

The Distinctive Aims of the Göttingen Apparatus: Examples from Ecclesiastes – An Edition in Preparation

PETER J. GENTRY

Introduction

The difference between creating critical editions of classical texts and of the text of the Septuagint is primarily twofold: (1) the text of the Septuagint is a translation, and (2) the text of the Septuagint is a canonical and sacred text for both Jews and Christians. The fact that the text is a translation establishes immediately two different approaches to the study of the text: (1) one approach aims to determine the meaning intended by the translator, and (2) another aims to determine the meaning as understood by the communities reading and using this translation throughout the entire history of textual transmission. The canonical character of the text affects both approaches to the study of the text. For both translators and tradents, the text was the Word of God. The apparatus, therefore, of a critical and scientific reconstruction of the earliest form of the text does not simply serve scholars and students by providing information crucial to the constitution of the critical text. A complete and full history of the transmission of the text is necessary to serve the aims and approaches just stated.

Below an eclectic assortment of problems in the textual transmission of LXX Ecclesiastes are examined and evaluated. This exercise demonstrates not only how to make use of the data in the apparatuses to assess the reconstruction of the earliest form of the text as proposed by the editor, but also shows how issues which might be considered by some scholars to be secondary to the constitution of the text are inextricably intertwined and of potential significance to disciplines only laterally related to the study of the Septuagint. For each example presented, the Masoretic Hebrew Text is provided alongside a sample text drawn from the forthcoming Göttingen Edition of Ecclesiastes to aid in determining and distinguishing the approach of the translator from copyist errors made subsequent to the time of translation.

Inner Greek Corruptions

Each translator followed a different approach to the task of translation. Broadly speaking, all translations can be categorised on a continuum between extreme formal and quantitative correspondence from source to target language on the

one hand and dynamic, functional correspondence or free translation on the other. The person who produced the translation in Greek we now know as Ecclesiastes followed an approach of extreme formal and quantitative correspondence between Greek and Hebrew so that for almost one hundred years his work was mistaken for that of Aquila himself. As a result, there are parts of this translation that are difficult for even a native speaker of Hellenistic Greek to comprehend unless they also knew Hebrew and could consult the Hebrew source text. Since scribes who copied the text did not know Hebrew and had no recourse to the parent text, sometimes they corrected the text on the basis of the context in order to improve the sense. These are commonly referred to as inner Greek corruptions. Consider, first, the case of 4:9-10a.

4:9-10a¹

MT

4:9 טובים השנים מן האחד
אשר יש להם שכר טוב בעמלם

4:10a כי אם יפלו האחד יקים את חברו

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

4:9 ἀγαθοὶ οἱ δύο ὑπὲρ τὸν ἕνα,
οἷς ἔστιν αὐτοῖς μισθὸς ἀγαθὸς ἐν μόχθῳ αὐτῶν.

4:10a οὗτι ἐὰν πέσωσιν, ὁ εἷς ἐγερεῖ τὸν μέτοχον αὐτοῦ

A B C S (870) 998 O L C^o d k min verss

10 πέσωσιν] absc 870 Did 126,9 126,10; πεση 411 L⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ (-σει 261) C⁻²⁹⁹ (-σει 609) 443 La¹⁶⁰ Hi 286,116 287,140 Aeth Arm Did^{lem} 124,12 Ps.CatA 1103 Amb Ep 81,3.6 *ter Inst virg* 11,74 Chrom *Matth* 22,3,5.6 *ter PetrChr* 170,5 = Ald Vulg | ὁ εἷς] inc C; > 534; + ο ετερος 411 L⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ C⁻²⁹⁹ Amb *Inst virg* 11,74 Chrom *Matth* 22,3,5 = Ald | ἐγερει 870] ...]ρει Did^{lem} 124,11 (sed hab Did^{com} 124,14 127,13); εγειρει S A 998 (εγει[...]) 475 L⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ 261 C⁻²⁹⁹ 390-260 254' 248 296 311 339 547 645 706 728 766 Syh Antioch 1676 Dam^{M^{PM}} PsChr (inc C; sed hab Aeth Anton 1108 Dion^{lem} 227 Met IV.1,3,45 Ol = Gra Ra) = Ald; εγειρη 261 390-dII^{-260 561} 698 (εγηρη); εγειρι 342-357 155 336 534 548; εγεροι Dam^{A^A}; + τον ενα 357 | μέτοχον] μετεχοντα 139-147-159-503-560-798; πλησιον 336'

10 πέσωσιν] α' σ' θ' ὁμοίως τοῖς ο' πέσωσιν Syh

The Hebrew Text can be rendered as follows:

9 Two are better than one when they have a good reward for their labour;
10a for if they fall, the one can lift up his partner.

1 See P. J. GENTRY, *Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Rôle of the Syro-Hexapla*, in: *Aramaic Studies* 1.1 (2003), 5–28, here 11–12. Here analysis is considerably expanded.

In verse 10a, the end of the protasis and the beginning of the apodosis is clearly marked in MT by the fact that the verb יָפַל is in pause. According to the critical reconstruction of the Greek text, the translation is literal and the translator has fastidiously followed the order of the words in his source text:

- 9 Better are two than one,
 because they have a good reward in their toil.
10 For if they fall, the one will raise his partner up²

Nonetheless, for scribes copying the Greek text without any knowledge of the Hebrew, delimiting the protasis and apodosis was not so transparent. Instead of both people falling down and each having a partner to help him get up, the position of δ $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\zeta$ naturally suggests a singular verb so that one of them falls and the other person who remains standing is the one who raises his fallen comrade. In this case δ $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\zeta$ belongs to the protasis and is construed as the subject of the verb $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ and the form is corrected from Third Person Plural to Third Person Singular $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta$. Since δ $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\zeta$ is now no longer understood as the subject of $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\rho\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$, the same scribes supplied δ $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ as an explicit subject. It is now abundantly clear, contrary to the source text, that the benefit of two is that when only one falls, the other person who is still standing can then raise his fallen comrade.

The first lemma in the apparatus is $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\sigma\iota\nu$. Immediately following the square bracket is absc 870, Did. 870 is a IV-V Century papyrus and Did refers to the Tura Papyrus preserving the Commentary on Ecclesiastes of Didymus the Blind deriving from the IV Century. The siglum absc is an abbreviation for *abscissus* and indicates that these extremely early sources are damaged at this point and so cannot be used as witnesses in this problem. Following the semi-colon is the variant $\pi\epsilon\sigma\eta$, the Third Person Singular Aorist Active Subjunctive. This reading is supported by 411, a manuscript frequently related to the hexaplaric or *O* group and so in the order in the apparatus is placed just after the uncials and papyri as indicated by the *Kopfleiste*. The siglum *L*, representing the Lucianic recension, follows 411, since Lucian based his revision on a hexaplaric text. Following the symbol *L* is -(125) in superscript. This means that all members of the Lucianic group except 125 support the variant $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta$. The number 125 is in parentheses to show that this is due to a larger omission in this manuscript. If one consults the *Einleitung* one will see that MS 125 has a number of large lacunae. Next is *C'*. Upper case italicised *C* refers to the main group of Catena manuscripts and the prime indicates the addition of the first sub-group designated *cI*; so $C' = C + cI$. In the Ecclesiastes Edition, *cI* represents a group of five manuscripts which are not Catena manuscripts, but whose text is derived from the biblical text of manuscripts in the tradition represented by *C*. Following the symbol *C'* is -299 in superscript. This means all twenty manuscripts comprising $C + cI$ except 299 have the variant

2 P. J. GENTRY, Ecclesiast, in: A. PIETERSMA / B. G. WRIGHT (edd.), A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title (NETS), Oxford/New York 2007.

πέση. Here MS 299 is not in parentheses and can be automatically assumed to support the lemma πέσωση unless it is listed in support of another variant. Since there is only one variant to the lemma, 299 can be assumed to have the lemma (*e silentio*).

Following the siglum *C'* in parentheses is (-σει 609) indicating that one of the members of the *cI* group has an itacistic variant but may nonetheless be considered to support the variant πέση. The same is true for MS 261 of the *L* group, which also supports the variant πέση. Finally, from a list of some thirty unclassified minuscules, only 443 also has πέση.

Following the main witnesses – the Uncials, Papyri, and Minuscules – are listed the evidence of the Early Daughter Versions and then the Church Fathers. Greek Fathers are listed first and Latin Fathers afterwards. Normally all citations in the first five hundred years are listed for Greek Fathers. Here we have a citation of this verse of Ecclesiastes in Catena fragments of Didymus the Blind's Commentary on the Psalms critically edited by E. Mühlenberg. This is significant since the witness of the Commentary on Ecclesiastes by Didymus was not preserved at this point. While citations from the Church Fathers may not always be the most reliable witness to a text for a variety of reasons, at the same time they do represent indirectly Greek manuscripts that are older than most of the witnesses to the text and so can be of great importance. In this case we see that the reading of the Lucianic and Catena groups goes back to an earlier point in the textual transmission than the date of the manuscripts in these groups.

No less than eight citations from three Latin Fathers are listed in a concise fashion. The principle for citing the Latin Fathers differs slightly from that for citing the Greek Fathers, as it relates to the problem of the Old Latin, which may be adapted and summarised from my Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint as follows:

Unfortunately no manuscripts exist of the text of the Old Latin for Ecclesiastes. Apart from citations in the Latin Fathers, there are three secondary sources to be noted. First is Jerome's Commentary on Ecclesiastes which reproduces the entire text in its lemma.³ Rahlfs used the siglum La for this source in his *Handausgabe*. This contravenes the principles of the Göttingen Editions as La properly designates only manuscripts of the Old Latin. Hence the siglum Hi is used here and also in the forthcoming Göttingen Edition. Second, approximately 26 verses of the Old Latin of Eccl are found alongside Job and fragments of Proverbs and Canticles in Cod. 11 of the Stiftsbibliothek in St. Gallen (Eighth Century).⁴ The siglum for this text is La¹⁶⁰. Third, we

3 M. ADRIAEN (ed.), *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Commentarius in Ecclesiasten* (CCSL 72), Turnhout 1959.

4 C. P. CASPARI, *Das Buch Hiob (1,1–38,16) in Hieronymus's Uebersetzung aus der alexandrinischen Version nach einer St. Galler Handschrift saec. VIII* (Christiania Videnskabs-Selskabs Forhandling 4), Christiania 1893.

have marginal notes made in 1561 in a Spanish Vulgate Bible from a now lost Tenth Century Valvanera Abbey Bible, indicated by the siglum La⁹⁴.⁵

Rahlfs' main source for the Old Latin, then, was the lemma of Jerome's Commentary – what kind of a source, we shall soon see. Significant articles published by A. Vaccari⁶ and S. Leanza⁷, in 1958 and 1987 respectively, argue that Jerome's work on Ecclesiastes had three stages: (1) first, he revised the Old Latin on the basis of the LXX, (2) second, he made a translation based directly upon the Hebrew but dependent upon the Old Latin, (3) thirdly, he made a translation based upon the Hebrew and completely independent of the Old Latin.⁸ According to Vaccari and Leanza, La¹⁶⁰ is a witness to the first stage, the Bible Text of the Commentary represents the second stage, and the Vulgate represents the third stage. Leanza differs from Vaccari in that while Vaccari treats the Bible Text of the Commentary as the Old Latin corrected occasionally towards the Hebrew, Leanza sees it as a new translation indebted somewhat to the Old Latin.⁹ Jerome explicitly states in his Commentaries on the Psalms and the Letter to Titus that he went to Caesarea and used Origen's Hexapla there.¹⁰ He made extensive notes from the Hexapla which he used both for his Commentary on Ecclesiastes and for the later translation in the Vulgate.

Analysis based upon my own inductive study demonstrated that the biblical lemma of Jerome's Commentary was spontaneously and sporadically corrected towards the Hebrew.¹¹ He was also aided and influenced in this "on-the-fly" revision of the Old Latin by the Jewish revision of Symmachus. Normally, then, accurate determination of the Old Latin from La¹⁶⁰ and Jerome's Commentary is problematic and emphasises the importance of citations in the Latin Fathers. As a general rule, only quotations in the Latin Fathers which are clearly not from the Vulgate are referenced in the Apparatus. In this instance, since the Third Person Singular verb is obviously not a correction to the Hebrew Text, the citations of the Latin Fathers along with the evidence of both the lemma and commentary of Jerome's Commentary and La¹⁶⁰ clearly attest the almost lost text of Old Latin. This witness can be combined with the citation in Didymus to show how early this inner Greek corruption entered the textual transmission of the Septuagint Ecclesiastes. The same could be said of the value of citing the Armenian and Ethiopic daughter

-
- 5 Collations for the Göttingen Edition are based upon a photograph of the manuscript. Recently I discovered that María Ángeles Márquez is preparing a critical edition of these marginal notes and has graciously shared with me a preliminary version of her text. Almost identical are glosses in the margin of a Twelfth Century Bible. See MSS 94 and 95 in R. GRAYSON, *Altlateinische Handschriften / Manuscripts Vieux Latins*, vol. 1, Freiburg i.Br. 1999.
- 6 A. VACCARI, *Recupero d'un lavoro critico di S. Girolamo*, in: A. VACCARI, *Scritti di Erudizione e di filologia*, Vol. 2 (SeL 67), Roma 1958, 83–146.
- 7 S. LEANZA, *Le tre versioni geronimiane dell'Ecclesiaste*, in: ASEs 4 (1987), 87–108.
- 8 I am indebted to my colleague Professor Gregg Allison for expert and gracious help in reading the Italian.
- 9 LEANZA, *Le tre versioni geronimiane dell'Ecclesiaste*, here 98.
- 10 Jerome, *Commentariolus in Psalmos* I,4 and *Epist. Tit.* II,9 (PL 26, 734).
- 11 This analysis was made before discovery of the articles by Vaccari and Leanza.

versions – these translations were made from Greek manuscripts that are earlier than most of the minuscules cited in the apparatus.

At the end an equal sign shows that the reading $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta$ or the equivalent in Latin is also that of the Aldine and Vulgate. It is the normal practice to collate for the Göttingen Editions the three earliest and most important Printed Editions of the Septuagint, the Complutensian Polyglot (1514–17), Aldine (1518–19), and Sixtine (1587). In Ecclesiastes these editions are based largely on MSS 248, 68, and B respectively. Economy is maintained in the apparatus by citing them only when the Complutensian differs from 248, when the Aldine differs from 68 and when the Sixtine differs from B. This notation in the apparatus here, is important, then, as an instance is recorded where obviously the editors of the Aldine corrected the manuscript they were using as their source on the basis of manuscripts in the Catena tradition. Readers interested in the Latin tradition are saved the trouble of checking the Vulgate as the note indicates that Jerome maintained the Third Person Singular against his Hebrew Text in his translation of the Vulgate.

Readers and users of the edition might well want to know what precisely is the support for $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\sigma\omega$. This can be readily adduced by subtracting the from the *Kopfleiste* manuscripts listed for variants that deviate from the lemma and this yields the following list of witnesses:

B-S-998-68^r A C O 299-III d k 155 248' 252 296' 311 336' 338 339 542 543 547
549 645 698 706 766 795 Syh

According to the principles of the Göttingen Septuaginta, only minuscules, papyri, and uncials can be deduced *e silentio* from the Apparatus. In this case, one daughter version and citations in five patristic sources also support the lemma: Aeth Anton Did^{com} Dion Met Ol. This is indicated by the notation 'sed hab' in parentheses. Thus, the notation (sed hab Aeth Anton 1108 Dion^{lem} 227 Met IV.1,3,45 Ol = Gra.) means that the Ethiopic, and citations from Anton, Dion, Met and Ol have the lemma rather than the variant. This notation also alleviates the necessity to list the source before the square bracket.

The Second Apparatus provides any extant materials from the Jewish revisors. These are normally fragments surviving from Origen's Hexapla. The note $\alpha' \sigma' \theta' \delta\mu\acute{o}\iota\omega\varsigma \tau\omicron\iota\zeta \sigma' \pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\sigma\omega$ represents a retroversion from the Syriac of the Syro-Hexapla. The margin and text of Syh are as follows:

ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ
Syh^{mss}: ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ Index super ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲁ

Approximately 70 notes employing the notation $\delta\mu\acute{o}\iota\omega\varsigma$ are in the margin of Syh in Ecclesiastes. I have discussed the meaning and purpose of notes of this type at length in articles published in *Aramaic Studies*.¹² These marginal notes appear to be

12 See GENTRY, Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Rôle of the Syro-Hexapla; P. J. GENTRY, Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three: The Priority of a New Critical Edition

derived from a different manuscript than the manuscript used as the exemplar for the text of the Syro-Hexapla. In all probability they came from a manuscript in the Catena tradition where the lemma was *πέσῃ* and the purpose of the scholiast was to note that the three Jewish revisors had a reading identical to that of the *o'* text, i.e. the Fifth Column of Origen's Hexapla, i.e. *πέσωσω*, although this reading was not his lemma. A citation from Olympiodorus' Commentary on Ecclesiastes forms part of the Catena at this point and the comment of Olympiodorus makes clear that *πέσωσω* was the reading of the *o'* text.

A solid vertical line in the apparatus separates the variation on the lemma *πέσωσω* from another problem – variants on the lemma *ὁ εἶς*, each divided by a semi-colon. First, inc C indicates that the uncial C, a V century palimpsest, is unreadable at this point. At first, collation for the Göttingen Edition was made from the published collations of Tischendorf.¹³ Later, a careful collation was made from examination of the manuscript in person by Felix Albrecht.¹⁴ Albrecht was able to clarify many readings that were uncertain in the edition of Tischendorf. Nonetheless, this passage remains difficult to read. If, however, new photographic techniques were applied to this manuscript, possibly the under-writing might be accurately read.

MS 534, but not its congeners 68 and 602–613 omitted *ὁ εἶς*. No obvious palaeographic or scribal error is readily apparent as the reason for this. Since 534 has *πέσωσω* in the protasis and the itacistic spelling *εγγεῖσι* in the apodosis, the omission of *ὁ εἶς* does not alleviate the main problem in the text.

A number of witnesses have *ὁ ἕτερος* after *ὁ εἶς* – almost exactly the same witnesses that have the Third Person Singular verb as already noted.

A second solid vertical line introduces another case of variation which at first seems more complex than is really the situation. The lemma of the Göttingen Edition has a Future Active Indicative of *ἐγγείσω*, while a number of manuscripts attest a Present Active Indicative *ἐγγείσει* or a Present / Aorist Active Subjunctive *ἐγγείσῃ*; *εγγεῖσι* is an itacistic spelling in which one cannot determine whether the scribe intended the Present Indicative or Present Subjunctive. Probably the Subjunctive is also an error for the Present Indicative motivated by itacism. The Future Indicative is almost certainly the original text. The Greek Translator renders *yiqtol* forms in Hebrew in 179 instances: in 114 he employed a Future Indicative, in 32 an Aorist Subjunctive – all but one in dependent clauses, in 12 a Present Indicative, in eight a Participle, in four a Present Subjunctive – all in dependent clauses, in four an Aorist Indicative, in four an Infinitive, and in one instance

of Hexaplaric Fragments, in: *Aramaic Studies* 2.2 (2004), 145–174; and P. J. GENTRY, The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes in the Marginal Notes of the Syro-Hexapla, in: *Aramaic Studies* 2.1 (2004), 63–84.

13 C. VON TISCHENDORF, *Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus sive fragmenta utriusque Testamenti e codice Graeco Parisiensi celeberrimo quinti ut videtur post Christum seculi*, Lipsiae 1845.

14 F. ALBRECHT, *Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus. Neue Lesarten zum Septuagintatext des Koheletbuches*, in: *ZAW* 122 (2010), 272–279.

a Present Imperative.¹⁵ None of the cases of Present Indicative are found in the apodosis of conditional sentences. The persistent commitment of the translator to extreme formal and quantitative correspondence between source and target languages makes it highly probable that he employed a Future Indicative here. The fact that a Present General Condition in Greek in which one normally employs a Present Indicative (or rarely Subjunctive, cf. Job 41:18) in the apodosis rather than a Future More Vivid Condition in which one usually employs a Future Indicative in the apodosis easily explains why Greek scribes changed the Future to a Present.¹⁶ The Present General Condition better suits this context.

Condition	Protasis	Apodosis
Present General	ἐάν + Subjunctive	Present Indicative
Future More Vivid	ἐάν + Subjunctive	Future Indicative

Once more, the textual witnesses supporting the lemma may be deduced *e silentio* by subtracting witnesses for variants from the *Kopfleiste* as follows:

B-68^r O-411 299-561 k 161 252 338 443 542 543 549 795

Note that in the *Kopfleiste* 870 is in parentheses. This IV – V Century papyrus contains only excerpts from Ecclesiastes and preserves only part of the text for the page of the Göttingen Edition in question. This warns the reader not to draw conclusions *e silentio*. It is precisely the reason why 870 is listed before the square bracket when it attests the lemma.

Since the Present Indicative is attested as early as 300 in 998 (Hamburger Papyrus Bil. 1), a full listing of the patristic witnesses is important to show that what is proposed as the original text is attested as early as that of the inner Greek corruption. The equals sign followed by the sigla Gra Ra indicates that the reading chosen as original text in the Göttingen Edition was adopted as early the edition of Grabe in 1709,¹⁷ a major milestone in critical editions of the Septuagint.

To return to matter of the witness of 998, note that this is represented in the apparatus as follows: 998 (εγελ[...]). 998 is listed as a witness supporting the variant εγελ[ε]. In parentheses, the reader is shown exactly what is extant in this manuscript: one can clearly read *epsilon*, *gamma*, *epsilon* and a damaged *iota*. Then a lacuna occurs in the papyrus. The editio princeps of the papyrus, however, offers εγελ[ε] as its text.¹⁸ For the Göttingen Edition, I have carefully checked all instances of lacunae in the manuscript against the photographs provided. There is

15 For an exhaustive presentation of all the evidence, see Y. Y. Yi, Translation Technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes. Ph.D. diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville 2005, 141–159.

16 See H. W. SMYTH, Greek Grammar, Cambridge, MA 1920, § 2297, 2336.

17 J. E. GRABE (ed.), Septuaginta Interpretum tomus IV, Oxonii 1709.

18 B. J. DIEBNER / R. KASSER (edd.), Hamburger Papyrus bil. 1. Die alttestamentlichen Texte des Papyrus bilinguis 1 der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg (COr 18), Genève 1989, 247.

no doubt that a iota follows the epsilon, similar to the iota in the word *εγειρε* at the end of the next line. The editors count agreements and disagreements with the major uncials as follows:¹⁹

Agreements with 998	Against 998
B 343	41
S (S ^c) 172 (37)	208 (53)
A 171	211
C 177	155

It is by no means impossible that 998 could have agreed with A and S against B here, but the editors have a predilection for restoring lacunae according to B. At any rate, some uncertainty over the reading of 998, which can be easily gathered from the apparatus, shows again the importance of the patristic testimony to indicate the early date for both the original text and the inner Greek corruption that arose at this point.

Variants Preserved Almost Entirely in Patristic Sources

7:20

MT

כִּי אָדָם אֵין צְדִיק בְּאֶרֶץ
אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה-טוֹב וְלֹא יִחַטָּא

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

7:20 ὅτι ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος ἐν τῇ γῆ,
ὃς ποιήσει ἀγαθὸν καὶ οὐχ ἁμαρτήσεται.

A B C S 998 O L C^r d k min verss

20 ἄνθρωπος] pr o 371; post ἔστιν tr 336' 443 Did^{com} 221,8 Ps.CatA 539 (sed hab Dam Met VII.1,3,81 PsChr Hi Gal 384 Hi^{lem} 309,307); post δίκαιος tr V; > Ath IV 92 Or IV 377,9; cf 3 Reg 8₄₆ | οὐκ ἔστιν] post δίκαιος tr L Ol | om δίκαιος Agnellus 45 Coll Avell 97,9 ConcilCarth Reg 115 ConcilMilev 7 Lucul 810 826 PsAug Ful 197,21 202,12 PsSalo Ecl 1005 Ruf Lev 459 SedScot Eph 1005 Arm^{te}

The quantitative approach of the Greek Translator provides as a literal rendering of the Hebrew Text: “for as to humanity, there is not a just person in the earth who will do good and not sin.” In the Hebrew, the sentence structure entails left dislocation or y movement – an element is removed from the clause and given first

19 DIEBNER / KASSER (edd.), *Hamburger Papyrus bil.* 1., 34.

position.²⁰ Such a literal rendering produces an awkward construction in Greek. Some scribes resolved this by moving *ἄνθρωπος* after the copula. Some scribes omitted *ἄνθρωπος* while others omitted *δίκαιος*. This last variation is attested only by 11 citations in 9 Latin Fathers and by the Armenian.

One of the main principles in the Göttingen Editions is that citations from patristic sources are only given when they support a Greek manuscript. Here the citations from the Latin Fathers do not support any Greek witness. Nonetheless, in conjunction with the Armenian, there is the distinct possibility that a Greek witness did attest the omission just as Greek witnesses also attested other inner Greek “improvements” to an awkward sentence structure. The omission of the word “just” may also represent the Old Latin at this point.

Interdependence of LXX Text-History and Text-History of the Jewish Revisors

6:5²¹

MT נִמְשָׁשׁ לֹא־רָאָה וְלֹא יָדָע
נִחַת לְיָהּ מָה:

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

6:5 καὶ γε ἦλιον οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω,
ἀνάπανσις τούτῳ ὑπὲρ τοῦτον.

A B C S (818) 998 O L C^o d k min⁻⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ verss

5 ἀνάπανσις] *αναπανσεις* B-S-998-68 A O⁻⁶³⁷ d⁻³⁵⁷ 296' 311 547 698 706 752 795 Syh (absc 818; sed hab Met V.5,14,100 Ol Amb Jb 2,4,15 An *Scrip* 1,10 Spec 392,13 Hi Aeth Arm = Gra. Ra **ⲙⲓⲪ**) = Compl; *αναπανσιν* 475-637-411 C^o k 443 766¹ Did 174,27 Fa^{1,2} Sa^{1 II 2,6} ↓; + *και ουκ επιχειραθη διαφορας ετερον (εταιρον 754)πραγματος προς ετερον* d⁻³⁵⁷ ↓; post *τούτῳ* tr 336' | *τούτον*] *τοντο* 601 k; *τοντων* 261 645; *τοντον* 637; + *ουδε επιχειραθη (επιραθη V) διαφορας (διαφθορας 637) ετερον (ετερον 475)πραγματος προς (> 637) ετερον* O 547^{mg} ↓

5 καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω ἀνάπανσις τούτῳ ὑπὲρ τοῦτον] *σ' et non temptavit distantiam alteri rei ad alterum* Syh | *ἀνάπανσις*] *α' σ' θ' requies* Syh

20 If an element is removed and not replaced by a pronoun, the fronting is called y movement. See T. Givón, *Syntax*, 2. Vol., Philadelphia 1984–1990.

21 This problem was briefly discussed earlier; see P. J. GENTRY, ‘The Role of the “Three” in the Text History of the Septuagint’: II. Aspects of Interdependence of the Old Greek and the Three in Ecclesiastes, in: *Aramaic Studies* 4.2 (2006), 153–192, here 172–173. The analysis here is developed further.

Here in 6:5 the textual transmission of the Old Greek (OG) is corrupted by an entire line from Symmachus: *καὶ οὐκ ἐπειράθη διαφορᾶς ἑτέρου πράγματος πρὸς ἕτερον*.

It is possible to demonstrate solely on the basis of principles of textual criticism that this line is clearly secondary in the textual tradition since it is attested by three of the four manuscripts in the *d* group after *ἀνάπανσις* and by the *O* group at the end of the verse. Normally the presence of the same text in different locations is a clear sign of a later insertion to the original text. This is confirmed by the fact that the text begins by *καὶ οὐκ* in *d*⁻³⁵⁷ and by a different clause connector, *οὐδέ*, in the *O* group.

Furthermore, a glance at the Hebrew text shows that the line constitutes a double translation, another clear indication of something secondary in the textual tradition.

Both the lemma and margin of the Syro-Hexapla as well as the lemma of Jerome’s Commentary and the text of the Vulgate are significant for this problem:

Syh	ⲛⲥⲱⲛ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ
	ⲛⲥⲱⲛ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ
Syh ^{mg.} :	ⲛⲥⲱⲛ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ
	ⲛⲥⲱⲛ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ
	ⲛⲥⲱⲛ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ
Hi	<i>nec cognovit, requies huic magis quam illi</i>
Vulg	<i>neque cognovit distantiam boni et mali</i>

While the text of Syh corresponds entirely to the text of 998 A B S alii, a marginal note provides a reading attributed to Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion for the term ‘rest’ and also a longer marginal note attributed to Symmachus. The index for the Symmachus reading although connected to ⲛⲥⲱⲛ supplies an alternative to OG *καὶ οὐκ ἔγνων, ἀνάπανσις τούτῳ ὑπὲρ τούτων*. This text attributed to Symmachus in the Syro-Hexapla matches precisely the additions in the *O* and *d* groups. The rendering *ἐπειράθη* for ⲛⲥⲱⲛ may at first seem strange but the translation “he experienced” is in fact contextually sensitive and is also employed by Symmachus for ⲛⲥⲱⲛ in 8:5, in contrast there as in 6:5 to the equivalent *γνώσκω* used by OG. The rendering *distantiam* in Jerome’s Vulgate Translation is derived from *διαφορᾶς* in Symmachus, while *boni et mali* is a free adaptation of his own. The lemma of Jerome’s Commentary, however, in this case represents the Old Latin uncontaminated by Symmachus and not corrected “on the fly” towards the Hebrew as is sometimes the case with Jerome.

Another problem in the same stretch of text has to do with the word ‘rest’. There are three possibilities: (1) the Nominative Singular *ἀνάπανσις* adopted as the lemma of the Göttingen Edition, (2) the form *ἀναπαύσεις* which could be construed either as Nominative Plural or Accusative Plural supported by the witnesses B-S-68 998 A O⁻⁶³⁷ d⁻³⁵⁷ 296’ 311 547 698 706 752 795 Syh = Compl, and (3) the Accusative Singular *ἀνάπανσιω* supported by the witnesses 637-411

C^o k 260^o 443 766^I Did 174,27 Fa Sa^I. Papyrus 818, dated to the end of the Third Century, is damaged at this point and cannot be used as a witness. Support for the lemma has been provided in parentheses using ‘sed hab’ as only Greek MSS could be determined from the *Kopfleiste e silentio*: C L 357 125^{II} 248^o 252 336^o (post τούτω tr) 338 339 534^o 542 543 549 645 766^{II} Met V.5,14,100 Ol Amb Jb 2,4,15 An *Scrip* 1,10 Spec 392,13 Arm Hi = Gra. Ra. Both Grabe and Rahlfs, earlier editors, have correctly seen the Nominative Singular ἀνάπανσις as the *lectio difficilior* in spite of strong support in terms of character, date, and number of witnesses for the other two variants. Again the problem is one of inner Greek corruption. Due to itacism, the Nominative Singular and Accusative Plural are identical, and the noun is more easily construed as the object of ἔγνω than as subject of a nominal sentence in v. 5b independent of the sentence in v. 5a. Since the construction with the Nominative Singular matches that in the Hebrew, while the Accusative does not, the evidence for inner Greek corruption is clear and persuasive.

Before considering the Accusative Singular variant ἀνάπανσιω, note that a marginal note in the Syro-Hexapla attributes the term ‘rest’ in the singular to all Three revisors. The second marginal note, however, attributes a longer reading to Symmachus for a lemma that overlaps with that for the first note. In combination with the Greek manuscripts in the textual tradition of the OG that are influenced by the Symmachus reading it is clear that Symmachus rendered רַחַץ by διαφορᾶς rather than a form of the noun ἀνάπανσις. The first note, then, can be interpreted in two ways: (1) either only Aquila and Theodotion had ‘rest’ and the attribution to Symmachus is incorrect, or (2) the purpose of the note is to indicate that the Three Revisors had a term in the singular while the lemma has a noun in the plural. In the second scenario, the exact equivalent in lexical terms was not the purpose of the scholiast, only the issue of grammatical number.

Therefore, consideration of the Accusative Singular ἀνάπανσιω attested by the Catena group and part of the O group results in suggesting that this variant is a kind of hyper-correction to the Hebrew text by Greek scribes who had no knowledge of Hebrew or direct access to the Hebrew Text, but used the Three as a sort of guide for this. It may also be just a simple correction based upon better style: the singular is more contextually suitable than the plural. The first mistake involved itacism and construing the noun as object of ἔγνω and then, based on a textual tradition that had ἀναπαύσεις, the Accusative Singular ἀνάπανσιω arose as a stylistic correction or hyper-correction to the Hebrew via the Three.

What the variants in the First and Second Apparatus show, then, is that critical reconstruction of the text of the Three is based on analysis of the textual tradition of OG and *vice-versa*, knowledge of the text of the Three may clarify the textual tradition of the OG.

7:12

MT כִּי בַצֵּל הַהֶכְמָה בַצֵּל הַקְּסֵף

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

7:12 ὅτι ἐν σκιᾷ ἀντήης ἡ σοφία ὡς σκιά τοῦ ἀργυρίου

A B C S 998 O L C^r d k min⁽⁻¹⁵⁵⁾ verss

12 ὅτι] pr σκεπει σοφια ὡς σκεπει το ἀργυριον 503 ↓ | ἐν] η k ; + τη 299 OI^{AT} Co
| σκιᾷ] κακια 357 | ἀντήης] αυτοις 609; αυτον OI^{BHZ}; αυτη 534 OI^{AIKM} | ἡ σοφία]
της σοφιας S^c V; εν σοφια 797; ὡς σοφια 357; om η 253; > 543 | om ὡς σκιά –
σοφίας 357: homoiot | ὡς σκιά] ὡς κακια 571*; ὠ σκια 998 299–571^c 336: haplogr
| om τοῦ B–68' 998 d⁽⁻³⁵⁷⁾ 336' 443 PsChr Sa¹⁶ | ἀργυρίου] ἀργυρον OI^{lemBH}

12 ὅτι – ἀργυρίου] σ' ὅτι (> Hi) ὡς (> 161 248 252 539) σκέπει σοφία ὁμοίως (ὡς
161 248 252 539) σκέπει (+ et Hi) τὸ ἀργύριον 161 248 252 539 (s nom) Hi Syh

An entire line corresponding to 7:12a has been preserved from the revision of Symmachus. This line has been transmitted in Greek in four manuscripts as a marginal note as well as being cited in the Commentary of Jerome and being preserved in Syriac in the margin of the Syro-Hexapla. The Latin and Syriac evidence is as follows:

Hi: quomodo protegīt sapientia, similiter protegīt et pecunia

Syh: ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ . ܘ.

The textual value of the non-Greek witnesses is significant here as Ph. Marshall notes: “both Syh and Hi agree against the Greek MSS in including ὡς (*quomodo* Hi; ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ Syh) before *σκέπει* 1^o and in reading *ὁμοίως* (*similiter* Hi; ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ ܩܘܡܘܕܘܐ Syh) before *σκέπει* 2^o.”²² This reconstruction was already posited by F. Field in 1875.²³ The tradition transmitted in the marginal notes of the four Greek MSS may well represent corruption and influence from the MSS of the OG in respect to the ὡς before the second instance of *σκέπει* in this verse.

The text of the Vulgate is remarkably similar to the text of Symmachus:

Vulgate: sicut enim protegīt sapientia sic protegīt pecunia

W. W. Cannon included the case of 7:12 in his list of instances where Jerome’s Latin Vulgate was influenced by Symmachus.²⁴ Indeed, evidence abounds that demon-

22 Ph. S. MARSHALL, A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Ecclesiastes. Ph.D. diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville 2007, 202.

23 F. FIELD, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt. 2 Vol., Oxonii 1875, vol. 2, 392 n. 25.

24 W. W. CANNON, Jerome and Symmachus: Some Points in the Vulgate Translation of Koheleth, in: ZAW N.F. 4 (1927), 191–199.

strates Jerome's dependence upon readings in Symmachus to guide his translation of the Vulgate. S. D. Weeks, however, has proposed that Jerome's rendering in the Vulgate may be due to his reading *kaph* in his parent Hebrew Text instead of *beth*.²⁵ Yet this suggestion is also a possible explanation for the rendering of Symmachus and even of that of the Old Greek for at least the second *beth* in the line.

With this discussion of the revision of Symmachus in mind, one can clearly see that the text of LXX in only one manuscript, 503, has been corrupted by the reading of the text of Symmachus, producing in fact, a double rendering of the source text at this point. What is also noteworthy is that the variant preserved in the text of 503 corresponds to the tradition for Symmachus that is preserved in the margin of the four Greek MSS 161, 248, 252, 539 in contrast to that preserved by Jerome and Syh. The reading of 503 is hardly significant for the constitution of the text, but reveals a genealogical relation between the tradition in the Catena Group to which 503 belongs and the textual tradition for the text of the Three represented in the four Greek MSS. Such information is of value in sorting out the text history in spite of the fact that the evidence is scant in this instance as well of being of interest to scholars seeking to understand either the Catena tradition or the relationship of Jerome and the Three to the text history of OG.

2:25²⁶

MT כִּי מִי יֵאבֹד לְנֶפֶשׁ יְהוָה וְיָחֹן חַוֵּץ מִמֶּנִּי

Ra ὅτι τίς φάγεται καὶ τίς φείσεται πάρεξ αὐτοῦ;

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

2:25 ὅτι τίς φάγεται καὶ τίς πίεται πάρεξ αὐτοῦ;

A B C S 998 O L⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ C^o d k min vers

25 πίεται] absc 998; φείσεται Hi (*parcet*) Syh (sed hab Dion^{lem} 223 GregNy 364,2 370,22 Ol La^{94 95} PsIgn 227,3 (*bibit*) = Gra. Ra. ↓ | αὐτοῦ] αὐτων 766^{ll}

25 φάγεται] α' φείσεται σ' ἀναλώσει 161^{mg} (ind ad τίς 1^o) 248^{mg} (ind ad φάγεται) | φείσεται] α' σ' ὡσαύτως φείσεται θ' πίεται Syh (ind ad φείσεται)

ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ

Syh^{mg}: ✥ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ. Index super ⲛⲓⲛⲁ

✥ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ. Index super ⲛⲓⲛⲁ

Field: α' σ' ὡσαύτως, φείσεται
θ' πίεται

25 See MARSHALL, *A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Ecclesiastes*, 202.

26 This example cited and taken from GENTRY, *Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three*, here 170–173.

Rahlfs (1935) reconstructs *φείσεται* as OG, as did Grabe before him (1709). His apparatus gives as support OLa†, meaning Origen's recension, the Old Latin and at most not more than one additional manuscript. While we do not know all the reasoning behind Rahlfs' reconstruction, we can safely say that he chose *φείσεται* because the reading better corresponds to the Hebrew parent text, it better approximates Aquila (and he thought the OG Aquila or Aquilanic) and it is supported by both Jerome's Old Latin and the Text of the Syro-Hexapla – the latter being a strong witness for Origen's Text.

One of the most enlightened treatments of this *crux criticorum* is that of Jan de Waard in 1979.²⁷ While he is concerned with establishing the Hebrew text, he provides excellent insights and a good summary of previous solutions. For the reading *φείσεται* he lists Origen's Recension, the Vetus Latina, Aquila and Symmachus as witnesses, also noting *parcet* in Jerome. This looks like five witnesses compared to the two listed by Rahlfs. The reading *parcet* is, in fact, the Old Latin of Rahlfs. So, aside from *α'* and *σ'*, he has only the same two witnesses as Rahlfs. Indeed, since 1935, no further witness for *φείσεται* has come to light. [Recently, A. Schoors has argued for the analysis of Ellermeier that *שׁוּחַ* means to 'fret' or 'worry' against de Waard who argued for the meaning 'enjoy'.²⁸ The central issue, here, however, is not how modern scholars construe the meaning of Ecclesiastes but how the Greek Translator understood his source text.]

Both readings must be considered paleographically: *ΤΙΣΦΕΙΣΕΤΑΙ* versus *ΤΙΣΠΙΗΕΤΑΙ*. If one were to assume a dittography of the sigma, a *ΣΠΙ* could have been read as *ΦΙ*. This would have occurred in the period of the uncials. It assumes *πίεται* is the *lectio difficilior* and *φείσεται* arose solely as an inner-Greek development. Yet this does not explain how *πίεται* dominates the text tradition, and it is a real stretch to confuse the two words on this basis alone.²⁹

One might assume *πίεται* arising as an inner-Greek development as it more naturally goes with *φάγεται*, and *φείσεται* is contextually odd. So *φείσεται* would be the *lectio difficilior*. Yet *πίεται* may be considered just as possibly based upon the same parent text as *φείσεται*. De Waard is worth citing in full here:

27 J. DE WAARD, The Translator and Textual Criticism (with Particular Reference to Eccl 2,25), in: Bib. 60 (1979), 509–529.

28 See A. SCHOORS, The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth, Part II: Vocabulary (OLA 143), Leuven 2004, 384–386. On p. 65 Schoors renders 2:25 “who can eat or who can have enjoyment/worry apart from him?” and on p. 185 he translates “who can eat and who can enjoy (or fret) without him?” Thus Schoors appears to place the solution for which he argues on pp. 384–386 secondary in his renderings.

29 An ingenious solution is proposed by McNeile who suggests that an original *πέσεται* could explain both *πίεται* and *φείσεται* and could be based upon *שׁוּחַ* understood according to the meaning in Aramaic and Post Biblical Hebrew ‘feel pain’ > enjoy. See A. H. MCNEILE, An Introduction to Ecclesiastes, Cambridge 1904, 158. Positing an intermediate step in the process, however, which has no attestation whatsoever, is just too ingenious.

There is no serious reason whatsoever to believe that this reading goes back to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* *yīšteh*. In fact, it can be explained in three different ways: (a) as a *Verlegenheitslesart* and an introduction of the pair *'kl – šth* from verse 24b; (b) as a specific rendering of MT *ga-hūš*, taken in the generic sense of “enjoy”; (c) as the rendering of a Hebrew verb which got lost in Hebrew, but which still exists in Arabic (*hasa* – to drink). Possibilities (a) and (b) are the more probable ones and they are not necessarily mutually exclusive, since the existence of the word pair *'kl – šth* in verse 24b may have inspired the specific rendering. It should at least be noted here that possibility (b) did not get the attention it deserves. Anyway, text-critically one can retain the important conclusion that in none of these cases the reading goes back to a different *Vorlage*.³⁰

If, as I have argued, OG Ecclesiastes is closer to the *καίγει* tradition than to Aquila, the first proposal would fit the translation technique well. I deem it likely that the OG Translator had difficulty with the verb, whether read *שׁוּתָה* or *שׁוּתָה*, and provided a contextually based rendering. It also makes sense that Theodotion retained this text in his revision.

As I have maintained, the marginal notes in the Syrohexapla come from a different manuscript than the manuscript which was the *Vorlage* for the Text. Fifty-five notes have *ὁμοίως τοῖς ο'*, one employs *ὡς* instead of *ὁμοίως* (*ὡς οἱ ο'* 3:10), and fourteen have just *ὁμοίως*. Only 2:25 has *ὡσαύτως*. Normally *ὁμοίως* indicates sources having a text identical to the lemma and *ὁμοίως τοῖς ο'* indicates sources having a text identical to the *ο'* text. The scholiast doubtless had *πίεται* in his text and noted in the margin that “Aquila and Symmachus in like manner had *φείσεται*, while Theodotion had *πίεται*.” He had to add *φείσεται* because it was not his lemma and did not add *τοῖς ο'* because theirs was not equal to the *ο'* text. According to the Colophon for Ecclesiastes in Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus, the parent text for the text of Syh was corrected by Eusebius and Pamphilus.³¹ This can explain why it is not the *ο'* text and why it is different from the *O* Group. It also assumes a different meaning for *ὡσαύτως* from *ὁμοίως*: why should we assume that the two words are used with identical intent or meaning?

The readings of the Three must be carefully sorted out in this passage as well. Field gives *φείσεται* for *α' σ'* and *πίεται* for *θ'* based upon the marginal note in Syh. The reading *ἀναλώσει* attributed to *σ'* in 248 appears to be ignored. The evidence of 248 and Syh are as follows:

248 Ind ad *φάγεται*. Margin: *α' φείσεται σ' ἀναλώσει*.

Syh Ind ad *φείσεται*. Margin: *α' σ' ὡσαύτως φείσεται θ' πίεται*.

When one considers the text in Hebrew and the equivalents normally used by LXX Translators, it is probable that in 248 *ἀναλώσει* is for *φάγεται* and that *φείσεται* is for LXX *πίεται*. Thus Aquila may have read *τίς φάγεται καὶ τίς*

30 DE WAARD, *The Translator and Textual Criticism*, here 522.

31 For a discussion on the colophon and its significance, see GENTRY, *Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Rôle of the Syro-Hexapla*, here 6–7.

φείσεται while Symmachus had *τίς ἀναλώσει καὶ τίς φείσεται*. We may thus assume that the note is correct in both 248 and Syh: both *α'* and *σ'* are similar (*ὡσαύτως*): “Who will spend/eat and who will be thrifty?”, whereas OG and *θ'* have “Who will eat and who will drink?” For proof that this is the correct meaning of *ὡσαύτως* in the marginal note of Syh, see a similar case in 3:11.³² As an aside, it should be noted that a lexicon of the Three would have to assign different meanings for *φείσεται* in the cases of Aquila and Symmachus (the context requires ‘spare’ for Aquila and ‘be thrifty’ for Symmachus) and that this could not be done without first reconstructing a critical text of the Three.

As for the Latin reading *parcet*, the probability that Jerome corrected the Bible Text of his Commentary on the basis of Aquila is strong. La^{94 95} has *bibet* (supported by the citation in Pseudo-Ignatius) and this is much more likely to be the Old Latin.

We can now summarise as follows. The reading *πίεται* is based upon the same parent text as *φείσεται*. It has better claim to fit the translation technique of the OG since OG is not Aquila and closer to Theodotion. Jerome’s Bible Text is not the Old Latin and Syh is probably not Origen’s recension here, but a correction of it based upon Aquila. Rahlfs’ supports for *φείσεται* are removed and we should adopt the reading of the entire Greek manuscript tradition including the Old Latin as in La^{94 95}. Not only does Aquila help us to reconstruct the true OG, but the reconstruction of the OG helps us sort out our hexaplaric witnesses and reconstruct *α'* and *σ'* for the entire verse once we understand the original lemma of the marginal note and the correct meaning of *ὡσαύτως*.

7:6³³

MT

כִּי בְקוֹל הַסִּירִים תִּחַת הַסִּיר

Ra

ὅτι ὡς φωνῆ τῶν ἀκανθῶν ὑπὸ τὸν λέβητα

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

7:6a

ὡς φωνῆ τῶν ἀκανθῶν ὑπὸ τὸν λέβητα

A B C S 998 O L⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ C^o d k min⁽⁻¹⁵⁵⁾ verss

6 ὡς B-S-68^o 998 C^o 357 296^o 311 338 443 645 706 795 Ammon Antioch 1724 Bas III 961 Dam (ωσπερ Dam^{KVRMH^oTL^oA^o} Max II 996) Amb *Exh virg* 11,76 BenA *Conc* 1126 Eugip *Reg* 28,74 *Spec* 557,8 (*et sicut Reg Mag* 179,183) Fa¹ Sa^{1 6}] pr ὅτι (sub * Syh) rel (Did Met VI.8,3,28 PsChr Hi Arab Arm Syh = Ra **Ⲛ Ⲓ** Pesch^{mss} Vulg) ↓

6 ὡς φωνῆ τῶν ἀκανθῶν ὑπὸ τὸν λέβητα] διὰ γὰρ φωνῆν ἀπαιδευτῶν ἐν δεσμοτηρίῳ γίνεται τις 161 248 | τῶν ἀκανθῶν] ἀπαιδευτῶν Syh (Ⲛⲓⲓ Ⲛⲓ)

32 3:11 employs ὡς (ⲙⲣⲥ) whereas 2:25 uses ὡσαύτως (ⲁⲟⲨⲟ).

33 This example is cited and taken from P. J. GENTRY, *Special Problems in the Septuagint Text History of Ecclesiastes*, in: M. H. K. PETERS (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Ljubljana 2007 (SBL.SCS 55), Atlanta 2008, 137–153, here 138–139.

The first problem is presented as background for issues arising later in this study. Rahlfs' Text has $\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota \acute{\omega}\varsigma$ at the beginning of 7:6a. His apparatus shows only that $\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota$ is omitted in B and S. No doubt his choice was based on the fact that the Greek Translation is extremely literal and he could not imagine that the translator would omit a word in his parent text. Moreover Rahlfs believed that the Bible Text of Jerome's Commentary on Ecclesiastes was a reliable source for the Old Latin and therefore one of the earliest witnesses, albeit indirect, to the LXX.

Rahlfs' choice is not sound for a number of reasons. First, as I have shown in other studies, in a few instances he based his edition solely upon Jerome's Text going against the entire manuscript tradition in Greek.³⁴ Good evidence is supplied in my Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint to show that Jerome corrected the Old Latin towards his Hebrew text in an impromptu fashion as he recorded the text of his commentary and so the Bible Text of the Commentary is not a reliable witness to the Septuagint.³⁵ Instead, the citations from the Latin Fathers constitute a better witness to the Old Latin and they all have an equivalent for $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ but not for $\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota$.

Second, the witness of the Syro-Hexapla is important in this problem. The equivalent for $\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota$ is preceded by an asterisk and followed by a metobelus. This is a clear indication that the $\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota$ was not part of the text Origen received as the Septuagint, but was added from one of the Three and appropriately marked to show that the text of the Septuagint was lacking what corresponds to this word in Origen's Hebrew Text. The Syro-Hexapla is one of the most reliable sources for preserving the diacritical marks used in the Fifth Column of the Hexapla and at the beginning of Ecclesiastes in Rahlfs' Text he indicates the Syro-Hexapla in the apparatus as his source for the o' text. He ought to have taken this witness far more seriously.

Third, Rahlfs did not account sufficiently for the fact that in a number of instances, the parent text of the Greek Translator may have differed from MT. At present this is best seen by studying the commentary of Goldman in the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*.³⁶ In this particular problem he proposes the same text as I do for the earliest form of the Old Greek. It is possible that by either haplography in the parent text or by parablepsis due to homoiarcton the Greek Translator read כִּי בְקוֹל instead of כִּי בְקוֹל .

Fourthly, while the text of the O group in this case contaminated a large part of the textual tradition, B S are strongly supported now by 998, the Catena group and a good number of unclassified minuscules. And formal correspondence on the part of the translator is maintained. The decision to banish $\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota$ from the critical edition should not be difficult to acknowledge.

34 See GENTRY, Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three.

35 GENTRY, 'The Role of the "Three" in the Text History of the Septuagint': II. Aspects of Interdependence of the Old Greek and the Three in Ecclesiastes.

36 A. SCHENKER et al. (edd.), General Introduction and Megilloth (BHQ 18), Stuttgart 2004.

8:8d

MT בַּמְלָחָמָה בְּיָמֵינוּRa *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀποστολὴ ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ*

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

8:8d *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀποστολὴ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πολέμου*

 A B C S 998 O L⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ C^{~(-299)} d k min⁽⁻¹⁵⁵⁾ verss

8 *καὶ* 2° ∩ 3° 252 | ἀποστολῆ] υποστολη 543 549 | ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πολέμου = Pesch] *in bello* Hi 316,102 317,117 = ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ Ra. **ⲙⲓ** ↓

8 *καὶ* 2° – πολέμου] σ' οὐδε ἔστι(ν) παρατάξασθαι (-ται 161) εἰς πόλεμον 161 248 252

Rahlfs' *Handausgabe* has ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ instead of ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πολέμου as in the forthcoming Göttingen Edition. The words ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ constitute a conjecture based, no doubt, upon *in bello* in the Bible Text of Jerome and the fact that this was precisely equivalent to MT. Rahlfs' conviction that the OG was, in fact, the rendering of Aquila meant that he did not permit any reading that did not represent complete and precise formal equivalence to the Hebrew Text. Rahlfs also believed that the Bible Text of Jerome's Commentary was an accurate and completely reliable witness to the Old Latin. The Bible Text of Jerome, in fact, represents here his Hebrew Text and not the Old Latin, as he sporadically and spontaneously corrected the Old Latin base for the Bible Text according to the Hebrew. Furthermore, as in many similar situations, there may well also be influence from Symmachus whose translation is functional, yet accurately represents the Hebrew text. As the Second Apparatus shows, the rendering of Symmachus for 8:8d is preserved in marginal notes in three manuscripts as follows: οὐδε ἔστι(ν) παρατάξασθαι εἰς πόλεμον and at least in regard to the prepositional phrase corresponds formally to the Hebrew while ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πολέμου does not. Jerome's rendering in the Vulgate *nec sinitur quiescere ingruente bello* certainly follows the interpretation of Symmachus. All manuscripts of Ecclesiastes have ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πολέμου and this should be taken as the text of OG. It may be that the OG Translator had a different parent text at this point or that due to an error of sight in the process of translation he read מלחמה ם(י)ב instead of MT בַּמְלָחָמָה. It may just be that this is one of a number of places where the OG Translator must be allowed to have a rendering that does not correspond formally to the Hebrew in a mechanical way. Elsewhere I have argued as have other scholars, that LXX Ecclesiastes is definitely not Aquila. The approach to translation fits somewhere within the *καίγε* tradition and is similar to the work of Theodotion. This assessment of translation technique in OG Ecclesiastes allows for the recognition that while the translator is committed to a high level of formal correspondence, there is the possibility, as in the renderings of Theodotion in Job

for example, for some functional renderings and some sporadic and spontaneous departure from an extreme formal and quantitative approach to translation.

The line immediately previous to v. 8d is also relevant, but contains difficult problems. The evidence for the line is supplied and a brief discussion of the problems before returning to the issues involved in 8:8d.

8:8c

MT אִין שְׁלֹשׁ בְּיוֹם הַמָּוֶת

Ra καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξουσία ἐν ἡμέρα τοῦ θανάτου

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

8:8c καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξουσιάζων ἐν ἡμέρα θανάτου

A B C S 998 O L⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ C^{o(-299)} d k min⁽⁻¹⁵⁵⁾ verss

8 ἐξουσιάζων 2°] pr o OI^{AI}; ἐξουσία B-68' 998 357 Georg Fa²³ Sa¹² = Ra | ἐν ἡμέρα 1°] ημερας A; ημεραις 609 | om ἐν 2° OI^{BH} | θανάτου Fa²] pr του O-411 130 542 766¹ Fa³ Sa^{1II2} = Ra 𐤀𐤓; + καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν υποστολη εν ημερα θανατου 543: dittogr | καί 2° ∩ 3° 252

8 NIL

Before considering the relevance of 8:8c for 8:8d, a couple of problems must be discussed.³⁷

For the *Handausgabe* Rahlfs chose ἐξουσία, the reading of B, against ἐξουσιάζων, the reading of S and A. Now that all available sources before 1500 have been collated we can see that B is supported by 998 and its congeners 68 and 534 and one member of the *d* group (357), while the rest of the textual tradition supports S and A. No doubt B and 998 provide an extremely early witness, but we should pause before adopting their witness against the rest of the tradition.

Consideration of the approach and habits of the translator gives us an Archimedean point from which we can gain leverage to move the world in this problem. All four instances of the verb שִׁלַּשׁ in the Hebrew Qoheleth are rendered by ἐξουσιάζω (2:19, 5:18, 6:2, 8:9). The noun or adjective שְׁלֹשׁ is rendered by a participle of ἐξουσιάζω in 8:4 and by the noun ἐξουσία in 8:8, at least according to Rahlfs' Text. The adjective שְׁלֵישׁ is rendered by a participle of ἐξουσιάζω in all three occurrences (7:19, 8:8, 10:5). It is clear that the patterns of the OG Translator constitute a probability against the choice of Rahlfs in 8:8.

Consideration of internal evidence also does not support the choice of Rahlfs very well. If ἐξουσία is, in fact, original, perhaps ἐξουσιάζων arose due to palaeo-

37 The problem of ἐξουσιάζων versus ἐξουσία was analysed and discussed in an earlier paper and is altered slightly here; see GENTRY, *Special Problems in the Septuagint Text History of Ecclesiastes*, here 155–156.

graphic factors from *ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ ΕΝ*, although such an explanation is not highly convincing. Indeed, this argument could provide support for the other reading as well.

If *ἐξουσιάζων* is original, one can easily explain *ἐξουσία* as an attempt to match 8c with the form and structure of 8d so that a noun, *ἐξουσία*, must match the noun *ἀποστολή*. Replacement of *ἐξουσιάζων* by *ἐξουσία* could be an inner Greek corruption.

In conclusion, the weight of external evidence, internal evidence, and the probability of how the translator would work in this instance are against Rahlfs. The variant offered by B and 998 belongs to a group of stylistic corrections to OG characteristic of this part of the textual tradition.

Second, note that the *O* group and 411 as well as four additional minuscules have an article before *θανάτου*. In addition 125^{II} and 542 form a manuscript pair and so count as a single witness, and moreover are related to the text of Syh. This problem is treated by Joseph Ziegler in a magisterial study on the approach of the Greek Translator of Ecclesiastes to articulation – his last work before his death in 1988.³⁸ Normally, nouns in bound phrases which are not articulated in Hebrew are also not articulated in Greek. In approximately 10 instances, individual manuscripts articulate the *nomen rectum*. When the bound phrase is articulated in Hebrew, the *nomen rectum* is articulated also in Greek although in all instances but three some witnesses lack the article. In 5:10a the article is supported by only one witness and in 8:8c, as we have seen, by nine sources counted as five separate witnesses. Rahlfs' Text has the article before *θανάτου* in 8c – in his case solely on the basis of V (*O* = V-253-637) – and *τῷ πολέμῳ* in 8d. Thus he relegates the article to the apparatus in 5:10a and retains it in 8:8c. Ziegler argues the article belongs in the apparatus in both instances. No doubt Rahlfs retained it in 8:8 because of formal correspondence to the Hebrew. Why does the *O* group have the article? Normally Origen did not correct the Fifth Column on the basis of the Hebrew, but the colophon to Syh indicates it was translated from manuscripts of the Hexapla corrected by Pamphilus and Eusebius. Thus correction towards the Hebrew is possible in manuscripts of the *O* group. Conversely, possibly scribes omitted the article in 8c since the matching phrase in 8d did not have it. This last possibility would have to have occurred extremely early to influence all the text tradition except manuscripts representing Origen's Fifth Column and so is not persuasive.

The relevance of 8:8c for 8:8d may now be considered. Is it not possible that the OG Translator adopted a freer approach rendering *בְּמִלְחָמָה* to make it match the phrase in 8c? This is more probable than the approach of Rahlfs who has to assume that the copyists did the same thing but so early that it affected even 998 and indeed the entire surviving textual tradition.

38 J. ZIEGLER, Der Gebrauch des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes, in: D. FRAENKEL / U. QUAST / J. W. WEVERS (edd.), Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren (MSU 20), Göttingen 1990, 83–120.

The example of 8:8d shows that even in following the entire manuscript tradition one has to balance consideration of translation technique, the work of Origen, the work of Jerome, and weigh probabilities of changes made by copyists against the probability of what came from the hand of the translator.

8:10

MT

וּבְכֹן רְאִיתִי רְשָׁעִים קְבָרִים וְבָאוּ
וּמִמְקוֹמָם קָרוּשׁ יְהִלְכוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכְּחוּ בְעִיר אֲשֶׁר בְּרַעְשׁוֹ

Ra

*καὶ τότε εἶδον ἀσεβεῖς εἰς τάφους εἰσαχθέντας,
καὶ ἐκ τόπου ἁγίου ἐπορεύθησαν
καὶ ἐπηγέθησαν ἐν τῇ πόλει,
ὅτι οὕτως ἐποίησαν.
καὶ γε τοῦτο ματαιότης.*

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

8:10

*καὶ τότε εἶδον ἀσεβεῖς εἰς τάφους εἰσαχθέντας,
καὶ ἐκ τόπου ἁγίου,
καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ ἐπηγέθησαν ἐν τῇ πόλει,
ὅτι οὕτως ἐποίησαν.
καὶ γε τοῦτο ματαιότης.*

A B C S 998 O L⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ C^{o(-299)} d k min⁽⁻¹⁵⁵⁾ verss

10 εἰς – εἰσαχθέντας] *sepultos et venerunt* Hi = **ⲙⲓ** ↓ | εἰς τάφους] *εις ταφον* 357 766¹ Georg Sa¹¹² Syh; *εις τοπον* 336'; *εις κολασιν* 159^{ms} 411^{mg}: ex Ol^{com}; post *εισαχθέντας* tr 766^{II} Fa²³ Sa¹¹² (absc Fa¹) | *εισαχθέντας*] *αχθεντας* C 798–295–260 543 549 Met VII.12,2 Ol^{IKM}; *καταχθεντας* 766^{II}; *εισταχθεντας* 698 | om *καί* 2° 357 | *ἐκ*] *απο* O–411 539; *οσοι* 766; > Ol^A | *τόπου* Hi Sa¹ Syh = **ⲙⲓ** > Fa¹²³; *του* rel (539) | *ἁγίου*] + *επορευθησαν* S^c O⁻⁶³⁷ 254' 338 547 Ol^{AG}; + *απεστησαν* 766 | om *καί* 3° S^c 637–411 797–cII 539 Met VII.13,2 Arm Fa¹²³ Hi = Ra **ⲙⲓ**

10 *εισαχθέντας – τόπου ἁγίου*] *α' καὶ ἦλθον ἐκ τόπου ἁγίου* 161 248 252 (s nom); *σ' οὐ* (> 161 248) *καὶ ὁπότε (ποτε* 252 Syh) *περιῆσαν (ησαν* 252 Syh) *ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ* 161 248 252 539 (s nom) Syh | *καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν – πόλει*] *α' θ' ivenunt et gloriati sunt in civitati; σ' revertebantur (ανεστρεφον* 161 248; *ανεστρεφοντο* 252; *αναστρεφομενοι* 539) *laudentes in civitati* Syh

In 8:10b Rahlfs' Text has *καὶ ἐκ τόπου ἁγίου ἐπορεύθησαν* whereas the proposed Göttingen Edition has *καὶ ἐκ τόπου ἁγίου, / καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν*. The difference entails proposing that the OG Translator either had a parent text והלכו or misread והלכו as such – the problem concerns the similarity of *waw* and *yodh* in the Hebrew script of the Herodian period. The difference in line division is not relevant. Yohanan Goldman, editor of Ecclesiastes for *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* has *καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν* G* in his apparatus. This constitutes a claim for his readers that he is giving them the original LXX even though problems exist in

its textual transmission. He devotes almost a page and a half to all the problems in this verse in the Textual Commentary portion of BHQ and proposes the following as the original Hebrew Text, which I have set beside MT for comparison:

MT

[10] וּבָכַן רְאִיתִי רְשָׁעִים קְבָרִים וְבָאִי
וּמִמְקוֹם קְרוֹשׁ יִהְלְכוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּבְּחוּ בְעִיר אֲשֶׁר בֶּן־עָשׂוּ

Goldman's Proposed Orig Text (BHQ)

[10] וּבָכַן רְאִיתִי רְשָׁעִים קְרָבִים יְבָאִי
וּבְמִקְדָּשׁ יִהְלְכוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּבְּחוּ בְעִיר אֲשֶׁר בֶּן־עָשׂוּ

Only part of the discussion by Goldman is necessary for our purposes:

Nowhere does הֵלךְ *piel* mean “to go out,” a meaning often proposed here. Qoheleth probably meant “to walk in,” and the alteration of the preposition ב in ובמקדש is easily explained in view of the preceding scribal error involving קרבים. If the wicked are not entering the sanctuary (קרבים), but are brought to the grave (קברים), they can no longer be brought *into* the sanctuary. That is why the original ובמקדש has been altered to וממקדש (G), connecting this to the verb יהלכו which follows – and so imposing an alien meaning on this verb. In G and M, an attempt to make a clear separation between the wicked dead and the sanctuary may be observed. In the proto-M text, a cj. was read instead of the י in יבאו (G); ובאו (M). In the *Vorlage* of G, this same phenomenon transpired with יהלכו (M) becoming והלכו (G) – Rahlfs omits the cj., and, in fact, chooses the Origenian text, but the large majority of the Greek mss. attest the cj. καὶ here.

The history of the text can be traced in two main stages: (1) A confusion between קרבים and קברים led to the alteration of ובמקדש into וממקדש (G); (2) Interpreting that form, G then read והלכו, leaving וממקדש in an erratic position (which gave rise to the insertion of ἐπορεύθησαν after καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου by a corrector of Codex Sinaiticus). The proto-Masoretic text avoided this by reading ובאו instead of יבאו, thus integrating וממקדש within the second phrase, and adding מקום for the sake of enlarging the concept of “sanctuary” (perhaps “synagogue” was meant: see Gordis, *Koheleth – The Man* 286).³⁹

Whether original LXX is ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου or ἐκ τόπου ἁγίου, his parent text almost certainly had [מ] and not ב. Aquila has ἐκ τόπου ἁγίου supported by Hi, the Peshitta and the Targum. Symmachus has ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, but this is best explained as a dynamic rendering and the Vulgate is doubtless based upon Symmachus. Support in the textual tradition for a Hebrew Text with ב is non-existent. So Goldman's proposal that an original ובמקדש became וממקדש and מקום was added as a clarification is not persuasive. In fact, the expression מקום קדוש suits Qoheleth (cf. מקום 1:5, 1:7, 3:16bis, 3:20, 6:6, 8:10, 10:4, 11:3) while מקדש as a way of referring to the central sanctuary is not otherwise attested.

39 SCHENKER et al. (edd.), General Introduction and Megilloth, 101*.

The article $\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta$ is contrary to the translation technique of OG, whereas the $\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ fits perfectly. I acknowledge with Goldman that the Bible Text of Jerome's Commentary is no basis for proposing $\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu$ instead of $\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta$ as original, but the witness of the Sahidic and Syro-Hexapla cannot be explained this way and remain a huge problem for Goldman's proposal. The change from $\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu$ to $\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta$ is easily explained as an inner Greek corruption occurring early enough to affect our entire manuscript tradition in Greek.

The parent text of OG certainly had וַיִּשְׁתַּבַּחַו and may have had וַיְהַלְכּוּ , but otherwise was virtually identical to MT. By contrast, Goldman's proposal involves several stages and has no evidence for קַרְבִּיִּים , the cornerstone of his suggestion. This example reminds us that the apparatus is not simply for those interested in the constitution of the OG. Scholars of the Hebrew Text and ancient early versions are helped by references that aid the analysis of questions which interest them and have to do with the place of the LXX in the larger history of the text of the Old Testament.

Relation to Ancient Early Versions (e.g. Peshitta)⁴⁰

1:17

MT $\text{הוֹלִלְוֹת וְשִׁכְלוֹת וַיְדַבְּרֵי}$

Ra $\text{\u03c0\u03b1\u03c1\u03b1\u03b2\u03bf\u03bb\u03b1\u03c3 \u03ba\u03b9 \u03b5\u03c0\u03b9\u03c3\u03c4\u03b7\u03bc\u03b7\u03bd \u03b5\u03b3\u03bd\u03c9\u03bd}$

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

1:17 $\text{\u03c0\u03b5\u03c1\u03b9\u03c6\u03bf\u03c1\u03b1\u03c3 \u03ba\u03b9 \u03b5\u03c0\u03b9\u03c3\u03c4\u03b7\u03bc\u03b7\u03bd \u03b5\u03b3\u03bd\u03c9\u03bd}$

A B S 998 O L^(-106^{ext} 125) C^o d k min verss

17 $\text{\u03c0\u03b5\u03c1\u03b9\u03c6\u03bf\u03c1\u03b1\u03c3 \u03ba\u03b9 \u03b5\u03c0\u03b9\u03c3\u03c4\u03b7\u03bc\u03b7\u03bd}$] *errores (erroresque PsSalò Vulg) et stultitiam Hi PsSalò = Vulg* ↓ | $\text{\u03c0\u03b5\u03c1\u03b9\u03c6\u03bf\u03c1\u03b1\u03c3}$ Ge.] $\text{\u03c0\u03b5\u03c1\u03b9\u03c6\u03bf\u03c1\u03b1\u03bd}$ Gra.; $\text{\u03c0\u03b1\u03c1\u03b1\u03c6\u03bf\u03c1\u03b1\u03c3}$ Gord.; $\text{\u03c0\u03b1\u03c1\u03b1\u03b2\u03bf\u03bb\u03b7\u03bd}$ k Sa¹; $\text{\u03c0\u03b1\u03c1\u03b1\u03b2\u03bf\u03bb\u03b1\u03c3}$ rel (= Pesch): cf 2_{12b} 7_{25d}; pr \u03ba\u03b9 L^(-106^{ext} 125) Sa¹ | $\text{\u03b5\u03c0\u03b9\u03c3\u03c4\u03b7\u03bc\u03b7\u03bd}$ OI] $\text{\u03b5\u03c0\u03b9\u03c3\u03c4\u03b7\u03bc\u03b1\u03c3}$ 147-159-503-560 OI^M | $\text{\u03b5\u03b3\u03bd\u03c9\u03bd}$] $\text{\u03b3\u03bd\u03c9\u03bd}$ 336

17 $\text{\u03c0\u03b5\u03c1\u03b9\u03c6\u03bf\u03c1\u03b1\u03c3}$] $\text{\u03b1' \u03c0\u03bb\u03b1\u03bd\u03b1\u03c3}$ 161 248 Syh; $\text{\u03b8' \u03c0\u03b1\u03c1\u03b1\u03c6\u03bf\u03c1\u03b1\u03c3}$ 161 248 Syh

40 Since the Fachtagung held in Göttingen in April, 2008 and before publication of this paper, further research on the problem in 1:17 by myself and John Meade resulted in a revised treatment: see J. MEADE / P. J. GENTRY, Evaluating Evaluations: The Commentary of BHQ and the Problem of הוֹלִלְוֹת in Ecclesiastes 1:17, in: G. BONNEY / R. VICENT (edd.), SOPHIA – PAIDEIA: SAPIENZA e EDUCAZIONE (Sir 1,27). Miscellanea di studi offerti in onore del prof. Don Mario Cimosà (Nuova Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 34), Roma 2012, 197–217. I would like to leave this treatment unrevised as a testimony to an earlier stage of thinking.

Syh

אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְעוֹלָם
 Syh^{mg}: *אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְעוֹלָם. Index super אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְעוֹלָם
 *אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְעוֹלָם. Index super אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְעוֹלָם

Peshitta

אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְעוֹלָם לְעוֹלָם

The question of the relationship of early versions, such as the Peshitta, to the Septuagint greatly interests textual critics of the Old Testament and specialists in the Early Versions as well as Septuagint scholars. One example will illustrate this.

1:17b has an old *crux* in determining the critical text of the OG which I discussed in a presentation at the Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography in Leuven in October, 2003.⁴¹ In 2004, the first fascicle of *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* appeared in which Goldman, editor of Qoheleth, commented extensively on the problem.⁴² His discussion demands response and possibly reconsideration.

Rahlfs' *Handausgabe* has *παραβολάς* ('comparisons', 'analogies', or 'parables'), a reading supported by all Greek manuscripts, although the *k* group and Sa attest a form in the singular instead of the plural. Such a rendering, however, is contrary to the translation technique of the Greek Translator. The Hebrew word being translated in 1:17 is הוֹלָלוֹת ('madness'). This is rendered by *περιφορά* in 2:12 and 7:25 and also by *περιφέρεια*, a cognate noun, in 9:3. Similarly, הוֹלָלוֹת ('madness') is rendered by *περιφέρεια* in 10:13 and מְהוֹלָל ('mad') by *περιφορά* in 2:2. For the inverse, the Greek Translator employs *παραβολή* for the only occurrence of מִשְׁלָּה ('comparison', 'proverb') in 12:9. The equivalences of the Greek Translator are absolutely stereotypical: *παραβολάς* is difficult to explain either contextually, or lexically as an equivalent for הוֹלָלוֹת, or in terms of translation technique.

Goldman carefully scrutinises the number of the nouns in both source and target texts. הוֹלָלוֹת (1:17, 2:12, 7:25, 9:3) is construed by Goldman as plural and הוֹלָלוֹת (10:13) as singular. Nonetheless, הוֹלָלוֹת may be construed singular as הַכְמוֹת in Proverbs 1:20 and 9:1.⁴³ הוֹלָלוֹת in 10:13 is without question singular.⁴⁴ As Goldman has observed, only in 1:17 is the equivalent in OG plural. The equivalents in Ecclesiastes are described by Goldman as follows: "G ... hesitat[es] mainly between *παραφορά* "derangement of mind, madness," and *περιφορά* "error, deviation" – a hesitation that might originate in the scribal transmission. As a matter of fact, *παραφορά* occurs as a variant only in 2:12 (supported by B 998 253 161^{mg} 248^{mg}

41 Symposium: Septuagint Lexicography and Beyond: Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion, on the occasion of the publication of the revised one volume edition of J. LUST / E. EYNIKEL / K. HAUSPIE, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Rev. Ed., Stuttgart 2003. Now published as GENTRY, *Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three*.

42 SCHENKER et al. (edd.), *General Introduction and Megilloth*, 68*–69*.

43 See H. BAUER / P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, Halle 1922, 506t and G. A. RENDSBURG, *Morphological Evidence for Regional Dialects in Ancient Hebrew*, in: W. R. BODINE (ed.), *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, Winona Lake 1992, 65–88, here 79–80.

44 See BAUER / LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, 505o.

602 613^{sup} lin GregNy 355,5^{te} (corr Jaeger) O1^{comm} (περιφοράν ... ἢ παραφοράν) = Sixt: cf 2_{2a}) and 7:25 (supported by A Sa³). Only forms prefixed with *περί* (περιφορά 2:2, 2:12, 7:25; περιφέρεια 9:3, 10:13) have been adopted in the text of the forthcoming Göttingen Edition, as was also the case in Rahlfs' Text. The lexical distinction drawn between *περιφορά* and *παραφορά* by Goldman is not so transparent. *παραφορά*, a noun from *παραφέρω*, can mean 'a going aside' hence 'derangement of mind, madness' (see e.g. Aeschylus *Eumenides* 330). *περιφορά* is a noun from *περιφέρω* which can mean 'a going around' hence 'becoming dizzy, giddy, mad' as in Plutarch *Caesar* 32 and Eccl 7:7. The cognate noun ought to mean the same thing. The meaning "error, deviation" given by Goldman comes from LSJ which has the category "wandering, error" and lists only Eccl 9:3. This in turn appears to be derived from the interpretation of Aquila. The basic meaning 'going round' could yield either 'dizziness, madness' or 'wandering, error'. Cumulative evidence from the OG Translator strongly supports the former. It may well be that *περιφορά*, clearly preferred by the OG Translator, is a later Hellenistic or popular term for madness while *παραφορά*, is preferred in Classical Greek and represents a stylistic improvement for *περιφορά* in 998 and B in 2:12.

For readings of the Three one need not rely on retroversion from Syriac since a couple of Greek manuscripts attest the readings for Aquila and Theodotion. Certainly *ⲕⲁⲓⲱⲟⲥ* ('enigma', 'proverb', 'riddle') in the text of Syh renders *παραβολάς* while *πλάνας* and *παραφοράς* properly represent *ⲕⲁⲓⲱⲟⲥ* ('straying', 'error') and *ⲕⲁⲓⲱⲟⲥ* ('wandering' > 'wandering of mind', 'distraction') respectively. An important point is that since recent scholarship has shown that LXX Ecclesiastes is not Aquila, a position dominating the field for one hundred years, and is more like Theodotion, it is reasonable to think that OG is equal to or similar to Theodotion at this point.

Therefore, the original text at 1:17 was probably *περιφοράς* for which *παραβολάς* represents a copyist's error of hearing and sight occurring so early that it dominated the textual tradition that has come down to us. Earlier noteworthy conjectures are *περιφοράν* (Grabe, 1709) and *παραφοράς* (Gordis, 1937).⁴⁵ The conjecture of Gordis is *ⲓ*' according to 161^{mg} 248^{mg} Syh and the proposal of Grabe closer to the mark. It seems again that Jerome has corrected the Old Latin on the basis of *πλάνας*, the text of *α'*.

Goldman argues that the original text had *ⲙⲟⲓⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ*. Already in the *Vorlage* of OG the second word was transmitted as *ⲙⲟⲓⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ* and hence rendered as *ἐπιστήμην*. Therefore both OG and MT gave a positive rather than negative meaning to the statement. Goldman disavows "the hypothesis presented by Gordis (*Koheleth – The Man* 202) that ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΑΣ would be an inner-Greek corruption of ΠΑΡΑΦΟΡΑΣ: (1) is graphically unlikely; (2) ignores the fact that *ⲙⲟⲓⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ* plural is an exception in G Qoh; (3) ignores the agreement between M *ⲙⲟⲓⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ* and G *ἐπιστήμη*; (4) and finally, ignores the literary inclusio made by this word in G Qoh (1:17–12:9). But is his apparently irrefutable rejection of Gordis so solid?

45 R. GORDIS, *Ecclesiastes 1:17—Its Text and Interpretation*, in: *JBL* 56 (1937), 323–330.

There are only five occurrences of שכלות in MT, all in Qoheleth (1:17, 2:12, 7:25, 9:3, 10:13). This word is paired with הוללות in 2:12, 7:25, and 10:13. In the first pair, שכלות is the second word but in the remaining two it is first. Goldman suspects the same pair was originally in 1:17 although the pattern is by no means as clear as he claims. Our concern here, however, is not some putative original Hebrew Text, but the *Vorlage* of OG which Goldman admits was שכלות. His argument that ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΑΣ as a graphical error for ΠΑΡΑΦΟΡΑΣ is unlikely may carry some weight. I have argued for an error in hearing or sound aided by graphemic similarity.⁴⁶ This explanation apparently needs to be fleshed out. Both β and φ are bilabials and are commonly interchanged in Egyptian papyri. Orthographic evidence shows that interchange is also well attested for λ and ρ.⁴⁷ In addition, bilingual Coptic–Greek interference aids and abets these interchanges.⁴⁸ Goldman’s argument that OG construed הוללות as plural may be of some value. The agreement between MT שכלות and OG ἐπιστήμη begs the question and his suggestion that OG intended an inclusio is a bit too ingenious. Goldman has not explained why OG departed from a fixed pattern of translation or how lexically παραβολάς can be derived from הוללות. Such interpretative translation is highly uncharacteristic of the OG Translator. I am aware that the conjecture I have proposed entails separate steps or stages: (1) περιφοράς changed to παραφοράς as a stylistic improvement. This is possible in the Second Century due to the Atticistic reaction to the Koine and is attested precisely in Egyptian sources in our text history in Eccl 2:12 and 7:25.⁴⁹ (2) ΠΑΡΑΦΟΡΑΣ changed to ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΑΣ, a copyist error of sight and sound. While positing separate steps is undesirable in textual criticism, this proposal is far more plausible than that suggested by Goldman.

At this point, the witness of the Peshitta is important. Previously scholars believed the Peshitta to be dependent upon the Septuagint. Brilliant and extensive research by Jerome Lund⁵⁰ and Michael Weitzman⁵¹ on the relationship of the Peshitta and the Septuagint has shown that for the most part, the Peshitta is an independent translation made directly from the Hebrew. Nevertheless, Weitzman

46 GENTRY, *Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three*, here 160.

47 Gignac documents consonantal interchanges between β and φ and λ and ρ in the papyri: see F. T. GIGNAC, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, I: Phonology, Milano 1976, 97–98 and 102–107. See also F. T. GIGNAC, *The Papyri and the Greek Language*, in: YCS 28 (1985), 155–165.

48 See GIGNAC, *The Papyri and the Greek Language*, here 157 and J. VERGOTE, *Grammaire copte*. Ia, Louvain 1992, 7–59.

49 On the Atticistic reaction to the Koine, see G. HORROCKS, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, New York 1997, 51.

50 J. A. LUND, *The Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta: A Re-evaluation of Criteria in Light of Comparative Study of the Versions in Genesis and Psalms*. Ph.D. diss. Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1988.

51 See M. P. WEITZMAN, *Peshitta, Septuagint and Targum*, in: R. LAVENANT (ed.), *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992: University of Cambridge, Faculty of Divinity, 30 August–2 September, 1992 (OCA 247)*, Rome 1994, 51–84 and M. P. WEITZMAN, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament (Oriental Publications 56)*, Cambridge 1999.

demonstrated that in certain individual books, notably Genesis, Joshua, all the Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Twelve), Psalms, Proverbs, Song, Qoheleth, Ruth and Daniel) clear cases of occasional and non-systematic dependence on the Septuagint can be found.⁵²

Mere agreement between Peshitta and Septuagint is not sufficient to prove dependence of the former upon the latter. Weitzman rigorously and systematically explores possibilities of polygenesis. Coincidence, common *Vörlage*, and common exegetical tradition can explain many agreements. The agreement between LXX and Peshitta in Eccl 1:17 defies such explanations and is a clear proof of dependence of Peshitta upon LXX since it also translates הוֹלְלוּת by a word meaning 'proverbs' and there is no other way to explain this unusual and unique rendering except that the translators consulted OG.⁵³ The interesting point is that the most recent position of scholars of the Peshitta is that this version may be as early as the Third Century, since it was quoted by Fourth Century Fathers. If so, the Peshitta is as early a witness as our earliest Greek manuscript (e.g. 998). The corruption of the text proposed above would then have to have occurred before this time, as I have indeed suggested – otherwise, Goldman may have better support for his thesis.

Diachronic Development of Greek (Hellenistic / Byzantine Periods)

Editors of the Göttingen Editions do not know who will use the critical texts they create and for what purposes. As a far reaching example, a revision of the grammar of Byzantine Greek could easily be written using the materials in the Apparatus and Grammatica and Orthographica sections of the editions. Again, one example will have to suffice.

One question in the diachronic development from Classical Greek through Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine Periods is the use of ἄν or ἐάν in indefinite relative sentences. This is discussed by Thackeray⁵⁴ and documented thoroughly by Mayser.⁵⁵ The matter can be summarised succinctly:

52 See also M. P. WEITZMAN, The Interpretative Character of the Syriac Old Testament, in: M. SÆBO (ed.), Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation. Volume 1: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300), Göttingen 1996, 587–611, here 594.

53 See A. SCHOORS, The Peshitta of Kohelet and its Relation to the Septuagint, in: C. LAGA / J. A. MUNITZ / L. VAN ROMPAY (edd.), After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for his Seventieth Birthday (OLA 18), Leuven 1985, 347–357, here 354 and WEITZMAN, The Syriac Version of the Old Testament, 76.

54 H. St. J. THACKERAY, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, Vol. 1, Cambridge 1909, 65.

55 E. MAYSER, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. Mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften, Vol. 2. Satzlehre. Analytischer Teil. Erste Hälfte, Berlin 1926, 261–267.

By the First Century, *ἐάν* is beginning to be used in relative sentences, whether with Aorist or Present Subjunctive, but the rule of *ἄν* is still strong from the classical period. The manuscripts in the textual transmission of the Septuagint show the same tendencies: *ἐάν* is beginning to be used, but the hold of *ἄν* from the classical period is strong. Like other phenomena in Hellenistic Greek, both could be used side by side, even by the same author in the same stretch of text. Thus *ἐάν* is the *lectio difficilior* and must be considered seriously in each instance.

There are five instances in Ecclesiastes of this phenomenon (3:22, 5:3, 8:3, 8:17e, 8:17g). They are all listed as edited for the forthcoming Edition. This is followed by a chart in which the manuscript support for the lemma is provided by subtracting the evidence for the variant from the *Kopfleiste*.

3:22

MT כִּי מִי יִבְיָאֵנוּ לְרֵאוֹת בְּמָה שִׁיחֲרִיב אֶחָרָיו

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

3:22 ὅτι τίς ἄξει αὐτὸν τοῦ ἰδεῖν ἐν ᾧ ἂν γένηται μετ' αὐτόν;

A B C S 998 O L C^o d k(46^s) min verss

22 ἄξει] εἰξει 155 ↓ | om τοῦ 252 | τοῦ ἰδεῖν] εἰδεναι 252 | om ἐν – γένηται 637 | ἐν ᾧ] εως V; o Aeth Hi; om ἐν 357 252 | ἄν] εαν B C 357 68 = Ald Sixt | γένηται] γενοιτο 125' | om μετ' αὐτόν 766 | αὐτόν] αυτου V 357 125' 155; αυτων S* 609-797* 252* 336' 534' 539 602; αυτο Ald

22 ὅτι – αὐτόν] τίς γὰρ αὐτόν ἄξει θεάσασθαι τὰ ἐσόμενα μετὰ ταῦτα 161 248 | τοῦ ἰδεῖν – αὐτόν] σ' ut videat ea quae futura sunt post haec Hi | ἄξει αὐτόν] θ' ἔξει αὐτόν (ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁⲓ. ⲁ.) Syh

5:3

MT אֵת אֲשֶׁר־תִּדְרֹךְ שְׁלָם

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

5:3 σὺ οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν εὔξη ἀπόδος.

A B C S 998 O L⁽¹²⁵⁾ C^o d k min verss

3 σὺ οὖν ὅσα = אֵת אֲשֶׁר] σὺν οσα = Ra. (ex Klostermann) אֵת (אֵת אֲשֶׁר): cf *quaecumque* Hi (sed hab *tu itaque quae* An *Scrip* 1,22 Fulg *Ep* 1,11 Spec 556,9); σὺ σταν 475; σὺ ος δ' αν 357; γοὺν οσα OI^{HN}; om οὖν Syh = Pesch ↓; om ὅσα 411 C^o-797 (inc C) | ἐάν B-S-68' O^V 475-411 C' 539 = Ald Ra] > 475 261-545 248' 260 336' 542 766 OI^{HN} An *Scrip* 1,22 Fulg *Ep* 1,11 Spec 556,10 Hi Georg = Vulg; αν rel (Met IV.6,3 OI^{HN} PsChr)

3 σὺ – εὔξη] α' tu omnia quae vovet; σ' si vovueris; θ' omnia quae vovet Syh

8:3

MT כִּי כֹל-אֲשֶׁר יִחְפֹּץ יַעֲשֶׂה

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

8:3 ὅτι πάν, ὃ ἐὰν θελήσῃ, ποιήσει

A B C S 998 O L C^{o-(299)} d k min⁻⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ verss

3 ἐάν] αν A 545 cII⁻²⁶⁰ k 248' 252 338 549 Ol^{ATLZIKM}; > 357 609 Hi = Vulg **III** |
 θελήσῃ] θελήσει B*-S-534 A C 540* 161-248* 543 795 Dam^{VOV}; θελήσει 296';
 θελή L⁻¹²⁵ k 338 766 Anton 1000 Dam^R; θελεῖ 125; λαλήσει Dam^{Mp}

8:17e

MT בְּשֵׁל אֲשֶׁר יַעֲמֵל הָאָדָם לְבַקֵּשׁ

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

8:17 ὅσα ἂν μοχθήσῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ζητῆσαι

A B C S 998 O C^{o-(299)} a b d⁻⁽³⁴²⁾ min verss

17 ὅσα 1^o] διοπερ O^V ↓ | ἂν 1^o] ∩ 2^o 253^{txt}; εαν A C 637 L cII 155 248' 252 296'
 311 698 706 795 Dam Ol (sed hab Anast 525 684 Met VIII.1,17 PsChr Syn 348 =
 Compl Ra) | μοχθήσῃ] -σει 253^{mg} 540-609 252 728 795 Ol^Z; ποιήσει k

ὅσα ἂν] διόπερ 248

8:17g

MT וְגַם אִם-יֹאמֶר הַחֲכָמִים לְדַעַת

Göttingen Ecclesiastes

8:17 καί γε ὅσα ἂν εἴπῃ ὁ σοφὸς τοῦ γνῶναι

A B C S 998 O L C^{o-(299)} d⁻⁽³⁴²⁾ k min verss

17 ὅσα 2^o] ο O^{-(253^{txt})} (253^{mg}) 542 766 Syh; οσας 698 | ἂν 2^o Anast 525] εαν
 O^{-(253^{txt})} (253^{mg} litt ε superscr) L k 443 795 Dam^C Syn 348 | εἴπῃ] ποιήσῃ (-σει
 139*-540-571*-609) C^{o-260}

The evidence for the five cases may be simplified as follows for the sake of clarity:

3:22

ἐάν]

ἐάν B-68 C 357 = Ald Sixt

5:3

ἐάν B-S-68' 253-637-411 C' 539 = Ald Ra]

ἐάν A V 106-130 cII d⁻³⁵⁷ k 155 252 296' 311 338 339 443 543 547 549 613 645 698
706 795 Met IV.6,3 Ol^H PsChr

> 261-545 248' 260' 336' 542 766 Ol^H An *Scrip* 1,22 Fulg *Ep* 1,11 Spec 556,10

8:3

ἐάν]

ἐάν A 545 cII k 248' 252 338 549 Ol^{AFAZIK}

> 357 609 Hi = Vulg

8:17e

ἐάν B-68" S 998 V-411 C' d k 336' 338 339 443 542 543 547 549 645 766 Anast 525
684 Met VIII.1,17 PsChr Syn 348 = Compl Ra

ἐάν A C 637 L cII 155 248' 252 260' 296' 311 698 706 795 Dam Ol

8:17g

ἐάν Anast 525

ἐάν O^(253^{ms}) (253^{mg} litt ε superscr) L k 443 795 Dam^C Syn 348

LXX reveals a slight *Tendenz* towards $\delta\zeta$ ἐάν and $\bar{\omega}$ ἐάν. Probably one should go with the oldest witnesses or majority, when only a few scattered witnesses support the other, e.g. choose 998 and B or 998 and S etc.

Conclusion

Textual criticism is an art and above all, a science. In editing critical texts of the Septuagint, however, the praxis of textual criticism differs from that in editing classical texts. Beyond the usual assessment of external and internal evidence involving the manuscript tradition, an important role is played by translation technique, early patristic testimony, and the early daughter versions. Even more complicated and interdependent are the text histories of the LXX and of the Jewish Revisors and para-hexaplaric materials. The role of Origen and Jerome in the text history are particularly problematic. In analysing the textual tradition it is impossible to clearly separate the constitution of the critical text from a complicated reception history and textual transmission. Study of the Septuagint is one of the most interdisciplinary endeavours, and a full report of the text history in the apparatus is necessary for the editors do not know to what uses this information will be put.

Bibliography

- ADRIAEN, M. (ed.), *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Commentarius in Ecclesiasten* (CCSL 72), Turnhout 1959.
- ALBRECHT, F., *Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus. Neue Lesarten zum Septuagintatext des Koheletbuches*, in: *ZAW* 122 (2010), 272–279.
- BAUER, H. / P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, Halle 1922.
- CANNON, W. W., *Jerome and Symmachus: Some Points in the Vulgate Translation of Koheleth*, in: *ZAW N.F.* 4 (1927), 191–199.
- CASPARI, C. P., *Das Buch Hiob (1,1–38,16) in Hieronymus's Uebersetzung aus der alexandrinischen Version nach einer St. Gallener Handschrift saec. VIII* (Christiania Videnskabs-Selskabs Forhandling 4), Christiania 1893.
- DE WAARD, J., *The Translator and Textual Criticism (with Particular Reference to Eccl 2,25)*, in: *Bib.* 60 (1979), 509–529.
- DIEBNER, B. J. / R. KASSER (edd.), *Hamburger Papyrus bil. 1. Die alttestamentlichen Texte des Papyrus bilinguis 1 der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg* (CO 18), Genève 1989.
- FIELD, F., *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt. 2 Vol.*, Oxonii 1875.
- GENTRY, P. J., *Ecclesiast*, in: A. PIETERSMA / B. G. WRIGHT (edd.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title* (NETS), Oxford/New York 2007.
- *Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Rôle of the Syro-Hexapla*, in: *Aramaic Studies* 1.1 (2003), 5–28.
 - *Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three: The Priority of a New Critical Edition of Hexaplaric Fragments*, in: *Aramaic Studies* 2.2 (2004), 145–174.
 - *Special Problems in the Septuagint Text History of Ecclesiastes*, in: M. H. K. PETERS (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Ljubljana 2007 (SBL.SCS 55), Atlanta 2008, 137–153.
 - *The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes in the Marginal Notes of the Syro-Hexapla*, in: *Aramaic Studies* 2.1 (2004), 63–84.
 - *'The Role of the "Three" in the Text History of the Septuagint': II. Aspects of Interdependence of the Old Greek and the Three in Ecclesiastes*, in: *Aramaic Studies* 4.2 (2006), 153–192.
- GIGNAC, F. T., *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, I: Phonology*, Milano 1976.
- *The Papyri and the Greek Language*, in: *YCS* 28 (1985), 155–165.
- GIVÓN, T., *Syntax, 2. Vol.*, Philadelphia 1984–1990.
- GORDIS, R., *Ecclesiastes 1:17—Its Text and Interpretation*, in: *JBL* 56 (1937), 323–330.
- GRABE, J. E. (ed.), *Septuaginta Interpretum tomus IV*, Oxonii 1709.
- GRYSON, R., *Altlateinische Handschriften / Manuscrits Vieux Latins, Vol. 1*, Freiburg i.Br. 1999.
- HORROCKS, G., *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, New York 1997.
- LEANZA, S., *Le tre versioni geronimiane dell'Ecclesiaste*, in: *ASES* 4 (1987), 87–108.
- LUND, J. A., *The Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta: A Re-evaluation of Criteria in Light of Comparative Study of the Versions in Genesis and Psalms*. Ph.D. diss. Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1988.
- LUST, J. / E. EYNIKEL / K. HAUSPIE, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Rev. Ed.*, Stuttgart 2003.

- MARSHALL, Ph. S., *A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Ecclesiastes*. Ph.D. diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville 2007.
- MAYSER, E., *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. Mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*, Vol. 2. Satzlehre. Analytischer Teil. Erste Hälfte, Berlin 1926.
- MCNEILE, A. H., *An Introduction to Ecclesiastes*, Cambridge 1904.
- MEADE, J. / P. J. GENTRY, *Evaluating Evaluations: The Commentary of BHQ and the Problem of הַקְלִיָּה in Ecclesiastes 1:17*, in: G. BONNEY / R. VICENT (edd.), *SOPHIA – PAIDEIA: SAPIENZA e EDUCAZIONE* (Sir 1,27). *Miscellanea di studi offerti in onore del prof. Don Mario Cimosà* (Nuova Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 34), Roma 2012, 197–217.
- RENDSBURG, G. A., *Morphological Evidence for Regional Dialects in Ancient Hebrew*, in: W. R. BODINE (ed.), *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, Winona Lake 1992, 65–88.
- SCHENKER, A. et al. (edd.), *General Introduction and Megilloth (BHQ 18)*, Stuttgart 2004.
- SCHOORS, A., *The Peshitta of Kohelet and its Relation to the Septuagint*, in: C. LAGA / J. A. MUNITIZ / L. VAN ROMPAY (edd.), *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for his Seventieth Birthday (OLA 18)*, Leuven 1985, 347–357.
- *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth, Part II: Vocabulary (OLA 143)*, Leuven 2004.
- SMYTH, H. W., *Greek Grammar*, Cambridge, MA 1920.
- THACKERAY, H. St. J., *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, Vol. 1, Cambridge 1909.
- TISCHENDORF, C. VON, *Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus sive fragmenta utriusque Testamenti e codice Graeco Parisiensi celeberrimo quinti ut videtur post Christum seculi, Lipsiae 1845*.
- VACCARI, A., *Recupero d'un lavoro critico di S. Girolamo*, in: A. VACCARI, *Scritti di Eru-dizione e di filologia*, Vol. 2 (SeL 67), Roma 1958, 83–146.
- VERGOTE, J., *Grammaire copte. Ia*, Louvain 1992.
- WEITZMAN, M. P., *Peshitta, Septuagint and Targum*, in: R. LAVENANT (ed.), *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992: University of Cambridge, Faculty of Divinity, 30 August–2 September, 1992 (OCA 247)*, Rome 1994, 51–84.
- *The Interpretative Character of the Syriac Old Testament*, in: M. SÆBO (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation. Volume 1: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*, Göttingen 1996, 587–611.
- *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament (Oriental Publications 56)*, Cambridge 1999.
- YI, Y. Y., *Translation Technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes*. Ph.D. diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville 2005.
- ZIEGLER, J., *Der Gebrauch des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes*, in: D. FRAENKEL / U. QUAST / J. W. WEVERS (edd.), *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren (MSU 20)*, Göttingen 1990, 83–120.

