) Infinitive Construct

i) Without Prepositional Lamed

Qoh uses the infinitive construct without prepositional lamed 14 times:

without any preposition - 3:4,4,5; 6:9;
7:1,2,21; 10:10; 12:12

with mem - 1:8; 3:5; 4:17

with beth - 5:10; 12:4

This is unlike MH where "the infinitive is found only when preceded by a ל" (Kutscher 1974:41; Segal s.344). Yet it is common in BH. For example, by counting all פ"ו and פ"י infinitive constructs in BH, one arrives at the following

figures:	פ"ן	פ"י
with lamed	322	401
with beth	62	90
without lamed (or with mem)	108	152

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

ii) With lamed

aa) פ"ן Verbs

Unlike BH, MH forms its פ"ן infinitive constructs after the pattern of the imperfect when introduced by lamed (Segal s.169), e.g. ליטול Ab 5:8, ליתן Šab 1:8. In BH, 322 of 323 instances do not have the tau or yod, 1 Kg 6:19 (לתת) is the one exception.¹ In Qoh three instances of these infinitives occur:

2:26 לתת

3:2 לטעת

5:18 לשאת

All lack the MH yod.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

bb) פ"י Verbs

As with the פ"ן verbs, MH spells the infinitive construct of פ"י verbs with prepositional lamed, with a yod. (Segal

1 By our own count.

s.165), e.g. לידע Ab 4:22, לילד Yeb 3:10. BH on the other hand forms it predominantly after the pattern לדעת. The yod is present in some BH cases where apherisis has not occurred (GK s.69n), e.g.

ליסד 1 Kg 5:31

ליחם Gn 30:41(J)

לירש Ju 14:15

Qoh has three roots without the yod in the infinitive construct:

לדעת 1:17; 7:25,25; 8:16,17

ללכת 1:7; 5:14; 7:2; 10:15

ללדת 3:2

There are also two roots with Yod: ליאש 2:20; לישון 5:11.

Since BH has such forms, these may be the proper forms for that era of the language; however this is not supportable or refutable since they are both hapax legomena as infinitive constructs. There are no comparators in BH. Other roots occur in BH exclusively in the pattern with yod, e.g. ירא, ירה, יסד.

Consequently, since Qoh uses the usual BH form 85% of the time, and the alternate form only 15%, it can be assumed safely that Qoh is working with the BH system in this regard.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

iii) Used Substantively

Though the infinitive construct is considered a "verbal noun" in BH (Williams s.35), there are times when it becomes more nominal than others; so at times it is the actual nominative or objective element in the sentence (*ibid.* ss. 192,193). Other uses are more verbal, such as the gerundial (*ibid.* s.195). MH preserved "only the gerundial use with the ל to express the direction and purpose of a verb. In its use as a noun, the infinitive has been supplanted in MH by the corresponding verbal nouns¹ which are so numerous in MH." (Segal s.344).

At 22 places Qoh employs the strongly nominal infinitive construct:

Nominative: 7:2,5; 11:7; 12:12

Accusative: 2:26,26; 4:13,17; 5:11,17,17,17

8:17; 10:15

Object of Comparison

with mem: 6:9; 7:1,2

with אֶל מִן : 3:12,12; 8:15,15,15

The disparity is obvious between Qoh and MH.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH.

iv) With Beth

Infinitive constructs with beth as a preposition, which

¹ These are distinct word patterns that serve as predicates; see p. 108, and Segal s.217.

are found frequently in BH, are totally replaced by other forms in MH (Segal s.344). In BH this combination results in an adverbial clause, e.g. "when", "while . . . ". Qoh forms this combination twice: ברבות 5:10, בשפל 12:4. Though the frequency appears to be slight, in light of the clear discrepancies in the other areas of infinitive construct grammar between Qoh and MH, the paucity here should probably be explained apart from a relation to MH.¹ Besides, the genre of the book may play a part in the limited use of this construction (not narrative). The point is, MH does not have the breadth of functions for the infinitive construct that BH does, a breadth Qoh shares, including the form with prepositional beth.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b) Infinitive Absolute

i) As a Finite Verb

In at least 3 passages in Qoh,² the infinitive absolute is used in the place of the finite verb:

4:2 וְשִׁבַּח אֲנִי אֶת-הַמַּתִּים

8:9 אֶת-כָּל-זֶה רָאִיתִי וְנָתַן אֶת-לִבִּי

9:11 שִׁבְתִּי וְרָאָה תַּחַת-הַשָּׁמַיִם כִּי

1 Segal (1909:39) associates Qoh with MH in this regard. But his opinion that "In Koheleth . . . the other infinitival constructions are extremely rare:", is obviously false given the data in the two previous sections."

2 Dahood (1952:49f) tenuously argues for more in 4:17; 9:15; 12:10.

Yet MH does not use the infinitive absolute as a finite verb (Kutscher 1971:1600). BH on the contrary, does not find it foreign to its grammar (GK s.113d,h,z; Joüon s.123w).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

ii) As an Imperative

Since MH does not use the infinitive absolute (Kutscher 1971: 1600), Qoh's use of it for the imperative is again unlike MH but in accord with BH (GK s.113bb; Joüon s.123IIIi (u)). It occurs in 4:17: וְקָרֹב לְשִׁמְעַת מַתַּת הַכְּסִילִים זָבַח.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

iii) As an Emphatic Cognate with the Finite Verb

This function of the infinitive absolute is found neither in MH nor Qoh (Segal s.344 n.2). At this one point of the infinitive absolute's syntax there is agreement. However other BH books are void of this construction, such as Ezra, Daniel, and the non-synoptic portions of Chronicles have it only twice, 1 Chr 4:10, 2 Chr 28:19 (Polzin 43f).

Furthermore, in light of the infinitive absolute's appearances in Qoh in its other functions, it is best to look elsewhere for a cause for its absence, such as the author's stylistic preference.

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH (i.e. in parts of BH)

4) Participle

a) Plus היה

MH uses the perfect, imperfect, and imperative aspects to express simple, singular acts, whereas the continuous, repeated sense is stated by the participle and the appropriate form of היה. The participle alone suffices for present continuous action, but MH also has "the participle with the perfect of היה for the past . . . with the imperfect of היה for the future . . . with the imperative of היה (=הוה) for the imperative."¹

This extensive change from BH in verbal syntax is not evident in Qoh where the combination never occurs. Though the MH examples to follow are not identical, their parallel forms will show how Qoh does not conform to the MH patterns when it had opportunity.

- Past Iterative

Suk. 2:7 היית נוהג
 you have conducted yourself

Qoh 2:3 ולבִּי נהג
 My heart was leading

Qoh 2:9 חכמתי עמדה לי
 My wisdom stood with me

The verb היה is missing also in 1:13; 2:10,18; 7:22 as further examples of the past.

¹ Segal, ss. 306, 324-6; this occurs in BH as well, but is not the practice as it is in MH - see Davidson s.100f rem.2).

- Future Iterative

Ab 1:8 כְּשֵׁיהִיוּ בְעֵלֵי הַדִּין עֹמְדִין
when the litigants will be standing

Qoh 5:19 לֹא הָרְבָה יִזְכֵּר אֶת-יָמָיו חֵיָיו
for he will not often consider
the days of his life

also, Qoh 11:4.

- Imperative Iterative

Ab 1:4 הוֹי שׁוּתָה
Drink!

Qoh 9:7 וְשָׂתָה בְּלֵב-טוֹב
Drink with a good heart

also Qoh 9:9,10; 12:1.

That Qoh does not participate in this mode of continuous verbal expression is an obvious and important distinction.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b) As a Present Tense

Since the participle is "the tense of the present" in MH (Segal ss.306,322), it is used regularly in that function, unlike Qoh which uses the perfect and imperfect frequently in this way as well as the participle (see pp.63,66). The participle plays this role in Qoh quite often, and consequently has been presented as evidence of MH influence on Qoh's language (e.g. Barton 53, Gordis 1960:408, Milik 1959:130). But this type of comparison is misleading since two facts must be remembered.

First, this function of the participle is not only found in MH, rather it is an accepted function of the participle in

BH, as any BH grammar-book will show.¹ S. R. Driver (1892: s.135 (2)) alone cites over 65 examples of various types of this verbal trait. Gordis (1960:408) for example cites the participial form of ידע which is found eleven times in Qoh, as an indication of MH practice in the book. But the following BH evidence shows the error in such a judgement. Four of the eleven instances are in interrogative clauses, the remainder in declarative phrases (all are translated in the present by the RSV).

- Interrogative - 2:19; 3:21; 6:12; 8:1

e.g. 8:1 ומי יודע פשר דבר

This is also found in 2 Sam 12:22 - מי יודע יחנני יהוה

- Declarative - 4:17; 8:7; 9:1.5.5; 11:5,6

e.g. 9:5 a כי החיים יודעים שימתו

Again, this is a frequent idiom in BH, e.g.

2 Sam 17:10 כי ידע כל-ישראל כי-גבור אביך

Also at Gn 3:5 (J); 33:13(J); Jo 22:22;

1 Sam 16:16,18; 23:17; 1 Kg 5:20; Neh 10:29;

2 Chr 2:6.

Consequently, this root is susceptible throughout BH to a participial construction for the present.

Second, and most importantly, the function of the participle as a present tense can be utilized in BH specifically for

¹ GK s.116n; Joüon 1965:s.121d; Davidson s.100f rem.1; Watts 45; Williams s.213.

expressing a general truth.¹ Qoh is a treatise composed of judgements and observations of reality, and is therefore expected to manifest these in generalizations. Again, Qoh's genre should be respected and given adequate consideration. Precedents exist for this feature of Qoh in its closest BH literary parallels, i.e. Proverbs² and Job. Its numerous examples in Proverbs (S. R. Driver 1892:s.135) show that the wisdom literature is disposed to such a syntactical device because it is interested primarily in general ethical and theological propositional truths, e.g.

Pr 11:13 הולך רכיל מגלה-סוד

ונאמן-רוח מכסה דבר

And Job has the same freedom to use the participle as a present in generalizations, e.g.

Job 15:20 כל-ימי רשע הוא מתחולל

נדר הוא ללחם איה 15:23

The remaining passages, which are usually offered to prove Qoh's linguistic dependence on MH in this role of the participle, are all general, universal statements: 1:4-7; 2:14,22; 3:20,21; 4:5; 5:7,9; 6:2 (if not an adjective); 8:12,14,16; 10:3,19. One expects this is the reason why Podechard (48) concluded that:

1 S. R. Driver 1892:s.135; Blake (32) gives examples of "General Present" and includes Qoh 1:4,7

2 The participle of ידע is frequent in Proverbs as in Qoh: Pr 14:10; 17:27; 24:21; 29:7.

"Le fait de remplacer un mode défini par le participe, précédé et plus souvent suivi du pronom . . . est en harmonie avec le développement que cette construction a reçu en araméen et en néohébreu. Néanmoins, sauf peut-être pour vii,26 et viii,12,¹ l'emploi du précédé ne paraît pas beaucoup plus avancé dans l'Ecclésiaste que dans le reste de la Bible hébraïque."

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

c) Participle with Pronominal Subject, and Related Forms

i) Participle with Pronominal Subject

Where the participle is used as the primary verb in a clause, Qoh sometimes uses a pronominal subject, i.e. 1:5,7; 7:26; 8:12;

e.g. 7:26 ומוצא אני מר ממות

If MH wishes to construe a pronoun as a subject of a present tense, it will use the participle as its verb since it is the aspect of the present (Segal ss.322,323). Therefore Qoh's construction along these lines has been seen as a significant similarity with MH.² However it is again unacceptable to compare Qoh solely with MH in this matter, for more than an adequate number of instances exist in BH. Because the finite verbs inflect the pronominal subject intrinsically in their own form,³ reason alone shows that

1 These two are discussed in the following section.

2 e.g. McNeile 309, Kroeber 42, Whitley 138.

3 Unless the independent pronoun is annexed to emphasize a verb, or for some other reason where the construction can serve a purpose, such as to indicate the preterite tense.

when Hebrew wishes to express a pronominal subject in a 'verbal clause', it will often use the participle or some form of the non-finite verb.

Consequently it is not unusual to see this feature throughout BH (GK s.116q), e.g. Gn 9:12(P); 16:8(J); 18:17(J); 37:16(J); 48:21 (E); Ex 11:4 (J); 13:5(J); Ju 15:3.

Posterior pronominal subjects, like those found in Qoh, are specifically found in BH as well, e.g. Gn 18:17(J); Nu 11:29 (JE); Ezk 8:6; Jb 15:23; Is 36:11; 48:13; Jer 38:14. Furthermore, posterior אָנִי in particular, as in Qoh 7:26, 8:12, occurs in 1 Sm 3:13 and Ju 15:3 for example.¹

In regards to 8:12, Joüon (1921:225 n.1) believed that the phrase יודע אני is not classical,

"On ne le trouve quici et Jon 1:12 sans doute sous l'influence de l'arameen (cf Dn 2:8 ידע אנה) Dans la langue classique, le present a la 1re p. sg., 'je sais', est toujours ידעתי."

But apart from whether the syntax is an Aramaism, or is actually a Hebraism in Daniel,² the parallel constructions in BH with the same posterior אָנִי, prove either that Joüon is incorrect, or that Aramaisms reside in the pre-exilic forms in 1 Sm 3:13 and Ju 15:3, which is unlikely. To single out one root, i.e. ידע, and to divorce it completely from other verbs which are in the same situation is simplistic.

1 It is doubtful that posterior pronouns are used only to stress a verbal idea (S. R. Driver 1892:169), since a look at the above examples does not discover an obvious stress, e.g. Gn 18:17. On the contrary, Nu 11:29 shows a stress can be elsewhere, e.g. לי in המקנה אתה ללי.

2 See the discussion on Hebraisms, p.261ff.

Consider that the corresponding participial form of the root שפט, which is found with the pronoun in 1 Sm 3:13, is not repeated in BH, and all other first singular predicates meaning 'I judge' are expressed just as שפטתי (Mandelkern 1223). Is this an Aramaism?

The numerous cases of the participle in Qoh are attributable to its literary nature; that four of these occur with the pronoun as their subjects is not surprising given the adequate precedent in BH as a whole. It is especially fitting that this construction is used in two of the four instances since they exist in a passage where the entire context is intentionally written with participial predicates (1:5,7).

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

ii) Verbal Adjectives with Pronominal Subject

Barton (53) considered the verbal adjective with a pronominal subject to be a "Late syntactical development". Thus Qoh 2:22:

שהוא עמל תחת השמש

He also lists ואיננו חסר (6:2); ואיננו מלא (1:7), שאני עמל (2:18); the first and last however are just as probably participles. Though he likens them to the participle plus pronoun found in MH (though they are also native to BH), he gives no examples of parallels found in MH. Aside from this lack of supporting evidence, the use of the verbal adjective in

tandem with the nominative pronoun is present in BH,¹ e.g.

Gn 32:12(J) כי ירא אנכי אתו

Dt 20:3 אתם קרבים היום

1 Kg 11:22 מה אתה חסר עמי

2 Kg 7:12 ידעו כי רעבים אנחנו

Job 32:4 כי זקנים-המה ממנו

Consequently, this is a needless and unsubstantiated claim of dependence on MH that is matched by BH use.

Whitley (26) inappropriately calls the form עמל (Qoh 2:18) the "stative participle" -

ושנאתי את-כל-עמלי שאני עמל

But the participle is obviously not stative since its cognate accusative, עמל, precedes by only two words; it is obviously transitive as it also is in 2:22 and 9:9. BDB 766a is more accurate than in listing it as a "verbal adjective". This alleged identity as a "stative participle" is important to Whitley because he feels that there are significant parallels in MH. Yet apart from his inaccurate identification, the parallels he wishes to draw close to Qoh's use are very weak for any relation between Qoh and MH to be supported. Aboth 2:2 has a variant reading, העוסקים,² and Berakoth 28b is a very late occurrence, i.e. mhe² (see p. 202). Finally, his reference to 4:8, where

1 Blake (34) says that "Verbal adjectives other than participles may have the same constructions as regular participles."

2 Jastrow II 1088b

מחטר functions like the parallel participle עמל, only proves a parallel function of the word, it does not prove that it is a participle itself; it is very likely the verbal adjective, as in the other instances.

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

iii) Participle with Pronominal Subject and אין

Barton (53) and Whitley (139) also mention the cases where Qoh negates a participial clause with the nominative pronoun by using אין, as evidence of a notable connection between Qoh and MH. For example:

Qoh 4:17 כי אינם יודעים לעשה רע

Nedar 11:7 איני יודע שיש מפירין

However, neither cite the parallel in BH which uses the identical pronoun and verb -

2 Kg 17:26 כאשר אינם יודעים את-משפט

A brief reading of Mandelkern's entries of אין plus the pronominal suffix will show the many BH occurrences of this syntax, e.g. Gn 20:7(E); 43:5(J); Ex 5:10(J); Dt 4:22; Ju 12:3; 2 Sm 19:8; Is 1:15; 7:16 etc. In fact, since the regular negation of the participle is by אין (Watts 43, Blake 35), it is an expected syntactical feature of Qoh, where the participle is frequently preferred by the book's literary nature.

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

d) Semi-conditional Clause

Many instances of the semi-conditional clause are in Qoh, introduced by an indefinite substantive participle, designating "he who . . ." etc., i.e. 5:9,9; 8:5; 10:8,8,9,9; 11:4,4, e.g.

10:8 חִפֵּר גּוֹמֵץ בּוֹ יִפּוֹל

This is in accord with BH, e.g. Ex 12:12; Pr 15:32. However the regular construction in MH is the definite participle (Segal ss.374VII, 439), e.g. Ber 2:3 הַקּוֹרֵא (he who reads . . .). Since in all instances Qoh uses the pattern found in BH, the book contrasts with MH in this area.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

e) Orthography - Masculine Plural

The plurals of the participle in Qoh are all spelled ים-. This is in accord with BH, but discordant with MH. The latter spells these plurals with ין-, though ים- is a frequent alternative (Segal 1909:67).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

c. Other Verbal Comparisons

1) Concord - Gender of Subjects and Verb

In two cases Qoh uses both a masculine and feminine subject with one verb:

9:11 כִּי עַתּוֹ וּפְגַעַתּוֹ יִקְרָה אֶת-כָּל־כֶּלֶם

The feminine nature of עת in Qoh is supported by the feminine attributive adjective at 9:12 לעת רעה.

לא תחשך השמש והאור והירח והכוכבים 12:2

שמש is the only possible feminine noun in this phrase because it can be either gender in BH, whereas the others cannot. In each case the verb conforms to the gender of its closest subject. Thus the masculine verb יקרה follows the masculine noun פגע, and the feminine verb תחשך precedes the feminine שמש. This is not characteristic of MH where the verb in these circumstances is masculine (Segal s.450), but is of BH where the verb is inconsistently construed (GK s.146d-g; Davidson s.114b).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

2) Interchange of ל"י and ל"י Forms

- ל"י spelled as ל"י

Kutscher (1971:1599) says of MH,

" ל"י verbs . . . generally turned into ל"י verbs: sometimes however, the former spelling is retained."

Qoh on the contrary, characteristically retains the ל"י spelling, only exceptionally substituting a ל"י form for it. Out of 51 cases of ל"י verbs in Qoh, 5 take on ל"י vowels only, i.e. וּפָּן in 2:26; 8:12; 9:2,18; and מוּפָּן 7:26. Both Gordis (1955:363) and Podechard (45) discount these as merely vocalic.¹ The more

¹ Segal (s.198) recognizes an Aramaizing tendency of Hebrew scribes at work in ל"י verbs. Among others, Rabin (1970:307) believes BH vocalization to be only an "altered reflection" of the original language. For additional reason to doubt evidence based on vocalization, particularly in Qoh, see p.256ff.

significant interchange is in 10:5, where לִצֵּא takes on the consonantal form of the לִיָּה pattern (the feminine participle לִצֵּאָה is contracted to לִצֵּה , and here the Hē is substituted by Aleph).¹

- לִיָּה Spelled as לִיָּא

Qoh 8:1 has the only occurrence of this interchange in the book. שִׁנָּא (change) stands for the more common שִׁנָּה . Of the 181 instances of the לִיָּה verbs in Qoh, this one interchange is negligible, especially since this same root undergoes the same exchange of letter in two other BH cases: 2 Kg 25:29; Lam 4:1.

Though many have cited this interchange of Hē and Aleph in Qoh to be significantly like MH^2 , it is obvious when one looks at the frequent occurrences in BH of the same interchanges, that Qoh is no more like MH than Samuel or Kings in this regard.³ Out of 232 total uses of לִיָּא and לִיָּה verbs, Qoh has only two consonantal exchanges, and five less important vocalic exchanges. This is no different than BH allows, but contrary to the frequent exchange in MH.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

1 Another explanation is possible. This could be another example of a colloquialism in Qoh. Here a feminine noun, שִׁגְגָה , may be construed with a masculine participle, לִצֵּא , resulting in the discord of gender which may be vernacular (GR Driver 1970:234). The form then would only be a vocalic interchange (qames).

2 e.g. Delitzsch 197, Wright 488, Gordis 1960:408, Whitley 68.

3 GK ss. 75nn-rr: 1 Sm 6:10, 10:6, 13, 22:2; 2 Sm 1:6, 26, 12:17; 1 Kg 17:14, 22:25; 2 Kg 2:21, 22. Even the Siloam Inscription replaces an Aleph with a Hē form - line 4: לקרת to לקראת: Gibson 1971:23; KAI 188.

3) Verbal Nouns

This study pointed out earlier that MH does not use the infinitive construct nominally, but employs it only with lamed for gerundial functions. To replace this feature of the BH infinitive, MH often forms verbal nouns after various patterns, a rare construction in BH (Segal s.228). Qoh has a possible instance in 12:12 of the קָטִילָה verbal noun form in defective orthography (feminine), קָטִילָה. But since the same pattern exists in BH, and twice in North Israelite texts in particular, Segal suggests it was originally a pre-exilic form of that region:

North Israelite - Ju 5:16 שְׂרִיקוֹת ; 1 Kg 19:8 אֲכִילָה

Others - 1 Sm 13:21 פְּצִירָה ; Ps 19:13 שְׂגִיאוֹת

Lam 3:63 קִימָה ; 2 Chr 30:7 שְׁחִיטָה

Therefore, since the form is found in BH, and since Qoh has only one candidate, it is unnecessary to postulate any causal relation between Qoh and MH in this area; an alternate dialectical cause is viable (see pp. 34,36, 218).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH - this is true in regards to frequency, but the reason for the form in 12:12 may be dialectical and thus not indicate BH influence.

2 Nouns

a. Morphology

1) Duplication

Whitley (97) apparently feels that the duplicated nominal pattern in the word חתחתים (Qoh 12:5) is evidence of the Mishnaic character of Qoh's language. He gives two other BH examples of this type of noun morphology (גלגל, תלתלים) but concludes, "Such formations are, however, more frequent in the Mishna." He refers to Segal's Grammar p. 112, which lists nineteen. Yet BH has many examples of this form (Bauer-Leander 1962:481f):

קדקד	סלסלות	חלחלה	בקבק
קעקע	צאצאים	חרחר	ברברים
קשקשות	צחצחות	חתחתים	גלגל
שעשעים	צלצל	טלטלה	גרגרות
שרשרות	צנצנות	כדכד	גרגרים
תלתלים	צעצעים	כרכרות	דרדר
תעתעים	צפצפה	עפעפים	זלזלים

This list of 28 duplicated forms in BH renders Whitley's generalization misleading, and certainly allows for Qoh's one instance without the book being related to MH exclusively.

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

2) Mutual Substitution of Masculine and Feminine Nouns

Siegfried (14) draws attention to the MH trait of forming feminine nouns from masculine BH nouns and vice versa. He then

lists alleged cases in Qoh to show a similarity.

- טחנה Qoh 12:4; טחון Lam 5:13

To assume that the Qoh form is a development from that in Lamentations, assumes Qoh to be a later composition. This begs the question of this study.

- שתי Qoh 10:17; שתיה Est 1:8

This too begs the question since the BH norm is not known. Furthermore, they may be intentionally distinct morphologically, since the first refers to "drunkenness", the second to "drinking" in general.

- מצודה Qoh 9:12; מצוד Qoh 7:26

This variation is an option in BH itself: מצוד in Job 19:6, and מצודה in Ezk 19:9. Hence the one form need not be a development from the other in the MH era.

- בחורות Qoh 11:9; 12:1; בחורים Nu 11:28(E)

The feminine plural form for the masculine plural is predated in BH, for instance at Ho 4:19 where Nyberg (35) has contended that זבחות is a North Israelite peculiarity (see p. 34,37).

- יגעה Qoh 12:12; יגיע Gn 31:42(E) etc.

Qoh's form might be a verbal noun, a formation found in BH including North Israelite passages (see pp. 34, 36, 108, 218).

- מרוץ Qoh 9:11; מרוצה 2 Sm 18:27

This one bi-form remains.

Five of the six examples of Siegfried's do not support his claim, since they either beg the question, ignore semantic

differences, or fail to see possible dialectical causes. It should be noted further that the remaining example, Qoh 9:11 could hardly carry the weight of the argument since the interchange of forms is prevalent in BH. Sperber (22ff) lists 118 cases in BH where the masculine and feminine forms of a noun exist. EBH examples are:

אמונה	1 Sm 26:23	אמוך	Is 26:2
גדולה	2 Sm 7:21,23	גדל	Nu 14:19(JE)
טובה	Gn 50:20(E)	טוב	Ex 33:19(J)
מלאה	Ex 22:28(E)	מלא	Ju 6:38
נקמה	Ju 11:36	נקמ	Ju 16:28
עזרה	Ju 5:23	עזר	Gn 2:18(J)
רעה	Am 5:13	רע	Am 6:3

Others: Peisker lists *אמר-אמרה*, *חלק-חלקה*, *חק-חקה*, *ישע-ישועה*.

Finally, Qoh does not conform to the MH morphology in the plural *פרדסים* (2:5), where MH uses the feminine *פרדסות*, e.g. Arakin 3:2.

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

3) Plural Termination

If the masculine plural absolute is intended in Qoh, it is always terminated by *-ים*. However, "the plural termination of masculine nouns is in MH almost as often *-ין* as *-ים*." (Segal s.281). Though the *-ין* ending occurs in BH (GK s.87e), it is very rare. Qoh therefore is solidly in the BH sphere in this respect.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b. Genitive Expression

On the whole, Qoh conforms to the usual BH practice in genitive relations where it is "regularly expressed by the close connection of the nomen regens (in the construct state) with the nomen rectum [absolute] ." (GK s.128a).

Qoh differs from MH in the following cases.

1) של

A common designation of the genitive relation in MH is the use of של (Segal ss.79,385,406-9). It is parallel to the BH אשר ל (GK s.129h). Yet despite its readiness to use the ש-relative, Qoh does not use ש for any genitival connection.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

2) ל

A much rarer, in fact "extremely rare" genitive construction in MH is formed by the bound word preceding the absolute with prefixed lamed (Segal s.384). Qoh on the contrary, uses this formation three times; the form is more typical of BH (GK s.130a).

1:11 אין זכרון לראשנים...

1:11 ...וגם לאחרנים

2:16 אין זכרון לחכם

Though גם interrupts the genitive chain in 1:11, the syntax is indeed genitival as seen by the bound vocalization of זְכוֹרוֹן .

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

3) Anticipatory Suffix

Another frequent circumlocation of the genitive in MH is the anticipation of the absolute noun by a possessive pronominal suffix attached to the previous noun (Segal s.387). For instance, Sab 1:1 ידו של עני "the hand of the poor man". This happens in BH too, especially in LBH (Polzin 38ff), but not to the extent as in MH. Qoh, as with the two previous circumlocutions, is unlike MH in that it does not employ this construction.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

3 Pronouns

a. Personal

1) אני

Because both Qoh and MH use אני to the exclusion of אנכי,¹ an obvious similarity is seen.² This study includes a thorough study of this point on p.172ff, but it should be noted here that this is a property of some BH books as well, especially the later ones.

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

2) Copular Third Person

Both the singular and plural third person pronouns are used as a verb in MH (Segal s.405). This occurs frequently in nominal clauses as in Sab 31a אתה הוא הלל, Art thou Hillel?

1 Segal s.67: In MH only in quotes and allusions to the Bible.

2 e.g. Gordis 1960:408 - 'proto-mishnic'; also Whitley 14.

Dahood (1952:197) claims Qoh uses the copular pronoun in 6 passages - 1:17; 2:23; 3:13; 4:8; 5:18; 6:2. Yet S. R. Driver (1892:ss.20,198) relegated all these but 3:13 to examples of a *casus pendens* clause resumed by the pronoun, e.g. 2:23 זה הכל הוא. In this case, 3:13 follows the same pattern since it too is appositional: ממת אלהים היא. There is no difference in gender between the subject of these clauses and the resumptive pronoun, thus there is no way to prove they must play an independent verbal role; they always agree and are consequently just as much appositional.

Many have cited the phrase in 1:17 as using the pronoun in a verbal way:¹

שגם זה הוא רעיון רוח

Yet the presence of one solid case of the feature in Qoh is not inconsistent with BH,² and is certainly not frequent, as in MH. Again, the question could be asked here as well whether the pronoun is not resumptive.

It is this instance in 1:17 that some have associated with the Mishnaic זהו³, e.g. Kel 5:10. The argument offered is that Qoh's unabbreviated phrase זה הוא, is the predecessor to זהו in MH and thus exhibits MH influence here. But contractions found in MH like זהו and מהו (Jastrow 1926:736),⁴ do not help show

1 Barton 52,87; S. R. Driver 1892 s.201; Davidson s.106rem.2; Podechard 47; Aalders 15.

2 S. R. Driver 1892 ss.198-201; Davidson op. cit.

3 e.g. Barton 52,87; Podechard 47; Aalders 15.

4 Also in Bar Kosiba letter #46 line 9 (Milik 1961:166)

any MH intrusion on the independently written pronouns in BH such as **זֶה הוּא**, and **מֵה הוּא**. This is evident from the following data.

- The identical phrase is found in BH:

1 Chr 22:1 **זֶה הוּא בֵּית יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים**

- The demonstrative-personal pronoun sequence is found more frequently in BH in the plural, but is seen thereby to have a legitimate place in its grammar,

e.g. Gn 25:16(P) **אֱלֹהֵם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**

also, Lev 23:2; Nu 3:20,21,27,33

- **מֵה הוּא** occurs at Nu 13:18(JE); 16:11(P); Ps 39:5; Zech 5:6.

It is also in Lachish Letter IX, lines 8,9. The contraction of MH would not prove MH influence on these passages, so the parallel in Qoh 1:17, **זֶה הוּא**, should not be taken as evidence of such either.

Consequently, the difference in form from the MH contraction, and the number of BH equivalents and parallels, draws Qoh's use in 1:17 into the grammatical sphere of BH.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

3) הָן - הֵנָּה

Qoh uses only the masculine plural pronoun **הֵם** for all five instances where one would expect the feminine **הֵן**, i.e. 2:6,10; 10:9; 11:8; 12:1. This is contrary to MH where the distinction is usually maintained, as in BH (Segal ss.70,71). For an explanation why Qoh is different in this way from both MH and

BH, see page 42f ; it could be a colloquialism.

Conclusion: Neither BH nor MH

4) המה

Qoh is morphologically dissimilar to MH in the third person plural pronoun. In four cases the המה form is employed by Qoh (3:18; 4:2; 7:29; 12:12). Yet MH uses this spelling only in Biblical quotations (Segal s.70). מה is the regular form.

Moreover, the pronominal suffix may terminate with nun in MH, rather than mem (Segal s.71; Kutscher 1971:1596). However Qoh uses the terminal mem exclusively, e.g. 2:6 מהם, 4:11 להם.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b. Demonstrative

1) הַ

In unique fashion, Qoh uses only the short form of the feminine demonstrative to the exclusion of the usual BH הַאֵ, i.e. 2:2, 24; 5:15,18; 7:23; 9:13. This is a common reason for ascribing Qoh to a proto-Mishnaic or Mishnaic era of the language.¹ This is because the phonological equivalent הַ, is also used exclusively in MH (Segal s.72). Since this shorter form is seen in North Israelite texts and elsewhere in BH, and could be a vulgarism (see pp.43,45), to restrict the cause to MH influence is unnecessary. The North Israelite הַ, is not only phonologically

¹ e.g. Barton 52, McNeile 489, Odeberg 98, Podechard 46 "probablement".

equivalent, but is the orthographic equivalent as well, hence provides a more viable comparand.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of MH, but, Independent of MH

2) הַ: Without Article

Barton (52) makes a curious remark about the "use of הַ¹ with nouns without the article, as כֹּל־זֶה 8:9, 9:1, like the Mishnic אֵלֶּה הַ, and הַ . . . הַ = 'this' . . . 'that' also without the article, 3:19, 6:5; 7:14,18; 11:6;". The absence of any demonstrative that is used as an attributive adjective in Qoh is sufficient grammatical reason however for the absence of an articulated הַ (GK s.126y). The parallel with MH that Barton cites is inappropriate since the כֹּל-זֶה is a bound construction identical to that of Ju 6:13, 1 Sm 22:15, 2 Sm 14:19:

e.g. Ju 6:13 וְלִמָּה מִצֵּאתְנוּ כֹּל-זֶה

The additional example of the reciprocal use is also curious. Barton later refers to König's Syntax s.48 which speaks about this function as,

"Correlativer (reciproker) u. qualificierende Gebrauch von הַ : Ex 14:20 J, Jos 8:22, 2 Sm 2:13, 1 Kg 3:23, 20:29, 22:20, Is 6:3, 44:5, 49:12, Ps 20:8, 75:8, Hi 1:16ff, 21:23,25, Qh 3:19, 6:5, 7:14,18, 11:6, Dn 12:2, 1 Ch 24:5, Misna: Pe'a 2:4."

Obviously then, by Barton's own reference, this reciprocal use of הַ is like BH as much as it is MH.

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

¹ An apparent misprint has only ה. Barton's failure to discuss this in detail within the commentary makes it difficult to understand what his precise point is.

3) אלה

The spelling of the plural demonstrative pronoun is different in Qoh and MH. At 7:10,28 and 11:9, Qoh uses the typical BH form אלה, whereas MH always forms this demonstrative as אלו (Segal s.72). That this is not merely an orthographic distinction is seen by the phonological difference, אלו-אלה

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

c. Reflexive Pronouns

1) Preposition and Suffix

Segal (s.428) describes MH's formation of the reflexive by a preposition plus the pronominal suffix, to be a rare form. Qoh on the other hand, employs the construction 9 times: 2:4,4, 4,5,5,7,8,8; 8:12, e.g.

2:4 בנית לי בתים

8:12 חטא עשה רע מאה ומאריך לו

This is according to the BH usage (GK s.135i; Davidson s.11b).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

2) עצם and Suffix

Qoh does not use this common MH replacement for the BH preposition plus suffix construction just discussed above. Where MH uses עצם with the appropriate suffix, Qoh uses BH forms instead. MH for instance uses in Pes 1:2, זו לעצמה וזו לעצמה (this for itself, and this for itself; Segal s.429). As seen above, Qoh employs lamed plus the personal pronoun in

parallel situations. BH also does not use this combination except for inanimate objects, as Segal (s.431) points out.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

3) נפש and Suffix

Though נפש is rarely found in MH for introducing the reflexive pronominal suffix (Segal s.432), Qoh has this BH expression (Davidson s.11c) at two locations:

2:24 והראה את-נפשו טוב בעמלו

4:8 ומחסר את-בפשי מטובה

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

d. Relative

1) את אשר

Some claim that in BH, Qoh 4:3 alone matches the MH combination¹ of the relative with את as a nominative (for example, Whitley 42):

וטוב משניהם את אשר עדן לא היה

However this should be compared with two texts in Jeremiah. In Jer 38:16, the Qere omits את, perhaps not knowing how to deal with the uncommon את-nominative expressed by the kethib. Hence Gordis (Ibid.) considers the kethib authentic, and simply a syntactical option at the time, becoming more frequent in MH. Furthermore, Blau (1954:17) has considered Jer 27:8 to be a BH

1 Segal s.422

instance of this formation:

..וואת אשר לא-יתן את צוארו בעל מלך בבל

Also, given the numerous situations where *אשר את* is found substantively in BH¹, it is expected that in its course the substantive would serve a nominative function.

Qoh's sole use of the phrase in 4:3, in light of these considerations, could be attributed only tenuously to MH influence.

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

2) *ש*-Relative

a) Frequency

MH uses *ש* exclusively as its relative, having *אשר* only in Biblical quotations and liturgical texts (Segal s.77). Since Qoh uses the *ש*-relative 68 times, and *אשר* 89 times, many have believed that Qoh is at a transitional stage between BH and MH.² This reasoning, that because Qoh uses both, the book must be placed between both eras of the language however, is faulty, for BH itself has other texts with mixed usage of *ש* and *אשר*, and even exclusive uses of *ש*. Lamentations for instance uses *ש* four times (2:15,16; 4:9; 5:18), and *אשר* nine times (1:7, 10,10,12,12,22; 2:17,22; 4:20).³ And Jonah has *ש* three times

1 BDB 83a, e.g. Gn 32:24(J), 34:28(J), Ex 4:15(J)

2 e.g. Barton 52, Gordis 1960:408, Whitley 8, Loretz 26.

3 Milik (1962:227) evidently feels this feature of Lamentations to be Mishnaic. Yet no other evidence of MH influence on the book accompanies his claim. One trait can hardly prove such a relation between MH and a Biblical book.

(1:7,12; 4:10), but אשר thirteen times (1:5,8,9,14; 2:10; 3:2, 8,10; 4:5,10,10,11,11).¹ Three Psalms also combine both

forms:	ש	אשר
Ps 135	vss. 2,8,10	vss. 6
144	15	8,11,12
146	3,5	6

Song of Songs employs ש to the virtual exclusion of אשר, the latter appearing but once in the introductory verse. Seven Psalms also use it exclusively: Ps 122:3,4; 123:2; 124:1,2, 6; 129:6,7; 133:2,3; 136:23; 137:8,9.

It is evident then that Qoh's combined use is unlike MH, yet acceptable within BH style. The existence of the ש relative in Qoh, and its combination with אשר, does not align the book with MH's total use, instead it likens Qoh to BH where texts exist which exercised the option to use one and the other.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

b) Compounded

Du Plessis (176) remarks that,

"Conspicuous in Qoheleth is the cumulation of particles e.g. בשכבר and שכבר - a phenomenon to be

¹ Milik (1962:226) suggests that, "Dans les livres comme Qohelet et Jonas, son emploi a du etre systematique, mais les copistes posterieurs et les redacteurs du Texte Recu lui substituerent le אשר classique." This too has little to support it. It assumes the later revisions to be unthorough for an unexplained reason, or that they were simply sloppy. It also does not account for the many Psalms with mixed uses.

found in the Mishna . . . "

Both of these combinations entail the ψ -relative, which is the frequent substitute for אשר in Qoh. That it is prefixed to other particles is a necessary fact of its nature; since it is inseparable, tautologically, it must be compounded if used. One would expect therefore, given the numerous cases of ψ in Qoh, that it would be seen in the company of adverbs and prepositions. Du Plessis considers the combination of ψ and an adverb to be "conspicuous", yet such a combination is equally conspicuous in BH elsewhere: Ps 124:6 ψ לא, 129:7 ψ לא, 144:15 שככה, 146:3 ψ אין, 146:5 ψ אל. He further generalizes (177) that,

"Peculiar to Qoheleth is also the fact that ψ - is combined with prepositions, e.g. ב (2:16) and כ (5:14; 9:12; 10:3; 12:7). Outside Qoheleth a similar combination is often found where אשר is concerned, but never where ψ - is used."

But the evidence is strikingly to the contrary: Ps 136:23 ψ על, 2 Kg 6:11 משלנו, Ju 7:12 ψ על, 8:26 ψ על.

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

e. Interrogative as the Indefinite Pronoun

MH uses the interrogative pronouns מי and מה for indefinite expressions, usually with the ψ -relative (Segal s.436), e.g.

Yeb 11:6 מי שלא שהתה
any woman who has not waited . . .

BH employs the interrogatives as indefinite pronouns

as well:¹

- מי without the relative: Ex 32:26(J) מי ליהוה אלי

- מי with the relative: 2 Sm 20:11 מי אשר חפץ ביואב
ומי אשר לדוד אחרי יואב

also Ex 32:23(J).

- מה without the relative: 1 Sm 19:3 וראיתי מה והגדתי לך

Qoh also uses these interrogatives for the same purpose:

- מי with the relative: Qoh 9:4 מי אשר יבחר אל כל-החיים

- מי without the relative: Qoh 5:9 ומי אהב בהמון

- מה with the relative: 1:9,9; 3:15,22; 6:10; 7:24; 8:7;
10:14

e.g. 1:9 מה-שהיה הוא שיהיה

Some have identified מי אשר in 9:4 as a "late" characteristic of Qoh,² and Barton (52) compares it with MH's form מי ש. But this neglects the BH precedents and exact parallels above.

A stronger relation seems evident to others (Gordis: 1968:207; Whitley 11) between Qoh's use of מה ש and MH, since this exact combination appears in Qoh alone in BH. Two obvious comments are needed however:

- 1 It is arbitrary to form a solid distinction between the personal (מי) and impersonal (מה) interrogative pronouns, and then to distribute

1 GK s.137; Williams ss.121, 125; Davidson s.8; F. Blake 180, BDB 567a and König (1897:s.72) question whether this really means an indefinite translation. BDB prefers a rendition that maintains the interrogative sense. Since the same question is applicable to MH, the parallel remains, and becomes merely a semantic distinction.

2 e.g. Siefried 13, Hertzberg 28.

their function to separate eras of the language, i.e. מה= MH, מי= BH and MH. Since מי אשר belongs to BH, מה אשר can reasonably be expected to exist in the language as well.

- 2 Any argument to the effect that the form using the ך-
relative is the late aspect, since the ך-relative
is supposedly late itself, is unacceptable.¹ BH,
including EBH and North Israelite, show this
judgement to be inaccurate.

Apart from its shorter form, מי ך is in grammatical
accord with BH in this area. Regarding its form, it is
simply another substitution of ך for אשר, which Qoh does
very often, but without any dependence on MH.²

Conclusion: Equally BH and MH

4. Preposition: The Frequency of לְ

A common preposition for "to(ward)" in BH, לְ, occurs 24
times in Qoh: (1:5,6,6,7,7; 3:20,20; 4:17; 6:6; 7:2,2,2;
9:1,3,4; 10:15; 12:5,6,7; suffixed 8:14,14; 9:13,14).

Yet MH uses it only rarely, substituting אֶל and ל (Segal

1 This is implied by Gordis 1968:207, and Whitley (11). To suggest a significant relation to the Aramaic מה די (Dn 2:20,29,45; Ezr 7:18) over against BH is unnecessary since the ך-relative is truly Hebrew.

2 Odeberg (98) cites the compound כִּשׁ- (5:14) as evidence of MH influence, MH using כִּמוּ ך (Segal s.496). Yet the equivalent כִּאֲשֶׁר in the very same verse, which is common BH, abrogates any need to see MH at work here.

s.301; Albrecht 21 - "ist in der Mišna ausserst selten, und dann noch fraglicher Richtigkeit.").

Conclusion: More Characteristic of BH

C. Summary

In total, Qoh has now been compared with MH in 61 grammatical areas. These areas have been discussed either because they have been said to show Qoh's dependence on MH, or because they offer differences between BH and MH which allow Qoh to align with either in each grammatical area. With reference to the specific principles for comparing Qoh's grammar with that of MH, which were outlined at the outset of this section of Chapter Three, the conclusions are summarized as follows.

1. Exclusively MH - If a grammatical trait is found in BH, but only in Qoh, yet is seen again repeatedly in MH, then the feature may be termed a Mishnaism tentatively.

No grammatical feature appears in MH and Qoh alone. That is, all common points of grammar between MH and Qoh are also found to some degree in BH elsewhere. There is not a single feature therefore that would represent this most significant comparative category, and thereby support a hypothesis that Qoh is dependent on MH and its grammar. Such features would have spoke emphatically in favor of such a hypothesis if at least some had existed. However, that none exist speaks clearly against the hypothesis.

2. Equally BH and MH - If a grammatical feature is found both in BH and MH, then that feature should not be considered a Mishnaism since it occurs throughout a large stretch of the history of the language.

Twelve grammatical traits that have been, or might be cited as evidence of Qoh's dependence on MH, either occur with similar frequency in other parts of BH, or not frequently enough in Qoh to contrast with BH frequency and resemble MH:

- 1 Infinitive Absolute (with finite cognate)
- 2 Participle as a Present Tense
- 3 Participle with Pronominal Subject
- 4 Verbal Adjective with Pronominal Subject
- 5 Participle with Pronominal Subject and אין
- 6 Duplication in Noun Formation
- 7 Substitution of Masculine and Feminine Noun Forms
- 8 Exclusive Use of אני
- 9 הַ without the Article
- 10 ׀-relative Compounded
- 11 Relative with אַ Nominative
- 12 Interrogative Pronoun as an Indefinite Pronoun

3. More Characteristic of MH - If a trait is predominately a MH trait, occurring only seldom in BH, then these points should be considered:

- a. Independent of MH - The question must be asked, "Is there any good reason why there should be a heavy use of this trait in Qoh outside of any dependence on MH grammar?"

Does the genre or dialectical peculiarities of Qoh suggest another cause?

Two traits of Qoh are disproportionate to the rest of BH, and more akin to MH:

1 Paucity of the Waw Consecutive Imperfect

2 הַלְּ as the Feminine Demonstrative

However both of these features have alternate explanations.

The waw consecutive imperfect may occur at most 3 times, but the waw consecutive construction in general occurs at least 18 times (16 perfect, 2 or 3 imperfects). The consecutive constructions as a total differentiate the book from MH. The phenomenon of only a few waw consecutive imperfects should therefore be analysed in light of the concerns of genre and dialect which this study has already outlined.

The appearance of הַלְּ in Qoh, as suggested by this study, is caused by the book's dialectical uniqueness, as is the cause in other parts of BH. This suggestion is especially appropriate since this is the only feature that resembles MH in its exclusive use, though not in its orthography.

- b. Dependent on MH - If there is no other viable reason for Qoh's similarity to MH at a grammatical point, e.g. genre, dialect, then the feature could be tentatively termed a Mishnaism.

No grammatical feature that occurs in Qoh in a degree unlike BH, yet similar to MH, is without an adequate

alternate cause to MH influence. Again, such features would speak strongly for such an influence if they existed, but that none exist, speaks against the theory.

4. More Characteristic of BH - If a feature is more characteristic of BH, including Qoh, than it is of MH (because MH has a different means to achieve the same end), then that feature indicates an independence of Qoh's grammar from that of MH. This would be true provided there are no alternate causes for such alignment with BH, such as genre or dialect.

Qoh shares 46 grammatical traits with BH in contrast with MH. That is, in 46 areas where a trait is more characteristic of BH than MH, Qoh shows its independence of MH grammar. In one of these 46 categories however, the absence of the trait may indicate a vernacular preference for simplicity, i.e. the use of the hophal only in the form **יִוָּכַל**. Of the 48 points of contrast between BH and MH (under 3a above, and these 46) that relate to Qoh, 96% show MH definitely had no influence on the book, but that BH was the grammatical pattern. The remaining 4% have alternate causes that have been seen by scholars to be regional or vernacular, i.e. **הִזָּ** and the few waw consecutive imperfects.

5. Neither BH nor MH - If a grammatical property appears disproportionately in Qoh, in contrast to both BH and MH, its effect will be to distinguish Qoh from both equally, and is of no chronological significance.

In one instance Qoh neither resembles BH nor MH, i.e. the use of the masculine forms for the third feminine plural pronoun.

Because of the evidence in this summary, it is not surprising that one would enquire with Greenfield (1963:352) into the validity of the MH influence hypothesis. He accurately concludes,

" . . . the proposition that the Hebrew of Koheleth is a middle stage between late biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew, containing many Aramaisms, has little to recommend it . . . Why is the syntax of Koheleth on the whole so different from Mishnaic Hebrew?"¹

1 The question of Aramaisms is discussed thoroughly in Section III of Chapter Four.

- II. Second Temple Hebrew and Qoheleth
 - A. Ben Sira
 - B. Copper Scroll and the Hebrew Bar Kosiba Letters
 - C. Qumran Sectarian Scrolls
 - D. Summary

One might say that to look at MH to the degree this study has, is too extreme a method since other literature exists which might more ably represent a transitional stage from BH to MH. Yet because it is the MH language that Qoh has been compared with for so long, and still is, a detailed comparison of Qoh with MH was necessary.

Even now, little attention is given to the so-called Second Temple Hebrew (STH) and its relation to Qoh. This study will look at this relation in the field of grammar through the examples of Ben Sira, the Copper Scroll, the Hebrew Bar Kosiba Letters (though these are technically post-second temple), and the Sectarian Scrolls from Qumran.¹ Since the nature of STH is so heterogenous, a document-by-document approach has been used when possible. The Sectarian Scrolls however will be handled collectively.

Again, only those features that are different from BH as a

1 Whitley uses the Shema and Eighteen Benedictions as well, but these are less reliant sources as Reif (125) points out: ". . . one would have to distinguish carefully the prayer as it then was [first two centuries B.C.] from the structure and vocabulary which it took on at a later date, when such matters became more formalized. The direct comparison of passages from a contemporary edition of the Hebrew Prayer-book with those of the Hebrew text in Qoheleth in an effort to arrive at a sound linguistic dating of the latter, is to say the least, a somewhat simplistic exercise."

whole will be assessed, since they alone can provide the necessary contrast in estimating to which style Qoh gravitates. The methodological principles outlined at the beginning of the previous MH section will be applicable here as well.

A. Ben Sira (BS)

A comparison of Qoh with BS is particularly necessary of late because Whitley has used such a comparison to date Qoh around 152 B.C., after BS. The implausibility of such a date will be obvious after the investigation of Whitley's brief linguistic argument, and the slightly broader enquiry of our own. The importance of BS lies in the book's role as the representative of STH wisdom literature, and though it is basically BH in nature, to a degree it reflects the later stage of the language.

For the purpose of this study, the basic authenticity of BS Geniza is assumed with attention paid to the notes of Di Lella and Levi on possible Syriac retroversions, and Yadin's notes on the Masada Scroll.

1. Whitley's Grammatical Comparisons (128-9)

These number five in all -

a. Parallel Phrases

1) Qoh 3:21 : BS 40:11

Whitley attempts to show that Qoh post-dates BS in its use

of **לֵאֲרָץ** rather than **אֶל אֲרָץ**, Qoh's preference for **לָמַד** presumed to be due to Aramaic influence. He uses the following parallel texts, which are quoted as he presents them.

BS 40:11 כֹּל מֵאֲרָץ אֶל אֲרָץ יָשׁוּב

Qoh 3:20,21 הַכֹּל הִיָּה מִן הָעֵפֶר וְהַכֹּל שׁוֹב אֶל-הָעֵפֶר .
הִיא לְמַטָּה לְאֲרָץ

But one notices that in Whitley's presentation of the parallel, he begins his reference in Qoh 3:20. This results in bringing the verb **שׁוֹב** closer in view so that the whole thought appears more lexically parallel to the BS text; otherwise **שׁוֹב** and **לֵאֲרָץ** are separated by 15 words. Within these 15 words omitted by Whitley's selective quotation, is the *true* predicate of the prepositional phrase **לֵאֲרָץ**, i.e. **הִירַדָּת**. This participial predicate of the prepositional phrase would have been identified more easily if he had only quoted one more word prior to **הִיא**:

הִירַדָּת הִיא לְמַטָּה לְאֲרָץ

Once it is seen that two different verbs are involved in the parallel between BS and Qoh, one can demonstrate the error in Whitley's argument. It is important that BS has **שׁוֹב**, and Qoh has **יָרַד**, at times even in EBH other verbs denoting "descent" take the same prepositional phrase as in Qoh. That is, they prefer **לֵאֲרָץ** to **אֶל אֲרָץ**, e.g. Am 3:14 **וְנִפְּלוּ לְאֲרָץ**; Is 14:12 **וְנִפְּלוּ לְאֲרָץ**; also Is 21:9; 25:12; 28:2. **יָרַד** does not recur in BH with this prepositional phrase, so the Qoh passage cannot be compared with another exact parallel either in BH or BS. Therefore **לָמַד** used with **אֲרָץ** is acceptable BH when connected with verbs of descent.

Furthermore, the true prepositional phrase of the verb which Whitley focuses his parallel on in Qoh 3:20, is ironically begun with אל (אל העפר). The verb that Whitley discusses therefore, שׁוּב, has the same prepositional phrase, -שׁוּב אל-, in both Qoh and BS and obviously cannot be offered as a contrast to show Qoh to be later than BS. The contrast Whitley proposes can only be accepted if one neglects to see that the correlative verb, הִירֵדָה, is different from that presented by him.

2) Qoh 8:4 : Dn 4:32

In support of his argument above, Whitley tries to show that Qoh's use of prepositional lamed with אָמַר is a later use than אָמַר followed by אֵל. He hopes to prove that יֹאמַר לוֹ is late, by using an Aramaic parallel:

Dn 4:32 וַיֹּאמֶר לָהּ מֵה עֲבַדָּהּ

Qoh 8:4 וּמִי יֹאמֶר לוֹ מֵה תַעֲשֶׂה

He concludes that Qoh is closer to the Aramaic of Daniel than to the earlier parallel in Job 9:12 where אָמַר אֵל is used:

מִי יֹאמֶר אֵלָיו מֵה תַעֲשֶׂה

But the question persists whether Qoh is different from Job because of an Aramaic influence, or because it was perfectly acceptable to use אָמַר ל in BH. To employ lamed as a preposition to the indirect object after אָמַר, is natural Hebrew even as early as Gn 41:55(E), Ex 3:14(E), 2 Sm 7:8. Any agreement with BA in this respect is not caused by any restriction on when BH used אָמַר ל, but because of the fact that BA is itself

restricted. BA only has lamed for a directional preposition meaning "to", it does not use אל.

3) Qoh 8:1 : BS 13:24

The word order of the phrases parallel to Qoh 8:1 also indicates to Whitley that Qoh was composed after BS. These phrases are:

Qoh 8:1	פניו לשנא
Dn 3:19	אנפיה אשתנו
BS 13:24	לשנא פניו
Job 14:20	משנה פני

If Qoh matches the Daniel passage, Whitley deduces that Qoh post-dates BS, because BS follows the earliest pattern found in Job. Since Daniel is later than BS, Whitley argues, Qoh must also be later. However it is an even probability by chance alone that Qoh would align with either Daniel or Job. More parallels are necessary from BH to support a claim such as this.

b. Waw Consecutive Constructions

Whitley believes Qoh to be a later composition than BS because Qoh has so few waw consecutive imperfects and because he believes there is an absence of waw consecutive perfects.

" . . . the Waw Consecutive, so characteristic of classical Hebrew, appears in a number of places in Ben Sira . . . In contrast to this usage in Ben Sira, the Waw Consecutive with the imperfect appears only three times in Koheleth . . . So,

while the perfect with Waw Consecutive occurs in Ben Sira 42:8 . . . and 42:11 . . . it is not found at all in Koheleth . . . In this decided preference for the simple Waw rather than the Consecutive tense, Koheleth is nearer than Ben Sira to the usage of the Mishna." 128f

But the waw consecutive perfects are *not* absent in Qoh. They occur frequently - at least 16 times. As this study has pointed out, the presence of these waw consecutives directs one away from ascribing a similarity with MH, so to neglect their presence is a serious mistake. The scarcity of waw consecutive imperfects has been explained already as conducive to the important tense differentiation (perfective or preterite) and the probable vernacular nature of Qoh's language (see pp. 41, 68ff).

c. ׀-Relative

Qoh's use of the ׀-relative (68 times) along with אשר (89 times) appears to Whitley to be proof of the book's later date than BS since according to him, ". . . the relative ׀ does not occur in Ben Sira . . . ". This is another misstatement, because it does occur in BS 17 times (Milik 1962:226). Though Qoh may use it to a higher percent, similar ratios of ׀ to אשר are found in Lamentations, Jonah, and some Psalms, all which one would not date after BS (see p. 120f). As concluded earlier, the reasons for Qoh's use of ׀ should be sought elsewhere than in a late development.

In summary, Whitley's grammatical argument, when it comes to Qoh and BS, is very weak since apart from his critical errors in reciting basic evidence, he fails to take into account alternate explanations. Still the additional weakness in his grammatical assessment is that he allows at most only 20 years for these grammatical distinctions to develop. He dates Qoh "within the period 152-145 B.C." (148). He claims that,

"The syntax, vocabulary and usage of much of the book indicate a time when the Hebrew language was in a state of transition from biblical to Mishnaic Hebrew, and contained, moreover, a considerable admixture of Aramaic. But at no time before the Maccabean-Hasmonean struggles [165-160 B.C.] was this true of Hebrew." p.148

In other words, developments that Hebrew scholars and grammarians describe in centuries, Whitley contracts to two decades or less.

2 Some Further Grammatical Comparisons between Qoh and BS

a. Morphology

1) Mutual Substitution of Masculine and Feminine Nouns

An earlier discussion revealed that Qoh has only one sure candidate for a later substitution of the earlier feminine form, i.e. מרוץ Qoh 9:11; מרוצה 2 Sm 18:27. BS on the other hand has five cases of this phenomenon which is found more frequently in MH than BH.

BS			BH
6:28	חבלה	rope	חבל
7:21	חפש	freedom	חפשה
13:11a			
38:18 ¹	עצבה	trouble	עצב
38:14b	פשרה	interpretation	פשר
3:14	תמור	substitute	תמורה

Qoh is well within what BH allows (see p. 109f for numerous other BH examples), but diverges from BS's frequency.

2) Mutual Substitution of Singular and Plural Nouns (Segal ss. 291,292)

Siegfried (14) commented on this MH characteristic in regards to Qoh, He mentioned,

Qoh 2:5 פרדסים
 2:7 תענגות
 5:1 מעטים

But the last two are found in other BH texts in the plural, i.e. SS 3:7 and Ps 109:8 respectively. The first is in the plural simply because 'Qoheleth' made more than one park. On the other hand, Strauss (67f) gives at least 5 instances of this exchange in BS:

BS			BH
38:25	אלוף	cattle	אלופים Ps 144:14
41:19	אציל	joint	אצילות Jer 38:12

¹ Thus Levi (45) and the Hebrew text; Box (451) reads with the Greek, עצמה.

	BS		BH	
48:3	אש	fire	אש	Ex 22:5
4:22	מכשולים	stumbling	מכשול	Is 8:14
43:21	צמחים	sprout	צמח	Ho 8:7

Qoh then is different ~~from~~ BS in this area, since it has no instances of this type of substitution that does not occur in BH, or that is not reasonable given the context.

3) Verbal Nouns

These were found to be frequent in MH (see p. 108f). Qoh however has only the possibility of conforming with the word יגע at 12:12. BS is more similar to MH since it uses 11 roots this way (Strauss 68).

Qal:	BS 38:16c	גריעה	burial
	38:25c	שעיה	conversation
	38:26	שקידה	care
Piel:	14:14	חמוד	desire
	40:29d margin	יסור	trial
	51:28	למוד	teaching
	33:1 44:20d	נסוי	trial
Hiphil:	51:17	הודאה	praise
	35:10	השגה	attaining
Hithpael:	43:8	השתנות	changing
	44:8	השתעות	telling

Again a contrast comes from comparing Qoh with BS, the latter exhibiting the frequency of verbal nouns approximated more by MH.

a. The Infinitive Construct with Preposition - פ"י Verbs

BS 30:17 spells the infinitive construct of ירד with the preposition lamed as לירד,¹ as in MH. The BH pattern is of course לרדת. As shown earlier, Qoh is always consistent with BH precedents (see p.91).

b. The Preposition - Lamed as Accusative

The language of BS at times prefixes a lamed to the accusative, as in MH (Segal s.351) and LBH (Polzin 64f), i.e. BS 4:7; 5:6a; 42:23b. Qoh however has no certain case of this (see p.187).

B. Copper Scroll and the Hebrew Bar Kosiba Letters

These two sources are dated in the first (Cross 1962: 217ff) and second centuries respectively. They offer the student original texts with which to compare the grammar of Qoh.

1. Verbs

a. Infinitive Construct with Preposition

1 Nöldeke (1900:84) questions the authenticity of the yod.

Like MH, the Copper Scroll (col. 1 line 13) forms the infinitive construct plus preposition as **בִּירַד פִּיִּי**. This is contrary to the BH pattern **בִּרְדַּת** of Ex 34:29, Nu 11:9, 2 Kg 7:17 etc., and to the morphology of the same type of **פִּיִּי** construction in Qoh (see p. 91).

a. Participle

1) As Present Tense

Participles express the present tense in MH, whereas in BH the imperfect regularly shares this function. The Copper Scroll uses the participle for the present, and like MH, never uses the imperfect. (col's 1:lines 2,7; 4:3; 6:2,8; 9:10; 12:10). Consequently it is unlike BH and Qoh which use both aspects for the present (see p. 66).

2) Masculine Plural Orthography

Both terminal **יִן-** and **יִם-** for the masculine participle are acceptable in the Bar Kosiba and related letters. To the men of Engeddi (lines 3,4) the spelling is **יִן**, whereas the letter from the Mashko administrators (line 5) includes an **יִם** spelling. This may however be because of two different amanuenses. A mixed use is in MH too. Qoh's exclusive use of the **יִם** spelling aligns it with the regular BH pattern.

The Copper Scroll has no relevant participles.

c. Verbal Nouns

Like MH, the Copper Scroll shows a higher frequency of verbal nouns than BH. The Scroll has at least six roots patterned after the common MH verbal noun forms, whereas Qoh has only one possible instance in *יגעתה*, which is within the acceptable range of BH (see p. 108). The six in the Copper Scroll are (Milik 1962:234):

col. 1:12	טבילה	bathing
4:3	ביאה	leading
7:14	יציאה	outlet
10:1	ירידה	descent
10:1	עליאה	ascent
11:5	הבטה	pressing, (i.e. dead body on the ground.)

2. Nouns

a. Genitive - של

The use of של for genitive expression is common to both the Copper Scroll, and the Bar Kosiba and Mashko letters, e.g.

Kosiba's supplies letter, line 3 של ביתי

Mashko administration letter, line 1 מן הפרנסין
also line 4. של בית משכו

Copper Scroll, col 1, line 9 בתל של כחלת
and some twenty other times.

Since Qoh does not use של as a genitive circumlocution, it is distinct from these texts, just as it is from MH in

this respect (see p. 112).

b. Masculine Plural Orthography

As with the plural participles, both -יָן and -יִם occur as terminal spellings in nouns of both the Bar Kosiba letters and the Copper Scroll. In the letter to Ben Galgula about supplies, כּוֹרִיָּן is used. Another letter to him uses כּבִּלִּיִּם , though this again may be a peculiarity of the amanuenses. The Scroll terminates all nouns that are plural with -יָן , except for מִיִּם (Milik 1961:233). Qoh, having only -יִם , contrasts with this literature as does BH.

3. Pronoun: שֶׁ -Relative

"Le pronom relatif est toujours שֶׁ " in the Copper Scroll (Milik 1962:232). This is also true of the Bar Kosiba letters, #42:3; 43:4,5,6; 44:2; 45:4 (Milik 1961); and line 5 of another Bar Kosiba text (Yadin 1961:47). This is consistent with MH's exclusive use of שֶׁ , but not with Qoh, where like other BH sources, the שֶׁ -relative is mixed with uses of אֲשֶׁר (see p. 120f).

4. Preposition: לְ for לָא

As discussed earlier, MH rarely uses לָא . Qoh however is not at all reluctant to employ this preposition (23 times). The Copper Scroll though, appears to align with MH since it is used only once (col.1 line 13) against 5 instances of לָא in a directional context:

1:13 בִּירַד אֵל סַמֵּל

10:16 בְּבוֹאֵךְ לְסַמּוֹל ; also, 1:2; 5:13; 6:9; 11:13.

The Bar Kosiba letters do not use אֵל at all in a directional sense, having ל and אֶצֶל instead, as in MH (see p.

Qoh is more like BH here.

C. Qumran Sectarian Scrolls

Comparison with the "Qumran Literature" is difficult since it is not a homogenous literature in genre, nor even in the grammar within the texts of the same genre. As summarized by G. R. Driver (1965:433¹).

" . . . no similar consistency can be detected in the Scrolls beyond a certain official and phonetic unity which is confined to the organizational texts, i.e. those dealing with the affairs of the community at Qumran; and these, on the ground of their contents, must be assigned to a single school of thought and practice."

Consequently, this study isolates these texts for general analysis.²

Since Qumran Hebrew is basically BH,³ there are few differences with which to compare Qoh. However the following categories are adequate help in this respect, pointing out the orthographic and phonetic changes.

1 All 1965 references of Driver's are to his "Judaean Scrolls".

2. The texts used depend on the sources quoted, e.g. Kuhn uses M. Burrows' edition of the Discipline Manual, "The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery" vol. II, New Haven, 1951.

3 Mansoor (1958:54): "The language is solidly BH, but is strongly flavoured with Palestinian Aramaic and late Hebrew."

1. General

In the Qumran literature, "the picture generally is one of phonetic fluctuation or transition, if not decay, in which Aramaic influence (already traceable in the Old Testament) can often be detected." (G. R. Driver 1965:421). The extent to which this is true is shown by the following list of such changes, compiled from the separate surveys of G. R. Driver and Goshen-Gottstein.¹

- 1 Elided Aleph and Hē
- 2 Yod for terminal Hē
- 3 Yod for Aleph and vice versa in central radicals
- 4 Yod for hiphil preformative He
- 5 Aleph otiose (mostly after \hat{i})
- 6 Elided Hē in hiphil and niphal infinitive constructs with Lamed.
- 7 Metathesis of Waw with Aleph, Heth, Ayin and Hē

These phonetic shifts or variations are extremely frequent in Qumran literature in comparison with BH. Those that do occur in BH are the ones that appear in Qoh.

1 Elided Aleph and Hē in BH (GK ss.23f,35d) - e.g.

2 Sm 22:40 ותזרני ותאזרני for ותזרני as in Ps 18:40.

Qoh 4:14 - האטורים for הטורים.²

1 G. R. Driver 1965; Goshen-Gottstein (1958:101;37), "It will not come as unexpected news that the system of four separate laryngeal and pharyngeal phonemes has collapsed in QS, probably under the impact of Aramaic, direct or indirect."; also Kutschera (1971:1586).

2 See Whitley (45) for suggestions on different roots.

5 Aleph otiose in BH (GK s.23i) - e.g. Joel 4:19

נקיא for נקי.

Qoh 11:3 - יהוא for יהו; but the text is questionable (see p. 273).

6 Elided Hē in hiphil infinitive construct with Lamed in BH (GK s.53q) - e.g. 2 Sm 19:19 להעביר for להעביר

Qoh 3:18 - לחטיא for להחטיא, and 5:5 - לראות for להראות. There are no examples of this elision from the niphal in BH or Qoh, although it is a MH practice.

Qoh therefore falls within the character of BH grammar in this area.

2. Verb Stems

a. Qal

In the Qumran literature, the presence or absence of the waw in the imperfect and imperative qal as a matter oflection follows a pattern. This pattern is summarized by M. Martin (1958:254):

"The general rule in all the Scrolls save Is^b, is that verbs with no radical guttural and which are transitive, take a Wau ML between the second and third radical in the Qal Imperfect and Imperative. The number of the simple forms of the Qal Imperfect is quite substantial; the number of simple forms of the Qal Imperative is relatively small, but the general rule is perfectly clear."

The converse of this principle then can be stated that, all guttural roots and also intransitive non-gutturals are

generally written defectively.

Qoh does not fit these principles. In its two transitive non-guttural roots, שפט (3:17), נשך (10:11), the spelling is defective, when by Qumran custom they would be plene. Furthermore, Qoh's 28 instances of the converse situation includes 9 plene spellings (32%) rather than being totally defective as in 1QS,M,H (see p. 56).

b. Pual

The Qumran literature spells the pual with the waw in the first syllable, as in MH (M. Martin:1958:271). As expected, the Biblical texts of Qumran use the defective writing more frequently, but the plene writing is exclusive in 1QS,M,H.

Qoh's one case of this plene spelling, יִקְשִׁים (9:12), is matched in other BH books (GK s.52q: see p. 57 in this study).

3. Personal Pronouns

a. Independent

The first common plural and third masculine and feminine singular independent personal pronouns differ in the Sectarian Scrolls from BH and Qoh. Using Kuhn's concordance we find.

אנו 1QS once

War Scroll 4 times

never אנהנו, just as MH (Segal s.68) .

הוא no 1QS 15 times, and הוא

War Scroll 4 times, and one הוא

היא 1QS 5 times

War Scroll 4 times

היא never

b. Suffixed

On the whole, the Sectarian Scrolls commonly use both קָה and קֶה and in some scrolls קָה -even predominates (Goshen-Gottstein 1958:120). G. R. Driver (1965:431f) has seen the pattern where poetic texts prefer קָה -, and prose texts prefer קֶה -. Since Qoh uses קָה - but once in 2:1 אנטקה, whereas קֶה - is used 11 times (5:1,5; 9:8,9,9,16; 11:9,9,10; 12:1,1), an obvious discrepancy exists. Qoh's one case is acceptable, though admittedly rare in BH (GK s.58q).

D. Summary

1. Ben Sira

Those grammatical traits that Whitley alleges reveal a post-Ben Sira date, actually do not. He either fails to quote the BH instances that show the trait to be earlier than Ben Sira, or fails to present the data accurately, or

does not consider the literary uniqueness of Qoh. In 5 additional areas, where Ben Sira clearly shows a dependence on a later linguistic stage, Qoh aligns solely with BH grammar. This indicates that the linguistic argument of Whitley is fundamentally invalid, and also that Qoh is not of the same grammatical mold as Ben Sira.

2. Copper Scroll and Hebrew Bar Kosiba Letters

In 8 grammatical areas where these documents differ from BH, and thus would allow Qoh to show comparability or contrast, Qoh shows itself basically BH in nature. Nothing is unique to these documents and Qoh alone. In fact, all these characteristics are indicative of the difference between BH and MH as well, Qoh resembling the former.

3. Qumran Sectarian Scrolls

The 5 grammatical points of departure between these scrolls and BH that this study has observed, show nothing unique to these texts and Qoh alone. Again, Qoh aligns only with BH grammar. Albright's comparison is interesting (1955:15 n.3).

" . . . the Qumran finds have proved that normal literary Hebrew in the last 2 centuries B.C. (including Ben Sira) classicized in conscious opposition to the dominant Aramaic; it was neither like the language of earlier Qoheleth nor like that of the later Mishnah (though nearer the latter than the former, which is definitely aberrant, as far as the evolution of literary Hebrew is concerned)."

Generally speaking, there is no evidence to show that Qoh is similar to STH when BH is not. When possible, Qoh always displays affinity with BH over against STH and its many MH properties.

III. Late Biblical Hebrew and Qoheleth
A. Method
B. Evidence
C. Summary

Qoh has shown itself to be quite distinct from MH and STH. So far the approach has been to compare Qoh with MH and STH where the latter two are different from BH, and to deal with the alleged similarities of Qoh with these later forms of the language. Now, a comparison of Qoh with the different eras of BH is necessary, to see with which it is the most consistent. The bulk of the material in this section deals with grammatical features that different scholars have considered to be LBH, though new contrasts between LBH and EBH are included as well. Of course the number of grammatical comparisons is less than was encountered with MH because the differences within BH are not as numerous as those between BH and MH.

Kropat (1909) and Polzin (1976) have shown ways how LBH differs from EBH. One would expect then that a comparison of the language of Qoh with their data should show how much Qoh has in common with LBH. The following specific principles of method will guide the study toward a conclusion regarding Qoh's relation to LBH. Though these principles are basically the same as those discussed with MH, there is need for some additional comments and adjustments.

A. Method

1. Exclusively LBH

If a grammatical feature is found often in LBH, and again only in Qoh, then the feature could tentatively be considered a LBH trait.

A question persists however as to the actual location and definition of LBH. Polzin (2f) has said,

"The language of Chronicles, Ezra, and N² [non-memoir] comprises the largest unified corpus of post-exilic Hebrew prose in the Old Testament. One may assume with some assurance that this body of material best represents the actual state of the language at the time of the composition. Thus the strong desire to archaize in the post-exilic books of Esther and Nehemiah's Memoirs is not present in Chronicles, Ezra, and N²."

Using Polzin's categories of grammatical comparison, the following table demonstrates the divergence of the LBH books from Chronicles. Chronicles' features are construed as standard, and the other books are thus compared.¹

The figures warn that comparisons with various LBH compositions will produce different conclusions. A book with affinities with Esther or Nehemiah memoirs may not thereby show itself to be "late", for the agreement may stem from a similarity of both comparands to EBH. In such a case, a demonstrably late book as Esther may be archaizing by continuing the EBH style, while the book under question might actually belong to an earlier time. Consequently,

1 It could be that Esther and Nehemiah's memoirs represent the LBH style, and the Chronicler (Chronicles, Ezra, N²) diverges because of a dialectical difference. This question is beyond the range of this study's purposes.

	Chr	Ezr	Nehemiah ² (non-memoirs)	Nehemiah (memoirs)	Est	pp. in this study
נא plus pronoun (Polzin p.28ff)	+	-	+	-	-	183
נא plus nominative (32ff)	+	-	+	-	-	171
Anticipatory genitive (38ff)	+	+	-	-	-	178
Collectives with pl. verbs (40ff)	+	+	+	-	-	
Infinitive absolute (43ff)	+	+	-	+	-	159
Quivis Construction (47ff)	+	+	-	-	+	168
Masc. pl. suffix for fem. (52ff)	+	+	-	+	-	
ויהי used less often (56ff)	+	+	+	-	-	
Substantive, then numeral (58ff)	+	+	-	-	-	169
Infinitive construct with ל (60ff)	+	+	+	-	+	156
Accusative with ל (64ff)	+	+	+	-	-	187
Unassimilated ן- of מן with indefinite noun (66)	+	-	-	-	-	
Use of עך ל" (69)	+	+	-	-	-	188

Percentage of Traits in Agreement: Chronicles/Ezra 77%

Chronicles/Neh² 46%

Chronicles/Neh(mem.) 15%

Chronicles/Esther 15%

since Esther and Nehemiah's memoirs do not purely represent LBH, their evidence can hold only secondary place in a study of Qoh and LBH.

Furthermore, as this principle states, the grammatical trait should occur enough times in LBH to treat it as indicative of that era. For example, Esther 9:1 has an infinitive absolute followed by the independent personal pronoun: וְנִהְפֹךְ הוּא. So does Qoh 4:2: וְשָׁבַח אֲנִי. Gordon (1955:85ff) cites this parallel as a significant sign of how North Israelite influence reached post-exilic Hebrew. The danger of this argument lies in the fact that these are the only two instances of this pattern in BH. Since it occurs nowhere else in LBH, and since Qoh is the book under question, the effect of this construction is nil in characterizing any text as "late". It need not be a trait of LBH, rather it may be an archaism in Esther after the pattern of both Ugaritic and Phoenician (see p.160), a trait which is present also in the dialect of the North Israelite (according to Gordon).

2. Equally EBH and LBH

If a grammatical feature of Qoh is found in EBH and LBH, then that feature can not be considered a LBH trait only.

3. More Characteristic of LBH

If a feature is preponderantly a LBH trait, occurring only

seldom in EBH, then these points should be observed:

a. Independent of LBH

Is there a good reason why there should be a heavy use of this trait in Qoh outside of any dependence on LBH grammar, e.g. genre, dialect? For instance, the greater part of LBH is historic narrative, hence Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, by their nature, are not entirely conducive for comparison with a proverbial-philosophical composition since they are expressing ideas that are of a different kind. That Qoh uses אני exclusively as the first person pronoun therefore, might be less an indication of a relation to LBH than an indication of its literary style and dialectical properties (see p.172ff), causes that are independent of the historic narrative patterns in LBH.

b. Dependent on LBH

If there is no other apparent reason for a similarity between Qoh and LBH to exist other than LBH influence, the feature could be considered tentatively to be a LBH trait.

4. More Characteristic of EBH

If a grammatical feature only appears in EBH, and not in LBH because it has a different means to the same end, then

that feature indicates an independence of Qoh from LBH grammar. However, if the feature is not used frequently in EBH, or if the feature could be due to a literary or dialectical cause, the relation to EBH is of course of no chronological significance.

5. Neither EBH nor LBH

If a trait is found in Qoh and not sufficiently in BH elsewhere, or if it is disproportionate in Qoh compared with both EBH and LBH, its effect will be to distinguish Qoh equally from both.

It would serve to confirm the conventional view of Qoh's language if an adequate number of "Exclusively LBH" traits was to surface, accompanied by enough features "More Characteristic of LBH," demonstrating a dependence on LBH's grammatical structure.

B. The Evidence

1. Verbs
2. Nouns
3. Pronouns
4. Prepositions
5. Phonology

1. Verbs

a. Imperfect

1) Waw Consecutive

An extended treatment of the waw consecutive imperfect's

seldom occurrence in Qoh is found in the earlier MH section of this grammatical study. The conclusion at that point was that Qoh's style was not historic narrative, and thus was better served by the absence of the waw consecutive imperfect and the presence of the simple waw plus perfect. It was more suitable therefore to use a verbal system that was simpler and more clear. This was felt to be a better solution than to ascribe the phenomenon to MH influence, since among other reasons, such little other evidence of MH similarity exists.

When it comes to comparing Qoh with LBH in this regard, two further facts are relevant. S. R. Driver (1892:162) explained that in the later writings the waw consecutive imperfect "continues to still be the predominant construction," and that it becomes only "somewhat more frequent" to substitute the conjunctive waw perfect for it. Qoh's 32 conjunctive waw perfects¹ and mere two or three waw consecutive imperfects is therefore in an inverse ratio to LBH. The three waw consecutive imperfects in Qoh cannot be considered a "predominant construction", nor can the 32 conjunctive waw perfects be thought of as only "somewhat more frequent". Qoh, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, having a similar number of chapters, employ 32,7,7,7, instances of the conjunctive waw perfect respectively. The numbers involved therefore demonstrate a contrast between Qoh

1 1:5,13; 2:5,9,9,11,12,13,14,15,15,15,17,18,19,20; 3:22; 4:1,4,7; 5:18; 8:10,15,17; 9:14,14,14,15,15,16; 12:1,9.

and LBH, as they would for Qoh and EBH.

Conclusion: Neither EBH nor LBH

2) Cohortative

Delitzsch (197) and Wright (488) claimed that Qoh's one case of the cohortative (אחכמה 7:23) was evidence of a degenerate style, hence indicative of LBH. Chronicles for instance only uses it once.¹ The question whether this one case in Qoh constituted a paucity of the form in that book was answered in the negative when this concern was covered in the previous MH section (p. 67f). The decision there was that Qoh uses the cohortative at the only point where it was possible to be used in the book.

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

a. Infinitive

1) Infinitive Construct

a) With Prepositional Lamed

The frequency of the infinitive construct with the prepositional lamed has been used by Polzin to characterize the grammars of different eras in the Hebrew language. His statistics show -

¹ Polzin (54) discusses the confused status of the cohortative form in LBH. It occurs in Ezra and Nehemiah over 50 times. See Japhet 337f for further discussion of this issue.

Source	Frequency	Reference in Polzin
J-E	One form per 5.5 vss.	pp. 117 n.10, 92
Court History	2.9	117 n.11, 60
"Deuteronomy"	2.6 ¹	117 n.12, 94
Chronicles	2.6	27ff, 60
Ezra	1.7	84 n.120
Nehemiah (non-memoirs)	1.8	84 n.121,168

Discounting Qoh 3:1-8 (which has a summation of infinitive constructs plus lamed as its special grammatical-literary character) the book's frequency of this form is 1 per 3 verses (70 to 212 verses). This puts Qoh outside the range of LBH and within that of the Court History.

To supplement Polzin's figures, it should be added that our count of this form in Esther resulted in 1 in every 1.8 verses (93 in 167 verses), which substantiates Polzin's discovery. Yet our count of the frequency in Nehemiah's memoirs brought the frequency to 1 per 4.5 Verses (32 in 143 verses; 3:1-38 excluded). This apparent contradiction is not a surprise since the memoirs are often inconsistent with LBH (see p. 151ff).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of EBH

b) With Beth

Polzin (45) demonstrates a marked decline of the infinitive plus כ-ב in the Chronicler, accompanied with a less

¹ Miller (1970) using Dt 1-34, and this data yields a 1/2.8 frequency.

frequent occurrence of a הִיָּה form when the construction *is* used. Taking a sampling from Kings and Chronicles, he sees a reduction from 41 uses in Kings to 22 in the latter. Qoh has only two cases of this construction, 5:10 and 12:4. These were discussed earlier when MH was the comparand, p. 93 . This may appear to be an important similarity with LBH, however more data helps in deciding this. BH as a whole is inconsistent in the frequency of this form since Hosea uses it 6 times (6:9,11; 7:1; 10:1,10; 13:1) in 14 chapters while Amos does not use it at all in 9 chapters, nor does Micah in 7 chapters.

So these pre-exilic prophets show this feature is not necessary at any time in BH and could or could not be used according to the preference of the author.

The absence of any form of הִיָּה with Qoh's two instances of this construction of the infinitive is not significant since it does not occur with any of the Hosea instances either.

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

c) Consecutive

Under "Mots et usages tardifs", Podechard (45) cites Qoh's use of the infinitive construct to continue the aspect of the previous finite verb -

נִחַתְּ אֶל-לְבִי וְלִבִּיר אֶת-כָּל-זֶה 9:1

His opinion of its lateness is supported by others,¹ but the

1 Davidson s.96 rem.4; GK s.114p.

evidence does not substantiate it. A compilation of examples from GK s.114p, Davidson s.96 rem.4, S. R. Driver 1892:s.206, and Miller (1970) gives the impression that the construction was available for use throughout BH: Ex 32:29(J); Gn 42:25(E); 1 Sm 8:12, 14:21; Am 8:4; Dt 26:17,17,17,18,19,19; Jer 17:10, 19:12, 44:14,19; Ps 25:14, 104:21, 109:16; Lev 10:10,11; Ezk 13:22; Is 44:28, 56:6; Jb 34:8; 1 Chr 6:34, 10:13, 12:33; 2 Chr 2:8, 7:17, 8:13; Neh 8:13; Dn 2:16,18. This shows that it is of no chronological significance, especially since it is found only once in Qoh anyway.

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

2) Infinitive Absolute

a) As a Finite Verb

i) With Conjunctive Waw

GK s.113z considers this an especially late form¹ and lists Qoh 8:9 and 9:11 as examples:

8:9 את-כל-זה ראיתי וְנָתַן אֶת-לְבִי לְכָל-מַעֲשֵׂה

9:11 שָׁבַתִּי וְרָאָה תַחַת-הַשָּׁמַיִם

Yet looking at the evidence,² this is a misleading correlation since it appears in all eras of BH; Gn 41:43(E); Ex 8:11(J), 18:22(E); Jos 9:20; Ju 7:19; 1 Sm 2:28,22:13,

1 Also Gordis 1968:292

2 This list is a composite of GK s.113z, Huesman 1956, Rubinstein 1952:363, Sola-Sole 90, and Sperber 73f.

25:26,33; 1 Kg 9:25; Is 8:6, 37:19; Am 4:5; Jer - 10 times; Ezk 23:47; Hag 1:6; Zec - 3 times; Neh - 4 times, Chr - 3 times; Esther - 9 times, Dn 9:5,11. The later books' uses are as infrequent as the earlier books in this use of the infinitive absolute, Chronicles using it no more than 1 and 2 Samuel. Jeremiah and Esther use it very often, whereas Ezekiel employs it only once and Deutero-Isaiah not at all. Its appearance twice in the 14 lines of the 7th century letter of Yavneh-Yam is ample warning against an exclusive association with LBH.¹ Hammershaimb (90) advises well when he concludes,

"Compared with the whole of the Old Testament, the instances are so strikingly few that it is hardly advisable to attach too much weight to their proportion within the various parts of the Old Testament."

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

ii) With Nominative Independent Pronoun

Qoh 4:2 begins, ושבח אני את-המתים, with the initial infinitive absolute with a posterior nominative independent pronoun. This pattern is only repeated in Est 9:1, ונהפוך הוא. However 5 considerations must be viewed before this is seen to be a LBH influence on Qoh:

- 1 Esther is not representative of LBH grammar in many ways, as pointed out earlier (p. 151f). Esther's 16 total uses of the infinitive absolute is unlike LBH.

¹ See KAI II p.200, Gibson 1971: I p.29, and Isserlin 200.

- 2 The one occurrence in one LBH book cannot be presented as evidence of a late trait.
- 3 This is an ancient Semitic construction, appearing in 6 Amarna passages (Canaanisms - Moran 1950: 170f), Ugaritic (Jirku 113), and Phoenician (Gordon 1949:112f; Bron 137).
- 4 Gordon (1955:85) considers this construction to be evidence of North Israelite influence on LBH. He cites both Qoh and Esther in this regard. Given the other properties of Qoh that resemble North Israelite, he may be close in his estimate in that Qoh may represent a North Israelite source, and Esther represent the influenced LBH text.
- 5 A question still stands as to the true identity of ושבח. The pointing is appropriate for the infinitive absolute¹, or a piel participle with its mem deleted. An instance of the latter situation is found in the pual at Qoh 9:12, יגקשם, and in BH elsewhere (GK s.52s). G. R. Driver (1964:94) has suggested it is an abbreviated perfect.

These considerations nullify any significant identification of a LBH feature in this construction.

Conclusion: Neither EBH nor LBH

1 Gai 254f, and most commentators before.

b) As an Imperative

As an imperative, the infinitive absolute is rare in LBH, not present in the Chronicler at all. Ginsberg (1970:114) goes as far as to say, "In the Silver Age, Hebrew dropped . . . the use of the infinitive absolute as an imperative." Qoh, with its one case of this function of the infinitive absolute in 4:17, וְקָרֹב לִשְׁמַע, differs from LBH in this respect. It does occur in Esther however, 2:3 and 6:9, but this is further proof of that book's non-conformity with the rest of LBH prose.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of EBH

c) As an Emphatic Cognate of the Finite Verb

LBH employs the infinitive absolute rarely to emphasize a finite cognate verb. Polzin (43f) finds it only twice in the Chronicler, including Ezra and Nehemiah's non-memoirs. (1 Chr 4:10, 2 Chr 28:19). Similarly, Qoh does not use it for this purpose. However, the other uses of the infinitive absolute in Qoh 4:2,17, 8:9, 9:11, would direct one away from considering this an indication of LBH, since the similarity is only in respect to this one function. It could be a literary preference of the author who did not shy from the use of the infinitive absolute as a whole. Nonetheless, the conclusion will read as follows:

Conclusion: Exclusively LBH

c.) Participle as a Present Tense

This study has already discussed how Qoh is like BH in the use of the participle for the present tense (see p. 97ff). The conclusion was that it is unnecessary to attribute Qoh's use to MH influence, because of the adequate precedent in BH. Yet which eras of BH display this trait? Gordis (1968:98) claims,

"In the last stage of Biblical Hebrew, represented by Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah-Chronicles, and Koheleth, the participle was increasingly used as a present tense, often with progressive force, a usage which became regular in Mishnaic and modern Hebrew."

However no proof accompanies this claim, nor can any be found elsewhere. One can only guess what Gordis means by "progressive", and if this denotes advancing from stage to stage, it is not an applicable characteristic of Qoh's grammar. Qoh uses the participle mainly to describe *states*, or universal observations and general truths. (see p. 98ff).

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

d. Interchange of ל"א and ל"ה Forms¹

This orthographic interchange is said to be a late feature by GK s.75nn, i.e. "especially in later writers and the poets." Since Qoh presents such interchanges, some have believed the

1 Barton (53) also cites the interchange of ע"י with י"י and א"י verbs to be late. He does not support his claim. Besides, this occurs in EBH, e.g. Gn 49:19(J) ל"ג from ל"ג (Whitley 78).

book to be under LBH influence.¹ The data was dealt with when MH was compared with Qoh in this area (p. 106ff), and the conclusion was that the two consonantal interchanges (אצ׳ 10:5, אצ׳ 8:1), out of 232 relevant words, did not distinguish Qoh. The vocalic interchanges are dubious evidence, especially in Qoh. To attribute this interchange to LBH influence is tenuous since EBH has an adequate number of precedents,³ e.g.

- Hē for Aleph

Gn 20:6(E); 1 Sm 6:10, 10:6,13; 1 Kg 22:25; 2 Kg 2:22; Is 26:20, 29:7; also the Siloam Inscription line 4.

- Aleph for Hē

Ex 1:10(J); 2 Sm 1:6, 12:17,21:16,18; Is 21:12
Zeph 3:1; Hos 13:15.

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

2 Nouns

a. Morphology: -ôn and -ûth Terminations

Nouns with -ôn and -ûth terminations are frequent in Qoh and have been used as examples of a late nature of its language.² These are:

1 e.g. Barton 53; Podechard 45; Whitley 71. Wagner (128) sees this interchange as a grammatical Aramaism, but the numerous EBH cases speak against this (GK s.75nn-rr).

2 e.g. Podechard 44, Aalders 13, Hertzberg 28, Du Plessis 165ff, Lauha 8, Di Fonzo 21; GK s. 86k says of -ûth endings, "more common only in the later books."

3 Rendsburg aptly states (1980:161), "...no one can deny the general statement [that] metaplasm between א"ל and ה"ל verbs is not any rarer in the earlier portions of the Bible...(34%) are from the period of David or earlier."

חסרון	1:15
חשבון	7:25,27,29; 9:10
יתרון	1:3; 2:11,11,13; 3:9; 5:10,11; 7:12; 10:10,11
כשרון	2:21; 4:4; 5:10
מלכות	4:14
סכלות	2:3,12,13; 7:25; 10:1,13
ענין	1:13; 2:23,26; 3:10; 4:8; 5:2,13; 8:16
רעות	1:14; 2:11,17,26; 4:4,6; 6:9
רעיון	1:17; 2:22; 4:16
שכלות	1:17
שחרות	11:10
שלטון	8:4,8

However, two matters should be covered before any such relation with LBH is drawn.

First, the antiquity of these forms is undeniable.

Wagner (130) explains:

"Das He. weist eine ansehnlich Zahl von Wörtern mit der Endung -ûth auf, die zum Teil schon früh belegt sind und zweifelsohne nicht auf Aram. Einwirkung zurückgehen (vgl. z.B. כַּבְרָת "Beschwer" Ex 14:25E . . .)."

Gul'kowitzsch (8) lists ten "vorexilisch" words with this termination that function as abstracts. Margoliouth (33) considered the -ûth forms in Qoh of possible Assyrian origin, and thus not necessarily late forms. W. J. Martin (28) says it is a pattern of noun "widely used in all periods of Hebrew, and is found in Akkadian as early as Hammurabi." Ugaritic also supports the antiquity of the

Semitic forms -ûth and -ôn. The root abynt (= abyanutu) means "misery" (Gordon UgMn:s.8.51), and two roots actually found in Qoh are present in Ugaritic as well, חִשְׁבוֹן; חִסְרוֹן (Donner 1960:181), and (Gordon 1965:403). Consequently, the forms appear unsurprisingly in both EBH and LBH. EBH examples are :

-ûth	-ôn
אלמנות Gn 38:14(J) etc.	אגמון Is 9:13 etc.
גאות Is 9:17 etc.	ארמון Am 1:4 etc.
גלות Is 20:4	גליון Gn 3:16(J) etc.
זנות Nu 14:33 (JE) etc.	נקיון Gn 20:5 (E)
כסות Gn 20:16(E) etc.	פדיון Ex 21:30(E)
מלכות 1 Sm 20:31 etc.	פקדון Gn 41:36(E)
עדות Jos 4:16 etc. ¹	פתרון Gn 40:5(E)

Gordis (1968:373) concludes that these forms could well be indigenous to Hebrew as in Arabic, thus obviating any Aramaic influence.

Having firmly established these forms as EBH as well as LBH, it remains to explain the frequency of these terminations in Qoh. These terminations are indicative of the abstract expression, both are used to express concepts as opposed to objects.² Needless to say, Qoh's

1 H. R. Cohen (80) "There is absolutely no justification for the assumption that 'edūt 'testimony' must be a late word (i.e. Aramaism) because of its construction with the abstract ending -ûth. While this ending is common in Aramaic, it is just as common in Akkadian ..."

2 Barth 316ff, 413ff; Bauer-leander 1962:498f; GK s.86k.

content is abstract in its virtual entirety and cannot be carelessly compared with the historical literature of the Bible. The views of Herzfeld and Kroeber to this effect were quoted earlier (see p. 31), and they are corroborated by R. D. Wilson's statistics (1925:246f). Using the -ûth words, he found that the books "treating of concrete events, whether early or late, have but one or two of these words; whereas those treating of more abstract ideas have more words with this ending whatever the date. JE, the earliest part of the Pentateuch, according to the critics, has four words ending in -ûth, whereas 'P', the latest part, has only two." Thus Judges and Daniel have one, Joshua, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, and Ezra have two each, 2 Chronicles and Nehemiah have three. However, more abstract literature has the form more frequently: Proverbs - 7 times, Isaiah - 9 times, and Jeremiah - 8 times.

Consequently, it should be considered in each case of these forms in Qoh whether they have an abstract use, appropriate to the genre of Qoh. This is a simple and fitting consideration, yet involves precisely one-third of Kautzsch's 69 "Aramaisms" in Qoh, and an even greater 42% (33 of 78) of Wagner's.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of LBH, but
Independent of LBH.

b. Plurality

1) Quivis, or, Singular - Plural Combination

It is well substantiated by Polzin (47ff) that the sequence 'noun waw-noun' where the noun is the same in both positions, is a primarily late configuration. Apart from דוֹר וְדוֹר, BH has no more than 4 pre-exilic instances to 41 post-exilic cases. Qoh has no such sequence to denote the plural. Beyond its absence there however, is a substitute sequence found only in the oldest of BH sources,

Ju 5:30 הלא ימצאו ... רחם רחמתים

Qoh 2:8 עשיתי לי ... שדה ושדות

In both verses the singular of a noun is followed by its plural or dual, syndetically. In the case of the late quivis construction, it is two syndetic singulars.

So both the absence of the LBH construction and the presence of an otherwise EBH form point to a relevant difference between Qoh and LBH.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of EBH.

2) Conjunctive Waw Patterns

When Qoh builds a series of nouns in a conjunctive manner, its pattern is consistently -

- With 3 nouns; noun, waw-noun, waw-noun

Qoh 2:21,26; 6:2; 9:1; as in Ex 6:16(P), Nu 3:17(P)

e.g. Qoh 2:21 יש אדם שעמלו בחכמה וברעת ובכשרון

- With 4 nouns; noun, waw-noun, waw-noun, waw-noun

Qoh 9:10; 12:2; as in 2 Sm 5:14.

Kropat (62) observed that the Chronicler, opposed to EBH, constructs the series in these ways -

- With 3 nouns: noun, noun, waw-noun

1 Chr 5:27 גרשון קהת ומררי

also, 1 Chr 6:1; 23:13, 2 Chr 20:13, 28:8, .

Ezra 10:5 and BA, Dn 2:17,49, 3:7,29 .

- With 4 nouns: noun, waw-noun, noun, waw-noun

1 Chr 5:3 בני ראובן בכור ^{1st born} ישראל חנוך ופלוא חצרון וכרמי

also, 1 Chr 1:8, 7:1,14:4,24:1; 2 Chr 2:14,30:18

36:17, and BA Dn 5:2, 6:8 .

It should be noted that according to our own search, the incorrigible LBH book of Esther uses the earlier pattern: noun, waw-noun, waw-noun, waw-noun (Est 1:6,4:3,8:16,9:3).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of EBH

3) Numbered Substantives

When Qoh uses the cardinals to modify a substantive, it uses the word order, number-noun. This occurs twice using numbers 3 and above, as does EBH -

6:6 ואלו היה אלף שנים

7:19 החכמה תעז לחכם מעשרה שלטים

Comparing this total use of the number-noun sequence with LBH shows that Qoh is not like Chronicles in that the latter uses the construction only 40% of the time (Polzin 59).

Source	number-noun frequency	documentation in Polzin
JE	100%	p.92
Court History	100%	93
"Deuteronomy"	93%	94
Ezra	5%	71
Nehemiah non-memoirs	twice only	73,168
Nehemiah memoirs	66%	73
Esther	100%	74

Qoh then resembles both EBH and the archaizing of Esther.¹

Conclusion: More characteristic of EBH

c. Definiteness: Non-assimilated Article

More than any other book, Qoh retains the consonantal article after a prefixed preposition or ψ -relative.

1:7 ψ הנחלים

8:1 כהחכם

6:10 ψ התקיף

10:3 כשהסכל

} Kethib

Some commentators have included this as evidence of Qoh's likeness to LBH.² It is true that LBH uses the form slightly more often than EBH (GK:35n).

	2 Chr 10:7	להעם הזה	vs 1 Kg 12:7	לעם הזה
Post-Exilic	25:10			
	29:27			
	Neh. 9:19			
	12:38			
	Dn 8:16			

¹ MH uses the number-noun sequence as well (Seg:394), as does Qumran (Polzin 60), but since these sources have shown themselves to be so distinct from Qoh in total, no significant relation can be made

² e.g. Delitzsch 336; Barton 52f; du Plessis 172

Exilic Ezk 40:25
47:22

Pre- 1 Sm 13:21
Exilic 2 Sm 21:20
2 Kg 7:12

However since the feature is found in Samuel twice, as well as in the book of Kings and the transitional book of Ezk twice and in Chr only 3 times, it would be quite tenuous to align Qoh exclusively with LBH morphology. Furthermore, the form may indicate a dialectical feature of Qoh (see pp. 33,45).

Conclusion: Neither EBH nor LBH in frequency

d. Nominative with אֵת

Whether אֵת אֲשֶׁר in 4:3 is actually a nominative has been discussed by many, and mainly three views have been offered.

- 1 It is a nominative with the verb expressed by the predicate adjective טוב (or "to be" is implicit) e.g. Saydon 209; Gordis 1968:239.
- 2 It is accusative, governed by an implied verb, שָׁבַח (e.g. Delitzsch 274; Barton 117; GK:117).

Assuming we have an instance of the subject introduced by אֵת , the question arises whether its one occurrence in Qoh is significantly like LBH with its increased use of the form.¹ Considering the instances in EBH,² such an alignment is not necessary, Qoh not showing a

1 Polzin 32; Kropat 2; GKs.117m

2 Polzin (35) Joshua and Judges twice each, Samuel and Kings thrice each.

number of uses, but only one. Here again, a North Israelite feature has been suggested by Polzin (see p. 34).

Conclusion: Equally EBH

3. Pronouns

a. Personal Pronouns

1) אני

Since Qoh's exclusive use of אני over אנכי had sufficient precedent in BH, the discussion of it was postponed in our consideration of MH, to LBH. Now a full discussion is necessary since this trait is commonly listed as an indication of Qoh's similarity with LBH.¹

It is fairly clear that the transition to a virtual disuse of אנכי occurs in LBH. A perusal of Mandelkern's concordance gives the following examples:

	אני	אנכי
Esther	6	0
Ezra	2	0
Nehemiah memoirs	15	1
Chronicles	30	1
Haggai	4	0
Zechariah	10	4
Malachi	7	1
Ezekiel	138	1
Daniel	22	1

1 e.g. Gordis 1960:408; Whitley 14; DiFonzo 22; Hertzberg 28.

The result of the progressive extinction of אנכי finds itself in MH where it uses אנכי only in Biblical quotes and allusions (Seg. s.67). Literary considerations have served critically in this study, and again in regard to this feature, Qoh's genre should be looked at. S. R. Driver (1882:222ff) comments on the stylistic aspects of using אני and אנכי. His conclusions derived from BH grammar are indispensable to our analysis of Qoh's 29 cases of אני.

"It is clear in the first place that though ultimately אני superseded אנכי, both forms were in use together in the earliest periods of the language; the examples from J, Judg. Sam. are sufficient to establish this. It was competent therefore for any writer, whatever his date, to use אני, if for some reason it seemed to him to be preferable to אנכי. Now two differences are notable between the two forms. One is slightly fuller and more emphatic than the other: and *they are not rhythmically equivalent*. Hence, though doubtless many cases would occur allowing equally of either form, we should not expect the usage of the best writers, where it fluctuates, to be determined *entirely* by accident or caprice, but rather by a delicate, instinctive appreciation of the form best adapted to the structure and rhythm of particular sentences. And indeed this is exactly what takes place. Sometimes the writer's choice is evidently determined by the position which the word occupies in the sentence, sometimes by a feeling that the sense which he desires to convey will be better brought out by one particular form: and there are, besides, individual phrases of frequent occurrence, in which one form is all but uniformly preferred to the other...

"Lastly, cases in which the shorter form, as a rule, is decidedly preferred, are when the pronoun is appended to the verb for the sake of emphasis, whether with or without גם (Ju 1,3 אני גם; 2Sm 17,15 אני; אתך בגורלך), and when it follows the participle (1 Sm 3,13 אני; את ביתו; Ju 15,3): on the contrary, *before* the participle (especially if הנה precede) אני is more common (1 Sm 3,11 הנה אני עשה דבר וג')."

Summarized, his main points are -

1. The shorter form is predominant in cases where the pronoun follows the verb for emphasis.
2. It is also predominant following the participle.
3. A reason for the shorter form's preference may lie in its own comparative morphological brevity.
4. It was possible at any time in BH to use אָנִי, since both forms are used early.

Herein lies an adequate alternate explanation for Qoh's exclusive use of אָנִי, rather than a simple comparison of numbers with the table above. The short form occurs in Qoh 29 times, and applying Driver's conclusions, the following breakdown of those uses renders this grammatical phenomenon chronologically insignificant.

In respect to the first conclusion of Driver's, Qoh appends the short form 20 times to an already conjugated perfect which precedes the pronoun.¹ This frequent sequence was seen as an intentional pattern to succinctly indicate a simple past tense as opposed to perfective or present (see p.77ff). According to S. R. Driver this is the usual BH form to be added after a finite verb. Therefore its use in these 20 instances where a simple past is emphasized over a perfective, present or pluperfect, is not surprising.

In Qoh 1:16 the pronoun precedes the verb with הִנֵּה in

1 1:16,2:1,11,12,13,14,15,15,18,20,24; 3:17,18; 4:1,4,7; 5:17; 7:25; 8:15; 9:16.

between, **אני הנה הגדלתי**. In BH **אני** is the usual form when the pronoun precedes **הנה**: when it follows it we have on the other hand **הנה אנכי** . . . " (ibid:226).

Qoh employs **אני** after the participle three times (4:2; 7:26; 8:12), the "decidedly preferred" form in EBH.

Two cases exist where **אני** could well have been preferred because of its lighter character. In Qoh 1:12 the pronoun begins the phrase, **אני קהלת הייתי מלך**. Driver (ibid:223) comments on this type of clause exactly, saying, "when the subject of a verb is to be expressed separately, **אני** emphasizes it slightly, **אנכי** is used where a stronger emphasis is desired." It is understandable then why the short form is used here, the longer form was not necessary, nor desirable since it could turn a phrase intended to merely identify Qoheleth as king, into an overbearing emphasis on Qoheleth's self-acclamation to be king. In the single instance where **אני** is used in a non-subject role, a similar reason may apply. In 2:15 Qoheleth realizes that -

כמקרה הכסיל גם-אני יקרני

Since the pronominal object **אני**, is resumed as a pronominal objective suffix on the following verb, a longer **אנכי** would have been an unnecessarily heavy form. Since an emphasis is already attained by the suffix and independent pronoun, a heavier independent pronoun was not necessary.

In one verse, אני occurs in an obviously corrupt sentence where no verb stands with it -

אני פי-מלך שמור 8:2¹

Whatever the reason or true reading, this particular instance is not assessable.

This leaves 2 instances where אני is used with the predicate adjective.

2:18 שאני עמל תחת השמש

4:8 ולמי אני עמל ומחסר את-נפשי

Though these do not submit to a common grammatical practice, it is quite reasonable to believe that Qoh having used אני regularly so far, would as a single author use אני in these situations as well, as a stylistic preference. Loretz' (27n.4) opinion of the total use of אני in Qoh is that -

"Die Gründe hierfür können von seiten des Verfassers persönlich, stylistisch oder zeitliche bedingt sein."

However, it is obvious that the above breakdown shows Qoh to conform to regular BH patterns in 24 of 28 intelligible cases. Two additional instances (1:12; 2:15) avoid too heavy emphasis by using the shorter אני. The last two then are the only viable candidates for either אנכי or אני. Thus Qoh's use of אני is primarily a grammatical requirement, not stylistic or temporal (LBH). These two final cases of אני could have a stylistic cause, however another cause could be suggested.

1 For various solutions see commentaries ad. loc. e.g. Whitley 71f; and Gordis 1945:198; Dahood 1958:311.

A. R. Millard¹ observes in Sam'al that two simultaneous dialects of the same Semitic language use two different first person pronouns. In the inscription Bar-Rakkab set up for his father Panammu, about 730 B.C., the form אַנְכִי occurs in 6.19 (KAI #215; Gibson II:80). This is a local dialect of Aramaic. In the inscriptions Bar-Rakkab set up for himself, the form אֲנִי is used, the texts being considered the earliest examples of Imperial Aramaic (KAI 216.1, 217.1, 218; Gibson II:89). It is apparent then that a use of one form of this pronoun over another need not be due to a development in time (as we see in the span from EBH to MH), but could be just as indicative of a regional, stylistic, or vernacular preference regardless of a separate chronological development in the history of the language.

אֲנִי was the vernacular preference long before it became the written preference (Harris 1939:74; see p. 43). Qoh's possible vernacular foundation of its language might afford us a logical explanation for its exclusive use of the short pronoun. This would then constitute a dialectical cause which if correct would render all other causes unnecessary.

However one decides to explain the exclusive use of אֲנִי though, the decision must analyze all the possible explanations, temporal, grammatical, stylistic, or vernacular.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of LBH, but Independent of LBH.

1 Private communication

2) Anticipatory Genitive Suffix

The anticipation of the absolute noun by a previous possessive pronominal suffix, which begins to appear in LBH (Polzin 38ff) and is a frequent genitive circumlocution in MH (Seg. s.387) is not found in Qoh;

e.g. 3:19 מקרה בני האדם

21 רוח בני האדם

4:1 דמעת עשקים

1 יד עשקהם

4 קנאת איש

5:2 קול כסיל

etc.

It occurs 8 times in Chronicles, and 3 times in Ezra, once in Nehemiah's non-memoirs section. But it does not surface in any definitively EBH texts except Nu 1 (12 times) and Nu 4 (3 times), both JE. Nor does it occur in Esther or Nehemiah's memoirs (Polzin 73,74), enigmatic LBH sources.

Conclusion: More Characteristic of EBH

b. The Demonstrative : Pronoun: Feminine Singular

The feminine demonstrative הַזֹּאת does not occur in LBH (post-exilic books); it uses the more common BH הַזֹּאת.

The latest datable book to use הַזֹּאת is Ezk at 40:45. Its rare yet predominant use is in the pre-exilic books:

i.e. Ju 18:4, 2 Sm 11:25, 1 Kg 14:5, 2 Kg 6:19;

Ho 7:16 (הַזֹּאת).

Qoh uses only הַ (2:2,24, 5:15,18, 7:23, 9:13), which could be due to a dialectical reason (see pp. 33,36,43).

Conclusion: More Characteristic of EBH (but probably dialectical)

c. Relative Pronoun

1) Subordinating an Entire Clause

Some have thought it particularly late of BH to use the relative without אַ to subordinate an entire clause to a verb of speaking or knowing.¹

e.g. Ex 11:7(J)

למען תדעון אשר יפלה יהוה בין מצרים ובין ישראל

Since Qoh has such a construction in 8 instances (3:22, 5:4, 7:18,22,29, 8:12,14, 9:1) the book might be thought to be similar to LBH. The following table will help compare -

Source	Frequency
Chronicles	2
Ezra	1
Nehemiah non-memoirs	4
Nehemiah memoirs	6
Esther	6
Daniel	2
1 & 2 Samuel	4

1 BDB 83a; S. R. Driver 1892; 39B note 2; Rosen 197.

**PAGE
MISSING
IN
ORIGINAL**

1 & 2 Kings	1
Ex 11:7(J)	1
Nu 32:33(JE)	1

One can see that Chronicles-Ezra actually uses the relative this way less frequently than Samuel-Kings. Again Esther and Nehemiah are distinct from other LBH sources, and are higher in frequency as Qoh is.¹

Conclusion : Equally EBH and LBH

2) וְ Frequency

As this study showed earlier, it is unnecessary to place Qoh midway between LBH and MH because of its mixed use of the relatives וְ and אֲשֶׁר (see p. 120f). Mixed uses occur in Jonah, Lamentations and some Psalms, including the pre-exilic Psalm 144 (Wagner 149). BH also includes a source, Song of Songs, where וְ is exclusively used (32 times) apart from the title verse. Delitzsch (18) did not let this divert him from considering Song of Songs to be from the tenth century.

Those citing this וְ relative as evidence of a late stratum in Qoh² need to compare the evidence. The Psalms aside (their dates are a moot question), the evidence for both periods of

1 Polzin's comment (128) is interesting here; "perhaps we have here rather a dialectical Hebrew element coming to the fore in LBH."
 2 e.g. Lys 59 n. 88; Du Plessis p.177.

BH is such that they aid little, other than to show that it is a rare use in the literature of both.

The rest of the instances are-
Gen 4:18, 18¹ (מתושאל), Gen 6:3(J) (questionable), Nu 24:3, 15 (JE) (Albright 1944:207f), 2 Kg 6:11, Ju 5:7, 6:17, 7:12, 8:26, 2 Chr 5:20, 7:27 (Polzin 150-"še occurs only exceptionally in the Chronicler.") Ezra 8:20, Job 19:29, Ex 6:22 מישאל, also Lev 10:4, Ne 8:4, Dn 1:6, 7, 11, 19.

The *š*-relative was available to pre-exilic and post-exilic writers, to use to the degree they were inclined. Gordis (1945:174) explains its role in the history of the language, and his statement applies equally to Qoh:

"...the conjunction *š*e was once confidently explained as a late form, reflecting Aramaic influence...and its presence in the Song of Songs was held to be prima facie evidence of its late date. It is today recognized as part of the north-Israelite dialect, and was probably used in Southern Palestine as well. Hence, its early occurrence in the Oracles of Balaam (Num 24:3, 15), the Song of Deborah (Ju 5:7), and the story of Gideon (Ju 7:12, 8:26)."

Rosen (59) postulates that "erst die Verschmelzung des

1 Bergsträsser 43; Margain 41

'Kanaanaischen' mit dem eigentlich 'aramaischen' syntaktischen Substrat in nachbiblischen Hebräisch brachte die "Universal Konjunktion 'še- hervos."

Qoh could well represent the Canaanite component of that blend.

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

d. Pronoun with ׀

In the historical books charted below, an apparent decline of the objective pronominal suffix appended to ׀ occurs in the span of BH. The alternate form, adding the pronoun directly to the governing verb, is more predominant in LBH, according to this chart.

Source	Pronoun-׀	Pronoun-Verb	%	
JE	28	49	36	Polzin 91
Court History	25	50	33	93
"Deuteronomy"	41	68	38	94
Chronicles	14	141	10	28f
Ezra	3	16	16	30
Nehemiah non-memoirs	0	23	0	30
Nehemiah memoirs	8	35	19	31
Esther	7	17	30 ¹	Striedl 77

¹ Though this may seem to be an additional aberrant feature of Esther as a LBH book, Striedl (77) explains, "Jedenfalls setzt der Autor bei pronominalen Akkusative-objekt regelmässig Verbalsuffix... ׀ nur, wenn es aus grammatischen oder auch stilistischen Gründen notwendig ist..."

Qoh has the pronoun-verb form 21 times (2:1, 12, 15, 18, 21, 3:22, 4:12, 5:3, 18, 6:2, 2, 12, 7:13, 24, 8:15, 10:12, 15, 11:1, 9, 9, 12:7) and pronoun- $\pi\kappa$ only once (9:14) for a percentage of less than 5%. This is even lower than most of the LBH books above. But what might be wrong here, is that again, Qoh is being compared with the wrong genre, or its dialect may be important. Qoh should not only be compared with historical literature.

A more reasonable comparison might be obtained by including some data from Hoftijzer's (1965:83-85) study.

Source	Pronoun-תא	Pronoun-Verb	Noun-תא ¹	% of Pron.-תא
North Israelite:				
Amos 1-6	1	14	12	7%
Hosea	0	Many	6	0
Pre-Exilic:				
Ps 2	0	4	1	0
72	0	4	1	0
78	0	Many	5	0
132	0	Several	1	0
144	0	Several	0	0
Hab 1 & 2	0	10	3	0
Is 1-5, 9, 10				
Mic 1-7:17	2	12	11	14
Jer 1-25 ²	5	57	16	9
Nahum	0	Several	1	0
Exilic or Post-exilic:				
Lamentations	0	Several	5	0
Ps 79	0	4	3	0
137	0	3	4	0

One can see that Qoh compares statistically with both LBH historic literature and poetic/prophetic books throughout BH. It is suggested that Qoh be associated with the latter since:

1 Listed to show תא is used normally too, as in Qoh.

2 Chp's. 1, 2, 4:1-6:8, 13:18-27, 14, 17:1-18, 18, 21:11-14.

1. Qoh is not historical narrative, having more a theological-ethical tone that is closer to the poet/prophets.
2. Furthermore, where Qoh is most "historical" in narrative,¹ 9:14-15, it uses the אָ plus pronoun only (9:14- אתה).
3. Where Qoh has a comparand in first person narrative, Nehemiah memoirs, the percentage is not comparable, 5% and 19% respectively. Qoh finds greatest similarity in first person delivery found in the poet/prophet material.

Finally, if Qoh is of a vernacular dialect, then the shorter, more efficient pronoun plus verb, is an understandable preference (see p. 43).

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

4. Prepositions

b. ב with Relative Pronoun

Qoh combines prepositional ב with the relative to introduce a causal clause, e.g. 7:2 $\text{באשר הוא סוף כל-האדם}$;
8:4 $\text{באשר דבר-מלך שלטון}$.

Also 2:16, 7:2

This is compatible only with EBH (Gen 39:9, 23J-BDB 84a).²

1 Though portions of Qoh are descriptive of historical events, the expression is not of a sequential nature, as Qoh 9:14-15 is, and as BH historic books are (see pp.29f,69ff).

2 Even if we were to agree with Redford's argument for the lateness of the Joseph story, Redford himself still allows a seventh century date (252).

Whitley (25) identifies the use as "classical." A different form occurs in Jonah 1:8 בַּאֲשֶׁר לִי, which may be a calque of the Aramaic בְּדִיל (BDB 84a).

Conclusion: More characteristic of EBH

b. ל

1) As Sign of the Accusative

Chronicles and Ezra use ל as the mark of the accusative very often, and this may represent an influence of Aramaic by its frequency (Polzin 64f).¹ However this trait is not present in Esther (Striedl 77) nor in Nehemiah's memoirs (Polzin 72). EBH uses this construction much less frequently.

Qoh does not use this grammatical form in any certain instance. Two occasions of its use have been argued for by Gordis and Whitley. Gordis (1968:224) cites 2:22 כִּי מֵהָהוּא לְאָדָם, where in fact the ל is more a dative of interest, or a genitive of possession, than it is an accusative, since the verb is intransitive, i.e., הוּא. Whitley (67) and Gordis (1968:279), using different roots, agree on the transitive nature

¹ Meek (1945:13) objects- "However, it is found in writings as early as Amos and it is simply the ל of specification used in place of the accusative, for the sake of emphasis originally, but later merely as a variant construction." Apart from a grammatical term however, we are dealing with the frequency of a form.

of תעז in 7:19 החכמה תעז לחכם, which would employ the ל then as an accusative prepositional phrase. Yet BDB 738b, to the dissatisfaction of Whitley and Gordis, translate intransitively, i.e., "Wisdom is strong for the wise." This renders the phrase less accusative than dative as in 2:22 above. Both intransitive and transitive translations are grammatically acceptable.

If one were to assume that Gordis and Whitley were correct in their analysis, one would still be left with the infrequency of this construction in Qoh compared with Chronicles-Ezra. Consequently, we could not say at this point, that there has been an Aramaic influence on Qoh as is evident in that literature, but at most, Qoh like EBH uses it rarely.

Conclusion: More characteristic of EBH

2) With עז

The combination of עז, plus ל prefixed to the following noun occurs in Chronicles and Ezra only, e.g. Ezra 9:4 עז למנחה הערב. With a noun it occurs 13 times in Chronicles, 4 times in Ezra. With an infinitive it is present 10 times in Chronicles, once in Ezra, and 3 times in earlier books¹ (Jo 13:5, Ju 3:3, I Kg 18:29²).

1 S. R. Driver (1913:538); Polzin (69) ignores the infinitives.
2 Torrey (1896:19) prefers the LXX variant.

Qoh does not use the combined form at all (עד at 2:3, 3:11, 12:1, 2, 6). However neither does Esther nor Nehemiah.

Conclusion: More characteristic of EBH

c. על

1) For Directional על

A "directional" use of על has been found by some in Qoh that indicates to them a late use of the preposition.¹ i.e.,

3:17 כי-עת לכל-חפץ ועל כל-המעשה

12:7 וישוב העפר על-הארץ

That this occurs in LBH is evident for instance from Kropat's itemization (41f) of phrases expressing "die Richtung auf." Regarding Esther, Striedl (77) only reluctantly ("vielleicht") offers 1:17 and 8:8 as instances of the same in that book, though they are as strong of uses of על for אל as Kropat cites,

1:17 כי-יצא דבר המלכה על-כל-הנשים

8:8 ואתם כתבו על-היהודים

(where על could mean "regarding" as RSV).

In respect to the 'directional' use of על for אל, Sperber cites explicit exchanges of על for אל in

1 e.g. Delitzsch 266, 425; Lauha 8, 205.

numerous cases in EBH.¹ Where the two prepositions are used in parallel relationship, the ability to interchange them is most obvious.

e.g. 1 Sm 25:25 אֶל-נָא יֹשִׁים אֲדָנִי אֶת-לְבוֹ

אֶל-אִישׁ הַבְּלִיעַל הַזֶּה עַל-נָבֵל

Sperber goes on to cite 42 more BH cases of this interchange. Also he shows in 24 further instances, a parallel use of the two different prepositions when separated by only a few verses. And in instances not cited by Kropat, Sperber shows where the Chronicler was equally apt to substitute על for אל, as he was אל for על in the Vorlage. The weight of his evidence leads him (633) to the radical conclusion that,

"the particles אל and על are used promiscuously... any differentiation in their meaning is without any foundation in the Bible, and must be considered as arbitrary."

This would include the directional aspect, as well as the uses for 'against' 'upon,' etc. Whether the overlap between them is total or not is not the topic of this section in this study.

The point here is that BH as a whole evidently

1 pp. 288, 633f; cf. Greenfield's unsubstantiated claim (1977:371 n. 6) that LBH shows a "gradual replacement of 'el by 'al."

used לַ directionally. BDB:757 has its own doubts concerning a certain distinction between לָ and לַ, i.e., "against" versus "upon"

"And in general לַ in such cases seems to be used merely as a syn(onym)--perh(aps) as a slightly more graphic syn(onym) of לָ."

In light of the numerous EH occurrences of לַ for לָ, it is not necessary to postulate an Aramaic influence unique to LBH.

So Qoh's uses of לַ in a directional manner (3:17, 12:7) cannot be associated particularly with any era of BH.

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

2) In Phrases Denoting a State of Being

Whitley (26) challenges Zimmermann's claim (1945/46:20) that the phrase רַע עָלַי in Qoh 2:17 is a calque from the Aramaic בָּאֲשׁ עָלַי in Dn 6:15. He does so by referring to the instances in LBH. His argument is only partial however, since the EBH parallels are not cited.¹ BDB 753a and 753b describe a function of עָלַי to be to express:

¹ Delitzsch 248, Wright 335, Gordis 1968:223 also consider this use of עָלַי as late.

"what rests heavily upon a person or is a burden to him,
Is 1:14...2 Sm 15:33...Ex 5:9(J)...Ecc 6:1, 8:6."

and *ל* can give

"pathos to the expression of emotion, by emphasizing the person who is its subject, and who, as it were, feels it acting upon him...Hos 11:8...I Sm 17:32, 25:36...".

Since BDB includes Qoh 6:1, 8:6 in this category, a look at Qoh 2:17 will show it to be equally acceptable EBH.

6:1 *ל*ש רעה...ורבה היא על-האדם
8:6 *כי* רעת האדם רבה עליו
2:17 *כי* רע עלי המעשה שנעשה

Qoh 2:17 therefore uses *ל* in the same manner as 6:1 and 8:6, where in all three statements it is ascribing a source of depression upon Qoheleth or mankind.

BDB 758a includes Qoh 2:17 in the examples of the "silver age" where *ל* has a force of a dative. But by this lexicon's own definitions above (753 a and b) we can see that this is an unnecessary classification, and that this function of *ל* to denote a "burden upon" has EBH parallels.

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

d. Compounded Preposition

Kropat (43) mentions that within the synoptic passages in Chronicles

"Die Chronik setzt vielfach zusammengesetzte Präpositionen, wo die ältere Sprache sich mit einfachen begnügte."

Qoh combines prepositions as well, but not without EBH precedent.¹ Those examples that Kropat gives and are found in Qoh have the following EBH references:

מאחרי Qoh 10:14, Nu 32:15(JE), 2 Sm 2:21, 23

מלפני Qoh 3:14, 1 Sm 8:18, 18:12, 1 Kg 11:15, 21:29

מעל Qoh 5:7, Gn 18:3(J), 24:64(J), Ex 3:5(J), Ju 4:15

Those not listed by Kropat:

מבלי Qoh 3:11, Is 5:13, Hos 4:6

לעמת Qoh 7:14, 2 Sm 16:13, 1 Kg 7:20

בשל Qoh 8:17, here a textual error is probable; see p.269ff.

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

5. Phonology - ש for ס

Qoh 1:17 spells סכלות (2:3, 12, 13, 7:25, 10:1, 13) as שכלות. Whitley (16) and Magnanini (381) suggest that this substitution is related to LBH and Aramaic influence, since such interchanges occur in both, and Aramaic sees the eventual loss of ש in Syriac. But these allusions are misleading:

a. The interchange of ש and ס is evident in EBH as well,

e.g.

1) סער - Am 1:14
שער - Is 28:2 storm

2) סערה - Is 29:6
שערה - Nah 1:3 storm

¹ Compounding prepositions is a common practice in BH; see Bauer-Leander 1962:81K" and GK s. 119 b-e.

3) סוג - Ho 5:10, Mic 2:6, 6:14 move away
שוג - 2 Sm 1:22

4) מסוכה - Mi 7:4 a hedge
שוג - Ho 2:8 to hedge

- b. The development of ψ to σ is irrelevant here since the root סכל occurs as early as Gen 31:28(E) and 2 Sm 24:10. Thus the ψ is irregular, not the σ in Qoh, which would make the argument for a late development out of place.

It is probably more sensible to agree with BDB 698 " ψ erroneously for σ ", an error in transcription, since it does occur only at the very first occurrence of the word in Qoh, the rest being correctly transcribed. Perhaps once corrected, the scribe neglected to change his initial error.

Conclusion: Equally EBH and LBH

C. Summary

This portion of the study has now compared Qoh with LBH in thirty areas of grammar. These features were discussed because either they have been said to be characteristic of LBH and have been (or might be) used to prove Qoh's dependence on LBH, or because they offer differences between LBH and EBH which allow Qoh to align with one or the other in each area. The following summary of evidence is with reference to the specific principles outlined above (p. 152ff).

1. Exclusively LBH -

If a grammatical feature is found often in LBH, and again only in Qoh, then the feature could tentatively be considered a LBH trait.

Only one feature in Qoh is similar to that of LBH exclusively; the absence of the infinitive absolute to emphasize a finite cognate verb. This is an argument from silence at best however. In point of fact, the infinitive absolute which is rare in LBH in *all* its functions, occurs four times in Qoh in its other roles as finite verb and imperative (4:2, 17, 8:9, 9:11). This nullifies any importance to the isolated absence of only one of the roles the infinitive absolute may play in Hebrew. If a number of features of BH that are not used in LBH were also to be missing in Qoh, then a cumulative force may come of those arguments from silence. But only one, and that one being counter-acted by the appearance of the part of speech in other roles, does not carry considerable weight.

2. Equally EBH and LBH -

If a grammatical feature of Qoh is found in EBH and LBH, then that feature cannot be considered a LBH trait only.

This category includes 14 of the 30 features compared. Some have been cited by different scholars to be late grammatical features in Qoh. Others have been cited by grammarians as differences between LBH and EBH, yet not specifically relative to any discussion of Qoh. Given the data however, these areas have been (or would be if applied

to Qoh) erroneously used as guides for determining the nature of Qoh's language. These are errors due mainly to insufficient analysis of BH, where EBH instances are not given ample attention, if not completely neglected. These features are:

1. Cohortative
2. Infinitive Construct with ל
3. Infinitive Construct Consecutive
4. Infinitive Absolute with Conjunctive Waw
5. Participle as Present Tense
6. ל"י and ל"י Verbs
7. Nominative with את
8. Relative-ש Frequency
9. Relative Subordinating an Entire Clause
10. Pronoun Suffixed to את
11. על for Directional אל
12. על in Phrases denoting a State
13. Compounded Prepositions
14. Phonology: ש for ס

3. More Characteristic of LBH

a. Independent from LBH -

Is there a good reason why there should be a heavy use of this trait in Qoh outside of any dependence on LBH grammar, e.g. genre, dialect?

Two grammatical traits resemble LBH, in that these traits are more frequent there than in EBH. However

both of these can be explained reasonably by other means than postulating LBH influence.

1) $\hat{o}n$ - and $\hat{u}th$ - Terminations -

The frequent occurrence of these forms is adequately explained by the abstract function they serve in the reflective and universalizing book that Qoh is. The forms, being used also in EBH, are useful to Qoh probably more than any other book in BH.

2) First Person Singular Independent Pronoun אני, not ever אנכי-

The exclusive use of אני can be explained most adequately by looking at the unique genre and probable dialectical differences in Qoh. (See pp. 43, 172ff).

b. Dependent on LBH -

If there is no other apparent reason for a similarity between Qoh and LBH to exist other than LBH influence, the feature could be considered tentatively to be a LBH trait.

No feature remains that could be considered a definite result of LBH influence.

4. More Characteristic of EBH -

If a grammatical feature only appears in EBH, and not in LBH because it has a different means to the same end, then that feature indicates an independence of Qoh from LBH grammar. However, if the feature is not used frequently in EBH, or if the feature could be due to a literary or dialectical cause, the relation to EBH is of course of no chronological significance.

Ten grammatical properties occurring in Qoh are more

characteristic of EBH than LBH. These are important either because they are lacking, or infrequent in both Qoh and EBH (though used often in LBH), or because they occur more often in Qoh and EBH than we would expect in LBH.

- a. Independent from EBH - One trait, the short form of the feminine demonstrative pronoun h^{t} , is probably a dialectical phenomenon of Qoh.
- b. Perhaps Dependent on EBH - The remaining nine features do not appear to have any dialectical or literary reason for their presence (or absence) from Qoh though they vary considerably in their value as similarities to EBH. Some are similar to EBH because Qoh lacks that feature which is frequent in LBH; this is *negative* evidence. The rest are present in Qoh and EBH and significantly less frequent in LBH; this is *positive* evidence.
 - 1) Negative Evidence - Three of these nine remaining grammatical characteristics are relevant because they are lacking in Qoh, when the opportunity for use existed.
 1. Genitive Anticipatory Suffix
 2. h as Sign of Accusative
 3. h with t^{y}

However these are arguments from silence and carry less weight than features that *do* exist in Qoh. Furthermore, all three do not occur in Esther or Neh

memoirs either, though they occur frequently in Chronicles-Ezra. Qoh then resembles EBH here. Esther-Neh-memoirs do as well, either because they are archaizing or because they genuinely represent a LBH alternative in grammatical style.

2) Positive Evidence - The other six features which may be dependent on EBH actually occur in Qoh and are not arguments from silence, but positive resemblances to EBH.

a) Esther-Nehemiah memoirs As Well. - Four of these positive traits are found in Esther or Nehemiah memoirs or both Esther and Nehemiah memoirs but not at all in Chronicles-Ezra. Again, whether this demonstrates a tendency to archaize, or a viable LBH grammatical alternative in style is a moot issue.¹

1. Infinitive Construct with ָ
2. Infinitive Absolute as an Imperative
3. Conjunctive Waw Patterns
4. Numbered Substantives

¹ Though Qoh resembles Esther and Nehemiah memoirs in these four areas and the three previous negative evidences, it should be stressed that Qoh is not thereby significantly similar to the nature of these LBH books. Apart from the Polzin's representative view that these LBH sources do archaize (see p. 151), they also possess definite LBH grammatical and lexical properties that Qoh does not match. These properties would need extensive research and documentation, however a start can be had in pursuing the following authors: Striedl, S. R. Driver 1913; 484f, Polzin, Moore LIVff, Paton 62ff.

b) Exclusively EBH - Two features of Qoh's grammar are paralleled only in EBH.

1. ן with the Relative Pronoun
2. Singular-Plural Form to Denote Plurality.

These may point to Qoh's dependence on EBH, though it should be recalled that the EBH instances are not frequent.

5. Neither EBH nor LBH -

If a trait is found in Qoh and not sufficiently in BH elsewhere, or if it is disproportionate in Qoh compared with both EBH and LBH, its effect will be to distinguish Qoh equally from both.

These final three characteristics accent further the peculiar nature of Qoh's language and lend additional support to the suggestion that Qoh be assessed carefully when any attempt is made to date it linguistically.

1. Consecutive Imperfect
2. Infinitive Absolute with Independent Pronoun
3. Unassimilated Article

In light of this summary, an association of Qoh with LBH grammar is without support. In fact, an accumulation of EBH properties surfaces to further diminish the suggestion that LBH influence can be seen in the grammar of Qoh.

CHAPTER FOUR

LEXICAL COMPARISONS

- I. Mishnaisms
- II. Late Biblical Hebrew Words
- III. Aramaisms
- IV. Persianisms
- V. Greek Words

Having completed the most significant level of linguistic comparison, the grammatical and structural level, it is now the place to investigate the secondary evidence contributed by Qoh's vocabulary. This will be done under the categories Mishnaisms, Aramaisms, Late Biblical Hebrew Words, Persianisms, and Greek Words. All of these categories will consist of words (some phrases) that one or more students of Qoh's language have thought to be evidence for a late date. The objective is to submit these words to reliable principles and thereby to assess the value of the word to dating the language of Qoh. Consequently, methodological standards are outlined before each relevant section of evidence is analyzed.

I. MISHNAISMS

A. METHOD

The words that some consider to be Mishnaisms will be assessed according to the following specific principles.

1. Mhe¹ and Mhe² - Lexical comparisons with MH must be made in light of the two distinct natures of MH of the Tannaim and Amoraim. The first represents the colloquial Hebrew dialect which this study described earlier in Chapter Two Section C, a form of the language used for writing up until the third century A.D. Mhe² is a literary language exclusively, from the third to fifth centuries A.D. Its components are the spoken Aramaic of the time, and a revival of Biblical Hebrew. Kutscher (1967:162; 1971:1591) discusses this vital distinction and supplies the following principle for comparing vocabulary.

"Wenn ein BH-Wort in Mhe¹ nicht erscheint, und, erst in Mhe² auftaucht, besteht der dringende Verdacht, dass seine Verwendung in Mhe² nichts anderes ist als eine literarische Entlehnung aus BH! Solch ein Wort kann natürlich nicht in einen etymologischen Wörterbuch des BH als eine Mh-Parallel des behandelten BH-Wortes gebraucht werden! Bezüglich Mhe¹ besteht dieser Verdacht kaum...Deshalb müssen diese zwei Schichten streng auseinander gehalten werden."

Consequently, a word like בטחון (Qoh 9:4) cannot be a Mishnaism since it only recurs in Mhe²" (KB 116; see p. 212 of this study).

2. Equally BH - If a word in Qoh is found elsewhere in BH as well as in MH, and with the same meaning, the word obviously is not a Mishnaism. Hence אבד occurs in MH in the sense "to lose", but because it also occurs in BH with this meaning, a relation with MH (e.g. Delitzsch and Wright)

is not exclusive (see p. 208).

3. Homonymous to MH - If a word in Qoh appears in other BH books as well as MH yet with different meanings in these two eras, then before the word can be termed a "Mishnaism" it must be clearly demonstrated that the instance in Qoh aligns with the MH sense *exclusively*. This then becomes an exegetical concern since a context may apparently allow both meanings. This principle is essential to preclude a circular argument, i.e. "the word in Qoh must be rendered by the MH sense because Qoh as a whole is 'Mishnaic.' " This is precisely a question of this study, is Qoh "Mishnaic"? For instance, in BH the verb נהג means "to lead, to drive". In MH it can mean "to behave". Qoh 2:3 uses the word in a phrase that can be rendered either way without losing any sense. This then could not be admitted as a Mishnaism (see p. 225).

4. BH Cognates Exist - If a word of Qoh's is in a unique form in BH, yet is matched in MH, care should be taken to prove the word could not have been formed without MH influence before it is cited ~~as~~ a Mishnaism. Thus חטרוך (Qoh 1:15) may at first appear to be a Mishnaism because its exact equivalent is seen only in MH. However the root חטר is used ~~often~~ as a verb and an adjective in BH and is malleable enough to form two other vocalizations and at

least another consonantal construction apart from חסרון (מְחַסֵּר, חָסֵר, חֶסֶר). Since Qoh uses abstract words terminated by $\hat{h}n$ and $\hat{u}th$ so frequently, it is not necessary to draw from MH as a source of this word.

5. Semitic Cognates Exist - If a word occurs in Hebrew in Qoh and MH alone, then before that word is admitted as a Mishnaism it should be asked whether it is possible for Qoh to be in debt to another Semitic language. MH may not be the only source. בטל appears in BH only in Qoh 12:3, but often in MH. Yet this does not imply a Mishnaism because the word also appears in BA (Ezra 4:21 etc.). The word may be an Aramaism (see pp. 213,267).

This will remove the temptation of another circular argument. If the purpose of this study is to assess the linguistic evidence in Qoh objectively, then no priority can be given to MH as an origin of a word without begging the question. A word in this category *may* be a Mishnaism, but it also could be from another source, a source behind both BH and MH, e.g. Aramaic. If a final judgment is possible, it can only be made (in respect to these words) after Qoh's language has been identified generally.

6. Identical Forms - When a word occurs in Qoh and MH, then the forms (verbal stem, morphology etc.) should be the same in both if the Qoh term is to be a Mishnaism. Take

לוה for example. Qoh 8:15 uses this root in the qal to denote "to accompany". This root can mean the same in MH, yet there the stems used are the piel and hiphil. This type of parallel has led some to associate Qoh with MH in the use of this word and others. However this difference in stem indicates as much a development in the language over an indefinite period of time as it does a contemporary use in Qoh and MH.

The niph'al of לוה means "to join" in BH as early as Gn 29:34(J), but by the time of MH, it is the nithpael that serves this purpose. Is Gn 29:34 under the influence of MH? The forms should therefore be the same before a significant relation with MH is alleged.

7. Frequency in MH - When a word is found but once in both Qoh and MH, no dependence of Qoh on MH can be proven. Thus the use of מלאה in Qoh 11:5 for "pregnant", cannot be cited as a Mishnaism since it is found in MH only once (Yeb 16:1), and the debt may be in the reverse.
8. "Mishnaisms" - Some words exist in Qoh whose closest match is in MH only. That is, they occur in identical forms in Mhe¹ frequently enough, they are not homonymous to MH, and no alternative sources are viable in the cognates in BH or other Semitic languages. Thus אביונה could be termed a "Mishnaism" tentatively since it fulfills the above

criteria. However, these words are critically dependent on the following rule.

9. Number of "Mishnaisms" - After the vocabulary of Qoh has been compared with MH, and the number of "Mishnaisms" (#8) have been collected, a final consideration is in line. Many BH books have such "Mishnaisms", even pre-exilic texts. Consequently, the appearance of "Mishnaisms" does not entail that a book was written immediately before or during the Mishnaic period. It does prove however that words can be hidden for many centuries, occurring but once in BH very early, and then only again in MH. The following list includes examples only from *pre-exilic* books, though many examples could be collected from later texts as well.

Gn 15:2(E)	משק	household
25:30(J)	לעט	to feed
28:12(E)	סלם	ladder
40:11(E)	שחט	to press out
Ex 9:31(J)	גבעול	bud
21:10(E)	עונה	conjugal duty
Nu 11:5(JE)	אבטיח	watermelon
11:5(JE)	בצל	onion
11:5(JE)	שום	garlic
11:8(JE)	דור	to beat

Ju	4:18	שמִיכָה	blanket
	5:28	יִבַּב	to cry
	16:16	אֶצֵּל	to urge
2 Kg	4:42	צִקְלוֹן	sack
	6:25	קֶבֶב	measure
	10:22	מִלְתָּחָה	wardrobe
	23:5	מִזְלוֹת	constellation
Is	3:18	שְׁבִיטָה	front-band
	5:2	עִזָּק	to dig
	5:6	עִדָּר	to hoe
	14:15	אֵרֶן	pine-tree
	17:6	גִּרְגֵר	berry
	22:18	כְּדוּד	ball
Ho	3:2	לֶחֶךְ	barley-measure
	9:14	צִמָּק	to dry up

(Collection from: Ullendorf 1971:247; Greenfield 1956:XXXVI, 313; and words in Casanowicz 226-9 that we found in Kassowski's concordance)

The reason for such a wide gap between uses of a word in BH and MH is given by Blau (1971:1318f) and Gordis (1944:270 n. 22; 1945:174f) respectively.

"Since the Bible, because of its small size and limited topics, has preserved only a small part of Hebrew vocabulary, it is often due to mere chance that a word occurs only once in the Bible, though there may be ample examples of it in Middle [Mishnaic] Hebrew (as in the

case of sullam 'ladder' Gn 28:12)."

"...it is highly hazardous to decide that a given word or usage is 'late', because only fragments of ancient Hebrew literature are extant, so that the absence or rarity of a linguistic phenomenon may be purely accidental...The 'Mishnaic' word nekhasim 'riches' is met with in such late books as Ecclesiastes ...and Chronicles...But actually the word is much older, as its etymology indicates, for it occurs in Joshua 22:8."

Therefore the relatively small amount of representative material in BH might be a cause for "Mishnaisms" to surface in Qoh, as it is for "J", "E", Judges, 2 Kings and Isaiah. The plausibility of such a cause however will depend on the number of "Mishnaisms" in Qoh, since if the number is significantly greater than these other sources, then a Mishnaic character of Qoh's vocabulary would certainly be supported.

B. EVIDENCE

1. עת לבקש ועת לאבד 3:6 : אָבַד

to lose

This piel stem with the meaning "to lose", appeared to Delitzsch (258) and Wright (341) to occur only again in MH, e.g. Taharoth 8:3. However BDB 2a points out that the piel occurs again in Jer 23:1:

הוּי רְעִים מֵאֲבָדִים ... אֶת צֶאֱן מֵרַעִיתִי

The causitive function of the piel in these two cases is directly related to the qal "be lost, strayed" in I Sm 9:3, 20, Ps 119:176 etc. Also, a feminine noun אבדה indicates a connection of this root with the concept of "to lose" as

early as Ex 22:8E.

Conclusion: Equally BH
BH Cognates Exist

2. ויסתבל ההגב ותפר האביונה 12:5 : אַבְיוֹנָה

caperry

This word is a Biblical hapax, yet found again in MH (Maasr IV, 6; Berachoth 36a) and consequently included in lists of "Mishnaisms" by commentators.¹ Its independent value for dating Qoh is nil however, since it could not be proven that this word only became popular or existent in later Hebrew. It is a word that had no use in the rest of Biblical Hebrew and thus surfaces only once. There is no synonymous term in early or late BH with which to compare. It is like other plant and animal names in BH. A parallel situation occurs in Is 17:6 when גרגר, "berry", finds its only repetition in MH (Kassowski 474).

Conclusion: "Mishnaism" (only tentative)

3. אי-לך ארץ שמלכך נער e.g. 10:16 : 4:10, 10:16 אֵי

woe

Nowhere else in BH does this short form of the classical אֵי occur. However, in MH both forms exist, and many have seen the short form in Qoh as a Mishnaism.² Two points are noteworthy:

¹ e.g. Graetz 185; Delitzsch 190; Lauha 7.

² e.g. Zapletal 62; Odeberg 98; DuPlessis 176; Gordis 1968:316; Whitley 43; Di Fonzo 192.

- a. A reduction in diphthong such as this is evident in non-Judean and North Israelite sources (see p. 34) and so an exclusive relation to MH is not necessary.
- b. A parallel situation to אֵי in Qoh occurs with another interjection, where a rare BH הֵא (only Gn 47:23(J), Ezk 16:43) is repeated again only in MH (KB:226)¹. This demonstrates how an interjection particularly, may span a long period of time but surface only rarely in literature.

These two considerations weaken any exclusive relation between Qoh and MH here.

Conclusion: BH Cognates Exist
North Israelite Morphology
"Mishnaism" (only tentative)

4. אֵי זָה : 2:3, 11:6 e.g. 2:3 עַד אֲשֶׁר-אֵרְאֶה אֵי-זֶה טוֹב לְבַנִּי הָאָדָם
which, what, where

Some attribute the use of this pair of words to Mishnaic influence since the usual meaning in BH is "where", and in MH it "became a pure interrogative pronoun or adjective." (Segal s. 82).² Yet sufficient examples exist to show that BH, including EBH, could use the pair to indicate "which" or "what". Davidson (s. 8, rem. 4) explains -

1 G. R. Driver 1970:232 suggests the phonological equivalent הֵי in Ex 2:9E, הֵי לִקְיִי, becoming הֵי לִקְיִי.
2 Segal s.s. 82, 415; Barton 52, 194; BDB 32a - "late".

"The expression...is an interrogative adjective "which?"
"what?" Jonah 1:8...2 Sm 15:2...I Kg 13:12, 22:24, 2 Kg
3:8, 2 Chr 18:23, Is 66:1, Jer 6:16, Job 38:19, 24,
Ecc1 11:6...In many cases...is merely "where?"

Whitley (40) concurs with Davidson

"אי-זה" has the force of the interrogative "what";
cf. 1 Kg 13:12..."

This phrase therefore is of no chronological significance.

Conclusion: Equally BH

5. ואלו חיה אלף שנים פעמים 6:6 : אלו

if

Though this is common in MH, the word also occurs in BH
(Est 7:4) and is also seen to be an Aramaism.¹ Most see it
in the tenth century Ahiham Inscription as well. At this
point, the most that can be said about this word in Qoh is
that it is either LBH or an indication of Aramaic influence
but not necessarily a Mishnaism (see under "Aramaisms" for a
fuller discussion - p. 265).

Conclusion: Equally BH
Semitic Cognates Exist

6. כי את-כל-זה נתתי אל-לבי ולבנור את-כל-זה 9:1 : בנור

to explain

Delitzsch (191, 354) alludes to the post-Biblical uses of
this form. However confusion about the root of לבנור reduces
its value for comparison with MH. Whitley (78) and Gordis
(1968:299) take it as a ע"ו verb form for the more common

1 e.g. Graetz 186; Wildeboer 114; Delitzsch 191.

geminate ברר . As ברר , there is no counterpart in BH or MH meaning "to test, to prove" (BDB 101b, 140f; Gesenius: Handwörterbuch: 361b). The versions render it variously: Vulgate and Targum read ולתור , LXX and Peshitto ולבי ראה . Therefore, its occurrence is all but valueless for estimating the date of the language of Qoh.

Conclusion: Ambiguous Material

7. כִּי-מִי אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר אֶל כָּל-הַחַיִּים יֵשׁ בְּטַחֲוֹן 9:4 : בְּטַחֲוֹן

trust, confidence, hope

Gordis (1968:304) and Whitley (80) feel that this has a Talmudic meaning in Qoh since in Talmudic literature it means "hope" (Jastrow 1926:156) whereas in 2 Kg 18:19 (= Is 36:4) it means "trust" or "confidence". Here then in Qoh they prefer "hope" to "confidence". However, the semantic difference is negligible, if any at all. Gordis (ibid.) himself, ironically, shows the ultimate identity of these alleged different meanings for בְּטַחֲוֹן . He defines the later Hebrew meaning to be "faith in God, especially under adversity". In the only BH context (2 Kg 18:19=Is 36:4) other than Qoh 9:4, this supposedly late denotation is precisely the meaning of Rabshakeh's challenge to Hezekiah's envoys,

"On what do you rest this בְּטַחֲוֹן of yours...if you say to me, 'we rely on the Lord our God', is it not He whose high places and altars Hezekiah has taken away...?"

Here בְּטַחֲוֹן certainly could be defined as Gordis has defined the post-biblical occurrences.

Furthermore, even if one was to grant a significant semantic disparity for the sake of discussion, this word's occurrences only in the Talmud i.e. Mhe² (KB 116), has no weight in dating Qoh's language since the language of Mhe² sources are composites of BH and third to fifth century (A.D.) vernacular Aramaic.

Conclusion: Equally BH
Mhe²

8. ובטלו הטחנות כי מעטו : 12:3 בַּטַל

to cease

This word is a BH hapax with cognates in BA (Ezra 4:21 etc.), Akkadian, Arabic, Palmyrene Aramaic and MH. It is a good example of a word that cannot be called a certain Mishnaism in light of these cognates, especially BA. It may be an Aramaism for example (see p.267).

Conclusion: Semitic Cognates Exist

9. כי-הלך האדם אל-בית עולמו : 12:5 בַּיִת עוֹלָמוֹ

eternal home, grave

Delitzsch (191) alludes to the MH reference Tosefta: Berachoth III, and the Targumic uses at Is 14:18, 42:11. However he also acknowledges (418) the Egyptian occurrence as well. As Whitley (100) explains,

"Diodorus Sicullus (c. 60 B.C.) relates that the Egyptians too referred to their graves as *αἰδίουσ οἰκουσ* (eternal houses)."

Furthermore, the phrase is seen in Punic and Aramaic, as

others have noted (Gordis 1968:347; Whitley 100; Loretz 88). This would nullify any exclusive relationship with MH, especially since only one MH instance could well indicate Qoh's or some other source's influence on MH. It does appear to be a common phrase of a number of pre-MH cultures.

Barton (196) and Whitley's (100) Talmudic evidence (Sanhedrin 19a) referring to a cemetery, בית עלמין, is discounted as Mhe².

Whitley (100) draws a further parallel with the Talmudic construction עולמו, that is, simply עולם with the masculine suffix (his eternity). Again this is Mhe² and Dahood (1958: 316) points out the Ugaritic parallel 'lmh (his eternity).

Conclusion: Semitic Cognates Exist
 Infrequent in MH
 Mhe²

10. כי מה-הָוָה לָאָדָם בְּכָל-עֲמָלוֹ : 2:22 הָוָה

to be (on 11:3 see p.273).

The participial form of this root is found in Qoh 2:22 and Neh 6:6 and has been considered Mishnaic since this occurs frequently in MH (Delitzsch, 191; Segal s. 212; Whitley 28). There is no question that this root is itself native Hebrew, a viable alternative to הִיָּה. Barton (95f) and Gordis (1968: 224) note the use in the "ancient poem" in Gn 27:29(J) as evidence of the word's existence throughout the periods of the language. And Gordis (ibid.) remarks that "it belongs to the common Northwest Semitic vocabulary." As to the partici-

pial form, one should consider the following:

1. The root only occurs at four certain times in BH (Gn 27:29(J), Is 16:4, Neh 6:6, Qoh 2:22). It appears twice as a participial. As an imperative it is masculine in Gn 27:29 הָנֵה , and feminine in Is 16:4 הָנִי . These also are found in MH (Ab 1:4, 2:3 etc.). Since two participles (Qoh 2:22, Neh 6:6) match MH use, and supposed "Mishnaic", are these two pre-exilic imperatives Mishnaisms as well? This is unlikely, yet it is the logical conclusion to the above reasoning.
2. Qoh's extensive use of participles to express general truth is the primary cause for the use of this word in this form. The book's genre is the relevant concern here, especially since the influence of MH cannot be proven.

Conclusion: Equally BH

11. $\text{כִּי מִי יֹאכַל וּמִי יִחוּשׁ חוּץ מִמֶּנִּי 2:25 : חוץ מן$

without

This phrase is found again only in MH, and is thus a possible indication of MH influence (Delitzsch 191, Hengstenberg 9, Segal s. 512, DiFonzo 22). The root חוץ is frequent in BH, but it is its mixture with a posterior מן that distinguishes it. It is also possibly an Aramaism, a calque form from בר מן (see p. 276).

Conclusion: "Mishnaism" (tentative)

12. מעֹנֹת לֹא-יֹוֹכַל לְתַקֵּן וְחִסְרוֹן לֹא-יֹוֹכַל לְהַמְנוֹת 1:15 חֶסְרוֹן
deficiency

This abstract noun, formed from a common BH root חסר , recurs in MH, and thus is thought to be a Mishnaism (Delitzsch 192: Whitley 14 alludes to MH). The root is very malleable in BH however, with six cognate forms: חָסַר (vb), חָסֵר (adj), חָסָר, חָסֵר, חִסְרוֹן, חִסְרוֹר. It is not surprising then that Qoh's abstract nature would express itself with the -ֹנ ending, and without any dependence on MH (see p. 164ff).

The antiquity of the -ֹנ ending with this particular root is also evident. The word mhsrn occurs in two Ugaritic commercial texts with the meaning "deficit" (Gordon 1965:403).

To demonstrate the poet's advantage of drawing from a larger stock of words than are common in BH (see p. 252ff), the following observation is offered. The assonance obtained from the chiastic form of the proverb wherein this word lies, would not be possible with any of the other BH cognates. The chiastic structure is evident in the medial -ֹנ sound (לְתַקֵּן חִסְרוֹן), the לֹא-יֹוֹכַל on either side of these, and the long vowels terminating the words at both poles (חִסְרוֹן-, -וֹת).

The use of חִסְרוֹן was possibly then intended to give a specific meaning with an advantage of assonance. It will be noticed further that the proverb is syntactically parallel: substantive, adverb, verb, infinitive. So, if the composer of this proverb wished to combine parallelism with chiastic assonance, he was very much in need of the -ֹנ terminated noun.

Conclusion: BH Cognates Exist
Semitic Cognate Exists
Genre of Qoh and Structure
of Proverb make the form suitable.

13. חֲפֵץ : 3:1, 17, 5:7, 8:6 e.g. 8:6 כִּי לְכָל-חֲפֵץ יֵשׁ עֵת וּמִשְׁפָּט
matter, business

MH uses this term in the sense of "thing, object" e.g.
Bera 5:2 - a man sells a thing to his fellow.

Some have thought that this same meaning appears in Qoh
3:1, 17, 5:7, 8:6 (Delitzsch 192; Zapletal 62; Whitley 30).
Gordis (1968: 374) dissents however,

"Actually, in Koheleth the word does not mean 'thing',
but still retains its volitional nuance, and means
'phenomenon, pursuit, activity, affair', very similar
in meaning to עֹסֶה, as it is clear from the context..."

The contexts are revealing and do suggest Gordis' judgment,
e.g.

Qoh 3:17 כִּי-עֵת לְכָל-חֲפֵץ וְעַל כָּל-הַמַּעֲשֵׂה שֵׁם

Here the word is in direct parallel to the word denoting
"activity", הַמַּעֲשֵׂה .

It is of further interest that the word Gordis compares
with חֲפֵץ in Qoh is עֹסֶה; it was exactly the absence of the
latter in Qoh that prompted Margoliouth (32) to discard a
theory of MH influence on the book, among other evidence.

Conclusion: Homonymous to MH

14. וְסִבּוֹתַי אֲנִי לִיאֵשׁ אֶת-לִבִּי 2:20 זָאֵשׁ

to despair

Though the root occurs as early as I Sm 27:1 (niph'al), it

is argued that since MH has a nominal root derived from the piel (יאוּשׁ), and a hithpael (תּתּיּאֵשׁ), MH has influenced Qoh's piel here (Gordis 1968:223; Whitley 27). This is a tenuous argument since in this case the MH comparand is only *extrapolated* from other evidence, i.e. no piel of this root exists in MH. The development could have its roots in a BH piel, i.e. Qoh.

Yet were the extrapolation granted, the root's existence in the niphal (1 Sm 27:1, Jer 2:25, 18:12, Is 57:10, Jb 6:26) attests to the BH meaning of "despair."

Conclusion: BH Cognate Exists
Not Identical Forms

15. וּלְהֵג הַרְבֵּה יִגְעַת בָּשָׂר 12:12 : יִגְעַת
weariness

BDB 388a describes this to be a "late format", alluding to the MH verbal noun pattern קִטִּילָה. Here in Qoh it is defectively written, and in the feminine form. In addition to MH, BH and North Israelite use the form as well (see pp. 34 , 108) which is especially pertinent since North Israelite has much more in common with Qoh than just this.

Conclusion: Form is Equally BH
North Israelite Morphology

16. כִּי גַם בַּמְלָכוֹתָיו נִוּלַד רֵשׁ 4:14 : יִלְד
niphal - be born

Delitzsch (279 n. 2) dismisses Graetz' claim that this is an example of the MH sense "to become". The niphal is again

used in Qoh 7:1 in the infinitive with the unquestionable denotation "to be born". There is no need to draw from MH.

Conclusion: Homonymous to MH

17. לְיוֹתֵר : 2:15, 6:8, 11, 7:11, 16, 12:9, 12 e.g. 6:8 כִּי מֵה-יֹוֹתֵר
לְחֹכֵם מִן-הַכְּסִיל
advantage, excess

Delitzsch' (192) allusions to the Talmudic Hebrew use of this word in nominal and adverbial functions are discounted because Talmudic Hebrew is not representative of MH. It also detracts from the BH precedents in 1 Sm 15:15 and Est 6:6 (see p. 238).

Conclusion: Mhe²
Equally BH

18. יָפָה : 3:11, 5:17 e.g. 3:17 אֶת-הַכֹּל עָשָׂה יָפָה בְּעֵתוֹ
beautiful

In MH this noun has the general meaning of "goodness", and this meaning has been seen in Qoh 3:11 and 5:17 as a Mishnaism (Delitzsch 259; Barton 105). However, "beautiful, fair", the BH meaning of the root, is equally acceptable as BDB 421b indicates by making no semantic distinction in the word's application to men, women, cows, cities, trees and singers. The interpretation in this case will be a secondary consideration, subordinate to the over-all linguistic nature of Qoh, i.e. whether it is Mishnaic or not.

Conclusion: Homonymous to MH

19. כִּי-יֵצֵא אֱלֹהִים יֵצֵא אֶת-כָּלם 7:18 יֵצֵא

to proceed, escape

This word has been associated with either a meaning of "escape" (e.g. Hertzberg 137; Zimmerli 209), or "do one's duty" (e.g. Delitzsch 326; Whitley 67). However the latter meaning is applied to Qoh 7:18 because of a supposition of MH influence on the book, MH itself using the word to denote obligation. It is perfectly intelligible to translate with the BH meaning "to proceed" (BDB 423b) as the LXX and Targum do. There is no cause for seeing an exclusive MH nuance. It is also merely a matter of exegetical preference whether "to escape" is a fitting rendition or not; and if it is, it occurs as early as Gn 39:12, 15(J) with this sense.

Conclusion: Homonymous to MH

20. כְּבָרָה 1:10, 2:12, 16, 3:15, 15, 4:2, 6:10, 9:6, 7 e.g. כְּבָרָה הִיא לְעֹלָמִים
already

This adverb is only found again in MH, and frequently there. Its etymology is uncertain (see p.281) but its meaning clear from the contexts.

Conclusion: "Mishnaism"

21. וַיִּשְׂרֵץ 10:10 וַיִּתְרוֹן הַכְּשִׁיר חֲכָמָה

to succeed

This root is gemeinsemitisch, found in Ugaritic (ktr), Akkadian (kašaru), Arabic (ktr); Phoenician (כְּשִׁר) and Aramaic (Wagner 68), all with a denotation of "succeed, be proficient,

prosper". It is also in BH in the pre-exilic portion of Ps 68, פֹּשְׁרוֹת in verse 7, with the sense of "prosperity".¹

In MH it is "the common word for that which is ritually suitable, or legally admissable" (C. H. H. Wright 494). For this reason, this word in Qoh 10:10 has been cited as an example of the post-Biblical hue of Qoh's language (e.g. Delitzsch 193, 381; Wildeboer 114). It would then be rendered in its context "wisdom has a superiority in setting right" (C. H. H. Wright: 300).

Again, this comes to a point of exegetical preference and a presupposition of when Qoh was composed. If Qoh is Mishnaic in its nature, then this latter translation is understandable. But, equally so, the BH meaning of the root כָּשַׁר is acceptable, i.e. "the advantage of wisdom gives success" as Barton (172) BDB 506b and Frenzo (544)² translate.

Whitley (86) again suggests a Talmudic denotation, "to improve, grow better"; but this is clearly due to his presupposition of the Qoh's date, and is besides. Mhe², and no help in dating Qoh's vocabulary.

Conclusion: Homonymous to MH

22. והוא ילונו בעמלו : 8:15 לְוָה

to accompany

The use of the qal stem with the meaning "to accompany" is

1 BDB 507a; G. R. Driver 1953:34; Oesterly 321; Gunke1 288.

2 Frenzo - "but the advantage to wisdom is success."

unique to this passage in BH. Some have noted that in MH the piel and hiphil are used for the same purpose, and thus have seen a significant relationship between Qoh and MH (Odeberg 98; Gordis 1968:298; Whitley 76f). However the difference in stem cannot be dismissed without comment. Such a difference could well represent a development from BH to MH, and not a contemporaneous existence of the qal, piel and hiphil.

It is interesting that the BH niph'al stem of this verb means "to join", as does the MH nithpael. But who would use this similarity to prove MH influence on Gn 29:34(J) or Is 14:1, where the niph'al is used in this sense? The different stems presumably would obviate such a relation to be important. This is just as true for the qal in Qoh.

Conclusion: Not Identical Forms
BH Cognates Exist

23. אינך יודע מה-דרך הרוח כעצמים בבטן מלאה : 11:5 מְלֵאָה
pregnant

This meaning to this word is allegedly paralleled in Hebrew only in MH: in Yeb 16:1 "she went forth מלאה" (pregnant). Consequently some have considered it a Mishnaism (e.g. Delitzsch 193: Podechard 46; Whitley 93). Yet Gordis (1968:332) sees in Ruth 1:21 a related meaning in reference to her two dead sons.

"I went forth pregnant, and the Lord has brought me back empty".

The one occurrence in MH is furthermore inadequate since it may represent BH influence on MH.

The relationship between "full" and "pregnant" is evident in other languages and shows the natural semantic interchange that can occur. For example, this occurs in Latin, Ovid's *Metamorphosis* 10, 465 (Barton 193), and at least American English, e.g. "pregnant with meaning".

Conclusion: Infrequent in MH and BH

24. והלך בדרכי לבך ובמראי עיניך 11:9 e.g. 6:9, 11:9 : מְרֵאָה
vision, pleasure

Under the subjective assumption that this word denotes "pleasure", some have used this word as evidence of MH influence on Qoh (Barton 136; BDB 909b; Whitley 59f). This is because a passage in Talmudic Hebrew (Yoma 74b) uses the phrase to mean "pleasure" (Jastrow 834b). This is a good example of poor reasoning since:

- a. The Talmudic passage is drawing from Qoh, using the very phrase found in these two passages (6:9, 11:9).
- b. The suspicion of borrowing from Qoh is reinforced by the fact that this only reference is in Mhe².

Conclusion: Mhe²

25. תרתי בלבי למשוך ביין את-בשרי 2:3 : מִשָּׁךְ

to draw

It is sufficient in this case to quote Whitley:

"Delitzsch maintained that מִשָּׁךְ in the Talmud occurs in the sense of 'refresh', and translated a passage in Hag 14a as 'The Haggadists refresh the heart of man as with water.'¹ See, however, Corre² who contends that the point of comparison in this Talmudic passage is 'in the ease of drawing, not in the refreshing qualities of the water.' "

On two counts then, this "Mishnaism" is devalued. It probably has a different meaning than Delitzsch believed, and its post-Biblical parallel is Mhe².

Conclusion: Mhe²

26. כִּי הָעֵשֶׂק וְהוֹלֵל חָכֵם וְיֹאבֵד אֶת-לֵב מִתְּנָה 7:7 : מִתְּנָה
gift (bribe)

The syntax and parallel structure of this verse, together with the morphology of the word מִתְּנָה, have caused some discussion as to its origin and meaning. Whitley (63) believes the conjunctive waw imperfect implies the same subject of the first clause (הָעֵשֶׂק), making מִתְּנָה the object, with the archaic third singular masculine possessive suffix. According to Whitley and others then, the root is related to the MH מָתַן "strong" (e.g. G. R. Driver 1954:229; Gordis 1968:270f). This is interesting, but not a necessary deduction from the text. As Whitley points out himself, discord of a masculine verb יֹאבֵד, with a feminine noun is precedented in BH elsewhere (GK s. 145). Furthermore, the word מִתְּנָה is met 17 other

1 Delitzsch 234

2 Corre 416 n. 2; also Epstein: Hagigah p. 85

times in BH with the primary meaning of "gift", and a secondary sense of "bribe" in Pr 15:27 (BDB 682b). Finally, it is an emphatic result that is attained by putting a word at the end of a clause; in this case on the opposite pole of the proverb to that of the initial and parallel subject העֶשֶׂק ("extortion" BDB 798b).

Conclusion: BH Word

27. וּלְבִי נִהַג בַּחֲכָמָה 2:3 : נִהַג

to lead

The common use of this word in BH is either "to lead", or "to drive". MH uses it in the sense of "to behave". Feeling that the latter meaning is more appropriate, some have seen this intransitive use as a Mishnaism (e.g. Delitzsch 194; S. R. Driver 1913:474; Wildeboer 114; Whitley 19f). However the BH sense "to lead" is equally suitable and discounts an exclusive relation to MH.

It may be objected that the Qoh passage, like MH, implies an intransitive meaning since an object is missing in Qoh 2:3. Yet BH in 1 Sm 30:2, 22, and the two North Israelite passages, 2 Kg 4:24, 9:20, demonstrates earlier intransitive (or at least elliptical) uses of the verb.

e.g. 2 K 9:20 כִּי בִשְׁגֵעוֹן יִנְהַג

Conclusion: Homonymous to MH

28. נָחַת לְזֶה מִזֶּה 6:5 : נָחַת

rest

It is not necessary to translate this noun as "pleasure", as MH uses the word, and call it a Mishnaism (e.g. Levy 101; Whitley 58; Gordis 1968:259). The root has made sense to many in the meaning of "rest" (e.g. BDB 629a; Whybray 97f n.15); Muilenberg 25). The opinion of Gordis' (ibid.) that the rendering "rest" results in a banal statement, is in its condescension, insensitive to the effective metaphor of death described as "rest".

Conclusion: Homonymous to MH

29. בוקע עצים יסכך בם 10:9 :סכך

be in danger - niphāl

It is unique for this word to mean "be in danger" in BH. However this sense of Qoh 10:9 is repeated in MH (Delitzsch 194; Whitley 86), but not in the niphāl. There it is piel, and in the much later Targum, the ithpael. The possibility of the niphāl existing prior to these MH and Targumic stems, is just as real as a contemporary use. Since the forms are not the same, and the BH cognates exist, it would be a strained argument to insist on MH influence here.

Furthermore the antiquity of the word is suggested by Lipinski (193) who sees this sense of the root in Ugaritic (UT 75 II 53), i.e. danger. He reasons

"On a traduit ce mot par 'soin' ou 'forme', sans réussir pourtant à donner au texte un sens intelligible. En revanche, la traduction 'danger' semble dissiper les obscurités du passage en question."

Rabin (1961:395f) has suggested that the meaning in Qoh is the original BH sense of "to be familiar or accustomed to", giving the translation "let him be careful with them". But this disturbs the parallelism with the other verbs of disadvantage in verses 8 and 9, i.e. נפל, נשך, and עצב and is then unlikely.

Conclusion: Not Identical Forms
Semitic Cognate Exists

30. וטוב משניהם את אשר-עדן לא היה 4:3
 מן-החילים אשר המה חילים עדנה 4:2
 yet, still

These terms are usually seen as contractions of BH עד and הָ or הֶּ (e.g. Delitzsch 194; BDB 725b; DuPlessis 175). MH has the approximate form from עד and יָ, עֲדִי, though the contraction has a different morphological component. Gordis (1955: 111) feels the Qoh form to be the older defective orthography which BH has many instances of in the diphthong ay. If the form is older, it presupposes that the spelling behind the Qoh words is that of MH עֲדִי. However this presupposition is unnecessary and thus misleading.

Dahood (1952:48; 1965:36) suggests that the root behind these adverbs is that which is found in Ugaritic (ʿadn), Akkadian (adannu), Aramaic (עֲדִי), meaning "time". These nouns then, are the source of Qoh's adverbs of the same root, עֲדִי, having the additional directional Hē. The reading then would be:

4:3 - he who to now, has not been.

4:2 - the living who were still alive.

Conclusion: Not Identical Forms
Semitic Cognates Exist

31. גם את-העלם נתן בלבם 3:11 עֲלָם

eternity, ignorance

This is one of the most controversial words in Qoh, its meaning varying between scholars.

- a. "Eternity" or "indefinite temporal duration", its regular BH use (Zimmerli 168, 172; Galling 93; Jenni 22-27; Lys 346; Piotto 1978:169; Barr 1962:118)
- b. "Ignorance" from the verb meaning "to conceal", as in Job 28:21, 42:3 (Graetz 70; Barton 105, Whitley 31ff).
- c. "World", the common MH use (Jastrow 1919:211; Kroeber 85, 116; Nöldeke 1900:84; Gordis 1968:231).

The third definition is relevant to this study because it has been used to indicate MH influence on Qoh. However as Barr (ibid.) points out,

"...the sense 'the world', given by Gordis...requires the rather difficult amplification as the 'love of the world.' "

Gordis (1968:407) attempts to refute this type of rebuttal by saying the aspect of "love" is inherent in לָב. However this is a bit too romantic for a context that deals immediately afterward with observation of the divine acts (מַצָּא). His argument is very subjective.

That a Mishnaism lies herein is doubtful.

Conclusion: Homonymous to MH.

32. כי אם-ראית עיניו 5:10 :ראית

look: kethib

The obscurity of this word robs it of any importance for dating Qoh. The qere is preferred by BDB 909a and Barton (131), ראית. Delitzsch (195) obtained interesting parallels to MH by revocalizing ראיית and ראיית but these have less to recommend them than the qere, and are not in any way acceptable as evidence of MH traits in Qoh.

Conclusion: Ambiguous Material

33. לב חכם לימינו ולב כסיל לשמאלו 10:2 :שמאל

error

Whitley (84) attributes a *moral* connotation to this word as is found in Talmudic Hebrew. But it is not inherent in the context that a moral opposition is the thrust of the contrast between the fool and the wise man. Though Old Testament ethics are frequently illustrated by the fool and the wise man, this may not be the intended meaning of the word שמאל, rather it may indicate more generally a simple opposition of activity, one correct, the other incorrect apart from morality i.e. mistake. Besides Talmudic parallels (if they exist here) are Mhe² and thus could well be dependent on the wisdom of BH times.

Conclusion: Mhe²

34. כי-הילדות והשחרות הכל 11:10 :שחרות

blackheaded, strong

The claim that this is a "NH [MH] word from 'be black' " (Barton 195) can only be entertained if one presupposes a Mishnaic background to Qoh as a whole. This is because ample opportunity to draw from the BH cognates precludes a necessary connection with MH. The concept of 'black' is

met in:	Jb 30:30	שחר
	Zec 6:2, 6 etc.	שחר
	Lam 4:8	שחור
	SS 1:6	שחרחר

However, as G. R. Driver (1932:38-47) has suggested, the word is more likely a metathesized form of Akkadian *šarāhu* "be strong, radiant", which is more closely parallel to ילדות.

Conclusion: BH Cognates Exist, or,
Homonymous to MH

35. וישתכחו בעיר אשר כן-עשו 8:10 : שָׁכַח

hithpael - be forgotten

Delitzsch (346) and Wright (499) note this hithpael stem occurs only this once in BH with this root. They go on to relate it to Talmudic uses (e.g. Gittin 56b), and to an aggadic Midrash instance (Tanchuma Par יתרו). But these are Mhe² references, hence not useful for dating Qoh.

Conclusion: Mhe²
BH Cognates Exist

36. ובשפלות ידים ידלף הבית 10:18 : שְׁפִלוּת

lassitude

This abstract form of the root שפל occurs only here in BH.

Qoh's propensity toward abstract forms makes such a word to be a natural part of its language. However Delitzsch (196), Whitley (90) and Gordis (1968:327f) allude to the Targumic (Jer 49:24) and Talmudic (e.g. Sot 48a) uses. Again, these are Mhe² and late instances that have no bearing on Qoh's language, except perhaps as borrowers themselves.

Conclusion: BH Cognates Exist
Mhe²

C. SUMMARY

Of the 36 words that one or more scholars have considered Mishnaisms (or they have loosely related to post-Biblical Hebrew) in Qoh, this study finds that at most only 4 could fall under this category, i.e. אביונה, אי, חוץ מן, and כבר. Even some of these have alternate causes. The rest fail to qualify for various reasons. However, assuming for the moment that these 4 were paralleled only by MH, they in themselves would not constitute proof of MH influence on Qoh. As pointed out earlier, other BH books, namely EBH, have as many if not more "Mishnaisms" than Qoh, but were not influenced by MH.

II. LATE BIBLICAL HEBREW WORDS

A. METHOD

1. Equally EBH - When a word exists in Qoh with the same meaning in EBH and LBH, that word is obviously not a 'late' word. So, though מלפני (Qoh 1:10) occurs in LBH, e.g. 1 Chr 16:30, 33, its occurrence as early as 1 Sm 8:18 shows the word to be of no chronological significance (contrary to Gordis 1968:208; see in this study p. 242).
2. EBH Cognates Exist - If a word in a particular form occurs in Qoh and LBH only, care should be taken to prove the word was formed by LBH influence before it is seen as 'late'. Thus זרע (Qoh 12:3) which is repeated only in Est 5:9 as a verb, still has cognates in EBH which could have been derived from this verb. The pilpel is found in Hab 2:7, the noun in Is 28:19 (see p.237).
3. Semitic Cognates Exist - When a word occurs in Hebrew only in Qoh and LBH, then before the word is judged late, it should be considered whether a Semitic cognate is a possible source, or if that cognate suggests the word to be *gemeinsemitisch*. Is LBH the only possible source? פָּנֶה is used only in Qoh 8:10 and Est 4:16 in BH, but appears in Ugaritic as well. A form with such antiquity could be only tenuously considered a 'late' Hebrew word only (see p.268).
4. Identical Forms - If a word is only found in Qoh and LBH, then

the forms (e.g. gender of nouns) should be the same if the Qoh word is to be deemed late. Take אטפות (Qoh 12:11); Qoh uses a feminine plural, whereas the other texts use masculine plurals (1 Chr 26:15, 17 etc.). This may indicate a separate development of the noun, a possibility supported by another feminine use in EBH, אטפה (Is 24:22). See p.236 .

5. Frequency in LBH - When a word in Qoh is repeated only in late sources, yet only in isolated instances, no dependence of Qoh on LBH can be proven. This is because the reverse is equally possible. Thus the use of חטבון in the plural appears only in Qoh 7:29 and 2 Chr 26:15, but the direction of indebtedness is not ascertainable (see p.237).
6. "Late Words" - Words exist in Qoh whose closest match is found frequently only in LBH. That is, they have no EBH equivalents, no alternate sources appear possible in EBH or Semitic cognates, and the LBH forms are the same as Qoh. Thus תקף (Qoh 4:12) might be judged a "late word" tentatively, since it fulfills the above criteria. However, these words are qualified significantly by the following principle.
7. Number of "Late Words" - After the vocabulary of Qoh has been compared with LBH, and "late words" have been accumulated, a final principle is in line. Many EBH books have such words. Consequently their appearance does not necessarily mean that a book was written late, it only shows that words can be sub-

merged for lengthy periods, surfacing but once or twice in EBH and again in later Hebrew. Since many examples of this situation can be found when comparing EBH with MH (see p.206f), one would expect that many more would be found within BH since the duration is that much shorter. The following list gives examples found in a search only through gimel in a concordance. Others are collected from an unthorough, random sampling of BH words. The comparands are pre-exilic words met only again in books that are late by self-pronouncement or by the current consensus of modern scholars, e.g. Job, Deutero-Isaiah.

Word	EBH	LBH
אגרוף	Ex 21:18(E)	Is 58:4
אד	Gn 2:6(J)	Jb 36:27
אוד	Am 4:11; Is 7:4	Zech 3:2
אחו	Gn 41:2,18(E)	Jb 8:11
אלמנות	Gn 38:14,19(J) 2 Sm 20:3	Is 54:4
אפסי	Zeph 2:15	Is 47:8,10
ארג	Ju 16:14	Jb 7:6
אשם	Gn 42:21(E) 2 Sm 14:13	Ezr 10:19
בדא	1 Kg 12:33	Neh 6:8
בית אלהים	Ju 18:31	Chr, Ezr, Neh, Dn = 51 times; Qoh 4:17

Word	EBH	LBH
בלה	Jos 9:4,5	Ek 23:43
בליל	Is 30 :24	Jb 6:5; 24:6
בצק	Dt 8:4	Neh 9:21
ברד	Gn 31:10,12(E)	Zech 6:3,6
ברה	2 Sm 3:35; 12:17 13:5,6,10	Lam 4:10
ברית	Jer 2:22	Mal 3:2
גאה	Ex 15:1,21(E)	Jb 8:11; 10:16 Ek 47:5
גד	Gn 30:11(J)	Is 65:11
גדוף	Zeph 2:8	Is 43:28; 51:7
גדלש	Ex 22:5(E) Ju 15:5	Jb 5:26; 21:32
גו	1 Kg 14:9	Ek 23:35 Neh 9:25
גלל	Zeph 1:17	Jb 20:7 Ek 4:12,15
גמא	Gn 24:17(J)	Jb 39:24
געה	1 Sm 6:12	Jb 6:5
גת	Ju 6:11	Neh 13:15; Is 63:2 Lam 1:15 Joel 4:13
דחק	Ju 2:18	Joel 2:8
נדב	Ju 5:2,9	Chr, Ezr, Neh, = 12 times
מגדנות	Gn 24:53(J)	2 Chr 21:3; 32:23 Ezr 1:6
מזון	Gn 45:23(E)	2 Chr 11:23 BA Dn 4:9,18

Gordis (1960:400) explains this phenomena:

"That one phrase occurs in an early Biblical text and the other in a late, is purely a matter of chance, which is to be expected since only a part of ancient Hebrew literature has reached us in the Bible."

If this is true for combinations of words ("phrases") then single words in this situation would be that much more frequent. For words to occur only sporadically in BH, sometimes skipping historical eras, simply indicates there was no need for the words to be used continuously. This is agreed explicitly by many (e.g. Barr 1968:224f; G. R. Driver 1949:57f; 1953:36; Albright 1962:62; D. W. Thomas 1938:391; Ullendorf 1971:245; Nyberg 11; Burney 1918:171; Nöldeke 1911:623).

The possibility that Qoh has been influenced by LBH vocabulary will depend on the number of these "late words", since if the number is great enough, it would support such a relation.

B. EVIDENCE

1. ואלו חיה אלף שנים פעמים 6:6 אלו:

if

The only BH cases of this word lie in Qoh 6:6 and Est 7:4. Though it is frequent in MH, it is also seen in the Ahiqar Inscription. This one instance in a LBH book, a book that in itself is not truly representative of LBH language (see p.151ff) is not sufficient evidence to claim the word is exclusively

LBH. This one instance in Esther may indicate dependence on an earlier use, or is possibly an Aramaism. As a contraction, it may indicate a vernacular element already seen in other aspects of Qoh's language (see pp. 44ff, 265).

Conclusion: Infrequent in LBH
Semitic Cognate Exists
Possible Vernacular Trait

2. וכמשמרות נטועים בעלי אספות 12:11 : אַסְפָּה

collection

Though the meaning of the phrase בעלי אספות is often debated, most agree אספות refers to a "collection" of some sort. This feminine plural is paralleled by the masculine plural in 1 Chr 26:15, 17, Neh 12:25. On this basis Barton (200) considers the Qoh word to be late as well. Some points should be observed however:

- a. A masculine noun in a duplicated form is found in Nu 11:4(JE) which suggests that the masculine existed in EBH, i.e. אספספ from אסף.
- b. The closest parallel to אספות is found in the feminine singular אספה in Is 24:22, and from the standpoint of the consonantal text may be the pattern which Qoh is following here.
- c. Though the vocalization of the Qoh word is that of the masculine counterpart in LBH, this would be a secondary consideration to the consonantal root; especially in Qoh, where the vocalization is dubious in other cases

(see p. 256).

The evidence to support the claim that this is a late word is very weak, therefore, and cannot sustain it.

Conclusion: EBH Cognates Exist
Not Identical Forms

3. ביום שזעו שמרי הבית 12:3 זעו

tremble

Siegfried (18) believed this word to be late because it is "nur noch Est 5:9", which is incorrect. The derived pilpel occurs in Hab 2:7, and the nouns זועה and זעוה as early as Is 28:19, all in relation to "tremble".

Conclusion: EBH Cognates Exist

4. לכל זמן ועת כל-חפץ 3:1 זמן

appointed time

This word occurs 18 times elsewhere in Biblical books, all in BA or LBH. The verb appears in Ezer 10:14, Neh 10:35, 13:31, Dn 2:9. The noun in Neh 2:6, Est 9:27, 31, Ezer 5:3 and in Dn 2:16, 21, 3:7, 8, 4:33, 6:11, 14, 7:12, 22, 25. This would indeed suggest a "late word" in Qoh here (see p. 275).

Conclusion: "Late Word"

5. ולתור ובקש חכמה וחשבון e.g. sing. חשבון : 7:25, 27, 29, 9:10

והמה בקשו חשבנות רבים . ו

reason, account

The plural occurs in BH only at Qoh 7:29 and 2 Chr 26:15. The meanings however are very different. In Qoh the

denotation is "moral devices", but in Chronicles it refers to technical military equipment. The one occurrence in a LBH book could hardly stand as evidence of the word's exclusive use in LBH. A parallel situation lies in the root מגר and its plural form. It occurs as the plural in the LBH books of 2 Chr 21:3, 32:33, Ezra 1:6 and a single EBH text, Gn 24:53(J). The same situation could exist between Qoh and Chronicles's use of their plural form.

The singular is used at Qoh 7:25, 27, 9:10 and only again in Ben Sira 9:15, 27:5ff, 42:3. But the tendency for Ben Sira to copy many terms and phrases from EBH and LBH is well demonstrated, showing him to be a "conscious imitator of BH" (see the list of over 360 such expressions in Schechter/Taylor pp. 12-27).

Conclusion: Infrequent in LBH

6. לְיוֹתֵר׃ 2:15, 6:8, 11, 7:11, 16, 12:9, 12 e.g.
 as a noun 6:8 כִּי מֵהַיּוֹתֵר לַחֲכָם מִן־הַכְּסִיל
 as an adverb 7:16 וְלֹא־תִתְחַכְּמוּ יוֹתֵר
 advantage, excess

This word is used as an adverb and a noun in Qoh. It also occurs as an adverb in Est 6:6. But this is not the only parallel, it is also used as a noun in 1 Sm 15:15, וְאֵת־הַיּוֹתֵר הַחֲרָמְנוּ. BDB 451a lists this latter use as a qal participle, however this would then be the only qal in BH among over 100 uses as niphal and hiphil. Since it is the identical word, it is most reasonable to combine it with the substantive uses in Qoh and Esther. This would then obviate a purely late use

of the term either as a noun, or as a noun used adverbally.

Conclusion: Equally EBH

7. שִׁמַּח בַּחֹר בִּילְדוֹתֶיךָ : 11:9, 10 e.g. 11:9
youth

Barton (194) uses this word to support the argument for a late date of Qoh's language. However the only other occurrence is in Ps 110. *Assuming* this Psalm to be 'late', one LBH case is not adequate.

Conclusion: Infrequent in "LBH"

8. אִם-שְׁנִיָּהֶם כְּאַחַד טוֹבִים : 11:6
as one, alike, together

This word occurs only in BA and LBH (see p. 280). It would then appear to be a "Late Word."

Conclusion: "Late Word"

9. כִּנְסָתִי לִי גַם-כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב : 2:8, 26, 3:5 e.g. 2:8
gather

S. R. Driver (1913:475) cited this as a late word in Qoh since it occurs in LBH books. Hurvitz (1973:77f) argues that Ps 147 must be late because otherwise the verb is found in LBH only. Yet it is ironic that these two relatively conservative scholars have made such weak points. Barton (90) spoke clearly and logically against such a view.

"Knobel's contention that כִּנַּס means 'collect' only in late Hebrew will hardly stand. Even its meaning in Is 28:20 [Hithpael] may be explained as a derivative of this meaning, as also the derived noun in Lv 16:4. The

- b. "God", a euphemism supported by the LXX translation, suggesting an original אלהים (e.g. Barton 125);
- c. "Angel" in charge of the altar (Ginsburg 343 ;Ginsberg 1950:30);
- d. "Your fulfilling" i.e. "before your fulfilling of it", repointed as a niphal infinitive with the personal suffix ה- by Dahood (1966:282).

These diverse meanings illustrate the ambiguity of the term in the text. However it makes it only more ambiguous to compare Qoh's term which is not a definite allusion to a priest, with the passage in Malachi which is explicitly identifying the messenger as a priest:

כי-שפתי כהן ישמרו-דעת...כי מלאך יהוה-צבאות הוא

Consequently to align the instance in Qoh with Malachi, is to presuppose without warrant that Qoh can only intend to mean "the priest". Other options for interpretation are viable and perhaps preferable.

Conclusion: Interpretation Open to Debate
Infrequent in LBH

12. כי גם במלכותו נולד רש : 4:14 מְלָכוּת

kingdom

Polzin (142) calls this a "late equivalent of mamlaka", yet apparently no one has used its presence in Qoh in evidence of a late linguistic nature of the book. This is presumably because as W. J. Martin (28) has pointed out,

"It was...no neologism, for it is found already in Numbers 24:7 [JE] and in 1 Samuel 20:31..."

Conclusion: Equally EBH

13. כבר היה לעלמים אשר היה מלפננו 1:10 : מְלַפְנִי

before

Gordis (1968:208) claims this is "a late and inexact form for "לפנינו". He then gives examples from 1 Chronicles 16, and its parallels in Ps 96 -

16:30 חילו מלפניו

Ps 96:9 חילו מפניו

16:33 עצי יער מלפני

96:12, 13 עצי יער: לפני

BDB 818a adds other late uses of this fuller form, but also includes three early passages 1 Sm 18:12, 1 Kg 21:29 (North Israelite) and 1 Sm 8:18. The evidence then does not warrant an exclusively late characterization.

Conclusion: Equally EBH

14. על-כן יהיו דבריך מעטים 5:1 : מְעַטִּים

few

Barton (125) and Delitzsch (286) call this a late word because Ps 109:8 uses the word in the plural as well, and these are the only instances in BH. If one was to assume the late date of Ps 109, one could still only say the word was a rare poetic word used only twice.

Conclusion: Infrequent in "LBH"

15. כִּי מִרְפָּא יִנְיַח חֲטָאִים גְּדוּלִים 10:4 : מְרִפָּא

composure

Whitley (84f) decides that a confusion between the meanings of the roots רפא (heal) and רפה (relax) is a trait of LBH because he assumes the latter is the true etymology of מרפא in Qoh, and the former is behind the word מרפה in

Jer 8:15:

קוֹה לְשָׁלוֹם וְאִין טוֹב
לַעַת מִרְפָּה וְהִנֵּה בַעֲתָה

He attempts to substantiate this argument by citing an Aramaic parallel where רפאה allegedly means "deference, submission", from the root רפה (sink, relax). He explains the initial cause of this confusion in BH to be the interchange of ל"ה and ל"א forms, a supposedly LBH trait.

The objections to this conclusion of Whitley's are as follows:

- a. Even if one was to grant all of Whitley's premises, his conclusion is invalid. It should be remembered in dealing with Whitley's volume, that he is attempting to date Qoh on the basis of its language, among other evidences. But this is a case where a fundamental methodological error is involved. By assuming Qoh to be LBH language, Whitley determines that a confusion in the roots רפא and רפה is a late feature. This is obviously begging the very question.

- b. However, even his collateral evidence is inadequate:
- 1) His Aramaic example is ambiguous (Ahiqar 100). Where Whitley would translate according to רפאה meaning "deference" from the root רפה (sink, submit), Ginsberg (1969:428b) relates the word to the root רפא and the meaning "healing", typical of wisdom literature, e.g. Pr 4:22, 16:24.
 - 2) For the source of the eventual "obscuring of the original meaning of the two roots", Whitley reaches to the exchange of alef and hē in ל"ה and ל"א roots. Yet this is not helpful to his conclusion since this interchange is not only characteristic of LBH, but occurs throughout BH (see p. 163).
- c. Whitley assumes the word in Qoh to mean "submission", and thus derives that the root must have been רפה and was confused with רפא. This is his exegetical preference, but not the exclusive possibility. Gordis (1968:318) prefers a meaning closer to the primary sense of the root רפה, i.e. "'relaxation of spirit, calmness' particularly in wisdom: cf Pr 12:18...14:30...15:4...". One might equally add Pr 13:17. It is questionable whether such a consistent use of the root רפא for mental composure in wisdom literature can be adequately explained as a *confusion*. The judgment of BDB 951 is more appropriate, where the semantic relationship of physical health and mental/spiritual health (composure) is

subsumed under מרפא. This discounts any "confusion" theory with the weaknesses seen above, and relates the word in Qoh to the primary sense of רפא, an EBH and LBH word.

Conclusion: EBH Cognates Exist
Exegetical Question
("submission" or "composure")

16. לֹשׁ צְדִיקִים אֲשֶׁר מֵגִיעַ אֲלֵהֶם כַּמַּעֲשֵׂה הַרְשָׁעִים 8:14 : נִגַּע אֶל

Hiphil - to happen to, extend to

Delitzsch (193) likens this use of the hiphil to Est 9:26 וְמָה הִגִּיעַ אֲלֵיהֶם. This phrase, meaning "to happen to" appeared to him to be exclusively late (also Greenfield 1977:371). The distinctive nature of this idiom however is not its combination of these two lexical elements, for this occurs elsewhere in BH (e.g. Ps 32:6, 1 Sm 14:9). Instead, in Qoh and Esther, the subject of נגע is unspecified, hence a more vague rendering such as "happen to" is a better English equivalent. The other instances of this phrase in BH are governed by subjects that would make such a translation clumsy, e.g.

Ps 32:6 מִיָּמַי רַבִּים אֲלֵי לֹא יִגִּיעוּ

1 Sm 14:9 דְּמוּ עַד-הִגִּיעֵנוּ אֲלֵיכֶם

The cause for the similarity of Qoh and Esther therefore is not Hebraic necessarily, but an English translation phenomenon. They are semantically equivalent to the other uses of this phrase.

Conclusion: Equally EBH

17. דברי חכמים כדרבנות וכמשמרות נטועים בעלי אספות 12:11 נָטַע
establish (figuratively), to plant

Some have compared this instance in Qoh with that in Dn 11:45 ויטע אהלי אפדנו (Barton 200; Delitzsch 435; Wright 496). However this figurative use of the root is applied in BH elsewhere: to an ear, Ps 94:9; to Israel, Ex 15:17(E), 2 Sm 17:10, Am 9:5; and the heavens, Is 51:16. To consider Qoh's figurative use to be late (BDB 642b) as Dn 11:45, is to make an arbitrary distinction between planting nails and tents, from planting ears, nations, and the heavens. But Dn 11:45 speaks of fixing a tent, not its pegs, an important distinction that the above scholars neglect to cite. No similarity greater than the other uses in BH exists between Qoh and Daniel.

Conclusion: Equally EBH

18. סוף: 3:11, 7:2, 12:13 e.g. 12:13 סוף דבר הכל נשמע
end

This noun, derived from the verbal root סוף, can be found again in 2 Chr 20:16, Joel 2:20. On this basis some have called the noun a late word (e.g. Hertzberg 28; BDB 693a; Polzin 146). The verb root occurs as early as Am 3:15 however, and these two LBH texts (Joel's date is uncertain), are insufficient to date a word's use in the post-exilic period only. See p.289 for a fuller discussion of this word's form.

Conclusion: EBH Cognates Exist
Infrequent in LBH

19. אמרתי אני בלבי על-דברת בני האדם e.g. 3:18 8:2 3:18 : על-דברת
on account of

The exact parallel to this phrase is only found again in BH in Ps 110:4. On this basis then, some have advocated its lateness (e.g. Barton 111, Gordis 1968:235). But the following is to be considered:

1. The phrase is certainly present in EBH, the only distinguishing feature being the final tau.

"because of" "for the sake of", appears in Gn 12:17(J), 20:11(E), 18(E), 43:18(J), Ex 8:8(J). In what way does a terminal tau indicate lateness?

2. If it is because the only exact match is found in Ps 110:4 that the term is considered to be late, this supportive evidence is unacceptable. This one Psalm of questionable date, and as poetry which is capable of archaizing, is hardly adequate.

Conclusion: EBH Cognates Exist
Infrequent in "LBH"

20. מה-יתרון לאדם בכל-עמלו שעמל תחת השמש e.g. 1:3 : עמל
verb - "to labour", noun - "labour"

Some have seen this meaning of the word as only a late use (e.g. BDB 765b, Gordis 1968:205). The same word has another meaning in BH, i.e. trouble.

As to the lateness of this meaning (labour) in Qoh, little substantiation can be mustered. Apart from Qoh, the verb occurs again only in Pr 16:26, Ps 127:1 and Jonah 4:10. As a

noun only in Ps 105:44, 107:12. However the related noun "labourer" occurs in one of the oldest sources of BH, Ju 5:26, and again in Pr 16:26. These references indicate the preference of this word among poetic and wisdom literature, and are evidence of BH use, in EBH and LBH, in this sense of the root.

Gordon (1955:87) sees a parallel between this word and Akkadian *nêmelu* (profit), and uses it to support a theory of an eastern origin of the book. Rainey (1964:150) concurred at one time, but within a year (1965:805) then opted for a Hebrew origin of the word meaning "skill, trade, profession." Gordon's suggestion is not exegetically necessary, as Rainey's change of mind indicates.

Conclusion: EBH Cognate Exists

21. לשחוק עשים לחם : 10:19 עשה לחם

prepare food

Delitzsch (389) compares this phrase with Ezk 4:15 and Dn 5:1, but this sense of the phrase "to prepare food" is as early as Gn 27:17(J), ואת לחם אשר עשתה. In the sense of "feast" however, one could not prove from the context in Qoh 10:19 that this is the meaning as in Dn 5:1. Neither can it be the proven nuance in Ezk 4:15. Whether the rendering is "feast" or prepare "bread" depends solely on the context, and the number of people involved, the latter not being provided in Qoh's text.

Conclusion: Equally EBH

22. דברי קהלת בן-דוד מלך בירושלם : passim e.g. 1:1 קוֹלֵת
teacher, assembler

This use of the feminine active participle to designate the title of an official finds its only parallel in the synoptic verses of Ezra 2:55, 57 = Neh 7:57, 59 -

Ezra 2:55 סִפְרָת - scribe

Ezra 2:57 פִּכְרָת - binder of gazelles?

These parallels however are family names whose predecessors presumably held positions that these roots indicate. But since these are family names, the times of the progenitors that held these offices are *indefinitely* previous to the return of the exiles. Consequently when these official nominal forms were current is undeterminable from the BH data, and thus this title is unable to assist us in placing the date of Qoh.

Conclusion: Indefinite Date of Origin

23. אִם-יִתְקַפּוּ הָאֲחֵר הַשָּׁנִים יַעֲמְדוּ נִגְדּוּ : 4:12 תִּקְרָף
to prevail

This verb occurs only again in BH in Jb 14:20, 15:24. Its noun cognate in Est 9:29, 10:2, Dn 11:27. The verb also lies in BA, e.g. Dn 4:8, 17, the noun in Dn 2:37, 4:30 and the adjective in Ezra 4:20 and Dn 2:40, 42, etc. Depending on one's dating of Job, this is a case of a frequently used LBH word found in Qoh (4:12, adj - 6:10).

Conclusion: "Late Word"

C. SUMMARY

All but 3 of the 23 supposed LBH words in Qoh can be rejected as "Late Words" on various grounds as outlined in Section A "Method". These are זמן, כאחד, and תקף. However, even the cumulative value of these is insignificant given the frequent situation in BH where a word surfaces only once or twice in EBH and then again in LBH. This is especially true when the *grammatical* nature of Qoh is void of any LBH influence. Each of these 3 words is discussed under the next category, "Aramaisms", in which category those words occurring in BA and Qoh only are covered as well. It would appear at this point then that apart from the words that may be considered post-exilic Aramaisms, no evidence of LBH vocabulary influence exists in Qoh.

III. ARAMAISMS

Aramaisms are consistently listed with alleged MH and LBH grammatical and lexical evidence to display a late character of Qoh's language. Kautzsch (101) figured there were 29 words with total occurrences of 69 Aramaisms in Qoh. Similarly, Wagner (142) counts 31 words for 78 total instances. Sheer numbers seem impressive for a late date to Qoh's vocabulary, but as with the other comparands, the "Aramaisms" should be assessed according to reliable principles, including a concern for the literary-dialectical framework of the book. The following considerations will therefore guide the judgments on each of the words discussed.

A. METHOD

The methodological concerns will be handled according to two categories: General and Specific Concerns.

1. General Concerns

a. Genre

1) Wisdom Literature

Hurvitz (1968:236) has mentioned the higher potential in wisdom literature for Aramaisms to appear. This is due to Aramaic being the possible origin and vehicle of many wisdom sayings that passed from nation to nation, and came to BH. Baumgartner (1961:211) likewise has discussed the close relationship of Israelite wisdom with that of the rest of the ancient orient, in writing,

"These connexions between Israelite and ancient orient Hokmah are often so close that a verse of one may quite easily be exchanged for the verse of another."

Therefore, the probability is that certain Aramaisms exist in a wisdom book like Qoh because of the international currency of wisdom material, and the importation of foreign words by that means. Qoh indeed is wisdom literature, with wisdom phraseology evident in its proverbs and engrained in its reasonings and contents.

2) Poetry

G. R. Driver and others¹ have commented on the higher frequency of "Aramaisms" in poetic passages of BH. After drawing up a list of several examples, including many from Qoh², he concludes (1953:35) "the percentage of words found otherwise only in Aramaic is far higher in poetry than in prose." Wagner (158) confirms this conclusion,

"Die vorliegende Untersuchung bestätigt diese Aussage, indem ungefähr 600 (=etwa 60%) der Belege sicherer und 60 (=etwa 65%) der Belege unsicherer Aramaismen poetischen Texten zugehören."

Driver attributes the reason for this higher proportion of so-called Aramaisms to a poet's normal use of

1 e.g. Nöldeke 1903:413; Burney 1918:172; D. W. Thomas 1938:236; Hurvitz 1968:234; Kutscher 1970:358; Gordis 1976:107.

2 In Qoh the following are found, the numbers referring to pages in this study: גומץ (270), כשר (283), יקר (279), מלך (287), קרב (294), שבח (297), שוק (298), שלט (298), תקף (301).

a larger vocabulary to enrich his language, drawing upon recondite and archaic words. Hence the words used but rarely in BH (especially pre-exilic) and which have their match only in Aramaic may not be real Aramaisms, but instead are "possibly or probably descended from the old common Semitic stock on which the vocabularies of several languages were based" (G. R. Driver 1953:36; also Kutscher 1970:359; Barr 1968:121).

Qoh would qualify for this type of consideration since sections of the book are poetic e.g. 1:2-11, 3:1-8, 12:1-7. Proverbs with poetic parallelism are numerous in the book as well. Furthermore, the above concern is equally fitting for a philosopher as it is a poet; the language he uses to express his thought would be very different from that of the historian and story writer. He also would draw from sections of the Hebrew vocabulary that are otherwise rare or absent in BH, or matched only in the related Aramaic tongue. This is most evident in Qoh's penchant for the abstract words terminated by *-ôn* and *-ûth* (see pp. 30f, 164ff).

These two aspects of Qoh's *genre* leads one to expect some Aramaisms (whether real or only apparent) in its contents irrespective of its date.

b. Dialect

In the previous discussion of Qoh's *grammar* and its dialectical peculiarities (p. 32ff), the North Israelite

properties of the book were singled out. Such a dialectical analysis is also relevant to the *lexical* character of Qoh, since it is in the texts of North Israelite origin that one expects a higher proportion of Aramaisms.¹

The historic connections between the Arameans and Israel were sufficient for mutual language interaction. Kitchen 1966:146 reasons quite correctly,

"Aramean penetration of Syria and Mesopotamia was well underway in the twelfth to tenth centuries B.C., and Israel was in constant contact with Arameans from at least the time of David, when Syrian Aram was politically subject to Israel. Hence some Aramaisms could be expected at any time from about 1000 B.C. onwards."

By the eighth century, Aramaic was the diplomatic language, the political personnel in Jerusalem knowing the language (2 Kg 18:26). Furthermore, as Rabin (1970:314) explains, Israel was a "veritable crossroad [where] diffusional influences from various directions produced in the area a number of superimposed isoglosses by which its language agrees now with one, now with another of the neighboring languages." *A fortiori*, these connections that involved all Palestine would especially influence its northern sector.²

1 This is a frequent claim e.g. Stade 12; S. R. Driver 1913:449; Burney 1918:175; 1903:209; D. W. Thomas 1938:386; G. R. Driver 1931:257; 1950:61; 1953:35; Greenfield 1956:XXVIII; Gordis 1968:59; Barr 1968:123; Hurvitz 1968:7; Rabin 1970:323; Morag 1972:299.

2 For further comments on the contact of Hebrew and Aramaic see Malamut 141f; Nöldeke 1903:412; R. D. Wilson 1925:234f; Bowman 1948; G. R. Driver 1953:26f; Kutscher 1974:25f.

This influence of Aramaic on North Israel which scholars have observed from literary evidence and historical connections, can also be supported by archaeology. Avigad (42ff) notes two artifacts from the ninth century B.C. found in North Israel that bear Aramaic inscriptions. A bowl from Tel Dan reads לטב [ח] יא "for the butchers", written on its base. A jar found at 'Ein Gev has לשקיא "for the cupbearers" written on its shoulder. These point to Aramean occupation of these areas and demonstrate the close relationship of Israel and the Arameans both geographically and linguistically.

After the fall of Samaria in the late eighth century, Aramaic speaking immigrants brought their language into that area (2 Kg 17:24). D. W. Thomas (1938:385) therefore suggested that the north became bilingual, which would have greatly increased the mutual influence between Hebrew and Aramaic in North Israel.

Hurvitz (1968:236) claims in regard to Biblical literature that Aramaisms do not necessarily preclude a pre-exilic composition. In discussing Job, Proverbs, and the Song of Songs he reasons,

"The possibility remains that the Proverbs may have passed from nation to nation in Early Aramaic, their original language and style. Similarly, *The Song of Songs* illustrates this problem. It is possible that this book stems, at least in origin, from the North. Now in the northern dialect as a whole there may have been numerous linguistic features which were also common to Aramaic, but which were unknown in the classical language of Jerusalem (i.e. standard Biblical Hebrew).

Consequently, the Aramaisms in the Song of Songs - many of them being at the same time 'Mishnaisms' as well - may not be helpful for our purpose [dating]."

In addition to the higher frequency of "Aramaisms" in poetry, these two concerns of Hurvitz are equally relevant to Qoh's language, Qoh is proverbial in much of its content, and it has many North Israelite grammatical properties.

2. Specific Concerns

a. Vocalization

Since punctuation of the Hebrew text was done so much later than the consonantal form had been recorded, vocalic spellings are less definite than consonantal. Thus Nöldeke's (1903:416) warning is appropriate -

"Sehr vorsichtig muss man mit der Annahme von Aramaismen bloss auf Grund der Punctation sein."

This caution should be particularly observed with Qoh because of an interesting pattern found in some vocalizations of words ending in $-\hat{o}n$. Some words with this termination are considered late¹ because of their bisyllabic form, e.g. שְׁלִטוֹן (8:4, 8)² opposed to the most common trisyllabic form, e.g. גְּלִיּוֹן . But curiously enough only words in Qoh that are unattested in BH elsewhere are given the bisyllabic form, whereas any word with BH precedent is given the other. זְכָרוֹן ³,

1 e.g. Aalders 13; DuPlessis 164f.

2 Others in Qoh, יתרון 1:3, 2:11, 13, 3:9, 5:8, 15, 7:12, 10:10, 11; כשרון 2:21, 4:4, 5:10; חשבון 7:25, 27, 9:10; חסרון 1:15; רעיון 1:7, 2:22, 4:16.

3 The construct forms זְכָרוֹן in 1:11 and 2:16 are normal BH.

בְּטָחוֹן, and חֲשׂוֹנוֹת¹; all have identical forms in BH.

This becomes especially clear with חֲשׂוֹן and חֲשׂוֹנוֹת which are simply the singular and plural forms of the same root.² The singular is bisyllabic, consistent with the rest of the words of this form in Qoh unattested otherwise in BH. On the other hand, the plural is derived from a trisyllabic root חֲשׂוֹן, just as 2 Chronicles 26:15 is. In other words, since the plural form is attested elsewhere in BH, it was pointed trisyllabically. It then appears that a scribe quite possibly worked with the principle that if no precedent for pointing existed, then the spelling was uniformly patterned after a 'late'³ form; otherwise it was spelled as it was elsewhere in BH.

Consequently, apart from other reasons that will be looked at, Aramaisms said to exist in הֶבֶל 1:2, 12:8, עֶבְדֵיהֶם 9:1, הוֹלִלוֹת 10:13, and כָּל-עַמַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל 5:15 are suspect since they are considered Aramaisms on pointing grounds alone and could well be due to a later transcription. Each of these is discussed later.

1 DuPlessis excludes this incorrectly since the shewa is vocalic here.

2 Gordis (1968:281) "There is no reason for assuming two distinct nouns...(against BDB)."

3 Whether it is a solely 'late' pattern is questionable since the bisyllabic root-form פִּתְרוֹן is represented by פִּתְרוֹנִים in Gn 40:8(E). DuPlessis includes erringly פִּדְיוֹן Ex 21:30(E), Ps 49:9. These are both constructs, so lose the third syllable.

b. Homonymous to Aramaic

If a word in Qoh is found in both BH and Aramaic, yet with different meanings in BH and Aramaic, before the word can be called an Aramaism it must be clearly demonstrated that the Qoh's meaning can only align with that of Aramaic. Homonyms are met frequently in BH and Aramaic. For example, Barr (1968:305-7) lists at least ten verb roots that are homonymous between BH and Syriac that begin with beth. This exemplary list shows the possibility of homonyms in Qoh. The word ענה, used in Qoh 1:13, 3:10, 5:19, must be proven only to mean, "to occupy" in these contexts, the Aramaic meaning, in order to legitimately call it an Aramaism. However, such proof is not possible, since the common BH meanings "to afflict" (1:13, 3:10) and "to answer (5:19) are also sensible renditions (see p.292).

c. Biblical Hebrew Cognates

If a word in a particular form occurs only in Qoh and Aramaic, care should be taken to prove the word could not have been formed without Aramaic influence before it is cited as an Aramaism. Thus אִב, a nominal form from the verb אָב is not necessarily an Aramaic loan word, instead it is probably a product of a frequent process in Hebrew noun formation, i.e. the use of the infinitive form of the verb for a noun (see p.289).

d. Semitic Cognates

When a word appears in BH only in Qoh and also occurs in Aramaic, then before that word is called an Aramaism it should be asked whether it is possible that Qoh be dependent on either another Semitic language for the use of the word, or on the *gemeinsemitisch* vocabulary behind Aramaic and Hebrew. G. R. Driver (1953:36) concludes "many if not most of the supposed Aramaisms... might be proved *gemeinsemitisch* if the sources were available for tracking them down." The importance of the Semitic cognates is exemplified by Greenfield (1956:XXVII) who writes,

"...not least among the contributions of the study of Ugaritic to Biblical and Biblical Hebrew studies has been the restoration to 'Canaanite' of many BH words which were considered 'Aramaisms'."

One might be tempted to call an Aramaism those words that have Akkadian and Aramaic cognates, believing that the transfer from Akkadian to Hebrew was probably through Imperial Aramaic. However, many have believed that a final judgment is not possible on 'Aramaisms' of this sort. Greenfield (1963:233) believes the Amarna age, when the *lingua franca* was Akkadian, was a time when Akkadians had a direct influence on Hebrew. Albright (1943:31) for example, finding קָלָל in the Amarna letters, thought it "rather amusing to note that the word is regularly given as an illustration of the late Aramaisms

in Hebrew vocabulary." The same might be said of זמן , a word found in Akkadian from c. 1800 B.C. onwards, at Mari, in an Amarna letter (29.119.123), and then again in Qoh 3:1 and LBH and BA (see p. 275). Finally, Whitley (44) fittingly objects to Podechard (46) who "thought that the appearance of מסכן in Koheleth is due to Aramaic influence...However we already meet the term muškēnu in the Old Akkadian period with the meaning 'dependent',¹ and it also appears in the Amarna letters² and in Ugaritic literature³ with reference to an inferior or poor person."

e. Internal Hebrew Semantic Development

Kautzsch (15) considered to be Aramaisms those words that occur in pre-exilic texts with a different meaning than in exilic and post-exilic sources that parallel an Aramaic meaning to the root. G. R. Driver (1953:28) impugns this reasoning, objecting that "such secondary meanings, though extant only in late Hebrew, may in fact have been current long before their first appearance." Consequently, many consider בהל (piel Qoh 5:1, 7:9) an Aramaism when it means "to hasten" as it does in some LBH texts as opposed to the pre-exilic meaning "to terrify." This is according to Kautzsch's methodology.

1 Speiser 91

2 Knudtzon II 1475

3 Virolleaud III 234

However, apart from other significant objections, a question persists whether the two meanings are not semantically related and indicate a linguistic bond independent of any Aramaic parallels. Hence the secondary meaning "to hasten", is perhaps a semantic derivative from "to terrify" since the latter obviously can instigate a *hasty* retreat, and thus could well be indigenous Hebrew. Other parallels, particularly roots with these meanings of בהל, are present in BH (see p.266).

f. Hebraisms

Words and calques found only in Qoh and BA should be soundly demonstrated to be originally Aramaic before they can be legitimately seen as Aramaisms. The instruction of G. R. Driver (1953:29) is valuable,

"synonyms described as Aramaic solely on the strength of Judaeo-Aramean sources, which may well be Aramaized Hebrew words...must be used with caution if not entirely excluded."

Greenfield (1978:154) supports this,

"It is not surprising to find Hebrew vocabulary elements in those dialects of Aramaic that have a Hebrew substratum..."

Earlier he had explained (1956:XXX).

"If it is a root that is found only in Palestinian Aramaic sources, there is the very strong likelihood that we deal with a Palestinian root, which is not really Aramaic, but either a Hebraism in Aramaic, or a remnant of the Canaanite substratum (excluding those occurrences where consonantic structure shows the Aramaic origin...A strict Aramaic cognate is not established unless the source of the cognate is both extra-Palestinian and non-Hebraicizing."

In the few BA chapters in the Bible, one finds the following list of examples of Hebraisms.¹

אחרית	Dn 2:28
אלפים	Dn 7:10
אנשים	Dn 4:14
דכרון	Ezr 6:2
חטיא	Ezr 6:17 Kethib
חנכה	Dn 3:2,3 Ezr 6:16,17
יוכל	Dn 2:10
כהניא	Ezr 6:9,16,18, 7:12,13,16,21,24
מלאך	Dn 3:28
מלכים	Ezr 4:13
מנחה	Dn 2:46 Ezr 7:17
נבואה	Ezr 5:1,2 6:14
נביאה	Ezr 6:14
נגד	Dn 6:11
ניהוחין	Dn 2:46 Ezr 6:10
נסכיהון	Ezr 7:17
נתיניא	Ezr 7:24
עליונין	Dn 7:18,22,25,27
קצף	Dn 2:12 Ezr 7:23(noun)
רבו	Dn 6:23
רעיון	Dn 2:29,30 4:16 5:6,10 7:28 (Qoh 1:17 2:22 4:16)
רענו	Dn 4:1

¹ From Rowley 1929:130, Bauer-Leander 1927:10, Rosenthal 1961:57; a more restricted view of Hebraisms is that of Powell's (1907).

שִׁלְטוֹן	Dn 3:2,3 (Qoh 8:4,8)
שִׁפְטִין	Ezr 7:25
תּוֹכַל	Dn 5:16

So the alleged calque "על דברת ש" , which has BH parallels, but still is exactly matched in BA only (Dn 2:30, 4:14), can not be safely cited as an Aramaism since BA is a Judeo-Aramean dialect with many Hebraisms (see p.291).

g. Circular Argument

Nöldeke (1903:412; similarly Hurvitz 1973:75) warns that

"Auf alle Fälle muss man sich vor dem *Circulus vitiosus* hüten: 'die stelle ist jung, denn sie enthält einen oder mehrere Aramaismen' und 'das Wort oder die Wörter sind aramäisch, denn die stelle is jung.' "

So a form like פְּגָן (Qoh 8:10, Est 4:16) though used in Aramaic, should not be considered to be an Aramaism since its antiquity is seen in its Ugaritic instances. To assume the word is Aramaic presumes that Qoh is late like Esther, when in fact the word could be EBH though used as rarely there as in LBH, i.e. Qoh's use could be an earlier one (see p. 268).

h. Pre-exilic Aramaisms

When a word in Qoh is thought to be an Aramaism, yet is used in EBH or in Old Aramaic, the word is not to be used as evidence for a late date for Qoh. Such a word

as נכסִיִם is a good example, where its use as early as Jo 22:8 precludes it from any dating significance. Nöldeke (1903:414) decides about this word, "...nehme ich wegen Jos 22:8 als hebraisch in Anspruch" (see p. 288). However the question whether a word is a pre-exilic Aramaism or good Hebrew is a secondary matter at this point since this study is primarily interested in the question of date. However this is not to diminish the relevance of such a question in discussing dialects (e.g. North Israelite). The question in this case of "Aramaism" or "good Hebrew" is often impossible to decide, in which case this study will indicate this uncertainty by the phrase "Pre-exilic 'Aramaism'", with Aramaism in quotes, in the conclusion.

i. Aramaism

If a word or calque cannot be reasonably explained by the "specific concerns" outlined above, and *is* frequently found in Imperial Aramaic, the contemporary non-Jewish type of Aramaic of the exilic and post-exilic eras, then the word could be considered a probable Aramaism.

j. Number of "Aramaisms"

Only when an analysis of the alleged Aramaisms in Qoh has been completed, can the question of Aramaic influence be answered. However, if the number of Aramaisms is not significantly reduced (from the following list of

49) by the application of the above principles, it would be a strained argument that still entertained a pre-exilic date for the book.

B. Evidence

1. ואלו חיה אלף שנים פעמים 6:6 : אלו
if

This is a contraction from אלו (או) and לו, and thus considered an Aramaism (e.g. Barton 135; BDB 47a; Lauha 115).

The only other BH instance is Est 7:4. The chronological importance of this contraction however is minimized by the probable occurrence of the same Aramaic form in the tenth century Ahiaram Inscription,¹ line 2 ואל מלך במלכם.

The occurrence of this word in only one other BH text, is not sufficient to align the Qoh case with Esther's age exclusively. But this is especially true if the word occurs as early as the tenth century. Furthermore, as a contraction, the value of this word may lie in its convenience as a vernacular element (see p.44f).

Conclusion: Semitic Cognate Exists
Pre-exilic Aramaism
Possibly Vernacular
Probable Aramaism

2. כי-לכלב חי הוא טוב מן-האריה המת 9:4 : אריה
lion

1 KAI ad. loc.; Tomback 19; Vincent 185; Dupont-Sommer 1949:163 n. 15; Dussaud 139; Muilenberg 27; Friedrich s. 253c "unsicher"; for dissentions see Albright 1947:155 n. 23; Ronzevalle 28.

Wagner (29) considers this an Aramaism since the termination is Hē. But even to assume this to be evidence of an Aramaism is of no help in dating Qoh since by his own reckoning 19 of the 34 datable instances of the form are pre-exilic. Also, this form is only one of two in Aramaic (as in Hebrew) i.e. אָרִיָּה and אָרִי. The former only occurs in Old Aramaic, and since this is the Qoh form, it speaks of a *pre-exilic* transfer if any transfer at all. This is especially evident when the only cases of אָרִי are in the later Ahiqar and Palmyrene texts (DISO 24).

Conclusion: Pre-exilic "Aramaism"

3. אל-תבהל מפניו תלך 8:3 (niphāl); 5:1, 7:9 (piel) e.g. 8:3
to hasten

Both of these stems with the meaning "to hasten" have been attributed to Aramaic influence (Wagner 33; Kutscher 1963/64: 122f). The more frequent BH sense "to terrify" is allegedly supplanted by the Aramaic meaning. Palache (12f) however, reasons that this is an unnecessary relation between Hebrew and Aramaic since the shift in meaning from "hasten" to "be frightened" is a semantic relation paralleled elsewhere in Hebrew. For example the root חפז demonstrates this:

Dt 20:3 אל תיראו ואל-תחפזו
do not fear or dread

2 Sm 4:4 בחפזה לנוס
in her haste to flee

G. R. Driver (1931:253) has suggested a similar situation in the root חוּשׁ, which means "to hasten" in BH, but elsewhere in BH means "to be troubled, agitated":

"we may...infer that the Hebrew חוּשׁ, like Acc. ḥašū, has preserved both meanings."

Vanderkam (245-50) interestingly suggests that the meanings of בהל "to hasten, to terrify" are derivatives from a common semitic root "to speak passionately" as in Akkadian, Arabic, Ethiopic. Thus in BH (Ps 2:5) it means "to speak excitedly, agitatedly" yielding the behavioural response of terror and haste.

Yet, even if one was to assume an Aramaic influence in the Hebrew use of בהל, it contributes little to our discussion of date since:

- a. The niphal occurs with the meaning "to hasten" in passages other than Qoh only in literature that Wagner considers to be pre-exilic i.e. Pr 28:22; Zeph 1:18 (where there is no need to emend to בְּהִלָּה).
- b. The pual may occur in a pre-exilic text Pr 20:21, as the Qere indicates, מְבַהֵלָת.

Conclusion: Internal Semantic Relation

4. ובטלו הטחנות כי מעטו 12:3 : כָּטַל

to cease

This verb is a pure BH *hapax*, having no cognate forms there, but found in BA (Ez 4:21, 23, 24, 24, 5:5, 6:8). Elsewhere in Aramaic, it occurs only in a Palmyrene inscription

of the second century A.D. (DISO 33). This evidence in part, or in full, has led some to believe this word to be an Aramaism (e.g. Zapletal 62; Levy 133; DiFonzo 319; Wagner 34). However, the evidence is insufficient for such a claim:

- a. The Palmyrene evidence is much too late, and the one book of LBH to use it (Ezra) does not establish the word's use as "late," the direction of influence between Qoh and Ezra (if any) is indeterminable. Its occurrence in MH (see p. 213) could speak of an Hebraic origin as well as an Aramaic.
- b. The cognates in Akkadian (baṭalu CAD 'B' 174-76) and Arabic (بَطَلَ) show the antiquity and gemeinsemitisch character of the word. To assume the word is Aramaic is to preclude with insufficient evidence the possibility of another source.
- c. This word resides in a strictly poetic portion of Qoh, where the possibility of a rare Hebrew word to surface is highest in BH (see p. 252).

Conclusion: Possible Hebraism
Semitic Cognates Exist
Poetic Setting

5. רבֹּכֹן רֵאִיתִי רְשָׁעִים קִבְּרִים 8:10 : בְּכֹן

thereupon, then

Wagner (35) believes this to be an uncertain Aramaism, on the basis that the two BH passages in which it occurs are "late" (here and in Est 4:16). Yet the objections to this

reasoning are -

- a. The occurrences in Aramaic are in Jewish Aramaic and the Targum, evidence that is not forceful since it is from Judaeo-Aramean sources (see p. 261).
- b. To date this use as late by assuming Qoh to be late as Esther is, is a circular argument.
- c. The components of this word are native Hebrew, כ and כו , and thus show no Aramaic phonology or morphology.
- d. The use in Ugaritic shows the word's antiquity in the Semitic word-stock (G. R. Driver 1956:164 n. 3; Dahood 1964:86; Gordon 1965 III: 464; Gibson 1978:143).
- e. Esther is not indicative in all respects of LBH. It is seen to frequently archaize.

Conclusion: Possible Hebraism
Circular Argument
Biblical Hebrew Components
Semitic Cognate Exists

6. בשל אשר יעמל האדם 8:17 : בְּשַׁל אֲשֶׁר

because ?

To many this is a calque from the Aramaic "בדיל ד" found in the Targum on Gn 6:3 (BDB 980a; Cazelles 1957-60:21; Wagner 110; Kutscher 1963/64:122). It also appears in Palestinian and Palmyrene Aramaic. In Hebrew it is found in the Qumran literature (Milik 1954:24; 1961:166). In BH only similar constructions occur in Jonah 1:7, 12, בשלמי and בשלי respectively. In all these cases the meaning is "on account of", and if the Qoh phrase has been transcribed correctly,

then a calque or parallel is possible.

The problem exists however, that a causal clause at this point of the context is redundant. Ewald (1870:s. 362c) thought the phrase non-sensical as it stands, as is quite clearly demonstrated by any attempt at a translation. Translations avoid causal subordination here to arrive at a sensible rendition, substituting concessive clauses in neglect of the consonantal text (e.g. Barton 157; RSV; NIV). To read **בכל אשר**, with the LXX, Vulgate and Peshitta, as do Ewald and others (Knobel, Hitzig, S. R. Driver Kittel:1st ed. ad. loc.) gives an amplification of the preceding clause which gives a superior reading in that the phrase is intelligible.

Conclusion: Wrong Transcription
as **בשל אשר**

7. **חפר גומץ בו יפול** 10:8 : **גומץ**
pit

A pure *hapax* in BH, and is considered an Aramaism since it occurs in late Aramaic sources (e.g. Barton 176; Gordis 1968:321; Whitley 86). Three considerations are necessary at this point however:

- a. Jewish Aramaic is the earliest Aramaic dialect to use the root. It is then, because of the Judaic context of the dialect, impossible to decide on the direction of influence. The Syriac and Mandaic instances are too late to be relevant to a discussion of influence on Qoh.

- b. Wagner (39f) is not certain himself whether this is truly an Aramaism since he recognizes the antiquity of the root in Akkadian (kamāṣu) and Ugaritic (qmṣ) which suggests the word to be *gemeinsemitisch*.
- c. G. R. Driver (1953:30) noted that the word stands in a poetic context, in proverbial style, and so included it in his list of synonyms found in BH. This synonym for *נחש* therefore, may simply represent a rare BH word, most suitable to the poet's purpose at this junction, a word otherwise obsolete or unusual.

A more specific reason for the use of this word specifically, rather than *נחש* is given by Lauha (187),

"Die internationale Spruchweisheit wiederholt oft den Gedanken, dass, wer anderen eine Grube gräbt, selber hineinzufallen droht, d.h. das sich Falschheit rächt, in dem der Täter selbst seinen Ränkin zum Opfer fällt (Spr 26:27; Ps 7:16, 9:16, 57:7; Sir 27:26). Doch liegt dieser Gedanke hier nicht vor. Wohl dürfte Kohelet bewusst darauf anspielen, aber er verändert die Intention. Das Graben einer Grube zielt nicht auf Schadensstiftung ab, vielmehr geht es um ehrliche Arbeit...Der skopus is charakteristisch für Kohelet; die Weltordnung is ungerecht, da auch ein redliches Unternehmen böse folgen haben kann."

Thus an entirely different root was preferable in this text of wisdom literature, since an association with *just* retribution, found in the contexts where *נחש* is used in BH, would have destroyed Qoh's point of *ironic* retribution in this context.

Conclusion: Possible Hebraism
Semitic Cognates Exist
Poetic Setting

8. דברי חכמים כדרבונות 12:11 : דְרָבְנֹת
goad

Barton (200) cites this word as an Aramaism since it appears in Talmudic Aramaic too. However, a word derived from the same root is found in EBH as well: דְרָבָן , 1 Sm 13:21. If it were an Aramaism therefore, it is of no help in dating Qoh's vocabulary. However, that it is an Aramaism is very doubtful since it has cognates in Arabic and Ethiopic (Gordis 1968:353; Whitley 102), and possibly Ugaritic (Dahood 1966:282). It is not listed by Kautzsch or Wagner, but Lauha (7) notes it as a *hapax* found only again in post-Biblical literature, only then to cite the word in 1 Sm 13:21 later (218f).

Conclusion: Semitic Cognates Exist
BH Cognate Exists

9. הבל הבלים אמר קהלת e.g. 1:2 : הַבֵּל
breath - singular construct

The reduced first vowel in this construct is evidence to many of Aramaic influence (e.g. Barton 72; Wagner 134; DuPlessis 169; DiFonzo 122; the additional anomaly of the lengthened second vowel is not paralleled in BH in conjunction with the reduced first vowel). However two points are essential in a decision on this claim.

- a. To see an Aramaism in a word's vocalization alone is dubious in the first place, and especially in Qoh (see p.256).

- b. Forms with this reduction in the first vowel of segholates occur in early and late Biblical Hebrew, whether they be Aramaisms or not:

גִּבֹּר	Ps 18:26 pre-exilic (Wagner 149)
זָרַע	Nu 11:7(JE)
חִדְּר	Ex 7:28(JE); Ju 3:24; 2 Sm 4:7; 2 Kg 6:12, 2 Kg 11:2, 20:30, but Qoh does <i>not</i> reduce the vowel in 10:20, though this word occurs in the construct there.
שָׁגַר	Dt 7:13; 28:4, 18, 51

Plus the numerous instances of בָּעַד, שָׁבַע and תָּשַׁע.

It would appear that some segholates in BH have legitimate reduced alternative forms, הִבִּיל being only one of them.

Conclusion: Vocalization
EBH Vocalization

10. מקום שיפול העץ שם יהוא 11:3 : הוא

to be

Various explanations have been given for this challenging form יהוא :

- It should be read as the personal pronoun הוא (e.g. GK s. 75s; Zimmerli 239; Dahood 1966:271)
- The alef is an orthographic device used in BH following final \hat{u} , \hat{i} , \hat{o} . Here it is allegedly added to the jussive יהא (Barton 193; GK s. 23i; Wright 433; Lauha 199; BDB 217b)
- It is the imperfect of the Aramaic verb הוא "to be"

(Whitley 93; Ewald s. 192b)

- d. It is also possible that the word has its origin in the Arabic **هَوَّه**, as some have seen it used in Jb 37:6 (e.g. Pope 241; Guillaume 1968:127f). That this would then be native Hebrew as well is explained by Pope (241):

"This does not mean that it is to be regarded as an Arabism: since the nominal cognates *hawwāh* and *hawwōh* 'destruction, disaster' occur about fifteen times in the Old Testament."

Given these four possibilities, it would be hard to argue for a definite Aramaism here. All renderings, regardless the view of the word's actual meaning, end in the redundant but emphatic sense of "where the tree falls, there *it is*."

Conclusion: The options render the word's identity uncertain.

11. תחלת דברי-פיהו סכלות ואחרית פיהו הוללות רעה 10:13 : הוללות
madness

BDB 239b says of this word, "formed unusually from the participle, an Aramaic formation." The other 4 instances of this word are in the abstract plural, הוללות (1:17, 2:12, 7:25, 9:3), and would therefore suggest the same reading here; this nominal form is itself Hebraic, e.g. לַיְלָה Is 21:3, סַרְרָה Hos 4:16, זולָה Lam 1:11. The writing הית- could have arisen from the nearby סְכָלוֹת which is parallel with it. See p.256 for the discussion of Aramaic and the late punctuations found in Qoh.

Conclusion: Misspelled Word.

12. לכל זמן ועת לכל-חפץ : 3:1 זמן

appointed time

Some consider this word an Aramaism since it occurs as a noun elsewhere in BH only in BA (Ezr 5:3; Dn 2:16 etc.) and the late passages of Est 9:27, 31 and Neh 2:6 (e.g. Galling 1940:48; Lauha 64; Whitley 30). However the antiquity and widespread use of the root in the Semitic languages have led some to cite it only as a late word (e.g. Gordis 1968:229; Barton 103). Wagner (49) can only list it as an uncertain Aramaism. The BA instances could just as well be Hebraisms. The word occurs from c. 1800 B.C. onward in Akkadian (simānu) including at Mari and in an Amarna Letter (29. 119. 123). Thus it could have entered Hebrew long before the exilic period.

Qoh's genre may play a role in the appearance of this word, found in the book only in a purely poetic setting where rare Hebrew words are most likely to surface. G. R. Driver (1953:33) includes it in his list of poetic synonyms, noting cognates in Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic. The need for a parallel and near-synonymous term to pair with *ny*, could have been the reason for selecting this word from a common Semitic word-stock. Its meaning of "appointed time" as opposed to "time" in general (*ny*) specifies the providence of God in the most exact expression.

Conclusion: Semitic Cognates Exist
Hebraism
Poetic Setting

13. כִּי מִי יֹאכַל וּמִי יִחוּשׁ חוּץ מִמֶּנִּי 2:25 : חוּץ מֶן

without

Though these components are used often in BH in the construction מחוץ "outside", this is the only instance of this sequence of the words. Its closest parallel is the Aramaic בר מן (DISO 43) hence it is cited by some as an Aramaism (e.g. Delitzsch 199; S. R. Driver 1913:474; Wagner 37). The probability of a calque here is evident, especially since these words do not occur in BH as a restrictive conjunction.

Conclusion: Probable Aramaism

14. אֲשֶׁרִיךְ אֶרֶץ שְׂמֵלֶכְךָ בֶן-חֹרִים 10:17 : חֹר

noble

This word is often called an Aramaism (e.g. Barton 178; Pöschel 45; Kautzsch 32f; Gordis 1968:373) occurring at times in Imperial Aramaic (DISO 95). However the word is used a dozen times in BH, and as early as 1 Kg 21:8, 11 and Is 34:12. The North Israelite instance (1 Kg 21:8, 11) is especially relevant since both Burney (1903:209) and S. R. Driver (1913:188n, 553 n.) consider it a North Israelite Aramaism. Loretz (25 n. 30) on the other hand sees a Hurrite origin:

"es ist kein Grund ersichtlich, der die Einordnung dieses Wortes...unter die Aramaismen rechtfertigte. Diese Bezeichnung geht vielmehr auf die Hurriter, die einmal im syrisch-palästinensischen Raume eine grosse Rolle spielten, zurück."

Wagner does not include it even as an uncertain Aramaism.

Conclusion: Pre-exilic "Aramaism"

15. כִּי מִי יֵאָכֵל וּמִי יִחוּשׁ חוּץ מִמֶּנִּי 2:25 : חוּשׁ

rejoice?

The etymology of this root has been discussed often, and the debate lingers on. The suggestions are:

- a. From חוּשׁ I (BDB 301b) with a semantic development from "to hasten" to "be agitated, worry" (G. R. Driver 1931: 253f; Castellino 27 n. 10).
- b. From Aramaic (as early as Imperial Aramaic DISO 97) and MH, where חוּשׁ means "to feel pain", and in later rabbinic literature "to consider" (Jastrow 441a). Without much explanation, the further development of this word leads to "enjoy" according to some (BDB 301f; Barton 97; Whitley stops at "consider", 29).
- c. From Akkadian:
 - 1) ḥašu "hasten, be worried" (Ellermeier 1963:197-217; cp. von Soden 1969:197)
 - 2) ḥašašu "rejoice" (Levy 78; Lauha 58; Dahood 1958:307f, citing the parallel transfer of this root from Akkadian to Ugaritic as Ginsberg [1946:26] and Rosenthal [1947:402] explained it.)
- d. From Arabic:
 - 1) حَسِيَ "abstain" (Gordis 1968:226f; DuPlessis 179)
 - 2) خروث "be full of food" (Reider 130)

The obvious uncertainty about the origin of this word counsels against considering the word to be a definite Aramaism as Barton (97) and Wright (388) claim. It

is impossible to prefer any one over the others without entering the subjective area of exegesis, and surmising the meaning from the context immediately around the phrase and the context of the whole book's message.

Conclusion: The options render the word's identity uncertain

16. חִפְּץ : 3:1, 17, 5:7, 8:6 e.g. 3:17 כי-עת לכל-חפץ
ועל כל-המעשה שם
matter, business (5:3; 12:1 "desire")

Those who believe the word means "thing" in the above passages see a parallel semantic development and *dependence* on Aramaic צבו, which also moves from "desire" to the object of desire, i.e. "thing" (Montgomery 241; Zimmermann 1945/46:19; Torrey 1948:154). But a parallel development does not prove borrowing (see e.g. p. 266). Besides, the same shift occurs in Arabic: شىء to نشاء (Kopf 173). Wagner (58) also relates it to the Jewish Aramaic חפצא "thing, object". However this is not the meaning of Qoh's use as Gordis (1968:374) has outlined the levels of meaning:

1. wish, desire = Classical Hebrew
2. matter, affair = LBH
3. thing, object = MH

He concludes,

"Actually, in Koheleth the word does not mean 'thing', but still retains its volitional nuance, and means 'phenomenon, pursuit, activity, affair'..."

In other words, the Aramaic evidence coincides with the third level, not the second, which is the meaning in Qoh.

Even if the word were an Aramaism, the sense of "matter, business" occurs in Aramaic as early as the Sefire Stele III:

ואשלח מלאכי אלוה לשלום או לכל חפצי

(Fitzmyer 97, 112; Gibson 1971 II:54, "the meaning is as in Hebrew, Is 58:3, Ecc 3:1.") So the "Aramaism" could be pre-exilic, if an Aramaism at all. That the meaning "matter, affair" is LBH as Gordis outlines it is only a guess, since too little evidence exists to allocate it to that era exclusively (Is 53:10; 58:3, 13; Pr 31:13).

Conclusion: Internal Semantic Development

17. יקר מחכמה מכבוד סכלות מעט 10:1 : יקר

heavy, precious

Some who assume that the meaning in Qoh 10:1 is "heavy, weighty" believe the adjective to be an Aramaism since it has this meaning in Aramaic too (BDB 430a; Montgomery 242; Whitley 83). However two further points are necessary to consider:

- a. As Palache (39) points out, where 1 Kg 5:31, 7:9, 10, 11 discuss the *size* of the stones used to build the temple, the adjective יקר could just as well (if not better) mean "heavy" as it could "costly"; e.g. 1 Kg 5:31

ויסעו אבנים גדלות אבנים יקרות ליסד הבית

So the meaning "heavy" could easily be an EBH sense as well as Aramaic.

- b. It is not certain on the other hand, that Qoh 10:1 could not be translated with the common BH sense of the adject-

tive, i.e. "a little foolishness is more precious [is often preferred] than wisdom and honor."

Conclusion: Both meanings are both viable and probably EBH.

18. מה-יתרון לאדם בכל-עמלו 1:3 e.g. passim : יתרון
profit, advantage

Nöldeke (1903:417f) and Wagner (63) include this in their lists of Aramaisms on the grounds that יתרון appears in various Aramaic dialects, and because the -ôn termination is believed to be Aramaic morphology. However the earliest Aramaic occurrences surface in Jewish Aramaic, a dialect vulnerable to Hebrew influence on its vocabulary. The -ôn termination is native to Hebrew, and Qoh's *vorliebe* for this abstract ending is expected not because of any Aramaic influence but solely because of the abstract nature of the book. Furthermore, Wright (306) believes the word "cannot be fairly asserted as late Hebrew because יתרו (Jethro) may be an apocopated form of it." Finally, the numerous cognates from the BH root (BDB 451f) show the root to be very malleable in Hebrew, and thus disposed to this abstract form.

Conclusion: Possible Hebraism
Biblical Hebrew Cognates

19. ואם-שניהם כאחד טובים 11:6 : כְּאַחַד
as one, alike, together

This has been explained as a calque from the Aramaic כחדא, appearing in BA Dn 2:35 (כחדה), Elephantine (Cowley 28:3),

and frequently later in Jewish Aramaic and MH (Kautzsch 39; Kutscher 1963/64:122; Wagner 63). It is also parallel to Akkadian *kī ištēn, kima ištēn*, which occur as early as the seventeenth century (Memoirs: 426:12) and later in the seventh (Borger 45). The word occurs elsewhere in BH in relatively late texts: Is 65:25, Ezr 6:20; 3:9; 2:64 = Neh 7:66; 2 Chr 5:13. This group of later BH texts tends to show a late use of the word, perhaps mediated from Akkadian through Aramaic.

Since the concept of "alike" is a simple result from the combination of two Hebrew elements, *כ* and *אחד*, it is questionable whether this can only be explained by Aramaic influence. Kautzsch (39) dismisses the possible origin of this word to be that of the phrase *כאיש אחד*, which then would have been contracted. This is however a possibility only if one assumes the contraction then lost its original personal meaning, "as one man." This is because it is used in a general sense of "alike", applicable to inanimate objects in Qoh where the object of comparison is "sowing seed."

Conclusion: Possible Aramaism

20. *כבר היה לעלמים אשר היה מלפננו* : *passim* e.g. 1:10
כָּבַר
 already

Kautzsch (39f) and Wagner (64) have cited this as an Aramaism, since it occurs in Syriac in the sense of "already." But this is only the secondary meaning of the word there, for

the usual sense in Syriac is "perhaps" (BDB 460b). A rare secondary meaning in Syriac is a remote source for a loanword in BH.

Speculation on the root of the word is most often founded in **כָּבַר**, the BH verb "to be great", thus "a length of time" and so, "already" describing a duration *previous* to an event. However BDB (460b) is cautious, "Derivation uncertain, connexion with **כבר** being dubious." Nöldeke (1875:202) suggested the word to be composed of **כ** and **בר** "ausser", however this is just as uncertain as the above BH semantic development. To suspend judgment on this word's etymology is not to doubt its meaning which is evident from the numerous contexts in Qoh as "already."

Conclusion: Etymology too Uncertain

21. כל-עמת שבא כן ילך 5:15 : כָּל-עִמָּת שָׁ"י

exactly

A debate over the word division in this phrase has split commentators as to the nature of the clause:

a. Some take it as **עמת + כ + ל** , in the same pattern as **מְלִעְמָת**, 1 Kg 7:20 (e.g. GK s. 361b n. 2; McNeile 70; Gordis 1968:253; Whitley 53). Then by Aramaic influence this vocalization was changed later to the pattern of Dn 2:8 which divides the components as **כל-קבל די**, "because that, according as".

b. Others say that it is originally an imitation of the Ara-

maic form of Dn 2:8, 40, thus an Aramaism "inasmuch as, according as" (Delitzsch 196; Barton 132).

As Lauha (107) points out, עמת is always combined with lamed in BH, thus "a." is an acceptable view, especially since an Aramaic pointing of rare words is frequent in Qoh (see p. 256) and could again be the cause for an apparent Aramaic punctuation here i.e. קָל for קְל. The second opinion still leaves the question of a Hebraism in Daniel, as opposed to an Aramaism in Qoh.

Conclusion: Merely Vocalization
Possible Hebraism

22. כִּי אֵינֶךָ יוֹדֵעַ אִי זֶה יִכְשֶׁר : 10:10; 11:6 e.g. 11:6 כִּי אֵינֶךָ יוֹדֵעַ אִי זֶה יִכְשֶׁר
prosper

This root is found in many Semitic languages, as well as Hebrew in the pre-exilic section of Ps 68:1-7. Thus that it is an Aramaism (e.g. Wagner 68) is both remote, and insignificant for this study since it is a pre-exilic root in BH (see p.240 for fuller discussion).

Conclusion: Semitic Cognates Exist
Pre-exilic "Aramaism"

23. לֵשׁ אָדָם שְׁעִמְלוּ בַחֲכָמָה וּבִדְעָתָה וּבִכְשָׁרוֹן : 2:21, 4:4, 5:10 e.g. לֵשׁ אָדָם שְׁעִמְלוּ בַחֲכָמָה וּבִדְעָתָה וּבִכְשָׁרוֹן
success

Adequate reason to discount this as an Aramaism (e.g. Gordis 1968:224; Lauha 7; Whitley 27) has been given on pp. 220, 240. The widespread use of the root throughout the Semitic tongues preclude any exclusive association with Aramaic. Its

abstract termination (-ôn) is acceptable Hebrew morphology before and after the exile. Wagner (68) entertains this word as an Aramaism because he explicitly assumes Qoh to be a LBH book. Of course for this study, this begs the question. He would not see the root in Ugaritic as due to Aramaic however, "weshalb ein Aramaismen hier nicht in Frage kommt."

Conclusion: BH Cognate Exists
 Semitic Cognates Exist
 Pre-exilic "Aramaism"

24. כְּנַסְתִּי לִי...סִגְלַת מַלְכִּים וְהַמְדִּינֹת e.g. 2:8 מְדִינָה : 2:8, 5:7
 province

Many have seen Aramaic influence in Qoh's use of this word (e.g. Kautzsch 48ff; Wagner 72; DiFonzo 148; Lauha 51). However the significance of this for the date of Qoh is discounted by the fact that like חֵר (p.276) it occurs in a pre-exilic North Israelite passage as Burney (1903:209) points out, i.e. 1 Kg 20:14, 15, 17, 19.¹

The word is gemeinsemitisch however, and a question would arise whether BH was dependent on Aramaic. The occurrences in Ugaritic as mdnt "city, province" (Gibson 1978:150b), Arabic madînatu, as well as Aramaic and Hebrew, would caution against a definite Aramaism here.

Conclusion: North Israelite
 Possible Pre-exilic Aramaism

¹ It is pre-exilic according to at least Noth 1943:79f.

25. גם במדעך מלך אל-תקלל 10:20 : מדע

repose, friend, relative

Because the same word apparently occurs in 2 Chr 1:10, 11, 12 and Dn 1:4, 17, and means "thought," and in BA with the same meaning (Dn 2:21, 4:31, 33, 5:12), some have called it an Aramaism here (e.g. Barton 179; Levy 127; Gordis 1968: 329). However many other suggestions have been offered:

- a. Perles (ad. loc.) emended to מצע, "couch" (also Lauha 196).
- b. Zorell (ad. loc.) sees "study-chamber" from the root "to know" and thus still parallel to "bed chamber" (also Seidel 33).
- c. Wildeboer (159) and KB (497b) see "bedroom" in this word from the more romantic connotations of ידע.
- d. D. W. Thomas (1949:177) believed it to be from the meaning of ידע as "be at rest, quiet" and rendered this word "repose" (also Barr 1968:20f; Emerton 1970:170).
- e. Dahood (1965:210f; in preference to his earlier etymology of 1958:311f "messengers") and Watson (205) prefer "friend", from the meaning "to know".

Since a final decision on the exact meaning would be presumptuous in light of the 5 alternatives to an Aramaic parallel; the evidence that would support the claim that this is an Aramaism is lacking.

Conclusion: Meaning Too Uncertain
Possibly Homonymous to Aramaic

26. מוֹתֵר : 3:19 מוֹתֵר הָאָדָם מִן-הַבְּהֵמָה אֵינֶן

advantage

Wagner (73) cites this to be an Aramaism since,

"Vielleicht zurückzuführen auf jüdisch-aramäisch,
christliche-palästinisch מוֹתֵר gleicher Bedeutung."

His uncertainty is explicit however. It is not necessary to go to these Aramaic dialects for the cause of this noun since the root from which it comes, יתר, is BH and is vulnerable to other formations in BH as well (BDB 451a). The word could well be a Hebraism in these Aramaic dialects.

Conclusion: BH Cognates Exist
Possible Hebraism

27. בַּעֲצֵלָתִים יִמַּךְ הַמְּקָרָה : 10:18 מְכַר

be low

Some call this word an Aramaism (Kautzsch 56f; Barton 178). Nonetheless this word has precedents in other cognate languages as well. Snaitch (107) reasons that the Ugaritic mkk¹ (more accurately mk: Aistleitner 184) and Arabic makka demonstrate this root to be a "perfectly good general Semitic root, and belongs to Hebrew as much as to the rest" (also Guillaume (1964:29). That the word is gemeinsemitisch is also supported by the Akkadian makaku "to spread" (von Soden 1965: VII:587f; CAD: 10: 121f).

Conclusion: Semitic Cognates Exist

¹ Seen in Ugaritic by Virolleaud 1955 III:Baal 2 col. 4; G. R. Driver 1956:160; Gibson 1978:151; Caquot 137.

28. כּי-מבית הסורים יצא למלך : 4:14 מֶלֶךְ

qal - to reign

Ogden (1980:312f) suggests that at least in this verse, this word should be taken in a secondary meaning of "to counsel" as in Neh 5:7. There it is in the *niphal*, and it is considered an Aramaism (Kautzsch 59f; BDB 576a; Wagner 77). Ogden's preference for this translation is based on two weak premises.

- a. He believes Qoh 4:13-16 is alluding to the Joseph tradition, where Joseph did not rise to become king (pharaoh) but only to be a counsellor of the highest rank. His argument is circular however: this section refers to the Joseph story because the verse speaks of a counsellor, and this verb is to be understood as "to counsel" because it refers to the Joseph tradition.
- b. Ogden, following others (e.g. Albright 1955:15; Kroeber 4-6) believes the uses of the noun מלך in Qoh 10:16, 17, 20 are closer to "counsellor" than to "king". This is a purely subjective preference with no greater support (if not less) than the BH meaning as "king, ruler".

Conclusion: Homonymous to Aramaic

29. טוב ילד מסכן וחכם : 4:13, 9:15, 15, 16 e.g. 4:13 מִמֶּלֶךְ זָקֵן וְכַסִּיל

poor person

Podechard's (46) identification of this word as an Aramaism is adequately met by Whitley (44):

"Podechard thought that the appearance of מסכן in Koheleth is due to Aramaic influence...However, we already meet the term muškēnu in the Old Akkadian period with the meaning "dependent"¹, and it also appears in the Amarna letters² and Ugaritic literature³ with reference to an inferior or poor person."

Ellenbogen (108) believes the Hebrew to be derived from the Akkadian, as was the Syriac (Kaufman 74).

Conclusion: Semitic Cognates Exist

30. ואין משלחת במלחמה : 8:8 מְשַׁלַּחַת

discharge

Barton (52) alone called this an Aramaism, but Gordis (1968:413) gives ample precedent of BH formation of such a segholate word:

מְצַנֵּפֶת Ex 28:4, 37, 39 etc.

מְשַׁאֲרֵת Dt 28:5, 17 etc.

מְשַׁעֲבֵת Ju 6:21, 2 Kg 4:29, 31 etc.

Conclusion: Equally BH.

31. יתן-לו האלהים עשר ונכסים וכבוד : 5:18, 6:2 e.g. 6:2 נְכָסִים

property

This word has been considered an Aramaic loanword (e.g. Kautzsch 65f; Podechard 45), yet if so, then it entered BH early as seen in the passage Jos 22:8 (though Noth 1952:133 sees a gloss here). Nöldeke (1903:414) doubts the word is an

1 Speiser 91; Driver-Miles 152; CAD M2:272-76.

2 Knudtson II 1475

3 Virolleaud III 234

Aramaism: "nehme ich wegen Jos 22:8 als hebräisch in Anspruch." The word appears in Akkadian (nikkassu) from the Sumerian NIG. ŠID "accounting", and later "property" (Driver-Miles 196); in Neo-Babylonian it becomes "possessions" (Kaufman 77). Gordis (1945:174) has already been quoted as a proponent of the word's Hebraic and pre-exilic currency (see p. 208).

Conclusion: Pre-exilic "Aramaism"

32. סוף דבר הכל נשמע : 3:11, 7:2, 12:13 e.g. 12:13
end

To a few, this nominal form of the verb root סוף constitutes an Aramaism (Kautzsch 67f; Gordis 1968:354; Wagner 87). However, as Wagner notes, "das verbum gut hebräisch und schon Am 3:15 belegt ist." Now it is not irregular for BH to form a noun from the simple stem, including ע"ו weak verbs (GK s. 84^ac). Consequently, it is permissible to derive this noun from the BH vocabulary itself, not needing to draw from the outside Aramaic, e.g. זרב → זרב, i.e. "to flow" becomes "issue of blood, gonorrhoea", and נווד → נווד, i.e. "to wander" becomes "wandering". The words that this noun replaces in LBH, קץ and אחרית, are coextensive with it in Qoh (4:8, 16, 12:12 and 7:8, 10:13 respectively). Thus the use of does not mark a new era of the language.

Conclusion: BH Cognate Exists
Internal Morphological Development

33. בוקע עצים יסכן במ 10:9 : סִכַּן

be endangered

Kautzsch (68) and Barton (177) believed this word in the niphal with the meaning "be endangered", is an Aramaism. Since however its first Aramaic appearance happens to be in Jewish Aramaic (Kautzsch 68), it is only a guess that makes the Hebrew reliant on Aramaic. The word may occur as early as Ugaritic as well (see p. 226). Wagner does not consider it an Aramaism.

Conclusion: Possible Hebraism
Semitic Cognate Exists

34. הצדיקים והחכמים וְעִבְדֵיהֶם ביד האלהים 9:1 : עֲבָד

deed, servant

The form of this word has been thought to be Aramaic only, since it has the qames retained even with the heavy suffix (e.g. BDB 714b; Gordis 1968:299). The reason for believing this to be Aramaic exclusively however is because BA Ezr 4:17, and Syriac use this pattern (Whitley 78). This vowel pattern in the absolute as well as the construct has been seen to be Aramaic (Wagner 122; Bauer-Leander 1922:470III). There are three problems with using this pattern to help determine the date of Qoh however:

- a. Pre-exilic examples of this pattern in the absolute remove the pattern from any chronological consideration:

שָׂאֵר Is 7-28 12 times
Zeph 1:4

מְצַד Ju 6:2, 1 Sm 23:14, 19

עֲנִק Ju 8:26

- b. No contrasting patterns in the construct state exist in BH, hence how these would be punctuated with the heavy suffix cannot be ascertained. The similar form מְעַבְדֵיהֶם in Jb 34:25 conforms to the Qoh pattern here. In other words, to say a form is Aramaic when no BH form exists to contrast with Aramaic, is to decide without adequate evidence.
- c. The danger of identifying Aramaisms on vocalization alone has already been discussed. This is particularly true for this word since repointing the consonants as עֲבָדֵיהֶם would produce the word "servant", which would fit the context just as well as "deeds". It is interesting that if the word does mean "deeds", there is no BH or BA precedent for this form, both use מְעַבְדֵי (BDB 716a, 1105a).

Conclusion: Pre-exilic "Aramaism"
Vocalization
No BH Contrasts

35. על דברת שלא ימצא האדם אחריו מאימה 7:14 : על דברת שְׁלֵא
so that not; therefore (Lauha 129)

Since this phrase meets its cognate parallel only in Dn 2:30, 4:14, על דברת די , it is sometimes called an Aramaism (e.g. Barton 143; Loretz 25). Two further concerns however discount this reasoning:

- a. The syntax of the phrase is formally equivalent to BH למען אשר לא Nu 17:5, Dt 20:18 etc. (König 1897: s. 396p), i.e. preposition, substantive, relative pronoun, negative adverb. And, the meaning is the same. Since the components in the Qoh phrase are all native Hebrew, it is unnecessary to go outside the language for the syntactical pattern. In other words, the phrases are an internal BH "calque".
- b. Since the only exact parallel to this phrase is in BA, the direction of influence is indeterminable. The phrase is just as likely an Hebraism, especially when one sees that על דבר is native to BH (Gn 12:17J, 20:11, 18E etc.), and that a non-Judaen Aramaic dialect (Egyptian) uses the same pattern as BH, i.e. על דבר (BDB 1087a), thus is not the pattern behind the BA which like Qoh has the terminal tau.

Conclusion: BH Cognates Exist
Possible Hebraism

36. עָנָה : 1:13, 3:10, 5:19 e.g. 1:13 ענין רע נתן אלהים
לבני האדם לענות בו
afflict, answer, occupy

Some take this word to mean "to occupy" as in Syriac ענא, and thus cite the word to be an Aramaism in Qoh (e.g. Barton 133; Bea 12; Whitley 56). However to reach toward Aramaic for a meaning, when adequate sense can be had with BH meanings is a questionable method. Though the Aramaic meaning makes an intelligible rendering of the phrase, so do the Hebrew

meanings "to answer (5:19), afflict (1:13, 3:10)" as applied by many commentators (e.g. Delitzsch 303; Gordis 1968:256; Zimmerli 1962:151, 168; Galling 1940:54, 60).

Conclusion: Homonymous to Aramaic

37. עֲנִיָּו : passim e.g. 1:13 עֲנִיָּו רַע נָתַן אֱלֹהִים
לְבַנֵּי הָאָדָם לְעֲנוּת בּוֹ
affliction, occupation

Many have called this an Aramaism both because of an alleged etymology from Syriac "to occupy" and the ׀ ending. These should be dealt with separately.

- a. As to the proposed meaning "occupation" from the Syriac meaning of the root ענא "to occupy" (e.g. BDB 775b; Barton 85; Bea 2; Whitley 12; Wagner 92), this is an interpretation that makes sense, but not in any superior way to a BH meaning of "affliction" (Gordis 1968:210; Nötscher 541; Galling 54; Lauha 38, 45f). Though this word occurs only in Qoh in BH, its derivation is very likely from the common BH verb ענה (see discussion under the last word covered, #36).
- b. If the ׀ ending is an indubitable Aramaic form (Wagner 127), it still does not help to date Qoh's language because the same ending is found in the pre-exilic לִיָּה derivative קִנְיָו (Gn 34:23E¹, Jos 14:4). Furthermore, this abstract termination (Barth s. 193a ff) is appropriate and not unexpected given the nature of Qoh's

1 "E" according to Eissfeldt (1922:70).

thought.

Conclusion: Homonymous to Aramaic
Pre-exilic "Aramaism"
Abstraction Suited to Qoh's Needs

38. ומי יודע פִּשֶׁר דָּבָר 8:1 : פִּשֶׁר

interpretation

One finds this word in BA Dn 2:4, 5 etc., and here in Qoh, thus it has been called an Aramaism (e.g. Kautzsch 74; Whitley 71). Yet Akkadian pašāru is probably behind both languages' use, that is, if it is not an Hebraism in Daniel. Wagner (96) only reluctantly includes it in his list of Aramaisms. Kaufman (81) concludes that little can be said for certain about the history of the root, especially with the early BH occurrences of פִּתַּר and פִּתְרוֹן in Gn 40 and 41 (E) where, "an Aramaic type form only serves to complicate the situation". In speaking against a derivation of the Hebrew from the Aramaic, Nöldeke (1903:420) describes the confusion that such a view would entail,

"Man müsste dabei ja annehmen, dass in sehr alter Zeit ein aramäisches verbum פִּתַּר ins Hebräische gedrungen und dann bei Aramäern verschollen wäre, die dafür ein hebräisches פִּשֶׁר übernommen hätten, das wieder den Hebräern verloren gegangen wäre!"

Conclusion: Hebraic Consonants
Possible Hebraism

39. טוֹבָה חִכְמָה מִכְּלֵי קָרֵב 9:18 : קָרֵב

battle

Since this word appears in Aramaic, and some feel it occurs only in LBH, it is frequently cited to be an Aramaism

(e.g. Kautzsch 77f; Gordis 1968:312; Lauha 7; Wagner [103] is uncertain). However it is doubtful that the word was used in LBH only. It appears true enough in Zech 14:3, Job 38:23, but additional references in Ps 68:31, 78:9 and 144:1 do not determine the word to be late since the date of the Psalms are uncertain in many instances, and specifically Ps 144 is pre-exilic (Gunkel 606). Also the word appears in the MT in 2 Sm 17:11, and should not be dismissed even though the LXX, Syriac and Vulgate read בְּקִרְבָּם . This emendation not only changes the vocalization, but adds the consonant mem as a pronominal suffix (in the midst *of them*). This is unnecessary, since the MT gives an intelligible reading fitting to the context, and especially given another possible pre-exilic instance outside of 2 Sm (Ps 144). (On pre-exilic vocalizations $\text{XX}\dot{\text{X}}$, see p. 256).

Conclusion: Pre-exilic "Aramaism"

40. $\text{כִּי-הַכֹּל הַבֵּל וְרַעוּת רוּחַ}$ e.g. 2:17 : רָעוּת passim
pursuit, desire

In Hebrew, רָעָה has three meanings: to feed; to associate with; to pursue or desire. However since only the latter sense can consistently be applied to all cases in Qoh of רָעוּת and רָעִיוֹן , it is probably the meaning intended in the book. This meaning is also found in the Aramaic parallel רָעָא and is consequently an Aramaism to many (e.g. Montgomery 241; Gordis 1968:210f, 1960:409f; Wagner 106).

In respect to this meaning of רעה, Gordis (ibid.) notices that this is an early Aramaism, found in the North Israelite Hos 12:2. The abstract form רעות is found only again in BA Ezr 5:17, 7:18 in the Bible, however the form could just have well been formed earlier as a contemporary with the verb, and then surfacing in Qoh because of the book's predisposition for abstract terminations.

Conclusion: Possible Pre-exilic Aramaism

41. שגם-זה הוא רעיון רוח : 1:17, 2:22, 4:16 e.g. 1:17 רעיון
pursuit, desire

This second abstract noun formed from רעה (see word above) also of course has been called an Aramaic loanword (e.g. Podechard 46; Wagner 106). Qoh's strong inclination toward abstractions formed with -ûn and -ûth terminations is evident in these two words' morphology. According to Gordis, (1968:211) the later meaning of רעיון as "thought" (e.g. Dn 2:29 etc.) is not reached by Qoh, which uses the earlier meaning "desire" instead. In this case, the word could not be used to help date Qoh's vocabulary since the root has this meaning before the exile (see #40). Bauer-Leander (1927:10) believed this word to be an Hebraism in Daniel.

Conclusion: Possible Pre-exilic Aramaism (in its root)
Hebraism (in its form)

42. וְשָׁבַח אֲנִי אֶת-הַמַּתִּילִים שִׁכְבַּר מִתּוֹ e.g. 4:2 : 4:2, 8:15
to praise

Since the word occurs in Aramaic, particularly BA Dn 2:23 etc., and in many LBH passages, it is often seen as a loan-word to Hebrew (e.g. Kautzsch 87; Wagner 111). However it appears in EBH in the pre-exilic Ps 63:4 (Gunke1 267; Kraus 441). Since it is used only in poetry in BH outside of Qoh (Ps 63:4; 117:1; 145:4; 147:12; 106:47 = I·Chr 16:35) it could have been a rare word used only by poets and intellectuals with their expanded vocabularies (see p. 252).

The root also occurs in Ugaritic according to Gordon (1965:487 #2374) bn asbh, showing the breadth and antiquity of its use.

Conclusion: Pre-exilic "Aramaism"
Semitic Cognate Exists

43. וּלְרֵאוֹת שֶׁהֵם-בְּהֵמָה הֵמָּה לָהֶם : 3:18 שְׁפָהֶם
that they

Montgomery (242) proposes that this is a conflation of Aramaic הַן and Hebrew אִם, both meaning "if" and prefixed by the שְ-relative.

This needless etymology is compared with only one reference, the Peshitta to Mt. 12:10. Admittedly the clause has been a crux in interpreting Qoh, but this unit in itself has not been a problem, since it is normally explained in the realm of Hebrew, i.e. the relative pronoun prefixed to the third masculine plural personal pronoun, "*that they* are but beasts"

(so Barton 107; Gordis 1968:158; Lauha 72; Lys 15).

Conclusion: BH Components

44. וּסְגְרוּ דְלַתִּים בְּשׁוּק : 12:4, 5 e.g. 12:4

street

Though this is a popular word in Aramaic sources (DISO 317f), Arabic سوق and Assyrian sūqu, show that the word is not necessarily of Aramaic origin. G. R. Driver (1953:36) surmised,

"sûq 'lane' [is] almost gemeinsemitisch and must have been in regular use at every period of Hebrew history."

Thus this word could not be considered a definite Aramaism as some have suggested (Kautzsch 88; Podechard 46; but not Wagner).

Conclusion: Semitic Cognates Exist

45. וַיִּשְׁלַט בְּכָל-עַמְלִי : 2:19, 5:18, 6:2, 8:9 e.g. 2:19

to control

As Wagner (114) points out, "Eine sehr grosse Verbreitung hat der stamm im Aram. gefunden." On this basis plus the cognates in LBH and BA, the word is frequently cited as an Aramaism (e.g. Kautzsch 88; Wagner 113f). A strong statement to this effect is made by Bendavid (127; translated by Hurvitz 1968:239 n. 27),

"If we find that in the Bible the root מַשַׁל is standard, and in Eccl. and MH שָׁלַט, the cause of this change is beyond any doubt: even though the adjective may be found in Gn 42:6 it is not sufficient evidence to support the claim that שָׁלַט is in all respects an early native Hebrew root. The root was admissible in BH, but it is isolated,

rare and unproductive. The motive for the *total* shift from the group *ימשול-ימשיל-ממשלה* and its replacement by the group *ישלוט-שליט-שלטון* is due to Aramaic" (italics mine).

The antiquity of this root is attested to by a probable Ugaritic instance as Caquot (168) summarizes, "Virolleaud et beaucoup d'autres rendant šlyt par 'le tyran' d'après l'hébreu šallit en Gn 42:6" (e.g. Gibson 1978:158b). The root also appears in Akkadian and Arabic. However it is the isolated but real (nonetheless) surfacing of the word שליט in Gn 42:6 ("E" according to Eissfeldt 1922:86) that diminishes the value of the root for dating Qoh's vocabulary. BDB 1020b considers this instance "probably a late substitution for original word of E." However this type of circular reasoning impedes objective analysis of the BH language, i.e. the case in Gn is a gloss because the word only occurs late; the word only occurs late since the Gn instance is a gloss. The root שָׁלַט therefore may be an Aramaism, but one that affected BH very early.

Kaufman (16) explains,

"in the ancient Near East during the first millennium B.C. for example, one might expect to find the political terminology of the Assyrian and Babylonian empires widespread throughout the area."

Consequently, the uses of this root in Neo-Assyrian (Kaufman 98f) could have made their way early into Aramaic and Hebrew.

The question remains however whether this word, with its many Semitic cognates is not *gemeinsemitisch*.

Conclusion: Semitic Cognates Exist
Pre-exilic "Aramaism"

46. באשר דבר-מלך שלטון : 8:4, 8 e.g. 8:4

power

This word is commonly compared with BA Dn 3:2, 3 "an authority" and Ben Sira 4:7 "governor", and termed an Aramaism (e.g. Barton 152; Wagner 114). These meanings are different however than the abstract sense in Qoh, "power". Qoh therefore used a word that was formed from a pre-exilic root, שלט (see word above, #45), and was formed very possibly from, or as a predecessor to the later Aramaic and LBH homonyms. In fact, Bauer-Leander (1927:10) even consider the use in Dn 3:2, 3 an Hebraism. The abstract use is found again in Aramaic, but not until A.D. 199 in a Palmyrene document (Schlumberger 144f: DISO 302). A pre-exilic BH cognate and Qoh's penchant for abstracts of this Hebrew pattern lead one to discount this word as an Aramaism.

Conclusion: Homonymous to BA
Hebraism
Pre-exilic "Aramaism"

47. החכמה תעז לחכם : 7:19, 8:8, 10:5 e.g. 7:19

מעשרה שליטים

an official

The evidence against this being a definite Aramaism has been adequately covered earlier (see above word #45). Though it occurs in Imperial Aramaic (DISO 302), it also occurs as early as Gn 42:6(E) in BH. Therefore, if an Aramaism, it is still pre-exilic.

Conclusion: Semitic Cognates Exist
Pre-exilic "Aramaism"

48. מעות לא-יוכל לתקן : 1:15, 7:13; 12:9 e.g. 1:15
 be straight

Some (Kautzsch 91f; Wagner 120) have used this word as evidence of Aramaic influence on Qoh's vocabulary because it is in Jewish and Christian-Palestinian Aramaic, Syriac and a Palmyrene text (KB 1137f; DISO 333; RB vol. 39:539); also in BA Dn 4:33. This evidence is not sufficient however to define an Aramaism. The Judaeo-Aramaic dialects cited above, including BA could indicate an Hebraism in Aramaic. Loretz (25 n. 25) concludes that because תִּקַּן is very possibly an alternative to BH תָּכַן (as Zorell 909), "es ist deshalb fraglich, ob wir tqn als Aramaismus zu betrachten haben."

Conclusion: BH Cognate Exists
 Possible Hebraism

49. ואם-יתקפו האחד : 4:12 vb.
 ולא-יוכל לדין עם שהתקיף ממנו 6:10 adj.
 vb = overpower adj = strong

Only the verb recurs in BH at Job 14:20, 15:24. The adjective is used in BA Ezr 4:20, Dn 2:40, 42, 3:33, 7:7. The nominal form is found in Est 9:29, 10:2, Dn 11:7. Since these references are all late in BH (Job's date is still debated), and in view of the presence of BA cognates, these words are considered Aramaisms by some (e.g. BDB 1075b; Kautzsch 92; Wagner 120). Others however have thought this to be a true Hebrew word regardless the Aramaic cognates (e.g. Snaitz 109; Guillaumè.1964:30). The evidence of Aramaic influence here is not

strong since outside of BA where a Hebraism is possible, the root occurs only in Nabatean in a technical legal sense "valid, authentic" (DISO 333), and very late Aramaic sources i.e. Syriac and Mandaic (R. D. Wilson 256).

Conclusion: Possible Aramaism

C. SUMMARY

Forty-nine alleged Aramaisms have now been discussed. The number of probable Aramaisms however, according to the preceding analysis, number only seven. These are אלו, מדינה, רעות, רעיון, which have parallels in EBH sources or early Phoenician (אלו); and, חוץ מן, כאחד, תקף, which have parallels only in literature later than EBH. The remaining forty-two "Aramaisms" have been discounted for the different reasons outlined in Section A "Method".

It should not be unexpected that such a reduction occur in the common list of "Aramaisms" in Qoh, because once it is seen that no LBH *grammatical* traits are found in the book an enormous number of Aramaisms would be puzzling.

On the other hand, it would not be unexpected to have a number of Aramaisms in a book that in its nature was more apt to borrow in its vocabulary. Qoh has a poetic/philosophic content and structure, and many North Israelite grammatical characteristics, criteria that would lead one to anticipate Aramaisms.

IV. PERSIANISMS

A. METHOD

It is common to list the two Persian words found in Qoh (פרדס, פתגם) as evidence of the book's late language (e.g. Barton 52; Galling 48; Lauha 7). Ginsberg (1971 VI:349) for instance argues,

"the nouns *pardes* (2:5) and *pithgam* (8:11) are both borrowed from Persian; but Persia only emerged from obscurity in the middle of the sixth century BCE, and no words are known to have been borrowed from its language before that."

But as Dornseiff (1959:200) has explained, this is too short-sighted:

"Es ist zwar ansprechend, wenn man zeitliche Fixtpunkte sucht, die Ausfuhr eines persischen Wortes erst von dem Augenblick ab für möglich zu erklären, wo dieses Volk 'in die Geschichte eintrat' -so sagt man doch für seinen ersten krieg -, aber das persische Volk und die persische Sprache waren bestimmt schon einige tausand Jahre vorher [550 B.C.] da..."

Contrary to Ginsberg, notable scholars have not considered it impossible that Persian had an early influence on Hebrew, without any mediation through Aramaic. Delitzsch (84), while holding to Solomonic authorship to Song of Songs, saw פרדס (SS 4:13) as an old Persian word. S. R. Driver (1913:449) likewise saw no contradiction in there being Persian words in a Solomonic Song of Songs: "the foreign words in the poem...are such as might have reached Israel through Solomon's connexions with the East." Koehler (1939:119f) attributed a Persian etymology to "Jordan", the combination of the roots *yar* (year) and *dan* (river), "den Fluss, der das ganze Jahr

hindurch Wasser führt." Mayrhofer (119-21) notes the Indo-Aryan word, *priya-medha*, in the fifteenth century B.C. Ta'anach tablets found near Meggido, the location mentioned in Ju 5:19. Gordis (1944:263; 1968:375ff) entertains the appearance of Sanskrit words in the tenth century B.C. in Song of Songs, as does S. R. Driver (*ibid.*) i.e. אפריון from *paryanka*. If it is conceivable that words as distant as India could have entered pre-exilic Hebrew, a fortiori, Persian words should not be such a surprise. To assume that a Persian word in Hebrew presupposes its transfer through Imperial Aramaic is unwarranted without adequate evidence of Aramaic influence, e.g. on the word's form (both Greenfield 1968: 233 and Morag [299] object to Wagner's inclusion of Persian words as "Aramaisms" on these grounds).

It is also important to compare the frequency of Persianisms in Qoh and in the post-exilic books of the Bible. In Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel and Esther, 26 Persian words are used a total of 109 times.¹ The following list shows these words and their distribution:

אדרזדא	BA Ezr 7:23
אדרכון	1 Ch 29:7, Ezr 8:27
אחשדרפן	Ezr 8:36, Est 3:12, 8:9, 9:3 BA Dn 3:2, 3, 27, 6:2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8
אחשתרן	Est 8:10, 14
אספרנא	BA Ezr 5:8, 6:8, 12, 13, 7:17, 21, 26
אפרן	Dn 11:45

1 From Ellenbogen, and Rabin "מלים זרות":1079

אפתם	BA Ezr 4:13
גזבר	Ezr 1:8, BA Ezr 7:27
גנזים	Est 3:9, 4:7, Ezk 27:24
גנזך	1 Ch 28:11
דת	Dt 33:2, Ezr 8:36, BA Ezr 7:12, 21, 14, 25, 26 Dn 2:9, 13, 15, 6:6, 9, 13, 16, 7:25, Est 20 x's
דתבר	Dn 3:2, 3
הדם	Dn 2:5, 3:29
המוניכה	Dn 5:7, 16, 29
זן	2 Ch 16:14, Ps 144:13, BA Dn 3:5, 7, 10, 15
נברשתא	Dn 5:5
נשתון	Ezr 4:7, 7:11, BA Ezr 4:18, 23, 5:5
פלדה	Na 2:4
פרדס	Neh 2:8, SS 4:13, Ecc 2:5, 1 Ch 26:18, 18, 2 Kg 23:11
פרתמים	Est 1:3, 6:9, Dn 1:3
פתבג	Dn 1:5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 11:26
פתגם	Est 1:20, Ecc 8:11, BA Ezr 4:17, 5:7, 11, 6:11, Dn 3:16, 4:14
פתשגן	Est 3:14, 4:8, 8:13
רז	Dn 4:6, 2:18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47
תולשתא	Ezr 2:63, Neh 7:65, 70, 8:9, 10:1
פר(ו ב)ר	1 Chr 26:18, 18 (פרבר): 2 Kg 23:11 (פרור)

Daniel uses 12 roots in 47 total instances, Ezra 10 roots in 20 instances, Esther 7 roots in 33 places. Chronicles uses just 4 roots, but this is expected given its synoptic relation with Samuel-Kings. Nehemiah uses only 2 roots in 5 cases, yet this book

is not typical LBH and contains a disparaging note about foreign language (13:24). Therefore Qoh's 2 roots in only 2 cases, is noticeably sparse compared with the late books it is often seen to liken itself. This is especially relevant since at least a dozen of these Persianisms found in post-exilic books are related to governmental terminology, vocabulary that could well have been used in Qoh with its many political contexts.

Consequently, Qoh has relatively few Persianisms, and the two it has are acceptable for even a pre-exilic book given the historical connections of Palestine with the East.

B. EVIDENCE

1. עשיתי לי גנות ופרדסים 2:5 : פְּרָדִים

preserve, park

This is a Persian word that "was borrowed from Iranian into a number of languages" (Ellenbogen 136) yet need not have come through Aramaic to Hebrew as others have noted (e.g. S. R. Driver 1913:449). Wagner (95) accordingly sees it only "more or less" as an Aramaism; he is not completely convinced of an Aramaic mediation. The only other two uses of this root are in SS 4:13, a book whose date is not certain, and Neh 2:8 (memoirs) the section which is not typically LBH. Consequently there is no definitely late group of texts that would by its number necessitate a late date for the use of this word.

In defense of a pre-exilic date for the use of פְּרָדִים ,

Dornseiff (200) reasons,

"Die persische Gartenkunst war zu allen zeiten sehr bedeutend...die persische Sprache waren bestimmt schon einige tausend Jahre vorher da [550 BC], und schöne Gärten werden die Perser, ehe sie kriegerische Lorbeeren geerntet hatten, erst recht gehabt haben."

2. אשר אין-נעשה פתגם מעשה הרעה מהרה : 8:11 פתגם

edict

An Old Persian word, patigama, is behind this form, and its appearance in BA and Egyptian Aramaic (G. R. Driver 1965¹:25) has led many to believe it could only have arrived via Aramaic. However, such a narrow view of Persianisms in Hebrew is challenged by the considerations discussed earlier in Section A.

C. SUMMARY

It is conceivable that the small degree to which Persianisms exist in Qoh does not demand a late date for the book's vocabulary. Both the facts that reputable scholars have advocated that Persianisms appear in the earliest of BH texts, and that only two words are involved, should caution against such a conclusion.

V. GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES

Many have seen Greek influence in Qoh in both philosophic and linguistic spheres, however the evidence is not convincing to many others. In Chapter One we briefly represented this debate on the philosophic level, now the linguistic evidence will be considered.

¹ Only this 1965 reference of Driver's refers to "Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century". All previous 1965 references of Driver's are from "The Judean Scrolls".

A. METHOD

Due to the few number of Greek words discussed here, there is no need for an outlined presentation of method. The reasons for the conclusions will be clear.

B. EVIDENCE

1. הנה אשר-ראיתי אני טוב אשר-יפה 5:17 : טוב אשר-יפה
a good which is fine

This phrase is purportedly the Hebrew phrase from $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\nu \kappa\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu$, "fine and good" (e.g. Wildeboer 435, Siegfried 21), but the objections are too strong to maintain such a relation.

- a. Loretz (47) points out that the Greek phrase was used only in relation to persons, whereas this Hebrew phrase deals with objects.
 - b. Gordis (1968:255 and others e.g. Barton 133) explain that the Hebrew calque would be טוב ויפה rather than to employ אשר.
 - c. Delitzsch (302) notes the parallel in Hosea 12:9 $\text{עוֹן אֲשֶׁר-חַטָּא}$ (a North Israelite source) and thus dismisses a Greek influence.
2. טוב לפני האלהים 7:26 e.g. 7:26 : טוב לפני אלהים
ימלט ממנה
one who is good before God

Braun (51f) sees this Hebrew phrase to be dependent on the Greek $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, "loved by God". However his argument is unacceptable. There is obviously no explicit mention of אהב in

Qoh's phrase. The appropriate Hebrew counterpart to this Greek idea *is* found in Neh 13:26, **וְאֶהוּב לְאֱלֹהֵינוּ הִיָּה**, conveying more the *loving* aspect of the Greek than Qoh does. This passage in Nehemiah therefore shows a contrast between Qoh and the Greek, since the Hebrew language was capable of constructing the thought that Greek used, but that Qoh only approximated.

3. **אֵין טוֹב בָּם כִּי אִם-לְשִׁמוּחַ וּלְעִשׂוֹת טוֹב בְּחֵינֵינוּ 3:12 : לְעִשׂוֹת טוֹב**
to do good

Several have explained this phrase as a rendering of **εὖ πράττειν**, "to fare well" (e.g. Siegfried 20; Braun 54; Lauha 8; Whitley 34). An objection to this relation with the Greek can be made from two different perspectives:

- a. If the phrase in Qoh actually means "to fare well", many have pointed out the parallel construction in 2 Sm 12:18 **עָשָׂה רָעָה**, "to do oneself harm", where the meaning is the opposite, but still represents a reflexive act (e.g. McNeile 40f; Barton 106; Gordis 1968:232; Loretz 48; Gallig 1934:362).
- b. It is not to be ignored however, that the moral denotation of **עָשָׂה טוֹב** is also a viable translation here, "do good". This is the sense found elsewhere in BH (Gn 29:26; Ps 14:1; 34:15) and most notably in Qoh itself (Qoh 7:20 **יַעֲשֶׂה טוֹב וְלֹא יַחֲטָא**). Some object to the moral interpretation because **טוֹב** is used again in the next verse in an amoral sense **רָאָה טוֹב** (McNeile 40; Delitzsch 262). But given that the phrase has an accepted BH meaning of

"do good [things]" it is too sterile of an approach to language to disallow טוב to be reconstrued with another verb (ראה) and take on a different meaning.

Consequently, BH precedent exists for either translation of the phrase and there is no need to draw from a Greek parallel.

4. מספר ימי-חילי הבלו ויעשם כצל 6:12 : עשה

spend time, work

The meaning of this common BH word as "to spend time" is debated. Barton (138) and Whitley (61) for example see this meaning in the Greek πολέω, and thus render Qoh 6:12 along this line. However two considerations are needed:

- a. Gordis (1968:264) sees the same meaning in Ruth 2:19, 19, 19, אנה עשית, "where did you spend time?" However, this could just as easily mean "work" too.
- b. McNeile (73) rightly sees an intelligible sense in the BH meaning "work", yielding "for he works them [days] as a shadow."

There is no need to relate this use exclusively to a Greek source.

5. סבותי אני ולבי לדעת ולתור ובקש חכמה וחשבון 7:25 e.g. 7:25 : תור 1:13, 2:3, 7:25
explore

There have been those who have seen this term to be dependent on σκέπτεσθαι (e.g. Wildeboer 125; Pedersen 331). Whitley (12), who holds to Greek influence on Qoh, nevertheless objects to this lexical relation with Greek. His view aptly summarizes the opinion of many (e.g. Barton 85; Gordis 1968:209):

"...from the root תוּר. So in Num 13:2, 16, 17 it is used of 'spying out' the land of Canaan. Hence, here and 7:25 Koheleth use לַתוּר of mental exploration. This is a natural semantic development from earlier Biblical usage and there is no need to assume with some scholars that the term depends on the philosophic Greek term ΣΚΕΠΤΕΣΘΑΙ."

6. וְאֵין כָּל-חַדָּשׁ תַּחַת הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ: passim e.g. 1:9

under the sun

Plumptre (104) and Ranston (55) compared this favorite phrase of Qoh with ὑφ' ἡλίῳ. But the appearances in Phoenician, in the sixth century Tabnit and fifth century Eshmunazar inscriptions (DISO 310), and in a twelfth century Elamite document (Friedrich 1949:28f) show the currency of the phrase in the Near East outside of Greece. This has been adequate reason for most all scholars to discount the relation now (e.g. Loretz 46; Gordis 1968:205; Whitley 8).

C. SUMMARY

The supposed Greek influence on Qoh's vocabulary is unfounded. All alleged instances¹ have adequate Biblical precedent, or natural Hebrew meanings that have no need for explanations based on Greek.

¹ This study has considered only those words that have found support for Greek influence since McNeile's treatment of alleged Greek parallels in Qoh.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

I. INTRODUCTION

In the introduction to this study we characterized the different routes various scholars have taken to reach a date for the book of Qoh. There was no consensus as to the means of dating the book apart from the common opinion that its language belonged to post-exilic times. However, even in the linguistic sphere there are widely different approaches. Delitzsch, Barton and Gordis represent the standard argument of LBH, MH and Aramaic influence; Whitley has recently postulated its writing after Ben Sira; Zimmermann, Torrey and Ginsberg seek evidence of translation from Aramaic, while Dahood looks to a Phoenician-Canaanite influence. But all agree to a post-exilic date for Qoh's language.

Nonetheless, it was obvious that the language is the most important criterion for dating the book because it is less subjective than the other methods tried. Yet the language of Qoh is so unusual that simple comparisons can, and do mislead the student to faulty deductions about it. This study has attempted, therefore, to analyze the many peculiarities of the language of Qoh. This has led to a re-examination of the evidence that one scholar after another has repeated as proof of the book's post-exilic date.

II. GENERAL METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

The second chapter, General Methodological Concerns, served as a warning against such simplistic comparisons, discussing three

areas to be observed more closely if one desired to be thorough in their investigation of Qoh's language.

- A. First, the basic nature of language is found to lie in its *grammatical* patterns rather than in its *lexical* stock, the area so often emphasized by earlier writers. Further support for this comes in the necessary specific methodological principles outlined before each appropriate lexical study in Chapter Four.
- B. The second caution advised care in dealing with a work such as Qoh with its unique genre in BH. Though it be wisdom literature indeed, its philosophic, introspective nature profoundly affects its language.
- C. Third, there is the possible effect of regional and socio-linguistic dialects on grammatical-lexical comparisons. The presence of an impressive proportion of North Israelite and vernacular features in Qoh weighs against immediate or hasty comparison with MH or LBH exclusively.
 1. North Israelite - Qoh was shown to have 90% of the relevant grammatical North Israelite features that scholars have extracted from BH:
 - a. Unassimilated Article
 - b. Anticipatory Accusative Pronominal Suffix
 - c. ׀- Relative
 - d. הַ Demonstrative
 - e. אַ plus Nominative
 - f. קטילה as a Verbal Noun Form

- g. Masculine Plurals from BH Feminine Plurals
- h. Reduced Diphthong
- i. Infinitive Absolute plus Nominative Pronoun.

Qoh also has the number of Aramaisms that further support a parallel of its language with North Israelite.

2. Vernacular - Traits that scholars had previously attributed to a Hebrew vernacular, are found in Qoh. Also a number of forms in Qoh that are simpler, indicate a language that conveyed ideas more conveniently, and which would be expected in a common every-day locution. It was suggested further, that some features which appeared to be North Israelite were actually vernacular since they also surfaced in isolated non-North Israelite parts of BH. Possible evidence for the colloquial element in Qoh is:

- a. Anticipatory Pronominal Suffix
- b. Discordant Subject and Predicate
- c. Missing Definite Article
- d. Subject and Predicate Couched in Prepositional Phrases
- e. Proverbial Medium
- f. First Person Delivery
- g. Conjunctive Waw Verbal Constructions
- h. Infinitive Absolute with Waw
- i. Absence of the Hophal
- j. Third Masculine Plural Pronoun for the Feminine Counterpart
- k. אנכי as First Singular Pronoun

- l. Pronouns with תא
- m. הַז as Feminine Singular Demonstrative
- n. ׁ- Relative
- o. Contractions
- p. Unassimilated Article
- q. תא plus Nominative

These 17 characteristics of Qoh's language make up only a part of its highly distinctive language, yet as possible vernacular evidence, they help to explain why the language is unique.¹

III. GRAMMATICAL COMPARISONS

Chapter Three began the systematic appraisal of Qoh's relation with MH, Second Temple Hebrew, and LBH in the primary sphere of linguistic comparison, i.e. grammar.

A. Mishnaic Hebrew

Qoh was compared with MH in 61 points of grammar. Some of these were chosen simply because previous studies had claimed they could allow Qoh to align with MH or BH. The balance however were included because they actually do allow Qoh to align with one or the other. No MH grammatical feature lies disproportionately in Qoh apart from those two² areas that can be

1 On the basis of evidence this study has already rejected, Pioto (1977:55f; following Dahood's evidence) feels a vernacular language would be more receptive to North-West Semitic language influence than a literary language would be. However the Phoenician-Canaanite theory that his suggestion rest upon is very dubious.

2 Conjunctive waw with finite verbs, הַז as the feminine singular demonstrative pronoun.

explained by the genre or dialectical causes presented in Chapter Two. All other alleged similarities between Qoh and MH proved to have a similar frequency in others parts of BH, or to occur so rarely that comparison with BH or MH was fruitless. No trait occurs exclusively in Qoh and MH, all have precedents in BH elsewhere. Yet in 46 points Qoh agrees exclusively or primarily with BH where a contrast exists with MH. Consequently, very little support can be found for the hypothesis of MH grammatical influence on Qoh. Those features considered to be evidence by previous studies or summaries of Qoh's grammar can only be persuasive if one neglects either to honour Qoh's uniqueness in genre and dialect or to survey BH for equal use of those features. All that can be said of the alleged MH affinities with Qoh, is that in the most important linguistic sphere, i.e. grammar, Qoh is apparently free from MH influence, leaving only the secondary lexical sphere to carry the weight of the hypothesis.

B. Second Temple Hebrew

The analysis continued with an investigation of Qoh in relation to the grammar of STH. Ben Sira, the Copper Scroll, the Hebrew Bar Kosiba letters, and the Qumran Sectarian Scrolls were used as comparands, but no evidence appears to suggest that Qoh is grammatically similar to STH, at least on the basis of extant STH texts. Though these sources are quite dissimilar among themselves, wherever comparison is possible, Qoh always displays affinity with BH rather than with STH and

its many MH properties.

C. Late Biblical Hebrew

Finding no significant grammatical relation between Qoh and post-Biblical Hebrew, this study turned to comparisons with LBH. In only one trait is Qoh similar to LBH exclusively: the *absence* of the infinitive absolute for emphasizing a cognate finite verb. However at best, this is an argument from silence, and this one similarity is even less important since the remaining functions of the infinitive absolute are represented in Qoh to a degree unlike that of LBH (as a finite verb and an imperative). Of the 30 points compared, 16 would be misleading as guides for determining a date of the text, and some have been so used (see p.195ff:#2 and #3a). In fact, 10 of the 30 points are more characteristic of EBH than LBH (see p.197ff:#4) though one of these could well be a dialectical oddity and thus not dependent on EBH (הִי). Although LBH presents more than one grammatical system (see p.151f) the discrepancy between Qoh and LBH in general makes it very unlikely that the latter influenced Qoh.

The *grammatical* evidence therefore, does not impose a date later than the Exile. It would certainly allow a pre-exilic time of composition. No significant cases of LBH or post-Biblical usage exist in Qoh. When there are strong similarities, other explanations are possible beside LBH or MH influence.

IV. LEXICAL COMPARISONS

The fourth chapter discussed all words alleged at one time or another to contribute to the evidence for a late date for Qoh's language. These were individually handled under "Mishnaisms", "Late Biblical Hebrew Words", "Aramaisms", "Persianisms" and "Greek Words". Applying certain specific principles in methodology to each of these categories ended in much reduced lists of these words.

A. Mishnaisms

Of the 36 words that one or more scholars have cited to be Mishnaisms, this study found that at most only 4 could fall under this category. Three of these have adequate alternate causes:

1. אֵי (4:10, 10:16) - may be an example of the North Israelite dialect's reduction of diphthongs.
2. חוץ מן (2:25) - may be a calque from Imperial Aramaic בר מן.
3. אביונה (12:5) - as a type of vegetation is the type of word that had no occasion to be used elsewhere in BH.

The fourth word כּבּר (passim) is without such an explanation, but is not surprising for a true BH book since some pre-exilic books use as many if not more *hapax legomena* which are found only in MH. It should be added that the absence of the supposed MH grammatical structure from Qoh weakens further the qualification as "Mishnaisms" of words which appear in Qoh and in BH with the same meaning, or as homonyms.

B. Late Biblical Hebrew Words

Twenty-five of the supposed 28 words that have at some time or another been considered LBH, can be rejected on various grounds as outlined in the preliminary methodological principles in that section of the study. The 3 remaining words (זמן, כאחר, תקף) cannot in themselves be considered weighty evidence for LBH lexical influence on Qoh, since they are the only words with multiple instances in both LBH and BA. Many pre-exilic books have words only repeated again in LBH books. When one remembers also, that the *grammar* of Qoh is distinct from LBH, these few words take on even less significance.

C. Aramaisms

One of the major arguments for the late date of Qoh's language is the number of alleged Aramaisms in the book. Forty-nine so-called Aramaisms were discussed in Chapter Four. According to this study's analysis however, the number of probable Aramaisms is only 7.

Scott (1965:200) infers from the Aramaisms in Qoh that the book was written with Phoenician connections¹ or in a North Israelite territory. His conclusion is most interesting especially since 4 of these 7 words are associated with North Israelite. אלו is probably found in the Ahiiram inscription (Phoenician, but adjacent to North Israel), מדינה was

¹ The "Phoenician" element, supported most strongly by Dahood, is dubious (see p. 14ff).

used by Burney (1903:209) to describe the Aramaic flavour of the North Israelite narratives in Kings, and רעה (רעיון, רעות) is found in the North Israelite book of Hosea 12:2, and infrequently elsewhere. Apart from this, Wagner (149f) considers there to be 151 Aramaisms in pre-exilic Hebrew. Thus these 4 words would not be surprising in a pre-exilic book.

The remaining 3 words, חוץ מן, כאחד, תקף, have their parallels only in later texts. The chronological import of these latter 3 is open to question since even if a word is a post-exilic Aramaism, this does not mean it could not have been introduced to Hebrew before the exile. Barr (1974:9f) believes this, "Naturally, the adoption of a word within Hebrew may have taken place a long time before the date of the earliest Hebrew text in which it appears." And G. R. Driver (1953:28) writes (in respect to secondary meanings, but nonetheless relevant) "though extant only in late Hebrew, [these words] may in fact have been current long before their first appearance." Hurvitz (1968:236) goes as far as to say that even if a word is an Aramaism and furthermore a Mishnaism, as in the case of חוץ מן, this does not necessitate a post-exilic date.

The remaining 42 "Aramaisms" were discounted on methodological grounds as presented earlier. These principles and the need to observe them are magnified by the fact that the grammar of Qoh does not reflect LBH grammar, which one would expect to be necessary for a high number of post-exilic

Aramaisms to be present.

The extent to which Aramaisms are of any dating importance is a difficult question, however the general inadequacy is felt by Polzin (10) for instance who claims,

"Modern scholarship has forced us to ask: 'to what extent (if at all) can we utilize Aramaisms when determining the age of a biblical text whose date is still uncertain?' "

G. R. Driver (1953:38) states the irony of the use of Aramaisms in studying Hebrew when he says that identifying words as Aramaisms in most cases is "rather a philological convenience than a demonstrable fact; yet it is a yardstick for measuring the development of the Hebrew language."

Hurvitz (1968:240) believes that even a high concentration of Aramaisms need not date a book in the post-exilic period if it is plausible "to assume any particular circumstances which may have given the text a peculiar and highly distinctive Aramaizing character as early as the pre-exilic period (for instance the possibility that a given text was coloured by the Northern dialect [Song of Songs] by wisdom phraseology [Job, Prov] or by foreign language [2 Kg 6]). The Aramaisms in BH may be used as a criterion for lateness, but only when evaluated in light of *other linguistic phenomena* associated with the text in which these Aramaisms occur." (italics mine). No text qualifies more for these provisions in assessing its Aramaisms than Qoh. No other single text in BH has the number of North Israelite properties that Qoh has. Qoh furthermore is saturated with wisdom phraseology. Even if one was to believe Qoh had more than 7 Aramaisms, that is

not unexpected given the book's genre and dialectical properties, and would not be an adequate reason in itself for dating the work in the post-exilic period.

D. Persianisms

The two Persian words פָּרְדָּס and פִּזְגָּם have convinced some that the book's date is post-exilic. Yet a number of respected scholars have been ready to admit Indo-Aryan linguistic influence before the era of the Persian Empire (e.g. Delitzsch, S. R. Driver, Gordis, Koehler, Mayrhofer, Dornseiff). Furthermore, the two instances in Qoh do not compare with the numerous instances in the post-exilic literature of the Persian Empire era, where in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel and Esther 26 roots are used in a total of 109 instances. The importance of these two Persian words as indications of date would be supported if Qoh showed a great similarity with LBH grammar and vocabulary. However, as this is not the case, they cannot be indisputable evidence for a post-exilic date.

E. Greek Words

The Greek words alleged to occur in Qoh and to show its post-exilic date were found to have equal if not more adequate parallels in BH. The argument for linguistic influence from the Greek culture is unfounded and many scholars have said so.

V. A PRELIMINARY CONCLUSION

A conclusion of this study therefore, is that Qoh's language should not be dated any later than the exilic period. No linguistic

evidence speaks against a pre-exilic date. All evidence presented in favour of the later date can be countered either by alternate considerations (as caused by Qoh's genre or dialectical idiosyncrasies) or by a more thorough search of BH which shows adequate precedent for Qoh there without recourse to MH influence, or by inquiring in EBH for precedents for Qoh apart from LBH influence. Whether Qoh's language is presented in a North Israelite dialect is uncertain because "North Israelite" is more of an extrapolation from various present sources, than a definite dialect represented by one or more exemplary documents (though there is no doubt that separate dialects did actually exist in ancient Hebrew; Rabin 1974:25). Whether Qoh's language is in the nature of a vernacular is also uncertain, though much evidence would support this, for again, there are no documents to illustrate such a vernacular. However, it is certain that Qoh does not find its closest similarities linguistically either in MH or in LBH. The peculiarities of the language find antecedents equally as often in EBH, if not more often than in LBH or MH. Further, features Qoh has in common exclusively or primarily with EBH tip the scales towards a pre-exilic date.

Three words however, may hint at a late pre-exilic date for the language of Qoh as we have it. חוץ מן, כאחד, and תקף have parallels only in Imperial Aramaic or LBH. Though the *grammar* of Qoh does not suggest a post-exilic date, these words may give slight evidence of a later writing than the grammar alone would suggest, thus a date in the pre-exilic era, in the eighth or seventh century B.C.

might be suggested.

VI. SOME OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

In the face of our study some may object that the very number of linguistic points that we have had to consider militates against a pre-exilic date for Qoh's language. Does not the fact of so many points put forward in favour of a later date have value as a cumulative argument? Again, it might be asked how the consensus of most all modern scholars could be so mistaken about the language of our text. Indeed it would seem to be simpler to concur with the conventional hypothesis of LBH-MH influence on Qoh. But this is because the mode of comparison in the past has been simplistic. One scholar after another has listed Qoh's linguistic peculiarities, and without assessing the book's stylistic and dialectical properties, has lined up a few of its grammatical features with what appear to be their closest parallels. Furthermore this process often neglects adequate BH precedent, and thus the closest parallels are mistakenly seen as Mishnaic or LBH. The large number of presumed evidences for a late date for Qoh's language is an accumulation of errors, errors made in the wake of the initial presupposition of a late date. This presupposition, arising from a superficial assessment of the linguistic evidence, channelled the linguistic expectations of those investigating Qoh toward seeking parallels with later Hebrew and totally ignoring the possibility that there might be equally strong ones in the earlier phases of the language. Thus a collection of these misjudgements is often presented, which at first

seems persuasive, if not only because of its volume.

The complexity of the comparative process is appreciated by Reif (125). In respect to the conventional method of assessing Qoh linguistically as represented by Whitley, he explains,

"Biblical Hebrew is no more than a fragment of the language spoken by the Israelites and Jews at any given time during the Biblical period, that fragment which happened to be frozen in the canonical books, if indeed, scribal tradition froze it while it was still fresh. Mishnaic Hebrew, on the other hand, is a much more comprehensive language deriving from a wide variety of contexts, preserving more of the colloquial and reflecting different dialectical elements, and associated with a literature the precise date of which is notoriously difficult to ascertain. Since Mishnaic Hebrew may not only contain elements of the later language but may also record some of those features missing from the canonical language, its relationship with BH must be viewed both synchronically and diachronically, and a wealth of data considered before any conclusions may confidently be reached. The matter is simply too complicated and the co-ordinates insufficiently alike and determinable for the researcher to mark BH and MH at two points on a chronological chart and plot a simple graph tracing the evolution of one into the other."

These concerns have been covered in this study and Reif's conclusion is substantiated by the data.

The similarities between Qoh and MH therefore might be interpreted in two different ways

- First, the common MH influence theory, or,
- Second, a theory that the magnification of Qoh's linguistic peculiarities in MH shows the development of MH *from* a vernacular and perhaps a dialect related to Qoh.

Thus the conclusion can be reasonably the converse of the generally accepted theory. In fact, the absence of any evidence of

MH influence on Qoh outside of grammatical areas held by scholars to be dialectical variables in BH (e.g. ψ -relative, η feminine demonstrative, אני over אנכי) or areas that are understandably dependent on genre (e.g. abstract noun terminations, consecutive constructions), this absence speaks clearly in favour of the second interpretation. And the absence of a LBH flavour to Qoh's language, most importantly, its grammar, lends additional suspicion to a MH influence since the transitional era of the language would be expected to make its impact on a book thought to situate itself between LBH and MH.

Another objection might arise: since the genre of Qoh is unlike the historical books of LBH, that it does not have LBH characteristics is irrelevant. Or it might be suggested that Qoh is an archaizing work, hence its language appears like EBH, but is still a late composition. However the answer to these objections should be clear:

- The areas where Qoh differs from LBH include those that are not related to genre, e.g. prepositions, numbered substantives, etc.
- Archaizing indeed occurs in LBH. We saw for instance where Nehemiah's memoirs and Esther were quite unlike LBH in some areas. Where they aligned with EBH could be evidence of these books' tendency to archaize. But the claim that a book archaizes is indefensible if the language of the book is not demonstrably LBH to a significant degree. In the case of Nehemiah's memoirs and

Esther the language is LBH to a degree that gives meaning to "archaizing" (not to speak of the explicit evidence of the post-exilic situation). But to take a book like Qoh with no indication of LBH grammar or an extensive LBH vocabulary, and to attribute its earlier mode of language to the archaizing procedure is to say that *any* book of BH can be late regardless of its language. There must be some linguistic reason to suspect the language to be late if one is to seriously argue for an archaizing element in Qoh.

VII. ONE FINAL CONSIDERATION

It is germane as well to look at the general literary structure of Qoh. To speak of one date for Qoh's composition is contrary to the structure and content of the total book. The framework of the book is a *report* of the words of Qoheleth by another. As Fox (91) most recently describes the structure of Qoh,

"The Book of Qohelet, therefore, is built on successive levels, each with a perspective that encompasses the next:

Level 1: The frame narrator, who tells about
Level 2a: Qohelet-the-reporter, the narrating "I",
who speaks from the vantage point of old age
and looks back on

Level 2b: Qohelet-the-seeker, the experiencing "I", the younger Qohelet who made the fruitless ? investigation introduced in 1:12f.

Levels 1 and 2 are different persons..."

This division is clear when one sees both the explicit narrative clause "Qohelet said" appearing in 1:2, 7:27 and 12:8, and the switch from the predominant first person delivery of Qoh 1:2-12:8 to the third person discussion about Qohelet in 12:9-14.

Furthermore, the "editor" reporting Qohelet's words is not only different, but presumably later since the verbs used to describe Qohelet are all in the perfect aspect in these verses. How much later this particular editor¹ composed the entire work depends on two considerations,

- First, how late can the language of the book be dated? This study concludes that Qoh's language need not be any later than the exile and could be pre-exilic.
- Second, what influence could the later editor have had on the language of the earlier composition? It is reasonable to accept (though not necessary) that some lexical substitutes from the editor's era be found in the revision. These might be the words that led us to limit a pre-exilic date to the eighth or seventh century, i.e. חוץ מן, כֹּאחֲרַי, תִּקְוֵי. These might also be seen in the two Persian words פֶּרְדָּס and פֶּתְגָם.

1 Some see more than one editor, e.g. Zimmerli 1962:127.

Since apart from these 5 words, Qoh's language has no properties that would identify it as late, the original could have been at a time much earlier than the revision. How much earlier is not a question that can be answered in linguistic terms, for there is no available characterization of the history of pre-exilic Hebrew century by century. Consequently no attempt to refine the dating in that direction can be made in this study.

VIII. THE RESULT OF THIS STUDY

This study has re-examined the *linguistic* criteria used to determine Qoh's age. These criteria ignore the genre and dialectical uniqueness of Qoh, and have resulted in a scholarly consensus on a post-exilic date that is invalid. The criteria have often neglected BH and EBH parallels to features that have been held to belong to a later time. The criteria have over-emphasized the lexical evidence, and have been used erroneously to identify late words.

This re-examination concludes that the grammatical structure of Qoh is fully in the realm of the pre-exilic language once one respects the complex nature of the book's style and language. It concludes further that the vocabulary of the book is as a whole pre-exilic in nature given the same considerations of Qoh's complexity. If to some the words found only in Imperial Aramaic and the Persianisms are not tolerable for a pre-exilic book, the possibility of a later editor's lexical influence still respects and maintains the fundamental pre-exilic nature of Qoh's grammar and

remaining vocabulary.

The complexity of Qoh's language does not deny the student an eventual understanding of why Qoh's language is : unique, but it does preclude the usual method used by most scholars to compare the language of others books in BH. It does negate the common approach to assessing Qoh's language which simply lists similarities with LBH and MH to the neglect of earlier uses of those same features. It does demand of the student respect for the unique character of the language and careful consideration of all the data and possible causes, including the dialectical and stylistic causes which so frequently apply in Qoh.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANET	Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament ed. J.B. Pritchard, Princeton 1955
Arch Or	Archiv Orientalni
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BDB	A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, eds., F. Brown, S.R. Driver, C. Briggs, Oxford 1907
BH	Biblical Hebrew
Bibl	Biblica
BiOr	Bibliotheca Orientalis
BSOAS	The Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAD	The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago, 1963ff
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
DISO	Dictionnaire des inscriptions semitiques de l'Ouest, C.F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, Leiden 1965
EBH	Early Biblical Hebrew
EJ	Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1929
GK	Gesenius W., Kautzsch E., Cowley A.E.; Hebrew Grammar Oxford 1909
GLECS	Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito Semitiques
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
HZAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Tübingen
ICC	International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal, Jerusalem
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JE	Jewish Encyclopaedia, London 1903
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JNWSL	Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
KAI	Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften, H. Donner, W. Röllig; Wiesbaden 1962-64
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Göttingen
KB	Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, Leiden 1965ff
LBH	Late Biblical Hebrew
MH	Mishnaic Hebrew
NIV	New International Version, London 1978
Or	Orientalia
OS	Oudtestamentische Studiën, Leiden
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
RB	Revue Biblique
STH	Second Temple Hebrew
UF	Ugarit-Forschungen

VT Vetus Testamentum
VTS Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
ZAW Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LITERATURE CITED IN THIS STUDY

AND IN THIS BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aalders, G. - Het Boek de Prediker, Kampen 1948
- Aistleitner, J. - Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache, Berlin 1963
- Albrecht, K. - Neuhebräische Grammatik auf Grund der Mishna, München 1913
- Albright, W.F. - An Archaic Hebrew Proverb in an Amarna Letter from Central Palestine, BASOR 89 (1943) 29-32
- The Oracles of Balaam, JBL 63 (1944) 207-233
 - The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Tenth Century B.C. from Byblos, JAOS 67 (1947) 153-160
 - Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom, VTS 3 (1955) 15 n.3
 - From the Stone Age to Christianity, Garden City 1957
 - The Archaeology of the Ancient Near East; in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, London 1962
 - Archaic Survivals in the Text of Canticles; in Semitic Studies Presented to G.R. Driver, eds., D.W. Thomas, McHardy, Oxford 1963
- Avigad, N. - An Inscribed Bowl from Dan, PEQ Jan-June (1968) 42-44
- Baillet, M.; Milik, J.T.; de Vaux, R.; Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan: III: Les Petites Grottes de Qumrân, Oxford 1962
- Barr, J. - Biblical Words for Time, London 1962
- Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament, Oxford 1968
 - Etymology and the Old Testament, OS 19 (1974) 1-28
- Barth, J. - Die Nominalbildung in den Semitischen Sprachen, Hildesheim 1967
- Barton, G.A., The Book of Ecclesiastes; ICC, Edinburgh 1908
- Bauer H.; Leander, P. - Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testament, Hildesheim 1962
- Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen, Halle 1927
- Baumgartner, W. - Was wir heute von der hebräischen Sprache und ihrer Geschichte wissen; in Zum Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt, Baumgartner, W., Leiden 1959, Chapter 7
- The Wisdom Literature; in The Old Testament and Modern Study, Rowley, H.H. ed., Oxford 1961
- Bea, A - Liber Ecclesiastae, Rome 1950
- Bendavid, A - לשון מקרא ולשון חכמים, Tel Aviv 1967
- Benoit, P; Milik, J.T.; de Vaux, R.; Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan: II: Les Grottes de Murabba'at, Oxford 1961
- Bergsträsser, G. - Das hebräische Präfix ׀, ZAW 1909 40-56
- Blake, F. - The Expression of Indefinite Pronominal Ideas in Hebrew, JAOS 34 (1915) 115-228

- Blake, F.R. - A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses, Rome 1951
- Blau, J. - Zum angeblichen Gebrauch von נח vor dem Nominative,
VT 4 (1954) 7-19
- Hapax Legomena, EJ VII 1318f
- Börger, R. - Die Inschriften Asarhaddons König von Assyrien, Graz 1956
- Bowman, R.A. - Arameans, Aramaic, and the Bible, JNES 7 (1948) 65-90
- Box, G.H.; Oesterley, W.O.E. - The Book of Sirach; in The Apocrypha
and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Charles, R.H., ed.,
Oxford 1913, 268-517
- Braun, R. - Kohelet und die frühhellenistische Popularphilosophie
BZAW 130, Berlin 1973
- Bright, J. - A History of Israel, Philadelphia 1981³
- Brockelmann, C. - Hebräische Syntax, Neukirchen 1956
- Bron, F. - Recherches sur les Inscriptions Phéniciennes de Karatepe
Genève 1979
- Brown, F.; Driver, S.R.; Briggs, C.; A Hebrew and English Lexicon
of the Old Testament, Oxford 1907
- Burkitt, F.C. - Is Ecclesiastes a Translation?, JTS 23 (1922) 22-28
- Burney, C.F. - Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings,
Oxford 1903
- The Book of Judges, London 1918
- Burrows, M. - The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, New
Haven 1951
- Casanowicz, I. - Hapax Legomena, JE VI 226-9
- Castellino, G.R. - Qoheleth and His Wisdom, CBQ 30 (1968) 15-28
- Caquot, A.; Sznycer, M.; Herdner A.; Textes Ougaritiques: Tome 1
Myths et Legendes, Paris 1974
- Cazelles, H. - Conjonctions de subordination dans la langue de
Qoheleth, GLECS 8 (1957-60) 21+22
- Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, Chicago
- Chomsky, W. - What Was the Jewish Vernacular During the Second
Commonwealth?, JQR 42 (1951) 193-212
- Cohen, H.R. - Biblical Hapax Legomena in the Light of Akkadian and
Ugaritic, Missoula 1978
- Corre, A.D. - A Reference to Epispasm in Qoheleth, VT 4 (1954) 416-418
- Cowley, A.E. - Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C., Oxford 1923
- Cross, F.M. - Excursus on the Paleographic Dating of the Copper
Document; in Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan: III:
éd. Baillet, Milik, de Vaux; 217-21
- Cross, F.M.; Freedman, D.N.; A Royal Song of Thanksgiving, JBL
72 (1953) 15-17
- Cross, F.M.; Talmon, S.; Qumran and the History of the Biblical
Text, Cambridge (MA) 1975
- Dahood, M. - Canaanite-Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth, Bibl 33
(1952) 30-52, 191-221
- Qoheleth and Recent Discoveries, Bibl 39 (1958) 302-318
- Qoheleth and Northwest Semitic Philology, Bibl 43 (1962) 349-365
- Ugaritic Lexicography; in Melanges Eugène Tisserant, Citta del
Vaticano 1964

- Canaanite Words in Qoheleth 10:20, Bibl 46 (1965) 210-212
 - Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology, Rome 1965
 - The Phoenician Background of Qoheleth, Bibl 47 (1966) 264-282
 - Scriptio Defectiva in Qoheleth 4:10a, Bibl 49 (1968) 243
 - Three Parallel Pairs in Ecclesiastes 10:18, JQR 62 (1971) 84-87
 - Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography IX, Bibl 52 (1971) 337-356
 - Northwest Semitic Philology and Three Biblical Texts, JNWSL 2 (1972) 17-22
- Davidson, A.B. - Hebrew Syntax, Edinburgh 1924³
- Delitzsch, F. - Commentary on Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes, Edinburgh 1877 (James Martin, translator, Grand Rapids, 1975)
- de Saussure, F. - Course in General Linguistics, Fontana 1974
- De Vries, S.J. - Consecutive Constructions in the 1Q Sectarian Scrolls; in Dörōn: Hebraic Studies in Honor of A.I. Katsch, Naamani, I.T. and Rudavsky, D, eds., New York 1965, 75-87
- Di Fonzo, L. - Ecclesiaste, Torino 1967
- Di Lella, A.A. - The Hebrew Text of Sirach, The Hague 1966
- Donner, H. - Review of, Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit: II; in Bi Or 17 (1960) 179-181
- Donner, H.; Röllig, W.; Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften, Wiesbaden 1962-64
- Dornseiff, F. - Antike und Alter Orient, Leipzig 1959
- Driver, G.R. - Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament I, JTS 32 (1931) 38-47
- Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament II, JTS 32 (1931) 250-257
 - Hebrew Notes, JBL 68 (1949) 57-59
 - Problems of Hebrew Text and Language; in Alttestamentliche Studien: Friedrich Nötscher zum Sechzigsten Geburtstage, Junker, H. and Botterweck, J. eds., Bonn 1950, 46-61
 - Hebrew Poetic Diction, VTS 1 (1953) 26-39
 - Problems and Solutions, VT 4 (1954) 225-245
 - Canaanite Myths and Legends, Edinburgh 1956
 - Once Again Abbreviations, Textus 4 (1964) 76-94
 - Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C., Oxford 1965
 - The Judaean Scrolls, New York 1965
 - Colloquialisms in the Old Testament; in Melanges M. Cohen; Cohen, D. ed., Den Haag 1970, 232-239
- Driver, G.R.; Miles, J.A.C.; The Babylonian Laws II, Oxford 1955
- Driver, S.R. - On Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist, Journal of Philology 11 (1882) 201-236
- A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew, Oxford 1892³
 - Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, Edinburgh 1913⁹
- Du Plessis, S.J. - Aspects of Morphological Peculiarities of the Language of Qoheleth; in De Fructu Oris Sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus Van Selms; Eybers, I.H. and Fensham, F.C. eds., Leiden 1971, 164-180
- Dupont-Sommer, A. - L'inscription phenicienne de la spatule dite d'Asdrubal, Arch Or 17/1 (1949) 158-167
- Dussaud, R. - Les Inscriptions Pheniciennes du Tombeau d'Ahiram, Roi de Byblos, Syria 5 (1924) 135-157

- Eissfeldt, O. - Hexateuch-Synopse, Leipzig 1922
- Ellenbogen, M. - Foreign Words in the Old Testament: Their Origin and Etymology, London 1962
- Ellermeier, F. - Das Verbum וָחַן in Koh 2:25, ZAW 75 (1963) 197-217
- Elliger, K., Rudolf, W., eds. - Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, Stuttgart 1967/77
- Emerton, J.A. - A Consideration of Some Alleged Meanings of יָדַע in Hebrew, JSS 15 (1970) 145-180
- The Problem of Vernacular Hebrew in the First Century A.D. and the Language of Jesus, JTS 24 (1973) 1-23
- Epstein, I. - The Babylonian Talmud, London 1938
- Ewald, H. - Lehrbuch: Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräische Sprache, Göttingen 1870
- Ferguson, C.A. - Diglossia; in Language Structure and Language Use: Essays by Charles A. Ferguson; Dil, A.S., Stanford 1971
- Fitzmyer, J.A. - The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire, Rome 1967
- Fox, M.V. - Frame-Narrative and Composition in the Book of Qoheleth, HUCA 48 (1977) 83-106
- Freedman, D.N. - The Biblical Languages; in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, Hyatt, J.P. ed.;, London 1966
- The Massoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls: A Study in Orthography, Textus 2 (1962) 87-102 (pp.196-211 in Cross and Talmon, see p. 333)
- Frendo, A. - The "Broken Construct Chain" in Qoh 10:10b, Bibl 62 (1981) 544-545
- Friedrich, J. - Altpersisches und Elamisches, Or 18 (1949) 1-29
- Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik, Rome 1951
- Gai, A. - The Reduction of the Tense (and other categories) of the Consequent Verb in North-West Semitic, Or 51 (1982) 254-256
- Galling, K. - Der Prediger Salomo; in Die Fünf Megilloth, HZAT, Tübingen 1940
- Gelb, I.J. - Thoughts about Ibla: A Preliminary Evaluation, Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 1/1 (1977) 3-30
- Gesenius (Kautzsch-Cowley) - Hebrew Grammar, Oxford 1910
- Gesenius, W.; Buhl, F.; Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament, Leipzig 1921
- Gibson, J.C.L. - Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions: I and II, Oxford 1971
- Canaanite Myths and Legends (second edition), Edinburgh 1978
- Ginsberg, H.L. - The Legend of King Keret, New Haven 1946
- Studies in Koheleth, New York 1950
 - Supplementary Studies in Koheleth, Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research 21 (1952) 35-52
 - Aramaic Proverbs and Precepts; in ANET 1969 427-430
 - The Northwest Semitic Languages; in The World History of Jewish People: 12, Tel Aviv 1970, 102-124,270
 - Ecclesiastes, EJ 6.351-352
- Ginsburg, C.D. - Coheleth, or the Book of Ecclesiastes, London 1861
- Gordis, R. - A Wedding Song for Solomon, JBL 63 (1944) 263-270
- Studies in the Relationship of Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew; in Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume, New York 1945, 173-199

- The Original Language of Qoheleth, JQR 37 (1946) 67-84
 - The Translation Theory of Qoheleth Re-examined, JQR 40 (1949) 103-116
 - Koheleth - Hebrew or Aramaic?, JBL 71 (1952) 93-109
 - Was Koheleth a Phoenician?, JBL 74 (1955) 103-114
 - Qoheleth and Qumran: A Study of Style, Bibl 41 (1960) 395-410
 - Koheleth - The Man and His World, New York 1968³
 - The Word and the Book: Studies in Biblical Language and Literature, New York 1976
- Gordon, C. - Azitawadd's Phoenician Inscription, JNES 8 (1949) 108-115
- Ugaritic Literature, Rome 1949
 - Ugaritic Manual, Rome 1955
 - North Israelite Influence on Post-Exilic Hebrew, IEJ 5 (1955) 85-88
 - Ugaritic Textbook, Rome 1965
- Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. - Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents, Scripta Hierosolymitana 4 (1958) 101-37
- ed.; Comparative Semitic Linguistics, Jerusalem 1974
- Graetz, H. - Kohelet, Leipzig 1871
- Greenfield, J.C. - The Lexical Status of Mishnaic Hebrew, Yale University 1956
- Review of, Qoheleth by H.L. Ginsberg; JBL 82 (1963) 351-353
 - Lexicographical Notes I, HUCA 29 (1958) 203-228
 - Review of, Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramäismen im alttestamentliche Hebräisch by M. Wagner; JBL 87 (1968) 232-234
 - The Small Caves of Qumran, JAOS 89 (1969) 128-141
 - The Prepositions 'AD/'AL in Aramaic and Hebrew, BSOAS 40 (1977) 371-372
 - Some Reflections on the Vocabulary of Aramaic in Relationship with the Other Semitic Languages; in *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di linguistica camito-semitica*, Fronzaroli P., ed., Firenze 1978, 151-156
- Grintz, J.M. - Hebrew and the Spoken and Written Language in the Last Days of the Second Temple, JBL 79 (1960) 32-47
- Guillaume, A. - The Unity of the Book of Job, The Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society IV (1964) 26-46
- Studies in the Book of Job, Leiden 1968
- Gul'kowitzsch, L. - Die Bildung von Abstraktbegriffen in der hebräischen Sprachgeschichte, Leipzig 1931
- Gunkel, H. - Die Psalmen, Göttingen 1926
- Hammershaimb, E. - On the So-called Infinitivus Absolutus in Hebrew; in *Semitic Studies Presented to G.R. Driver*; Thomas, D.W. and McHardy eds., Oxford 1963, 85-94
- Hengstenberg, E.W. - Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes, 1869
- Harris, Z.S. - Development of the Canaanite Dialects, New Haven 1939
- Hertzberg, H.W. - Der Prediger, KAT XVII 4, Gütersloh 1963²
- Herzfeld, L. - קהלת, Braunschweig 1838
- Hitzig, F. - Der Prediger Salomos, Leipzig 1883
- Hoftijzer, J. - Dictionnaire des Inscriptions semitiques de l'Ouest, Leiden 1965
- Remarks Concerning the Use of the Particle 't in Classical Hebrew, OS 14 (1965) 1-99

- Hruby, K. - 'La survivance de la langue hebraïque pendant le period post-exilienne, Memorial du Cinquenaire Ecoles des langues orientales de l'Institute catholique de Paris, Paris 1964, 109-120
- Huesman, J. - The Infinitive Absolute and the Weak waw++ Perfect Problem, *Bibl* 37 (1956) 410-434
- Hummel, H.D. - Enclitic Mem in Early Northwest Semitic, Especially Hebrew, *JBL* 76 (1957) 85-107
- Hurvitz, A. - The Chronological Significance of "Aramaisms" in Biblical Hebrew, *IEJ* 18 (1968) 234-240
 - בין לשון ללשון, Jerusalem 1972
 - Linguistic Criteria in Dating Problematic Biblical Texts, *Hebrew Abstracts* 14 (1973) 74-79
- Isserlin, B.S.J. - Epigraphically attested Judean Hebrew, and the question of "upper class" (official) and "popular" speech variants in Judea during the 8th-6th centuries B.C., *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 2 (1972) 197-203
- Japhet, S. - The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew, *VT* 18 (1968) 330-371
- Jastrow, M. - A Gentle Cynic, Philadelphia 1919
 - A Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature, New York 1926
- Jenni, E. - Das Wort 'ōlām im Alten Testament, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 1-35
 Jerusalem Bible, The - Garden City 1966
- Jirku, A. - Zum Infinitivus absolutis im Ugaritischen, *Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung* III 1, 111-115
- Johnson, B. - Hebräisches Perfekt und Imperfekt mit vorangehende w^e , *Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series* 13, Lund 1979
- Johnston, D. - The Authorship of Ecclesiastes, London 1880
- Jouon, P. - L'emploi du participe et du parfait dans l'Ecclesiaste; in "Notes de syntax hebraïque", *Bibl* 2 (1921) 225-226
 - Grammaire de l'hebreu biblique, Rome 1965²
- Kassowski, H. - Concordance to the Mishna, Jerusalem 1965
- Kaufman, S.A. - The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic, Chicago 1974
- Kautzsch, E. - Die Aramäismen im Altentestament, Halle 1902
- Kitchen, K.A. - The Ancient Orient and the Old Testament, London 1966
- Klausner, J. - The Origin of the Mishnaic Language, *Scripta Universata-tis Atque Bibliothecae Hierosolymitanarum. Orientalia et Judaica: I*, Jerusalem 1923, Essay XI
- Knudtzon, J.A. - Die El-Amarna Tafeln, Leipzig 1907
- Koehler, L. - Lexikologisch-Geographisches, *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 62 (1939) 115-125
- Koehler, L.; Baumgartner, W.; Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament, Leiden 1953
- König, E. - Historisch-Comparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache, Volume III of Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprachen, Leipzig 1897
 - Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik im Bezug auf die biblische Literatur Leipzig 1900
- Kopf, L. - Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch, *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215
- Kraus, H.J. - Psalmen I, Neukirchen 1960

- Kroeber, R. - Der Prediger, Berlin 1963
- Kropat, A. - Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik, BZAW XVI, Giessen 1909
- Kuhn, K.G. - Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten, Göttingen 1960
- Kutscher, E.Y. - בבואה של הארמית בעברית, Tarbiz 33 (1963/64) 118-130
- Mischnisches Hebräisches, Rocznik Orientalistyczny 28 (1964) 35-43
 - Mittelhebräisches und Judisch-Aramaisch im Neuen Köhler-Baumgartner, VTS 16 (1967) 158-175
 - Aramaic; in Current Trends in Linguistics, VI; Seboek, T.A., ed.; The Hague-Paris 1970
 - Hebrew Language, EJ Supplement 1583-1607
 - The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a), Leiden 1974
- Lipinski, E. - Skn et sgn dans le semitique occident du nord, UF V (1973) 191-207
- Lauha, A. - Kohelet, Neukirchen 1978
- Levi, I. - The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, Leiden 1951
- Levy, M.L. - Das Buch Qoheleth, Leipzig 1912
- Lloyd, J. - An Analysis of the Book of Ecclesiastes, London 1874
- Lohfink, N. - melek, šallîṯ und mōšēl bei Kohelet und die Abfassungkeit des Buchs, Bibl 62 (1981) 535-543
- Loretz, O. - Qoheleth und der Alte Orient, Freiburg 1964
- Lys, D. - L'Ecclesiaste ou Que vaut la vie?, Paris 1977
- Magnanini, P. - Sull'origine litteraria dell'Ecclesiaste, Annali dell' Instituto Orientale di Napoli NS 18 (1968) 363-384
- Malamut, A. - The Arameans; in Peoples of Old Testament Times, Wiseman, D.J., ed., Oxford 1973, 134-155
- Mandelkern, S. - Veteris Testamenti Concordentiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, Lipsiae 1925
- Mansoor, M. - Some Linguistic Aspects of the Qumran Texts, JSS 3 (1958) 40-54
- Margain, J. - Essais de Sémantique sur l'Hebreu Ancien, Paris 1976
- Margoliouth, G.G. - Book of Ecclesiastes, JE 32-33
- Martin, M. - The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls: I and II Louvain 1958
- Martin, W.J. - The Hebrew of Daniel; in Some Problems in the Book of Daniel, Wiseman, D.J., ed., London 1965
- Mayrhofer, M. - Eine Neue Ta'anach-Tafel und ein Indo-Arischer Name, Anzeiger der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 109 (1972) 119-121
- McNeile, A.H. - An Introduction to Ecclesiastes, Cambridge 1904
- Meek, T.J. - The Syntax of the Sentence in Hebrew, JBL 64 (1945) 1-13
- Memoirs de la Délégation en Perse, Paris 1900
- Milik, J.T. - Le Travail d'Edition des Manuscrits du Désert de Juda, VTS 4 (1954) 17-26
- Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea, Nappersville 1959
 - Textes Hebreux et Araméens; in Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan, Benoit, Milik, de Vaux, eds., Oxford 1961, 70, 155-167
 - Le rouleau de cuivre provenant de la grotte 3Q (3Q15); in Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan III, Baillet, Milik, de Vaux, eds., Oxford 1962, 201-317

- Miller, C.H. - The Infinitive Construct in the Lawbooks of the Old Testament, CBQ 32 (1970) 222-226
- Montgomery, J.A. - Notes on Ecclesiastes, JBL 43 (1924) 241-244
- Moore, C.A. - Esther, Anchor Bible, Garden City 1971
- Morag, S. - Review of, Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentliche Hebräisch by M. Wagner; JAOS 92 (1972) 298-300
- Moran, W.L. - The Use of the Canaanite Infinitive Absolute as a Finite Verb in the Amarna Letters of Byblos, JCL (1950) 169-172
- Muilenberg, J. - A Qoheleth Scroll from Qumran, BASOR 135 (1954) 20-28
- New American Standard Version, The - La Habre 1971
- New English Bible, The - Cambridge 1970
- Nöldeke, Th. - Mandäische Grammatik, Halle 1875
- Bemerkungen zum hebräischen Ben Sira, ZAW 20 (1900) 81-94
 - Die Aramaismen im Alte Testament untersucht von E. Kautzsch, ZDMG 57 (1903) 412-421
 - Semitic Languages, Encyclopaedia Britannica 24, p.623, Cambridge 1911¹³
- Noth, M. - Überlieferungsgeschichte Studien, Halle 1943
- Das Buch Joshua, Tübingen 1952
 - The History of Israel, New York 1960
- Nötscher, F. - Kohelet; Echter Bibel, Würzburg 1959
- Nyberg, H.S. - Studien zum Hoseabuche, Uppsala 1935
- Odeberg, H. - Qoheleth, Uppsala 1929
- Oesterly, W.O.E. - The Psalms, London 1953
- Ogden, G.S. - Historical Allusion in Qoheleth 4:13?, VT 30 (1980) 309-315
- Palache, J.L. - Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon, Leiden 1959
- Paton, L.B. - A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther; ICC, Edinburgh 1908
- Payne, J. Barton - An Outline of Hebrew History, 1954
- Pedersen, J. - Scepticisme israelite, Revue d'Historie et de Philosophie Religieuses 10 (1930) 317-370
- Peisker, C.H. - Hebräische Wortkunde, Göttingen 1962
- Perles, F. - Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testament I, Leipzig 1895
- Piottó, F. - Osservazioni su alcuni usi linguistici dell' Ecclesiaste Bibbia e Orient 19 (1977) 49-56
- Osservazioni su alcuni problemi esegetici nel libro dell' Ecclesiaste, Bibbia e Orient 20 (1978) 169-181
- Plumptre, E.H. - Ecclesiastes, Cambridge 1881
- Podechard, E. - L'Ecclesiastes; Paris 1912
- Polzin, R. - Late Biblical Hebrew, Missoula 1976
- Pope, M.H. - Job, Anchor Bible, Garden City 1965
- Powell, H.H. - The Supposed Hebraisms in the Grammar of the Biblical Aramaic, Berkeley 1907
- Pritchard, J.B. ed. - Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament, Princeton 1969³
- Rabin, C. - Qumran Studies, Oxford 1957
- The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew; in Scripta Hierosolymitana 4 (1958) 144-161

- Etymological Miscellanea, Scripta Hierosolymitana 8 (1961) 384-400
- Hebrew; in Current Trends in Linguistics, VI; Seboek, T.A., ed.; The Hague-Paris 1970
- A Short History of the Hebrew Language, Jerusalem 1974
- מלים זרות, in אנצקלופדיה מקראית, ד, 1070-1080
- Radday, Y.T.; Leb, G.M.; An Analytical Linguistic Key-Word-In-Context Concordance to Esther, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Wooster 1978
- Rainey, A.F. - A Study of Ecclesiastes, Concordia Theological Monthly 35 (1964) 148-157
- A Second Look at Amal in Qoheleth, Concordia Theological Monthly 36 (1965) 805
- Rankin, O.S. - Ecclesiastes, The Interpreter's Bible, New York 1956 47-49
- Ranston, H. - Ecclesiastes and the Early Greek Wisdom Literature, London 1925
- Redford, D.B. - A Study of the Biblical Story of Joseph, VTS 20 1970
- Reider, J. - Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew, VT 2 (1952) 113-130
- Reif, S.C. - Review of, Koheleth: His Language and Thought by C.F. Whitley, VT 31 (1981) 120-126
- Rendsburg, G. - Evidence for a Spoken Hebrew in Biblical Times, Dissertation, New York 1980
- Laqtil Infinitives: Yiph'il or Hiph'il?, Or 51 (1982) 231-238
- Revised Standard Version, The - Grand Rapids 1952
- Ronzewalle P.S. - L'Alphabet du Sarcophage d'Ahiram, Melanges de L'Université Saint Joseph 12(1927) 1-40
- Rosen, H.B. - Zur Vorgeschichte des Relativsatzes im Nordwestsemitischen, Arch Or 27 (1959) 186-198
- Rosenthal, F. - Review of, The Legend of King Keret by H.L. Ginsberg, Or 16 (1947) 399-402
- A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic, Wiesbaden 1961
- Rowley, H.H. - The Aramaic of the Old Testament, London 1929
- Rubenstein, A. - A Finite Verb Continued by an Infinitive Absolute in Biblical Hebrew, VT 2 (1952) 362-367
- Salters, R.B. - Notes on the History of Interpretation of Qoheleth 5:5, ZAW 90 (1978) 95-101
- Saydon, P.P. - Meanings and Uses of the Particle 'T, VT 14 (1964) 192-210
- Schechter, S.; Taylor, C.; The Wisdom of Ben Sira, Cambridge 1899
- Schlumberger, D. - La Palmyrène du Nord-Ouest, Paris 1951
- Scott, R.B.Y. - Proverbs; Ecclesiastes, Anchor Bible, New York 1965
- Segal, M.H. - A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew, Oxford 1958²
- Mishnaic Hebrew, Oxford 1909
- Hebrew in the Period of the Second Temple, International Journal of Apocrypha 23 (1910) 79-82
- Seidel, M. - Heker Millim, Debir 1 (1923) 33
- Siegeried, D.C. - Prediger und Hoheslied, Göttingen 1898
- Snaith, N.H. - The Book of Job, London 1968
- Sola-Sole, J.M. - L'infinitif semitique, Paris 1961

- Speiser, E.A. - The "Elative" in West Semitic and Akkadian, JCS 6 (1952) 81-92
- Sperber, A. - A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, Leiden 1966
- Stade, B. - Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik, Leipzig 1879
- Strauss, D. - Sprachliche Studien in den hebräischen Sirach-Fragmenten, Zurich 1900
- Striedl, H. - Untersuchung zur Syntax und Stilistik des hebräischen Buches Esther, ZAW 55 (1937) 73-108
- Thomas, D.W. - The Language of the Old Testament; in Record and Revelation, Robinson, H.W., ed., Oxford 1938, 374-402
- A Note on *בְּמִדְעָה*, Eccles. X:20, JTS 1 (1949) 177
- Tomback, R. - A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages, Missoula 1978
- Torrey, C.C. - The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah, BZAW II 1896
- The Question of the Original Language of Qoheleth, JQR 39 (1948) 151-160
- Tyler, T. - Ecclesiastes, London 1874
- Ullendorf, E. - Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?, BSOAS 34 (1971) 241-255
- Vanderkam, J. - BHL in Psalm 2:5 and its Etymology, CBQ 39 (1977) 245-250
- Vincent, L.H. - Les Fouilles de Byblos, RB 34 (1925) 161-193
- Virolleaud, C. - Palais Royal d'Ugarit, II, III, V, Paris 1957-1965
- Von Soden, W. - Akkadisches Handwörterbuch, Wiesbaden 1959ff
- Akkadisch *hāšum* I "sich sorgen" und hebräisch *hūš* II, UF I (1969) 197
- Wagner, M. - Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentliche Hebräisch, BZAW 96 (1966) Berlin
- Watson, W.G.E. - Archaic Elements in the Language of Chronicles, Bibl 53 (1972) 191-207
- Watts, J.W. - A Survey of Syntax in the Hebrew Old Testament, Nashville 1951
- Whitley, C.F. - Koheleth: His Language and Thought, BZAW 148 (1978) Berlin
- Koheleth and Ugaritic Parallels, UF 11 (1979) 811-824 (this source is quoted only once in this study; p.21; all other references to Whitley are to the volume above)
- Whybray, R.N. - Koheleth, Preacher of Joy, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 23 (1982) 87-98
- Wildeboer, D.G. - Der Prediger, Freiburg 1898
- Williams, R.J. - Hebrew Syntax: An Outline, Toronto 1976²
- Wilson, A.M. - The Particle *nx* in Hebrew, Hebraica (1890) 139-150, 212-224
- Wilson, R.D. - Aramaisms in the Old Testament, Princeton Theological Review 23 (1925) 234-266
- Wright, C.H.H. - Ecclesiastes in Relation to Modern Criticism and Pessimism, London 1883
- Yadin, Y. - Expedition D, IEJ 11 (1961) 47
- The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada, Jerusalem 1965
- Zapletal, V. - Das Buch Koheleth, Freiburg 1905

- Zimmerli, W. - Das Buch des Predigers Salomo, Göttingen 1962
- Zimmermann, F. - The Aramaic Provenance of Qohelet, JQR 36 (1945/46)
17-45
- The Question of Hebrew in Qohelet, JQR 40 (1949) 79-102
 - The Inner World of Qohelet, New York 1973
 - Biblical Books Translated from the Aramaic, New York 1975
- Zorell, F. - Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum Veteris Testamenti,
Rome 1954