



## Durham E-Theses

---

### *Wine, women and work: the generic transformation of the Masoretic text of Qohelet 9. 7-10 in the Targum Qohelet and Qohelet Midrash Rabbah*

Hardy, John Christopher

#### How to cite:

---

Hardy, John Christopher (1995) *Wine, women and work: the generic transformation of the Masoretic text of Qohelet 9. 7-10 in the Targum Qohelet and Qohelet Midrash Rabbah*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/5403/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

WINE, WOMEN AND WORK: THE GENERIC TRANSFORMATION OF THE MASORETIC TEXT OF QOHELET 9. 7-10 IN THE TARGUM QOHELET AND QOHELET MIDRASH RABBAH

John Christopher Hardy

This thesis seeks to understand the generic changes wrought by targum Qohelet and Qohelet midrash rabbah upon our home-text, the masoretic reading of Qoh. 9. 7-10. An introduction orientates the reader by contextualizing our three subsequent analyses: of the masoretic text (Chapters I and II); of the targum (Chapters III and IV); of the midrash (Chapters V and VI). Hence the Biblical verses are positioned within their structural context, the targumic verses within their wider thematic context (the rabbinic debate on the respective merits of Torah-study, charity and prayer) and the midrashic verses within a methodological context (differing approaches to the study of haggadic midrash). Having located Qoh. 9. 7-10 within their parent text, we are free to define them generically. In Chapter I, we examine the indices of our sample verses' poeticism; and in Chapter II, the generic "nursery" from which our putative verse-fragment emanates, comparing it with Ancient Near Eastern parallels: in the Gilgamesh Epic, Ugaritic Baal myth, Theognidean lyric and Egyptian Royal Instruction. We further argue (a) that, although these may elucidate our sample-text's *Sitz im Leben*, they do not, demonstrably stand in a direct literary relationship to it; and (b) that it is best understood when read intrabiblically, that is with reference to its wider Wisdom context (the Proverbial "table etiquette" and "temperance" traditions, and the Deuteronomic Calls to Joy). Chapter III introduces our chosen targum-text (Knobel's) of Qoh. 9. 7-10, and investigates its modifications of the Biblical text and co-text, accounting for these in terms of (a) the targum's exegetical presuppositions (its dogmatic agenda) and (b) generic transformation (conversion into a pro-Solomonic oracle). Chapter IV broadens our enquiry by classifying the thematic matrix of the targumic adjustments, their explicit and implicit motifs: the Messianic banquet and sages' charity-obligations (explicit); Torah-study's priority, the world to come and Torah-renewal (implicit). The rabbis' pedagogical preoccupation with personal deportment further contextualises, we argue, the targumic rendition. Our two midrashic chapters offer a selective critique of Qohelet midrash rabbah 9. 7-10: Chapter V assesses its generic transformation of Qoh. 9. 7, principally arguing, with three examples, (one of which, the Abba Tahnah pericope, is further tendered as a case-study in "chriization" - a specialized generic change) that its diverse traditions are thematically congruent (Abrahamic), hermeneutically dextrous comments on the *Aqedah*. Chapter VI, a quasi-biographical reading of the haggadic stories built around Qoh. 9.10, proposes that these evidence later tradents' reimagining of their predecessors: *amoraim* generally (in relation to sage-dreams), and R. Judah ha Nasi specifically (in relation to his holiness). The conclusion highlights some methodological issues outstanding from our comparative survey.

WINE, WOMEN AND WORK: THE GENERIC  
TRANSFORMATION OF THE MASORETIC  
TEXT OF QOHELET 9, 7-10 IN THE  
TARGUM QOHELET AND QOHELET MIDRASH  
RABBAH

JOHN CHRISTOPHER HARDY

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts

The University of Durham  
Department of Theology  
1995.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.



14 NOV 1995

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful for the assistance which I have received from my Supervisor, Dr. Robert Hayward, whose critical comments as the thesis progressed were both encouraging and helpful.

Professor John Sawyer (perhaps more aware than he knew of my predilections) suggested Qohelet 9. 7-10 as an appropriate thesis topic and supervised my work in its earliest stages.

Without the typing skills of my mother, Carol Pickering, the printing-out skills of my step-father, Bill Pickering, the forbearance of my Vicar, Raymond Best, and the loving support of his - and my - congregation at Christ Church, Walker, Newcastle upon Tyne, this project would never have been finished.

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	i
I. POETICS: POETIC INDICES IN QOH. 9. 7-10	20
II A COMPARATIVE LITERARY STUDY: QOH. 9. 7-10	49
III TQ 9. 7-10: GENERIC TRANSFORMATION OF THE MASORETIC TEXT	85
IV CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS: THE THEMATIC LOCALE OF TQ 9. 7-9	105
V QR 9.7.1: THEMATIC UNITY, HERMENEUTICAL DEXTERITY AND GENERIC TRANSFORMATION.	123
VI QR 9.10.1-3: PARANETIC SAGE-TALES	148
CONCLUDING REMARKS	168
APPENDICES	173
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	203

### **Statement of Copyright**

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

### **Declaration**

I declare that none of the material contained in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other university.

## ABBREVIATIONS (PRINCIPAL)

AJP *American Journal of Philology*

- ANET *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* ed. J.B. Fritchard. Third Edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969
- ANETS *Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies*
- AF *Andersen and Forbes*
- AOAT *Alter Orient und Altes Testament*
- BDB *Brown, Driver and Briggs*
- BZAW *Bethefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
- CCSL *Corpus Christianorum (Series Latina)*
- CHCL *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*
- EJ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*
- FJB *Frankfurter Judäische Beiträge*
- GKC *Gesenius Kautsch - Cowley*
- HAR *Hebrew Annual Review*
- HAT *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*
- HSCP *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
- HUCA *Hebrew Union College Annual*
- ICC *International Critical Commentary*
- TDOT *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*
- JAAR *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
- JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*
- JE *Jewish Encyclopaedia*
- JJS *Journal of Jewish Studies*
- JNES *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
- JQR *Jewish Quarterly Review*
- JSOT *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
- JSOTSS *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series*
- JSS *Journal of Semitic Studies*

- JTS* *Journal of Theological Studies*
- LCL Loeb Classical Library
- NCB New Century Bible Commentary
- NEB *New English Bible*
- OCD *Oxford Classical Dictionary*
- OLA *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*
- OTL Old Testament Library
- REB Revised English Bible.
- RSV *Revised Standard Version (of the Bible).*
- SCM Student Christian Movement
- SH Scripta Hierosolimitana
- SPCK Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge.
- TOTC Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
- VT *Vetus Testamentum*
- VTS *Vetus Testamentum, Supplements*
- ZAW *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
- (1) Biblical books (2) targums, (3) mishnaic and talmudic tractates and (4) midrashim other than Qohelet Rabbah are cited in the following form:
- (1) Gen. 1. 1; Exod. 1. 1 etc.
- (2) TN; TO; FT; Ps-J. etc.
- (3) M. Ab. 1.1; B. Sanh 99a; J. Shabb. 12 b etc.
- (4) Gen. R. 56.1; Lev. R. 20.2; Sg. R. 8.2; PRK; PR



## INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a miniature exercise in comparative midrash, partially inspired by C.A. Evans' study of the interpretation-history of Is. 6. 9-10 (1). The writer seeks to understand the generic changes wrought by targum Qohelet (TQ) and Qohelet midrash rabbah (QR) upon our home-text, the masoretes' reading of Qoh. 9. 7-10.

§1. Our starting-point is naturally the *masoretic text* (MT) of these verses. Qoh. 9. 7-10 is a triadic unit (2), often commended as a vigorous (3) and specific (4) summons, to enjoy life, a summary of Qohelet's philosophy (5), reminiscent of other such "Calls to Enjoyment" in ancient literature (6). A climactic (7) presentation of the *carpe diem* theme (a recurrent Qohelet-motif), in imperatival rather than  $\text{נִשְׁמַח}$  form, fuller than earlier statements, it also casts incidental light on the author's and addressee's socio-economic status (8), possibly intimating their bourgeois religiosity (9).

*The context of Qoh. 9. 7-10 in Qohelet.* By way of orientating the reader, we initially offer some view of our verses' role within the macro-structure of Qohelet. While some critics, assuming Qohelet's fundamental *disunity* (10) have entered upon special pleading for 9. 7-10 (as being, for example, an Epicurean gloss), arguably richer findings have come from proponents of the work's organic character, its overall coherence. Referring to our Call, we therefore critique two comparable analyses based on this premise.

1. A.G. Wright, noting the variety of putative structures worked out by commentators who feel that Qohelet has a plan - "some unity or progression of thought" (11), shares their belief in the text's integrity. Inspired by Castellino's article of 1968 (12), he uses rhetorical ("New") criticism to

solve the conundrum of Qohelet's structure (the "Riddle of the Sphinx"), by reference to the patent repetition of key phrases (13). He identifies two main parts sandwiched between a poetic prologue (on toil: 1. 2-11), a concluding poem (on youth and old age: 11. 7 - 12. 8) and an epilogue (12. 9-14). Their arrangement is as follows:

(1) *An Empirical Enquiry into Life* (14) (1. 12 - 6. 9), in response to the provocative query in 2. 3 ( *מה-יתרון לאדם בכל-עמלו שיעמל* ). A double introduction (1. 12-15; 1. 16-18) prefaces Qohelet's evaluation of pleasure-seeking (2. 1-11), wisdom (2. 12-17) and, in four sections, the products of toil (2. 18-26; 3. 1 - 4. 6; 4. 7-16; 4. 17 - 6. 9). Each of these eight units concludes with a formulaic phrase: "vanity" and / or "a chase after wind" ( *וּרְעִיּוֹן רֵחַ* [4.16], etc.); and the two introductions also append a proverb.

(2) *The Preacher's Conclusions* (6. 10 1- 11. 6) A similar "key-word" principle prevails. Two main ideas are developed. The first unfolds in 7. 1 - 8. 17: that humanity cannot identify the purposes of God. Four sections (7. 1-14; 7. 15-24; 7. 25-29; 8. 1-17) each end with a form of the verb "find out" ("not find out" / "who can find out" ( *שָׁאֵל יִמְצֵא הָאָדָם אַחֲרָיו* [7.14], etc.); its triple occurrence in 8. 17 separates this thematic sequence from the second, in 9. 1 - 11. 6. Here we are told that: . . . . *לֹא יִדְעֵנָה יְיָ* (11.2). We do not know what follows us. The phrase "do not know" / "no knowledge" underscores this motif, marking off six sections in turn: 9. 1-6; 9. 7-10; 9. 11-12; 9. 13 - 10 .15; 10. 16 - 11. 2; 11. 3-6. A third introduction (6. 10-12) precedes the two sequences. A punchy three-fold citation of the key phrase concludes the second (11. 5-6), in similar manner to 8. 17.

### *Critique.*

Wright's elegant dissection of Qohelet has been commended (15) for being

grounded in verbal repetitions. This makes for a transparent division of the material, less arbitrary than one achieved by conceptual explication, but not "sinning against logic" (16). Wright subsequently sought to buttress his case by applying the study of numerology to Qohelet (17): numerological patterns seem, for example, to confirm the bipartite division of the book. Although certain commentators (e.g. Murphy) again approved the sobriety of his observations, others (e.g. Crenshaw) were less enthusiastic: thus Crenshaw notes that Wright ignores some instances of his chosen key phrases (e.g. *הבל לעות רוח* in 4. 4), and his neglect of others (such as *ששש (המת השש)* "under the sun"). Wright's limited focus, on just three expressions as sectional markers, counteracts the apparent objectivity of his project (18).

Despite its defects, we suggest that Wright's article is a useful springboard for discussing the structural role of the Calls to Enjoyment. Far from being maverick, it refines earlier attempts in the history of Qohelet's interpretation to locate their rhetorical significance, such as C.D. Ginsburg's notion that they were sectional conclusions (19). Thus, on Wright's view, the four Calls, (in 2. 24-26; 3. 12-13; 3. 22; 5. 17-19) answer to the "vanity ..." phrases' underlining of the futility of toil in the final four sections of pt. 1. They summarise Qohelet's solitary antidote to such futility: "enjoy the fruit of your toil". Even their prescription is qualified: our ability to enjoy is divinely given (e.g. 2. 24-26), selectively bestowed (6. 1-6), and offset by our instability (6. 7-9). In the second part, two further Calls (8. 15; 9. 7-10), although acquiescing in it counterbalance Qohelet's acknowledgement of human ignorance. They recommend the only viable response to it. The final summons to rejoice (11. 9-10) opens the poetic *conclusion*. It is reiterative, for it reinforces Qohelet's earlier advice. But, Janus-like, it also anticipates (and high-

lights by its contrast) the sombre sequel on old age (12. 1-8).

Yet there are drawbacks with this neat package: notably, Wright treats the Calls somewhat two dimensionally, as repetitive, qualified prescriptions, born almost of desperation: "This is the only advice that Qoheleth feels he can offer on what is good for man to do" (p.322). He does not ask if they may have a more dominant role in the text.

2. *Ogden* implicitly builds on Wright's schema (20). Ambivalent about their genre (21), he presents the five "enjoyment" refrains between 2. 24 and 8. 15 as varied; but thematically coherent reactions to Qohelet's programmatic question in 1. 3 (22).

The key points of this his initial survey are as follows:

(1) Four of the calls (2. 24-26; 3. 12-13; 3. 22; 8. 15) share a common form, whose essential elements are:

- (a) prefatory  $\text{כִּי}$  expression, linked to
- (b) a prepositional phrase;
- (c) a subsequent deictic particle,  $\text{וְ} / \text{וְהִנֵּה}$ , + the qal imperfect; or
- (d) the negative  $\text{אֵין}$  + the infinitive construct, prefixed by  $\text{לֹא}$ .

(2) Each occurrence of the  $\text{כִּי}$  form is followed by specific reference to divine provision (2. 25-26; 3. 13,22; 8. 15), in subordinate clauses. These guarantee Qohelet's  $\text{כִּי}$  advice; their validating role is highlighted by, for example, the deictic  $\text{כִּי}$  in 2. 24 and 3. 22. Qohelet may be consciously squaring his position with God's alleged purpose / will: 2. 24ff.; 3. 12ff. and 8. 15 each have a conclusive function, encapsulating Qohelet's reply to the pessimistic results of his empirical enquiries. Thus:

(a) 2. 24-26: a declaration of intent (1. 13-14) opens Qohelet's rejoinder  $\text{לֹא יִשְׂמַח אִישׁ בְּעוֹשֵׂיוֹ}$  in 1. 3, leading into specific tests of the respective merits of

pleasure and wealth (2. 1-10), and wisdom *vis-a-vis* folly (2. 12-21). Both quests produce a negative yield, made explicit in 2. 11 and 2. 18-21: it is futile to toil, and bequeath one's gains to the next generation. *To this absurdity, Qohelet proposes a robust answer - enjoyment under God, of one's life and toil*

(b) 3. 12's commendation of joy (as divine bounty) concludes Qohelet's resumé of times and actions (embodied in an antithetical poem, 3. 1-9). It complements his negative finding in 3. 11, which is, implicitly, a reply to 1. 3 (= 3. 9): man's inability to see the larger pattern behind God's matching of time and activities.

(c) 8. 15 closes Qohelet's research into the potential of righteousness and wisdom (7. 15 - 8. 13). Again, its positive note offsets Qohelet's negative discoveries: humanity's universal limitations: the apparent success of impiety.

(d) 3. 22 and 5. 17-19 likewise commend enjoyment, undercutting further negative responses to the pilot question, *מה-יתרון?* 3. 22 supplements a double assessment, framed first positively, then negatively: having observed venality at work in the seat of justice (3. 16), Qohelet defers to God's inevitable and timely judgement (3. 17: *אלהים יפטר* "God will judge"), and stresses humanity's parity with the beasts (3. 19-21 *אין אדם יתרון*)

*אין אדם יתרון על החיה* : "man has no advantage over beast". 5. 17 (not in *אין אדם יתרון* form) provides a footnote to Qohelet's sardonic demonstration of the transience of wealth (5. 12-16): "seeing that this applies", he virtually says, "enjoy yourself...".

3. Ogden's *later* surveys of 9. 7-10 and 11. 9-10 (23) supplement his previous observations.

(1) In 9. 7-10: these verses, argues Ogden, respond to the plight of the

wise outlined in 9. 1-6.

(a) In 9. 1-6, Ogden notes various resonances with chaps. 2 and 3: for example, the pairings in 9. 2 (=2. 12-16; 3. 1-9; 3. 16-21); the opening verb signalling Qohelet's intention to scrutinize a vexing problem (= 11. 13,17: cp. 8. 9-16); the reflections on the common fate of humanity (9. 2-3 : =2. 12-15); the stressed (24) contrast between the dead and alive (9. 4-5: = 1. 16; 3. 2,19); the non-participation of the former in life under the sun (9. 5-6: = 1. 13,14; cp. 8. 9,16,17). He concludes that 9. 1-6 is a resumé of material in chaps. 2-3, reapplying it specifically to the wise.

(b) 9. 7-10, a forceful summons to enjoyment, built on a catena of imperatives, answers the predicament. The motivation for pleasure touched on in 9. 7 (כִּי רָצָה הוּא) and developed in 9. 10 (the non-availability after death of mental attributes) corresponds not only to Qohelet's remark in 9. 5-6 (25), but also - at the macro-level - to 5. 19a which, Ogden elsewhere argues, is the ground for the Call to joy in 5. 17: כִּי לֹא הָרְבֵה יִזְכֹּר אֶת יְמֵי מִיָּן. (2) 11. 9-10: Ogden notes the formal difference of this Call from the other invitations: its vocabulary, for example, is more "mental" than "physical", being a key word of the section. He also identifies its "recapping" function, as the first part of the final poem. 11. 7-8 announces the poem's dual themes: enjoyment and recollection. 11. 9 explicates the first, resuming the thread of 5. 19a, much as did 9. 10 - but transmuting that verse's negative tone (our amnesia in Sheol) into a clarion call to immediate theological reflection (יְהוֹלֵךְ לְבָבְךָ) as a source of joy.

### *Critique*

Ogden's understanding of the Calls' contextual function is more nuanced than Wright's. Each call more clearly (on his analysis) corresponds to a particular complaint, a negative answer to the Preacher's pilot question

concerning human advantage: "Complaint / Call" forms a regular negative / positive pairing. He also appears to make more of the motivation - development in 9. 7-10 and 11. 9-10. Further, his assumption that the subordinate clauses *simply* guarantee / validate the prescription, in 2. 25-26, etc., is grammatically suspect. "Deictic" particles such as  $\text{>D}$  may have a more subtle function. But is Ogden's analysis sufficiently *dynamic*? Is there, maybe, a *greater conceptual progression* through the Calls than he acknowledges? Our "prompt" here is Ogden's own observation, tantalizingly issued in his 1977 article: "In general, one can assert that the internal structural variation [in the  $\text{>D}$  sayings] serves an *emphatic* purpose by drawing attention to the values expressed in the variant element". Whybray (26) has highlighted the Calls' thematic variations: the seven texts announce (with increasing stress) seven aspects of the enjoyment-idea:

(1) 2. 24-26: Real joy comes from God. (2) 3. 12-13: Humanity gets happiness from accepting, not fretting over God's plan. (3) 3. 22: Enjoy the present: the date and consequences of one's death are unknown. (4) 5. 17-19: Acquisitions are vacuous if work is joyless. (5) 8. 15: Enjoy your opportunities for leisure and toil. (6) 9. 7-10: Life is a gift to be enjoyed - and it can be, if the divinely-given opportunities for joy are properly managed. (7) 11. 7-12: Life is brief: economy of effort is required to make the most of the present.

Can we accept such a model? An abiding question is whether we may define a *logical* development through the seven texts and (2) their *functional* status: are they keynote utterances rather than responses to negatively framed dicta?

*Generic Definition.* Having thus positioned Qoh. 9. 7-10 within their parent text, we are free to define them generically. Prompted by Loretz's study in de Moor and Watson's anthology of Ancient Near East Prose (1993), the present writer seeks evidence of the Call's *poetic* character (Chapter I). In this, he is substantially aided by the work of W.G.E. Watson: Watson's notional methodology for critiquing Hebrew poetry is the model for his own analysis of the verses' *broad* and *structural* poetic indices.

We then (Chapter II) investigate the generic "nursery" from which our putative verse-fragment emanates, comparing it with some Ancient Near East prototypes: Gilgamesh, Ugaritic Baal-myth, Theognidean lyric and Egyptian Royal Instruction. While these may (we suggest) notionally indicate its *Sitz im Leben*, "prototypes" is perhaps a misnomer for the literary samples under scrutiny: the term assumes our passage's ultimate derivation from the latter, and such a dependence-relationship is not, we argue, properly demonstrable. We contend, rather, that Qoh. 9-7, at least, is more comprehensible when read *intrabiblically*, i.e against (a) the Proverbial "table etiquette" traditions and pro-temperance poem (Provs. 23), and (b) the Deuteronomic references to joy: as a summons to a "consumption" posture (rejoicing) which is both Toranically accredited, (especially in festal contexts) and offset by other, non-Toranic consumption-styles (the indulgent, the miserly, and the debauched).

§2. *TQ 9. 7-10.* The targum to Qohelet is a document of uncertain date (Knobel places it tentatively "somewhere in the seventh century" CE (27), and, seemingly, of Palestinian provenance (28). The MSS tradition is a rich one, and Knobel exploits it by offering an eclectic text, which we adopt in preference to Levy's, Corré's or Sperber's. The writer is chiefly



concerned, first, to describe the *targumic modifications* of the *text* and *co-text* of MT 9. 7-10 (we take our cue here from Samely's handling of speech-reports in the Pentateuchal targumim), and, second, to account for these in terms of (a) the targumist's dogmatic agenda and (b) generic transformation: he argues that our wisdom verse-fragment has been converted into an oracle, perhaps in the service of pro-Solomonic propaganda.

Behind these two concerns lies the present writer's awareness both of targum's formal difference from other, comparable models of Biblical interpretation (translation, rewritten Bible, midrash (29)); and of its exegetical presuppositions, well summarised by Samely. Thus Scripture is an *organic unity* (30), wholly *coherent* (31) and *relevant* (32). In Chapter III we opt for a focused demonstration of these. We chart the targumist's linkage of the relevant text to its co-text through choice lexical additions to both, trying to show which features of the Hebrew are accounted for by the Aramaic rendition (33); and (referring to Qoh. 2. 24-6), we highlight the targumist's confidence in Qohelet's internal coherence. We also advert, via a lexical analysis (of the preposition  $\Delta T \eta$ ) to a notorious theological posture of targum: its anti-anthropomorphism.

In Chapter IV, we go "back stage", as it were, to explore the thematic context of TQ's modification of MT. We consider TQ 9. 7 in the light of its *overt* and *covert* motifs which, we argue, form a kind of thematic matrix. To the overt theme of the *Messianic banquet* (to which we provisionally attribute this verse's imagery) answer the staple rabbinic notions of the *world to come* and *eschatological Torah-renewal*. Likewise, the theme of *Torah-study's priority* (for the trainee sage) implicitly complements the overt motif of his *charitable obligations*: the "charity imperative".

*The motifs in the context of rabbinic debate, post-70 CE.*

Again, to orient the reader, we may briefly review these targumic motifs in a wider context: namely, the post - 70 CE rabbinic debate about the comparative importance of the "Three Pillars" of Judaism: Torah-study, worship / prayer and charity. S.C. Reif's recent analysis (1993) conveniently elucidates it. After the Jerusalem Temple was destroyed, the rabbis disputed about the best way forward for Judaism: what would now cement the special relationship between God and Israel? Was it (a) Torah-study; (b) worship and prayer; or (c) good deeds? Arguments were promulgated in favour of each (34). For the early *tannaim*, each of them was a theological priority. In *M. Ab.* 1. 2, Simeon the Just is credited with saying that the world's existence depends on a threefold basis: Torah,  $\text{לַבַּיִת}$  (= Temple service) and good deeds. But after 70 CE there was, among the rabbis, an intensified stress on Torah and good deeds, in response to the disappearance of Temple service (35). Thus, by way of comment on Simeon's statement, R. Johanan b. Zakkai, the pupil of Hillel and a founding father of post-Temple Judaism in the first decades following the loss of the Holy City (36), through his establishment of the Jabnean academy, allegedly assured his pupil R. Joshua b. Hananiah (a second-generation *tanna* (37)) that atonement for sin was still possible after the fall of the Temple through good deeds (i.e. charity). This contrasts with the anonymous view expressed in *ARN* (A) (38) that God prefers Torah study to burnt-offerings. The *locus-classicus*, however, on the debate is found in *B. Qid* 40b (39). The episode concerns high-level discussions during the Hadrianic persecution (40), convened in order to clarify the best path for Judaism in this national emergency. In this context, R. Aqiba's (41) preference for Torah study triumphed.

R. Aqiba's view won a large following in subsequent generations of rabbis. B. Ber. 8a is a good mine of information for the hold of the "Aqiba

line" on them. Thus R. Shesheth, a fourth century Babylonian *amora* (42), grew so impatient with public Torah reading that he continued with his studies instead. R. ben Papa, the pupil of R. Shesheth's contemporary, R. Hisda (43), indicated that God preferred *halakhah*-study centres to synagogues. Raba strongly advocated Torah study rather than prayer; R. Hamnuna's wordy prayers prompted his comment: "such people are abandoning eternal life in order to engage with mundane matters". R. Zera (44) applied Prov. 28. 9 to R. Jeremiah, his pupil, who wished to adjourn his Torah study for prayer: "he that turneth his ear away from learning Torah, even his prayer shall be an abomination": cf. *B. Shabb.* 31a (45). A more moderate line, represented (for example) by R. Hamnuna and R. Abbahu (46), in the fourth century, proposed that Torah study was complementary to prayer: R. Hamnuna thought that each had its moment, and Abbahu allegedly gave an haggadic rendering of Is. 55. 6 to the effect that God is discoverable both in houses of prayer and houses of study.

Reif stresses, however, that other views also existed. Good deeds were important, and prayer,  $\eta \text{ תפלה}$ , had become of prime significance. Thus the haggadic midrash, *Siphre* on Deut. (on 11. 13), para. 41 (47), offers a reinterpretation of  $\eta \text{ דבדב}$  as  $\eta \text{ תפלה}$ , prayer. The service demanded by Deut. 11. 13 is to be whole-hearted, and only prayer, it is argued, can be this type of service. *B. Ta'an.* reiterates this view; yet we must note that in the same passage, the first-generation *tanna* R. Eliezer b. Jacob the Elder (48) assumes that  $\eta \text{ דבדב}$  denotes  $\eta \text{ תפלה}$ . Judah b. Batyra (49) says that the festive joy once achieved through sacrificial meat-consumption is now, after 70, attainable through wine-drinking perhaps a reflection of the growing liturgical importance of wine (50). In a string of traditions cited under his name, which stress the fresh and splendid nature of prayer in contrast with cult (51), the third century

*amora*, R. Eleazor b Pedat (52) claimed that *הַשְׁפָּטָה* was better than offerings or good deeds: only Moses' prayer, not his good deeds, procured for him God's answer in Deut. 3. 26-27.

Moving on, we locate TQ 9. 8-9 in the contrasting context of rabbinic pedagogy, relating these verses to Babylonian talmudic traditions, intimately described by Neusner (1968) about sages' (and their disciples') personal hygiene, reputation and sexual *mores*.

§3. QR 9. 7-10. In an article reviewing recent approaches to the study of rabbinic literature (1986), P. Schäfer warmly prescribes (53) the "analytical-descriptive" technique of Arnold Goldberg (54). Goldberg, unhappy (for example) with the characterisation of midrashic homily as a species of *rhetoric* (that is, as comprising sequential propositions with formal features (55)), primarily attends to the precise (56) <sup>(57)</sup> *formal* and *functional* analysis of individual text-unity (*textemes*), whose original contexts are now lost. This double procedure is a route to recovering the text's *message* (its self-contained, a-contextual implications) and *meaning* (its sense within the citator's mind, within the "superordinate redactional unit" (58)). It is an inherently descriptive process, stressing the *synchronicity* (59) of a given text's *textemes* (i.e. their simultaneous existence), and, logically, forgoing their *diachronic* treatment (60). Alert to Schäfer's critique of alternative methodologies, including the thematic and the biographical (61), we nonetheless apply these to our material (Chapters IV, V and VI).

*Interpretative Basis*: We start by recognizing our text as *midrashic* (62) *haggadah*, again, of uncertain date (63)). In Heinemann's terms (1989), *haggadah* is " ... that multi-faceted type of material [including sage-dicta

and Biblical narrative-additions] found in talmudic-midrashic literature which does not fall into the category of Jewish law (i.e. *halakhah*)". According to Heinemann (64), *haggadah's* features include its self-conscious didacticism, its targetting of simple folk (65), its interpretative ingenuity. And its exegetical premises complement targum's: e.g. Scripture is polysemous (66) and multi-layered (i.e. with *overt* and *covert* dimensions of specifically *contemporary* relevance at the latter, more subtle level). Hence we shall not be surprised to discover our text's *homiletic* character, its generic diversity (67), or that it is spiced with a variety of hermeneutical technique.

On this basis we introduce our midrashic chapters. Chapter V, an examination of QR 9.7.1, effectively assesses its generic transformation of Qoh. 9. 7. Part 1 seeks to show (with three examples) the *thematic congruity* of the section's diverse traditions, which the writer argues to be essentially Abrahamic elucidations of the *Aqedah*. Part 2 argues for their *hermeneutical dexterity*: Qoh. 9. 7, their focal ingredient, is now deployed as a cluster of "trigger words", evoking (a) a wealth of Biblical contexts and (b) (via these) specific motifs treated in our sample potpourri of *Aqedah* matter. Their *resonance* is supplemented by other traces (rhetorical and lexical) of the midrashist's heuristic skill. Part 3 seeks to demonstrate the "chriization" of one of our sample traditions, a folk-loric sage-tale.

Chapter VI proposes a quasi-biographical reading of QR 9. 10: while inherently doubting with Green (1978), the historicity of sage-traditions, we suggest that the cluster of haggadic dream-stories around Qoh. 9. 10 evidence some later tradents' paranetic reimagining of their predecessors (the *amoraim*) in terms of their own interests: religious psychology (sage-dreams) in general and Rabbi's holiness in particular.

*Procedural Note:* This dissertation employs a variety of heuristic models: Hebrew-poetry analysis (Chapter I); structural critique (the Introduction); the thematic approach (Chapters IV and V); textual and intratextual criticism (Chapters I, II and III); word-studies (Chapters I, II, III and V).

#### NOTES

- (1) C.A. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6. 9-10 and Their Interpreters*, Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989
- (2) *Triadic*, because built on a three-fold pattern around three imperatives and three  $\text{>}$ -introduced motive-clauses; a *unit* because marked off by inclusions (forms of  $\text{75D}$ ): cf. Ogden 1982, 11987.
- (3) Murphy, 1992, p.90.
- (4) Whybray, 1989, p.43.
- (5) Barton, 1908.
- (6) Although not necessarily derived from them. See, for example, Hengel, 1981, II, p.83, n.129.
- (7) Cf. Whybray, 1982.
- (8) See, e.g., Gordis, 1944.
- (9) So Hengel, 1981, I, pp.126-27; and II, p.86, n.154.
- (10) For example, Siegfried argued that four different glossators, two editors and two epilogists had produced the work we know as Qohelet, as well as the original author. 9. 7-10 was contributed by glossator Q2, a Sadducee with Epicurean leanings, striving to offset the pessimism of the author's original text (found in such verses as 9. 2,3,5,6 or 10. 5-7: for a complete list of the "original" verses see Barton, (1908, p.28)). It is no surprise, therefore, that Q2 also added the other verses which stress the pleasure theme: 3. 22; 5. 17-20; 7. 14; 8. 15; 11. 7-9. McNeille (1904)

modified Siegfried's scheme so far as to postulate the activity of only two glossators. Barton himself is in broad agreement with McNeille's schema, which suggests that the bulk of the text we have is original, including the principal verses on the pleasure theme. Theories of this type would appear to exaggerate the role, in Qohelet's creation, of a common phenomenon in ancient books: glosses. If Qohelet lacked glosses entirely, it would be unique among the books of the Hebrew Bible. It seems hasty, however, to assume that most of its contents are from a glossator's hand. The critic should invoke interpolation-theory only if Qohelet proves unintelligible as a literary whole without it. Also, the editorial process envisaged (for example by Siegfried), would require a period longer than that which actually elapsed between the book's completion (probably about 250 BCE) and its general circulation, around the start of the next century.

(11) Wright, 1968, pp.315-16.

(12) G. Castellino, 1968, pp.15-28.

(13) Wright, 1968, pp.320ff.

(14) We have adopted Wright's titles.

(15) E.g., by Murphy, 1992, p.xxxviii.

(16) *Ibid.*

(17) See "The Riddle of the Sphinx Revisited: Numerical Patterns in the Book of Qoheleth", *CBQ* 42 (1980), pp.38-51, and especially "Additional Numerical Patterns in Qoheleth", *CBQ* 45 (1983), pp.34-43.

(18) Crenshaw, 1988, pp.40-42.

(19) 1861, p.17 with reference only to 2. 26; 5. 17-19 and 8. 15: compare other schemata mentioned by Wright, 1968, p.315, n.7.

(20) And, e.g. Ginsburg's (n. above). in stressing the Calls' conclusive role.

(21) In his 1977 article, Ogden scarcely touches on the *ḥōdā* dicta,

hesitant as to whether he should include them as a subspecies of the *tob spruchs* saying (p.493).

(22) Ogden, 1979, pp.341ff.

(23) Ogden, 1982, 1984, respectively.

(24) In vv.4-5,  $\eta>\eta$  and  $\eta$  <sup>(in cognate form)</sup> each recurs three times, in an a-a-b // a-b-b pattern.

(25) Ogden does not appear to note this correspondence.

(26) Whybray, 1982.

(27) Knobel, 1976, p.88; see pp.86-8 for discussion. A scholarly consensus places TQ's composition-date (cf. QR's) between the closure of the Talmuds and the Arabic conquest of Palestine, i.e. in the sixth or seventh centuries.

(28) Knobel believes TQ to be a "corrected" document, originally in Palestinian Aramaic, which was emended by Babylonian scribes to assimilate it to the language of the Babylonian Talmud and the Onkelos targum. He summarises the evidence for this Palestinian origin. For example, of the prepositions used  $\text{ܐܘܘܟܝ}$  (3. 13) and  $\text{ܩܫܢ}$  (9. 7) are found in western Aramaic, and only in Syriac among the eastern Aramaic dialects. Again, the use of  $\text{ܨܕܢ}$  (to see) is frequent in all the MSS. The presence of Greek and Latin loan words also betrays its Palestinian Aramaic nature of TQ. Not only the *language* but also the *style* of TQ suggests that its provenance is Palestinian. Stylistically, it is close to the Palestinian targumim to the Pentateuch; *contra* A. Corré, who favours Babylonia as the place of origin. He adduces the frequent citations of the Babylonian Talmud in support of this opinion.

(29) Samely, 1993, pp.158ff.

(30) Samely, 1993, p.168.

(31) See, e.g., Samely, 1993, pp.105ff; p.168.

(32) Samely, 1993, p.134.



- (33) Cf. Samely, 1993, p.169.
- (34) Reif, 1993, p.67.
- (35) Reif, 1993, pp.95f.
- (36) For a note on the establishment of Jabneh and other academies, such as Lydda, see Schurer, 1973 *et seq.*, pp.369-70.
- (37) Strack, 1959, p.111, nn.17-19.
- (38) Recension A, commenting on *M. Ab.* 1.2: cf. Reif, 1993, p.95 and p.355, n.14.
- (39) See also Urbach, 1975, I, pp.351-53 for the theological crisis involved.
- (40) The Roman back-lash to the Jewish uprising of 132-135 CE, Bar Kochba's revolt.
- (41) R. Aqiba ben Joseph, usually R. Aqiba, 110-135 CE. His school was at Bene Barak, east of modern Jaffa, but he also frequented Lydda and Jabneh. He was renowned for deriving "mountains of *halakhoth*" from each tittle of the Law. (Strack, 1959, p.112 and n.40.)
- (42) Strack, 1959, p.127.
- (43) Strack, 1959, p.127. d. 309 CE. He was head of a school at Sura.
- (44) Strack, 1959, p.127. Another fourth century Palestinian *amora*, hailing from Babylonia. He was a pupil of R. Judah bar Ezekiel (d. 299 CE).
- (45) Strack, 1959, p.127, another fourth century Babylonian *amora*.
- (46) Abbahu flourished in the fourth century CE. He was one of the later pupils of R. Johanan bar Naphaha (d. 279 CE?), and a disputant with Christians. He possessed a good knowledge of Greek <sup>language</sup> and culture.
- (47) For a general introduction to the tannaitic midrashim see Strack, 1959, pp.206ff. Their date is hard to fix; in their original form they probably date from the second century but were revised later. See also Schurer, 1973 *et seq.*, I p.90.

- (48) Late first century: especially interested in Temple service and equipment, (Strack, 1959, p.110 and n.29.).
- (49) An early second century *tanna* (Strack, 1959, p.114).
- (50) Reif, 1993, p.356, n.24.
- (51) *B. Ber.* 32b.
- (52) Another fourth century Palestinian *amora*; a pupil (in his native Babylonia).
- (53) Schäfer, 1986, pp.144ff.
- (54) See, e.g., Goldberg, 1985.
- (55) Goldberg, 1985, p.162.
- (56) Cf. Goldberg's microscopic studies of rabbinic text forms: Schäfer, 1986, pp.144-5.
- (57) E.g., of the Midrashic Dictum and  $\int \psi \Delta$ : see Schäfer, 1986, for citations.
- (58) Schäfer's expression, 1986, p.144.
- (59) Goldberg, *FJB* 11 (1983), pp.5f., quoted by Schäfer, 1986, p.145: "The synchronicity of a text is...the simultaneous juxtaposition of various units, independent of when the units originated."
- (60) Complementary, however, is the necessarily diachronic study of MSS traditions and their reception, which will elicit *their* life-setting, if not that of the texts themselves.
- (61) Schäfer objects to the conceptual artificiality of thematic analysis, both in terms of themes identified (e.g. the Holy Spirit: not inherent as such to rabbinic literature) and their illustrative material (typically assembled piece-meal from disparate sources). For biography's flaws, cf. Green, 1978, and Chapter VI.
- (62) We would accept Porton's (1981, p.62) as our working definition of midrash, over against earlier ones (e.g. Bloch's, 1957: see Callaway, 1978,

pp.31-3): "...a type of literature, oral or written, which stands in direct relationship to a fixed, canonical text, considered to be the authoritative and the revealed word of God by the midrashist and his audience, and in which this canonical text is explicitly cited or clearly alluded to."

(63) For discussion, see Knobel, 1976, pp.87-9: he favours "somewhere in the seventh century", as for TQ: cf. Cohen, 1951, p.vii, and Corré, 1953, p.27.

(64) Heinemann, 1989, pp.46-7.

(65) Cf. *Hirshman*'s judgement, quoted below, p. 158

(66) Cf. *B. Sanh.* 34a (quoted by Heinemann, p.47).

(67) See especially Hirshman, 1989, who, in the light of early Greek patristic exegesis, defines five exegetical categories in QR which reflect the multiple contexts in which exposition occurred: Solomonic exegesis; allegory (etc.); anecdotes (*ΧΡΙΔΙ*); categories.

CHAPTER I

Poetics: Poetic Indices in Qohelet 9. 7-10.

In his commentary, J.A. Loader notes that although the masoretes received Qohelet as prose, the LXX translators ranked it among the poetic books (1). The present writer wishes to argue that Loader's confidence in Qohelet's poetic status is justified in respect of Qoh. 9. 7-10 (2). Broad indicators of our focal passage's poetic nature are its distinctive lineation and use of metre. Structural indicators include word-pairing, repetition (keywords, formulae), merismus and (possibly) sound-patterning (3).

Text (BHS)

זָלַף אֶכֶל בְּשִׂמְחָה לַחֲמֶה וְשָׂתָה בְּלֵב-טוֹב יַיְגֶה  
 כִּי כִכָּר רִצָּה הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת-מַעֲשֵׂיךָ :  
 בְּכָל-עֵת יִהְיוּ בְנֵיךָ לְבָנִים וְשִׂמְן עַל-רֹאשְׁךָ אַל-יִחָסֵר :  
 רְאֵה חַיִּים עִם-אִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר-אָהַבְתָּ כָּל-יְמֵי חַיֵּי הַבְּלָדָה  
 יֵאָשֶׁר נָתַן לָךְ תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ כָּל יְמֵי הַבְּלָדָה :  
 כִּי הוּא חִלְקֶךָ בְּחַיִּים וּבַעֲמֻלָּךְ אֲשֶׁר-אַתָּה עֹמֵל תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ :  
 כֹּל אֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָא יָדְךָ לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּכַחַךְ עֲשֵׂה  
 כִּי אֵין מַעֲשֵׂה וְחִשְׁבוֹן וְדַעַת וְחִכְמָה בַּשָּׂאֵל  
 אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה הֹלֵךְ שָׂמָּה :

9<sup>a</sup> add; > nonn Mss S || <sup>b</sup> > pc Mss C || <sup>c</sup> sic Q<sup>Or</sup>; K<sup>Or</sup> היא || <sup>d</sup> εὐ εἶν εἶν || <sup>e</sup> ωω  
 ωω = קָחֶיךָ || 12<sup>a</sup> sic L, mit Mss Edd אֵת- || 13<sup>a</sup> dl? - || <sup>b</sup> = עָלֶי cf 6,1 || 14<sup>a</sup> 1  
 c 2 Mss ε σ'σ' מצורפים || 15<sup>a</sup> mit Mss C וְחֵ.

Translation (RSV)

7 Go, eat your bread with enjoyment, and drink your wine with a merry heart; for God has already approved what you do.  
 8 Let your garments be always white; let not oil be lacking on your head.  
 9 Enjoy life with the wife whom you love, all the days of your vain life which he has given you under the sun, because that is your portion in life and in your toil at which you toil under the sun. 10 Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with your might; for there is no work or thought or knowledge or wisdom in Sheol, to which you are going.

## A. Broad Indicators.

1. *Lineation*: O. Loretz tries to determine the stichometry of Qohelet 9. 7-9 by *letter-counting*, a technique which he has used elsewhere (4) to distinguish between original and later material: lines of above-average length will wholly or partially fall into the latter category. Loretz regards 9. 7-9a as originally a lyric fragment (an Israeli tavern-song), preceded by Siduri's message to Gilgamesh in the garden by the sea (5), and stilted by the later accretion of dogmatic sentiments:

9. 7.1 (14 letters)	לחמה ... ל	(=9.7a)
9. 7.2 (14 letters)	כי ... י	(=9.7b)
[9. 7.3 gloss]	[כי ... מעשיך]	(=9.7c)
9. 8.1 (19; last 5 glossed)	[לבוים] ... כ	(=9.8a)
9. 8.2 (16 letters)	ושי ... יחסר	(=9.8b)
9. 9.1 (19 letters; last 7 perhaps glossed)	[א' אהבתה] ... ראה	(=9.9a)
[9. 9.2 gloss]	[כך ... הכלך]	(=9.9b)

*Critique*: What are we to make of this? Although a helpful aid to checking lineation, Loretz's method seems somewhat facile, for accretions (glosses, liturgical inserts) are over-identified (6) and (consequently) cavalier text-critical decisions made. The critic must therefore hesitate to accept the above schema at face-value.

R. Gordis prefers to delineate our focal verses according to their *syllabic accentuation*. 9. 7-9.1 comprise a distinct strophe in 4/4 verse-form, couched in a bed of prose (9. 4-5: "ordinary prose"; 9. 6: "rhythmic prose"; 9. 9c-11 (7): "rhythmic prose"):

לך אכל בשמחה לחמה / ושתה בלב טוב יינה	9.7ab
כי כבר רצה האלהים את מעשיך:	c
בכל עת יהיו בנדיך לבנים / ושמן על ראשך אל יחסר:	9.8ab
ראה חיים עם אשה אשר אהבתה / כל ימי חיי הבלך	9.9.ab
אשר נתן לך תחת השמש יכל ימי הבלך <sup>9</sup>	c d ?
כי הוא חלקך בחיים ובעמלק אשר אתה עמל תחת השמש:	ef ?
כל אשר תמצא ידך לעשות בכחך עשה	9.10 a ?
כי אין מעשה וחשבון ודעת וחכמה בשאול	b ?
אשר אתה הלך שמה: °	c ?

*Critique:* Gordis' decision assumes the metrical character of Qoh. 9. 7-9.

It is therefore best considered from the metricist's perspective.

2. *Metre:* The accentual (stress) theory of metre is well-established (8) and certainly deserves attention in the present context. Given that the Hebrew verse-couplet (Hebrew verse's "normal unit" (9)) may be *variously* accented (10), we may say that the *manner* of accentuation is basically consistent: *although the final syllable normally carries the accent, the accent is often on the penultimate syllable* (11). Qoh. 9. 7-9, as accented by Gordis, conform to this principle. We may therefore provisionally accept his lineation.

*Critique:* If we have identified an accent-pattern in our putative verse segment, is it of any importance? It is arguable that Hebrew poets (a) consciously exploited word-stress (12) and (b) did so for the sake of their poems' *oral performance*. Thus stress-determined metre indicates the ideal tempo and texture of performance (a dirge would be slow, a victory song spritely: compare Lam. 5 with Ps. 29; Jer. 46. 3ff, with its two-beat staccato cola, moves fast). Such metre also sets up a creative framework for the oral poet and a certain expectancy in the audience - a "listening pattern" - which may be "defeated" by metrical dislocations, changes.

Thirdly, it refreshes the poet's language and stretches his verbal dexterity: he is drawn away from banal phraseology. Fourth, "metre implies the unusual": so with Qoh. 9. 7-10 - this verse fragment, sandwiched into prose, reiterates (as it were, with underscoring) two of Qohelet's key ideas: the inevitability of death and humanity's corresponding duty to maximise its life. Finally, metrical verse could be more easily memorised - a vital factor in the transmission of orally composed poetry (13).

B. (*Structural Indicators*).

1. *Parallel word-pairs*: Our putative verse fragment contains at least two parallel word-pairs (14) - that is, pairings which are (a) fairly frequent in BH, (b) used in a couplet's parallel lines and (c) comprised of elements belonging to the same grammatical class (15). Each pair is considered in turn.

שתה / לך: Y. Avishur (16) has identified this as a pair common to four Semitic languages (Hebrew, Akkadian, Ugaritic and Aramaic), which occurs with fair frequency in BH, paratactically (17) and parallelistically (18). "There are pairs", claims Avishur (19), "where logical sequence determines the componential positioning. Thus, it is most logical to position pairs that mark two actions wherein one is an extension or continuation of the other, in the order of activity. Pairs reflecting this postulate are ... לך/שתה, etc." May not שתה / לך be among them (20)?

} > / דחם: H.L. Ginsberg was one of the first scholars to note this pair as one of many common to Ugaritic and Hebrew (21). More recently, J.C. Greenfield (22) has recognized the affinity, in both tongues, of דחם and } >. According to Avishur, the pair occurs both in parataxis (23) and in parallelism (24). In Qoh. 9. 7-8, it contributes (with } >) to a triplet: a Ugaritic text (CTA 16 [126] III 13-16) (25) reflects Qohelet's componential order (bread / wine / oil) (26):

kly lhm [b] 'dnhm: spent is the bread from their jars

kly ya bhmthm: spent the wine from their skins

killy smn bq [ ]: spent the oil from their jugs.

In Greenfield's view, the two Hebrew examples enjoy close affinity in

content and phraseology.

*Critique:* These two word-pairs seem to fall into Watson's broad category of synonymous couplings: in each case, their members belong to the same semantic class. Perhaps they are best termed *hyponyms* of this large class (27): compare  $\text{y}^{\text{T}} / \text{y}^{\text{z}}$  "to understand / to know" (hyponyms of the verbal class denoting mental activity). Further, we might call  $\text{b}^{\text{ns}} / \text{y}^{\text{z}}$  a correlative word-pair, since they are correlated hyponyms of a class of nouns for food and drink, possibly linked by a simple idea-association (28).

What, then, of our word-pairs' significance: do they perhaps indicate the *oral origins* of Qoh. 9. 7-9? Scholars are divided over the connection of parallel word-pairs with the oral beginnings of Hebrew poetry. Thus Yoder (29), having asked whether Hebrew poets could rely on an orally-transmitted "dictionary" of such pairs for help in composing, readily recognises their frequency in a given sample of verse (e.g. Ps. 54 and Nah. 1) (30), and infers from this fact the poems' possible oral origin (31). His "traditional fixed word-pairs" are comparable to Parry's Homeric formulae (32). They are part of the oral poet's "regular stock-in-trade" (33) serving his need for readily available vocabulary to meet "the exigencies of parallelism". ("He must have for his use word-groups all made to fit his verse and tell what he has to tell.") A corpus of traditional pairings arose to oblige the poet who has to find parallel words to fit parallel cola. Whallon's earlier comparative studies of ancient formulaic diction similarly regard the Hebrew poet as having a stockpile of orally-developed (34) formulae (which, for him à la Parry (35) includes both the repeated, traditional word-pair and the repeated phrase) (36). For Whallon also, Biblical word-pairs ("synonyms in parallel cola" (37)) are a compositional aid, largely part of a gradually accumulated "word-fund", developed by oral poets. Gevirtz likewise sees



seemingly clichéd word-pairs as a reflection of the Biblical poets' respect for oral tradition - as a flexible mode of conventional diction which enabled rapid composing in new situations (38).

Conversely, Watters refuses to view word-pairs solely or primarily as an aid to oral verse-making, for these "traditional", supposedly orally-transmitted pairings also occur (like other forms of formulaic diction) within written texts (39). Indeed, Watters argues against the very notion of a "thesaurus" of word-pairs (*pace* Ginsberg, Wallon *et al*), handed down through the generations. From a survey of Isaianic word-pairs, he finds that the recurrent pairings are far outnumbered by non-recurrent ones (40). These latter, he thinks, are the poet's free creation; and he attributes, against Whallon (41), the repetition of the former to mundane reasons: their facility (42) or naturalness (they are marriages of convenience), and the "exigencies of a limited root vocabulary in Hebrew". The abundance of unique pairings reflects the poet's creativity: his(?) preference for *personal* word-choice over dependence upon an ancestral database of lexemes. Nor will Watters compare word-pairs to Homeric formulae such as epithets. For, whereas the epithet is artistically created (43), aiding (but not vital to) the prosody of the hexameter, word-pairs are mechanically essential to the composing of parallel cola.

Kugel further jibes against any idea of "fixed" pairs being part of the "regular stock-in-trade of the Canaanite poets" (44). He notes that many of the pairs are elsewhere used "merismatically": this suggests to him that word-pairs may have been commonly formed from the breakdown of such stock phrases (merisms) into parallel halves (45), the merisms being originally no more poetic than stereotyped expressions in English, such as "bag and baggage". "What is poetic", says Kugel, "is the breaking<sup>k</sup> up of such proverbial pairs ..... into adjacent clauses to establish the interclausal

connection and the feeling of closure".

If they are not primarily (or at all) a compositional aid for the oral poet (46), what poetic role do our pairings play? Kugel comments that word-pairs "strongly establish the feeling of correspondence between (colon) A and B. Indeed, the more stereotypical the pairing, the greater the bond; with the most frequently used pairs, the appearance of the first in itself creates the anticipation of its fellow, and when the latter comes it creates a harmonious feeling of completion and satisfaction. Secondly, in another way the pairs themselves may bring out the 'what's more' relationship of B to A, for, as has been pointed out, the second word of the pair sequence is most often the rarer and more literary term (47); when both terms are common, the second is sometimes a going-beyond the first in its meaning" (48). The first observation would seem to apply to Qoh. 9. 7 more than the second - it is not apparent that 9. 7b is a "going-beyond" 9. 7a in meaning, but the double pairing certainly reinforces the correspondence between the cola.

Watson stresses another function of pairings. They aid cohesion of the verse passage, help to weld the parallel cola together, to achieve lexical complementarity between them: "There is cohesion between any pair of lexical items that stand to each other in some recognizable lexico-semantic (word meaning) relation ..... There is always the possibility of cohesion between any pair of lexical items which are in some way associated with each other in the language" (49).

## 2. Repetition: *Formulae and Keywords.*

(1) *Formulae: orality.* Inspired by Milman Parry (50), R.C. Culley argued that the Psalmic corpus bristled with *formulae* and *formulaic systems*. A formula he defined as "a repeated group of words the length of which

corresponds to one of the divisions in the poetic structure, such as the line or the smaller divisions within the line created by some formal division such as the caesura" (51). A formulaic system, on the other hand, was "a group of phrases having the same syntactical pattern, the same metrical structure and at least one major lexical item in common" (52). Scouting through the Psalms, Culley detected "72 phrases which are formulas or belong to formulaic systems" (as, for example  $\text{אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  in Ps. 31. 3; 88. 3).

The putative *orality* (i.e. oral origin) of his Psalmic formulae Culley felt to be indicated by a distinct profile (53): e.g. strategic sound patterning (for maximum audience-impact (54)); their traditional origin; their preservation of archaic ideas. And both formulae and formulaic systems were, he suggested, primarily functional: compositional aids, metrical slot-fillers (55). Culley's Psalmic samples fail, however, to meet his own generated criteria (56): they are not, for example, prevalently archaic in wording or import, nor rich in sound-arrangements which are (a) absent in *written* Hebrew verse or (b) obviously designed for *oral* effect. Culley accordingly also remains agnostic about their derivation from a traditional orally-transmitted stockpile (57).

Qohelet contains several expressions which seemingly answer to Culley's (or Watson's) formula-definition. One example, attested in the Calls to Enjoyment, is the phrase  $\text{הַבֵּל וְרַעוֹת רִנָּה}$ , found at 2. 26 (and also at 1. 14; 2. 11, 17; 6. 9), which forms the lexemic core of a Culleyan formulaic system, being variously modified:  $\text{וְהַנְּהֵה הַבֵּל וְרַעוֹת רִנָּה}$  (1. 14; 2. 11);  $\text{אֲבֵן הַבֵּל וְרַעוֹת רִנָּה}$  (2. 17);  $\text{אֲבֵן הַבֵּל וְרַעוֹת רִנָּה}$  (2. 26; 6. 9);  $\text{אֲבֵן הַבֵּל וְרַעוֹת רִנָּה}$  (4. 6);  $\text{אֲבֵן הַבֵּל וְרַעוֹת רִנָּה}$  (4. 16). Another is the recurrent idiom  $\text{פְּחַת הַשֹּׁמֵר}$  (57a) which appears twice in Qoh. 9. 9 and 25 times elsewhere in Qohelet (58): on this we presently focus.

Both are *recurrent*, a primary feature in Culley's prescription, and both are *metrical* combinations. Yet neither seems to mesh with Culley's orality-profile (59), any more than his selection. We would, therefore, be rash (on Culley's terms) to describe either as oral-formulaic, as "ready-made [phrases or invented] taken [or becoming] from traditional diction" (60).

(2) *Formulae: depth*. If they are non-traditional (or, at least, not *demonstrably* traditional) we need not ascribe to them a purely (or primarily) *functional* role (61): may they not have a significant *semantic* import? Rephrased, that question becomes: *do they have "depth", i.e. certain evocative possibilities?* Previously asked of less equivocally traditional phraseology (principally, Homeric epithets), the query seems equally pertinent to our cases also.

Initiating his analysis (62) of selected Homeric epithets, R. Sacks considers generally the vexed question of whether or not depth can be said to attach to a traditional phrase. He quotes Parry's disciple, Lord (63): "All the elements in traditional poetry have depth, and our task is to plumb their sometimes hidden recesses, for there will meaning be found". The depth of which Lord speaks, Sacks notes (64), seems to be the formula's traditional, often intricate (65) meaning: this may be ascertained through contextual analysis of its occurrences. Sacks then briefly adverts to examples (66), but warns against over-zealous attempts to plumb the depth of Homeric formulae - such as Austin's illegitimate explication of the "dawn" phrases' original context and impact (67).

Sacks proceeds to examine certain formulae, like *φαίδριος* (commonly glossed "shining" or the like), an epithet particularly associated with Hector. He charts its Iliadic occurrences in their full linguistic context, discovering that it modifies *men* only, except in the phrase *φαίδριμα γυῖα*, found some eight times (at 8. 447-53; 10. 9-5; 13. 434-44; 16. 20-7, 793-

805; 23. 889-97). This description characterises men and gods at their least potent. Six times *φαιδριμπος* is found with the proper name *Ἄϊξ*, four times with the noun *ἕϊος*. Invariably, in these cases, the epithet's subject is bemired in inglorious circumstances (68). It applies to the Trojan hero, Hector, 29 times. Again, the context of its usage is consistently inappropriate to its glossed sense. Hector is far from "shining" on the occasions when he is so described. Sacks notes: "The most concentrated instances [of *φαιδριμπος*] are in passages overtly emphasising his defeats, delusions and ultimate death; [*φαιδριμπος*] is indeed non-ornamental, embedded in a contextual pattern characterising the hero who clings, self-delusively, to the old social order" (69).

(3) *Formulae*: *שש הן חן* Our preliminary (70) contextual analysis of Qohelet's ubiquitous idiom, *שש הן חן*, highlights its largely negative nuances. Only twice, seemingly, does it link with the preacher's enjoyment-prescriptions: once in relation to toil (at 5. 17, joy is a proper return for toil 'ש הן חן), and once more generally (joy is the only good for man 'ש הן חן : 8. 15). Otherwise its associations are relatively dark. Thus, twice, at least, 'ש הן חן modifies Qohelet's pessimistic assessment of *life* (*ד>ח*) in general: at 9. 9, *ד>ח* is *ל הב* under the sun, and, at 6. 12, highly uncertain (*ל>ד*). More frequently, it delimits the writer's negative *observations* (introduced by *הן*) of more specific phenomena. At 3. 16;, he sees, *שש הן חן*, the displacement, by wickedness, of justice (*שש*) and righteousness (*הן*); and, at 4. 1, he notes "all the acts of oppression (*העשק*) (*העשק*)"; and, at 4. 3). At 9. 13, he observes the momentous neglect of wisdom by a small, besieged city (cf, 10. 5), and, at 9. 11, the predominance *שש הן חן* of time and chance. Most strikingly, a little crop of instances associate the phrase with toil's

negativity - especially in (אגב). 2. What profit is there from toil (עמל),  
 , Qohelet enquires at 1. 3 and 2. 22 (cf. 2. 11)? He came to hate his toil  
 (עמל) תחת השמש

(2.18), having to bequeathe its fruits to a successor (2.  
 19): it generates despair (2. 20).

Given this background, we suggest the idiom evokes (at Qoh. 9. 9) a  
 double concentration of gloom, the implicit profitlessness of life generally,  
 and one's toil in particular: *in toto*, one's מלך, one's potential  
 portion (70a).

*Keywords.* Qoh. 9. 7-10 contains some of the Preacher's favourite words,  
 notably עמל, איכל, שמוח, הטב, טרב, עשהו, ריאה

(71). We may tabulate these in order to determine their

comparative frequency and relative positions (72); observing the metrical  
 Schema from p. 21.

9. 7 a	ב	טוב	שמוח	ב	איכל	לך
b		טוב	שמוח	ב		
c						כי
d						אעניך
9. 8 a						כל
b						
9. 9 a						ריאה חיים
b					כל	הטב חיים
? c						
? d					כל	הטב
? e					כי	חיים
? f				ב(2)		עמל
						עמל

Note: תחת השמש occurs twice, in 9.9c and e.

9.10 a	ב	כנ	עשות(2)
b	ב		עשה
c	הלך		

The result is suggestive. Centrally incident is *ב* (x 3: juxtaposed with *עשה*, twice, and *עשה*, also twice), flanked by four occurrences of and cognates (9. 7d; 9. 10a [twice]; 9. 10b). Do these possibly highlight the text's structure and thematic progression? If so, the twin motifs of work and life are dominant, perhaps delimiting (or summarising) the units of thought as follows: (a) God approves the addressee's *deeds*; (b) enjoy *life*; (c) your *life* is empty / toilsome / gloomy [*עשה*]; (d) Act positively. *ב*, *עשה* (and cognates) would, in other words, be functioning as *keywords*, encoding the text's principal emphases (73). A translation, with the putative keywords italicized, will show up these:

9. 7 Go, eat your bread with pleasure,

And drink your wine with a good heart.

For already God has approved your *work*.

9. 8 At all times let your clothes be white,

And oil upon your head - let it not be lacking.

9. 9 See life with a woman you love

(All the days of your absurd *life*)

Which God gives to you *under the sun* -

(All the days of your absurd *life*),

For this is your portion in *life* and in your *toil*

wherein you *toil under the sun*.

9.10 Everything which your hand finds

to *work at* - with your vigour, *work at*

for there is no *work* nor profit

nor knowledge nor wisdom in Sheol

which is where you are going.

3. *Merismus* 9. 10:

כִּי אֵינְךָ אַעֲשֶׂה וְחִשְׁבוֹן וְדַעַת וְחִכְמָה בְּשֵׁאוֹל

Is this sequence meristic, that is, an "abbreviated expression of a totality" (74)? Apart from Watson's definition, just cited, Honeyman (75) offers the following: "Merismus consists in detailing the individual members, or some of them - usually the first and the last, or the most prominent - of a series, thereby indicating either the genus of which those members are species or the abstract quality which characterises the genus and which the species have in common". Thus the significance of the individual units is subordinated to the whole idea for which they stand, so that their collective effect is what matters. See, for example, Is. 1. 6:

אֲכַף רֶגֶל וְעַד לֵאשׁ  
אֵינְךָ בְּרֵאשִׁית

This implies the disease's all-pervasiveness.

Now if the Qoh. 9. 10 sequence is meristic, can we define it more precisely? Are we not, perhaps, presented with a *selective list*? Watson distinguishes three sub-types of such a list: (a) a list with an *explicit* total at its *head*; (b) a list with an *explicit* total at its *end*; (c) a list with an *implicit* total. Clearly, our list (if list it be) does not fall into category (a) or (b): if it is meristic, it may be an example of sub-type (c). As specimens of this, Watson offers Gen. 12. 6; Ps. 81. 3 and (the closest parallel to ours) Hos. 4. 1:

כִּי אֵינְךָ אֵשֶׁת  
וְאֵינְךָ חֶסֶד  
וְאֵינְךָ דַעַת וְדַעַת אֱלֹהִים בְּאֶרֶץ



Drawing out the comparison between this latter verse and Qoh. 9. 10, we observe that *Hosea's* is a non-exhaustive list of *ethico-religious* qualities, the first two of which are subsumed in the third. It is this third element which captures the state of mind sought by the prophet. *Qohelet's* is a non-exhaustive list of *mental* states which, the present writer suggests, is summed up in the term: *הַמְכִיחַ*. This would seem to be the "gather word", representing the latent quality shared by members of the *genus*, intellectual activity.

Finally, is there any significance in our list's *triadic* nature? Does this perhaps lend a proverbial edge to the imperative, *בְּכַחַךְ עֲשֵׂה* in Qoh. 9. 10? It seems less likely that the triad simply acts as a line-filling expletive, as in Jb. 41. 18b (75a).

#### 4. Sound-patterning.

Qoh. 9. 7-10 exemplifies Qohelet's preference for elaborate sound-patterning: another structural (?) (76) indicator of his poeticism in this key "Call to Enjoyment".

(1) *Alliteration (i.e. consonant repetition)*. In Qoh. 9. 7-10: there is an *ש* cluster (9. 7a), alliterative initial *ד*'s, alliterative initial *ו*'s (9. 9), alliterative *נ*'s (9. 9b,c). With the *ש* cluster in 9. 7, it is instructive to compare the /s/ alliteration which adorns the advice of Siduri to Gilgamesh, in the Akkadian (cited by Watson, 1986, p. 226):

*sikaram siti simti mati*: "Drink beer: it's the country custom!"

We also find some echo-alliteration in 9. 7-10: the alliteration spills over from one colon into the next: *כְּכַבֵּר | כִּי יִנְדָּב* (9. 7c,d); *וּבְכַחַךְ | כִּי* (9. 9b,c). 9. 9b,c, indeed, contains an extensive piece of repetitive alliteration.

In terms of *function*, alliteration is *cohesive*. It binds together the elements of a poetic unit (this, according to Watson, is especially true of word-initial alliteration), often occurring within a single line (77). The linking effect of alliteration is apparent in verse *segments* (as opposed to separate *cola*). Thus in 9. 7-9, *Ḷ* occurs fourteen times, *Ḷ* thirteen times (78). Other functions of alliteration (79) include the *mnemonic* function (it aids the oral poet's recall), the *energetic* function ("to focus the reader's attention, vividly and suddenly on the physical details of an object, a person or an event"), and the *vocative* function. This last is pertinent in 9. 7-10: it lends the reader a sense of "energetic imperative or request" (80).

(2) *Assonance (i.e. vowel repetition)*. In our putative verse-fragment, we find what we may term *sequential assonance*, or sequences of vowel sounds: an opening vowel-series, /e,e,o/ (9. 7), and closing series, /o,e,e,a/ (9. 7); and line-final /e,a/ (9. 7a,b,c; 9. 8,b; 9. 9a,b; 9. 10).

Functionally, as with alliteration, assonance has a cohesive role: it helps to cement together a poem's component parts, at the level of single words (as in word-pairs), phrases or longer verse passages. Thus, for example, the repeated line-final /e,a/ in 9. 7-10 bind the cola closer. A *secondary* function often apparent is *emphasis*, where the sound underscores the meaning (81).

(3) *McCreesh's analysis*: McCreesh's study of sound in Proverbs furnishes us with more elegant tools for sound analysis. An example pertinent to Qoh. 9. 7-10 is *correlation*: a phonic pattern definable as the "indirect support of argument by related echoes" (82), or as follows: "the sounds of the word(s) ... which are key to the meaning are echoed throughout the verse

so as to subtly reinforce the sense" (83). By correlative sound-patterning, the sense is reproduced, underscored by phonic reiteration. (An English example is in G.M. Hopkins poem "Margaret":

Margaret, are you grieving  
 rg r r grieving  
 over Goldengrove unleaving  
 r g gr eaving

Here, the theme of grief is reiterated as semantic progress is made as the argument develops.)

An example culled from Proverbs by McCreesh exemplifies this pattern in Hebrew poetry: 11. 26.

בָּנֵעַ כֶּרֶם יִקְבְּהוּ לְאֹמֹם (וּבְרִכָּה לְרֵאשׁ אִשׁ בַּיִר

The proverb's opening sounds recur at the start and end of the second colon. The keyword כֶּרֶם (= grain) has its consonants reappear in the second colon's בְּרִכָּה and אִשׁ: this underscores the notion of the grain-seller's blessedness. Further, the sound-sequence א, ב, כ, the opening phrase of the proverb recurs at the end. Thus the two opposed personalities, the grain hoarder and seller, are phonically linked. And the double sounding, in slightly different sequences, in the final colon of the consonants א, ב, שׁ (רֵאשׁ/ב, רֵשׁ, בֶּרֶךְ) stresses the blessing's bestowal on the seller.

McCreesh's other examples of sound-correlation from Prov. 10-29 are perhaps matched in Qoh. 9. 7-10:

(a) Here we note the reiteration of /e/ in 9. 7a's first and 9. 7b's first and last words. This emphasises the urgency of the pursuit, the intimacy of the chase and its object. The "repetition furnishes a common background against which the transition from action to consequence...can be highlighted"

(84). Again in 9. 7, the semantic correlation between the objects of the secondary imperatives,  $\text{سَئِد}$  and  $\text{اِشْرَاف}$ , is reproduced phonically by the repeated sequence /e,a/.

(b) Further, in 9. 9, the preponderance of  $\text{س}$ 's in 9. 9a is sustained by the  $\text{ش}$  in 9. 9b: does this stress the link between the *imperatives*, their *objects*, and the *addressee's* requisite *attitude*? 9. 9a and 9. 9b also share the vowel sequence /e,e,o/, which underscores the relevant activities' correlation. And the alliterative endings of 9. 9a and b stresses a basic idea: the total vanity or absurdity of life. It also marks off the phrase as a grammatical unit in each of 9a and b: in McCreesh's terminology, the repetitive alliteration provides *sound-tagging*. Sound-tagging occurs where phonic sequences mark off syntactic or grammatical units, thus indicating the building blocks of the poet's thought,

(c) The *repetition of word-roots* in 9. 7 and 10 creates an echo which links our passage's beginning and end. The repeated roots represented by an imperative and a participle are strategically wedged into a sound-pattern which phonically stresses the link between the start and finish of the salient enterprise: the pleasure-search.

(d) Finally a longer-distance phonic correlation between the constituent cola of 9. 7-10 is achieved by the reiteration of the /e,a/ sequence, in line-final position, concluding 9. 7a,b,c; 9. 8b and 9. 9a,b. Does this phonic linkage underline the conceptual link between the ideas in the strophe: objects of pleasure; work/action; a lack of such; vanity or absurdity?

Conclusion. The writer has made out a provisional case for the Call's poetic tendencies, which might be strengthened by the preciser and more extensive application of Watson's criteria. More attention might also be paid to certain matters outside Watson's immediate remit: e.g. the emotional

impact of (a) (*inter alia*) the text's sound-patterning (e.g. vowel, consonant sequences) (85); and of (b) Qohelet's vocabulary: lexical repetitions (stock words, standard word-pairs, particles) and *paronomasia* (86).

#### NOTES

- (1) J.A. Loader, 1986.
- (2) The present writer makes no assumption about the rest of Qohelet. Certainly, there are many verse-segments embedded in BH prose. Specimens analysed in J.C. de Moor and W.G.E. Watson, 1992, are Exod. 3. 2-6, 1 Sam. 2-3 and 2 Sam. 7. 13-14; also Exod. 34. 21. C. Westermann, on Genesis, cites (e.g.) 2. 23 (two lines, respectively, three cola: two stresses, and two cola: three stresses [1984, p. 231]) and 21. 7 ("It is a poetic cry of joy in the readily recognizable rhythm of two double-threes" [1985, p.334]).
- (3) The "broad" / "structural" distinction is adopted from Watson, 1986, pp.46-7. Strictly speaking, sound-patterning is a non-structural feature - according to Watson's scheme, at least (1986, p.47, where he classes sound-devices as comprising a separate set of indicators). But, since word-sound is textured into the verse-structure of Qoh. 9. 7-10 (see p.33ff), it is convenient to regard any emergent pattern as a structural signal of those verses' poetic character.
- (3a) Initial considerations in poetic analysis include text-critical ones. At which level of the text should we operate? At the emended or unemended level? We choose the latter, although aware of our verses' textual conundra - see Appx. 1, which offers two examples of how text criticism may nuance our exegesis of Qohelet's Calls.
- (4) E.g. in his analysis of Ps. 117 (cf. Watson, 1986, pp.105-6) where the average line-length (14 letters) induces him to dismiss the final, six-

letter line as a liturgical insert. His account of Qoh. 9. 7-9 is to be found in de Moor and Watson, 1992, pp.185 ff.

(5) See *ANET*, pp.89b-90a. Loretz conjectures that in 9. 9.1,  $\eta\omega\lambda$  may have replaced an original  $\eta\lambda\lambda$  (= "prostitute"), the original summons to carouse with a whore thus being sanitised in line with other sapiential warnings against prostitutes and alien women.

(6) So Watson, 1986, p.106. Thus Loretz typically treats the entirety of 2. 24b-26a as an extended prose-gloss, "a pious comment" on 2. 24a, in which God is depicted as the giver of the situation under review. 2. 25 is, further, a gloss (a gloss within a gloss) which ruptures the link between 2. 24b and 2. 26a. 2. 26a resumes the main argument from 2. 24a. This seems over-severe editing to be taken altogether seriously.

(7) Gordis (1968, p.302) compares the shift within v.9 from verse to prose to that within an ancient Egyptian "Hymn of the Victories of Thumosis VII" (c. 1470 BCE).

(8) In his "metrical afterword", Kugel summarises some key episodes in the history of accentual theory (*vis-a-vis* Hebrew metre): cf. 1981, pp.292ff. for a resumé of the analyses of Ley, Budde, Sievens and Bickell.

(9) Thus Watson, 1986, p.97.

(10) Each couplet-line may contain three stresses (Jb. 29. 8), or just two (Is. 21. 5), or four (Ps. 46. 6: cf. Qoh. 9. 7-9, à la Gordis). Non-identical lines (three and four stresses: Jb. 17. 12; three + two: Lam. 2. 21 [the  $\eta\lambda\lambda$  or lament metre]; two + three: Deut. 32. 10b) are also found. See Watson, 1986, pp.97-8.

(11) So Watson, 1986, p.99, who also (pp.100-1) maps out a useful procedure for determining accent-distribution, with an illustrative analysis of Mic. 3. 12b.

(12) So Watson, 1986, p.100.

- (13) The writer's summary of metrical function is based on Watson, 1986, pp.111-13. An example of *non-accentual* approaches to Hebrew metre is *syllable-counting*, where "the number of syllables are closed or open. It is, in effect, a mechanical reckoning of the number of vowels per colon." (Watson, 1986, p.104.) Popularised by F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman (e.g. in their 1960 article, "Archaic Forms in Early Hebrew Poetry" [ZAW 72]), the technique relies heavily on textual reconstruction: "prosaic" elements (e.g. the "nota accusativi") are edited out of the focal text - minimally, by Freedman, more boldly by his disciple, D.K. Stuart (*Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*. Missoula: Montana, 1976, p.9), who finds in it a basic tool for defining a poem's metre and colometry. Cross and Freedman, in their above-cited article (p.167), more modestly, claim that it "affords a clue to the rhythmic structure of Hebrew poetry more precise than the accentual system". Syllable counting may indeed help to confirm lineation (e.g. Lam. 4. 15: cf. Watson, 1986, p.105), and verse-structure (so T. Longman, 1982, pp.230-54), with reference e.g. to Jer. 12. 2-4, but is of doubtful value as a tool for metrical analysis largely because it ignores stress (Watson, 1986, p.105), it assumes an emended text (an inherent weakness: Longman, 1982, p.248; cf. Kugel, 1981, p.297); and the emendation-criteria are subjectively defined and applied (Longman, 1982, p.248).
- (14) For terminology, see Watson, 1986, p.128.
- (15) Cf. Yoder, 1971, p.472.
- (16) 1984, pp.579-80. A virtually unique equivalent is  $\eta\Omega\psi/\delta\gamma\zeta$ , at Provs. 9. 5 (Story, 1945, pp.328-9).
- (17) E.g., at Is. 21-5 (in asyndetic parataxis) and Jer. 22.15 (and passim, in syndetic parataxis).
- (18) See, e.g., Ps. 50. 13, and (for the pairing's reversal), Am. 9. 14. The parallelism is duplicated in Sg. 5. 1, and triplicated in Ezk. 39. 17-19.

Elsewhere the pairing occurs in noun-verb parallelism (Is. 62. 8) and noun-noun parallelism (Ezr. 3. 7; cf. Dn. 1. 10).

(19) Avishur, 1984, pp.298ff. "Logical sequence" is Avishur's sixth test for establishing the primary component of a pair.

(20) For brief discussion of this word pair's conceptual stress, in relation to a ~~w~~ fragment (Jer. 22. 15.), see *Hilady, 1986, ad loc.*

(21) Ginsberg's work dates from the 1930s, when he began extensive comparison of Hebrew and Ugaritic word-pairs. A seminal article was in *Orientalia* 5 (1936), where (p.172) he defined the phenomenon for word-pairing as "...certain fixed pairs of synonyms that recur repeatedly, and as a rule in the same order, in these texts [Ugaritic]...are shown by their presence in Hebrew poetry as well to have belonged to the *regular stock-in-trade* of Canaanite poets." For the arguable illegitimacy of this contentious, italicized phrase, (our italics) see below, pp. 24-5.

(22) Cf. *Eretz Israel* 9 (1969), pp.64-5.

(23) In syndetic parataxis, at Gen. 14. 18; cf. Jud. 19. 19; 1 Sam. 16. 20, etc.

(24) Four times in poetic parallelism, in wisdom literature only: Provs. 4. 17, 9. 5; Qoh. 9. 7, 10-19. In prose there are other examples, e.g., Deut.29. 5.

(25) Avishur, 1984, p.379; cf. Greenfield, *art cit.*, pp.63-4.

(26) In Ps. 104. 15, the item order is wine-oil-bread.

(27) I.e. "one of a group of terms whose meanings are included in the meaning of a more general term" (Chambers English Dictionary, Cambridge: Chambers, 1988). For a treatment of types of parallel word-pairs, see Watson, 1986, pp.130ff.

(28) See Watson, 1986, p.132.

(29) 1971, p.471, after M. Held, "More Parallel Word-Pairs in the Bible and



in the Ugaritic Documents", *Leshonenu*, 18/19, 1952/54, pp.144-160.

(30) So in Ps. 54, "traditional", word-pairs account for 75% of the psalm's parallelism: they are "traditional", because 9 of the 12 parallel members recur elsewhere. Likewise in Nah. 1, 18 out of 25 (72%) word-pairs are "traditional".

(31) "A high percentage of word-pairs in a particular passage is a strong indication that the text originated orally, although it does not automatically follow that poems with such high ratios were necessarily orally composed." (Watson, 1986, p.137).

(32) Parry defines a formula as "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given idea": "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse Making: I Homer and the Homeric Style", *HSCP* 41 (1930), p.80.

(33) See n. (21) above for the origins of this phrase.

(34) See his *Formula, Character and Context: Studies in Homeric, Old English and Old Testament Poetry*, 1969, pp.138-172, cited by Watters, 1976, pp.29ff.

(35) Cf. Culley, 1967, p.10.

(36) Whallon, *op.cit.*, p.138.

(37) Watters' summary of Whallon's definition, p.29.

(38) Gevirtz, 1962, pp.10-11.

(39) Watters, 1976, pp.48-59. He notes (p.53) how difficult the memorizing of Lamentations' acrostic poetry would be, in terms both of its content and of the alphabetical arrangement of lines' first words. But for references to the debate about acrostics' value as an *aide memoire*, cf. Watters, p.53 n.31.

(40) Watters subdivides the pairings into three groups: 1. those which recur in one section (out of three) of Isaiah; 2. those which recur in more

than one section; 3. pairs which occur once only in the book (1278 out of a total of 3168 word-pairs). See the numerical summary he offers on p.154, and his Appx.1, pp.155ff.

(41) Whallon, 1969, p.139, thinks that the repetitions may be the work of the "Isaianiae", who standardized the diction of the book: cf. the Homeridae who demonstrably did this for Homer. Watters suggests that there is no independent proof of such a circle's (i.e. a transmissional school's) existence.

(42) The poet's facility in associating words may (Watters suggests, p.86) have been nurtured by prose of the Torah which also favours word-pairs.

(43) Watters cites as examples Hector "of shining helm" and Apollo "who strikes from afar" as "poetic creations of the highest order, not made on the spur of the moment, but directly related to the characterization."

(44) Kugel, 1981, p.33.

(45) Cf. the seminal articles by E.Z. Melamed, "Hendiadys in the Bible", *Tarbiz* 16 (1945), and his later "Break-up of Stereotypical Phrases", in Ch. Rabin, *Studies in the Bible*, Jerusalem, 1961, pp.115-153; both cited by Kugel, 1981, p.28 n.70.

(46) *Pace* Whallon and Yoder; and Watson, 1986, pp.136ff.

(47) But cf. Watson, 1986, p.139.

(48) A comment on this important statement may be appended: the notion of a "what's more" relationship between the A and B cola may be interestingly compared with D.J.A. Clines' idea of a "parallelism of greater precision", where colon B is (from time to time) more specific than, or disambiguating of, A. See Clines, 1986, *passim*.

(49) M.A.K. Halliday and R. Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, London, 1976, p.284: quoted by Watson, 1986, p.140.

(50) Culley applied Milman Parry's groundbreaking criticism of Homer to the

Hebrew Bible. Briefly Parry had noted the formulaic nature of Homer's diction (i.e. his use of repeated stock expressions - a word, phrase or line in length). Homer, he argued, had drawn these from an inherited stockpile of oral formulae. The recurrent epithets he felt to be especially significant, as encapsulating the character and purpose of such received diction. For example, the Achillean designation  $\pi\acute{o}\delta\epsilon\chi\varsigma \omega\kappa\upsilon\varsigma$  (more than forty lines in the Iliad) both helps to describe the mighty man of valour and - just as crucially - acts as a "metrical filler", being of a "standardized metrical length" (Watters, 1976, p.7.): it is thus a compositional aid, which existed primarily to facilitate Homer's oral versifying. Watters compares the stock pious forms used by the Christian clergyman responsible for extempore prayer. Parry's formula-criticism is embodied in *HSCP* 41 (1930) (see n.322 above), and *HSCP* 43 (1932), 1-50; and see now *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected papers of Milman Parry*, ed. Adam Parry, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971. Parry's subsequent field work in Yugoslavia (undertaken to determine current oral poets' procedure, in relation to his theoretical specifications), and that of his disciple, Lord, helped to "earth" his formulae-theory, and set the scene for later analyses (field and textual) of oral verse-making which served Culley as a backcloth for his observations.

(51) Culley, 1967, p.10. Cf. Watson's definition (1986, p.74): "The formula is a ready-made phrase taken from traditional diction (or invented by the poet and eventually becoming part of traditional diction) which fits the metrical slots characteristic of a particular verse-form."

(52) Culley, 1967, p.12.

(53) Culley, 1967, pp.15ff.

(54) E.g., strings of labials are said to be common in formulaic verse: Culley, 1967, p.15.

- (55) Formulaic systems point up the formula's functional nature: the poet in command of the "system" and its keywords can deploy it/them multi-contextually: cf. Watters, 1976, p.10.
- (56) Cf. Watters, 1976, pp.15f.
- (57) Culley, 1967, p.114: he tenuously concludes that highly formulaic psalms (i.e where 40% + of the wording is formulaic) may be of "oral-formulaic composition", or from a period when it was in vogue.
- (57a) For the old notion that  $\psi\chi\omega\eta\eta\eta\eta$  is a Graecism, see p.75<sup>AS</sup> below.
- (58) Murphy, 1992, p.xxx. It also surfaces in ancient Semitic inscriptions (Murphy, 1992, p.6, on 1.3: an indication of the phrase's firm anchorage in Semitic culture).
- (59) E.g. they exhibit no striking sound-patterns.
- (60) Cf. n.51.
- (61) It is worth asking whether or not... $\zeta\eta\eta$  acts as a formulaic-style *refrain*, "a block of verse which recurs more than once within a poem". (Watson, 1986, p.295) and (functionally) "segments a poem into smaller units" (Watson, 1986, p.297) and (in an oral context) "enable(s) the people listening...to join in" (Watson, 1986, p.297). But cf. (70a ).
- (62) R. Sacks, 1987.
- (63) "Homer as Oral Poet" HSCP 72 (1968), 46.
- (64) Sacks, 1987, p.4.
- (65) Cf. Muellner, *The Meaning of Homeric Euchomai Through its Formulas* - Innsbruck, 1976, p.15: "Any single word [may have] maintained or acquired in time a sense which is more rigid, resonant and intricate than might be for a poet who lacks such a medium."
- (66) E.g.  $\alpha\varphi\theta\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , often glossed imperishable. G. Nagy has argued (*The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in the Archaic Greek Poetry*, Baltimore, 1979, p.189) that contextual analysis of this epithet reveals

its divine connotation, its intimacy with the sacred and imperishable Olympian order. Nagy is led on to other evidence of such an order, into which the hero is incorporated after death through various media: epic, cultic observance, etc.

(67) N. Austin, *Archery and the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's Odyssey*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1975, pp.79-80, cited by Sacks, 1987, p.72.

(68) Three "shining sons" lose their lives by the end of the passages in which they are so described: Hippothous (17. 288-292), Asteropaeus, grandson of Axius (21. 152-160; 179-182); Lycaon (21. 92-97, 114-119). And a fourth son comes off badly in an arms deal (Glaucus: 6. 144-151; 232-236). Ajax is *φαιδῖμος* when his Locrians collapse in dung in a footrace (23. 772-784) etc.

(69) Sacks, 1987, p.142. There are two concentrated blocks of examples: Hector is *φαιδῖμος* three times in fifteen lines: in 4. 388, 390, 402, embroiled in an unpropitious venture - a battle with Poseidon; and in Bks. 15-18 we meet over a dozen occurrences of the epithet attached to Hector, again in contexts strongly implying his impending doom - not least, in reference to his fight with Patroclus: 15. 65, 231; 16. 577, 588, 649, 727, 769, 859; 17. 316, 483, 754; 18. 155, 175.

(70) I.e., based on a cursory survey of around 20 examples.

(70a) Is etc. *לְבַי* a similarly "depth-charged" formula? See Appx. 2 for brief discussion.

(71) In verbal or cognate forms, these terms occur as follows: *לָגַע* : 8 times; *לָגַע* : 15; *לָגַע* : 17; *לָגַע* : 38; *לָגַע* : 51; *לָגַע* : 62; *לָגַע* : 46 (Murphy 1992, p.xxix).

(72) Watson (1986, pp.288ff) recommends tabulation as a comprehensive method of keyword-identification.

(73) Cf. Watson, 1986, p.291. A question arises as to the role of the

other repeated words:  $\text{ב}$ ,  $\text{ו}$  and  $\text{ו}$ . Are they structural markers with  $\text{ו}$  visually defining the thought-units (1), (3) and (4), the repetitions of  $\text{ו}$  serving to bind together (3) and (4) (9.9b and d), and  $\text{ב}$  providing a frame for the whole? The forms of  $\text{ו}$  also mark off the unit as discrete. A skilled exponent of keyword analysis (along Watsonian lines) is Magne (1958), in his classic study of keywords of Ps. 51 (also of Pss. 91, 123, 126, 129, 137, and the Pater Noster). He aims (1) to work out all the repetitions, then (2) to identify their role in the sample psalm, and finally (3) to correlate the progression of the writer's thought (*rhythme de pensée*) with the repetitions, the latter being taken to show how the former proceeds.

From his tabulation of Ps. 51's keywords, Magne concludes that they form the thematic and structural basis of an elegant penitential poem echoing 2 Sam. with a strophic arrangement in at least the first half (vv.3-6 comprise the strophe, vv.7-11 the antistrophe).

The thematic highlighting which key words offer is also apparent in Auffret's involved analysis of Pss. 111 and 112 (1980). The half dozen or so keywords in each psalm represent their main ideas. Thus, for example, in Ps. 111:  $\text{ו}$  (vv.1,2,7,10);  $\text{ו}$  (vv.2,4,6,7,8,10);  $\text{ו}$  (vv.5,9);  $\text{ו}$  (vv.5,9);  $\text{ו}$  (vv.7,8) virtually encode the psalmist's argument. It treats of the works of the Lord, established in *truth*, and forever, among which the *covenant* deserves a particular mention. These works are destined for *all* who accept the covenant.

(74) Watson, 1986, p.321.

(75) 1952, pp.13-14.

(75a) Watson, 1986, p.174.

(76) See above, p.37/3.

(77) Cf. Qoh. 8. 15.

(78) Watson's example (1986, p.227) is J1 2. 15-16a, where  $\text{ו}$  appears

eight times in as many cola.

(79) These are identified by J.T.S. Wheelock "Alliterative Functions in the Divina Commedia", *Lingue e Stile* 13, 1978, pp.373-404: cited by Watson, 1986, p.228.

(80) As in the Joel passage cited by Watson.

(81) As with onomatopoeia, e.g. אָרָרָר שָׁרָר ("a voice crying out", "a loud shout"), in Is. 40.3. Other "Call" e.g.s. of alliteration: in 2.24-6, we find alliterative  $\text{D's}$ , the juxtaposition of end and initial  $\text{D's}$ , an  $\text{S}$  cluster and an  $\text{J}$  cluster. In 3.12-13; we find, again, the juxtaposition of initial and final  $\text{D's}$ , (three times) and alliterative  $\text{S's}$ . In 8.15: there are alliterative  $\text{V's}$ , and another  $\text{S}$  cluster.

Examples of simple assonance: /a/ and /o/ (2.24), /i/ and /u/ (2.25), /a/ (2.26a), /u/ (2.26c), /o/ (2.26b).

Examples of sequential assonance: /a,a,a/ (2.24 twice); an opening vowel series, /e,e,o/, a closing series /o,e,e,a/ (9.7); and line-final /e,a/ (9.7a,b,c, 9.8b, 9.9a,b, 9.10).

(82) T. McCreesh, 1991, p.64.

(83) McCreesh, 1991, p.124.

(84) McCreesh, 1991, p.75. A simple English example might be: Spare the rod and spoil the child: sp                      d                      sp                      d.

(85) See, for an example in Greek poetry-criticism of this topic, W.B. Stanford, *Greek Tragedy and the Emotions: An Introductory Study*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983, pp.63-75; he earlier (chapter 1) stresses the centrality of emotional elements in Greek tragedy; chapter 7 explores the emotive power of tragic vocabulary.

(86) Projects like Ceresko's, 1982, a suggestive study of Qohelet's use of *antanaclasis* (his adroit exploitation of the nuances of אָרָרָר, a vital word

in 9. 10) offer (though not intentionally) a good starting-point for the gauging of such word-plays' emotional freight.



## CHAPTER II

## A Comparative Literary Study: Qoh. 9. 7-10.

*Introduction.*

Qohelet, an "intensely Jewish" (1) text, is highly dependent on the Hebrew Bible (2): his *topoi* are those of Semitic wisdom (3). Yet we must also acknowledge Qohelet's substantive overlaps with ancient Near Eastern literature: Mesopotamian, Ugaritic, Greek and Egyptian. Without necessarily claiming precise links between Qohelet and specific ancient Near Eastern *opera*, we can arguably elucidate *his* text by examining it in *their* light (4). With reference to the pleasure-Calls, especially 9. 7-10, we might thereby better define that passage's purpose, genre, and setting in life: as analogies, the comparative materials can - potentially, at least - aid our *definitional* task. We now anchor this suggestion to Qoh. 9. 7-10, making selective comparisons only (5).

1.. *Gilgamesh*

*Context.* Gilgamesh's journey to Utnapishtim, the Faraway (who dwells in Dilmun, in the heavenly garden of the sun), is punctuated by a series of brief encounters (6). One of these is with Siduri, the *sabitu*, "the woman of the vine, the maker of wine", who offers the following advice: (7)  
 "Gilgamesh, where are you hurrying to? You will never find that life for which you are looking. When the gods created man, they allotted to him death, but life they retained in their own keeping. As for you, Gilgamesh, fill your belly with good things: day and night, night and day dance and be merry, feast and rejoice. Let your clothes be fresh, bathe yourself in water, cherish the little child that holds your hand and make your wife

happy in your embrace; for this too is the lot of man" (8). Her interrogation ends with the resonant formula (9): "Why do you come here wandering over the pastures in search of the wind?"

*Analysis.* The marked similarity between this and Qohelet's behest at 9. 7-9, in terms both of the substance and sequence of ideas, has not escaped modern commentators (10). This may not, indeed, be proof of Qohelet's direct dependence upon the Babylonian passage (11), but the latter may tell us something about the *ethos* of Qohelet's prescription. Siduri's apparently hedonistic summons assumes the pragmatic character of dietary and sanitary advice, issuing from the woman's domain (12), and expressive, perhaps, of Mesopotamian social norms (13), when examined in relation to Enkidu. For her words have found prior expression in him, the Mowgli-like figure whom Shamhat, the prostitute, has domesticated (14). She, "a crucial agency for the conversion of nature into culture" (15), teaches Enkidu the basis of civilized life: *eating, drinking and dressing*. He learns to consume processed food (*bread and wine or beer* (16)) instead of grass and milk, and to upgrade his appearance: he *anoints himself with oil, and, donned in male clothes*, resembles a bridegroom. May Qohelet, we ask, be recommending *his* pleasure-package as a pragmatic antidote to "wandering in search of the wind" (17) - that is, as an accoutrement of civilized life in a chaotic, futile, absurd (18) world, an emblem of his addressees' domestication?

*Passing now specifically to Qoh. 9. 7*, we examine this verse in relation to resonant passages both in the Ras Shamra tablets and Greek lyric verse. Unlikely to have exercised direct influence they may point us to a *Sitz im Leben* for it. We further argue that 9. 7 is perhaps better understood in the light of Hebrew wisdom.

2. *Ugarit*. Six tablets (19), dating from the second millennium BCE (20), compress the Baal-mythography into three coherent episodes: Baal's battle with Prince Yam (21); the building of Baal's palace, consequent on his defeat of Yam (22); and Baal's final triumph over Mot (23). Relating this material to Qohelet's pleasure-calls, we note especially CTA 4.iv.11.35-7:

Behold, El surely perceived her, he opened wide the passage of his throat and laughed, he placed his feet on his footstool and snapped his fingers, he lifted up his voice and cried: "How (is it that) dame Athirat of the sea has arrived, how (is it that) the creature of the sea has arrived, how (is it that) the creature of the gods has come? Are you very hungry, having journeyed afar? Or are you very thirsty, having travelled all night? Eat and drink, eat food from the tables, drink wine from the flagons, the blood of trees from cups of gold. Or does affection for El the king move you, love of the bull rouse you?" (24)

*Context*. Athirat, El's consort, has arrived by ass at her husband's distant abode (the goddess Anat following behind on foot), in order to persuade him to build a palace for the homeless Baal, who has recently gained his throne from Yam. His invitation to eat and drink - a joyous response to Athirat's arrival - appears, partially, to assume that she has visited for love of himself: it may be an implicit overture to sexual intercourse (25).

*Analysis*. El's summons is *thematically* similar to Qohelet's Call in 9. 7, but *contextually* dissimilar: Qohelet's Calls are all (broadly) issued in reply to humanity's general situation (26), while El's imperative is context-specific, determined by his consort's visit.

A lexical overlap with Qoh. 9. 7 is the occurrence of the word-pair *lhm* and *yn*, "bread and wine", found elsewhere in the Ugaritic texts (27). Is Qohelet's usage a possible indication of Ugaritic influence, as Dahood would

have us believe (28)? We discuss this pairing at greater length elsewhere (29), but may note in passing Craigie's commonsensical view of the matter: that the commonalty of human experience will have contributed to the cross-cultural sharing of parallel word-pairs by Qohelet and Ugarit (30). The present writer, accordingly, refrains from deducing Qohelet's direct indebtedness to Ugarit, noting, however, that *CTA* 4.iv.11.27ff. may elucidate the notional *Sitz im Leben* of Qoh. 9. 7-10: tavern or brothel-attendance, the Call being, in fact, a cheery challenge to carouse with a prostitute(31)!

### 3. *Greek Lyric: Theognis.*

*Introduction:* The interpretation-history of Qohelet is rich in efforts to connect his thought with specific strands of Greek literature (32) or philosophy (33). While we need not wholly deny his affinity with such material (34), we can be fairly confident that Qohelet's precise derivation of ideas from a Greek background (e.g. gnomic poetry of the Stoic-Cynic diatribe) is less likely (35) than his general indebtedness to a Hellenistic *Zeitgeist* (36). This is perhaps reflected in the language and logical structure of his discourse (so Lohfink) (37), or in that discourse's substance (e.g. in the treatment of the God-humanity relationship) (38). But maybe the debt rather lay in Qohelet's broad appropriation of "the common stock" (39) of Greek philosophy (that is, its styles and motifs: Sophistic, Cynic, Stoic and Sceptic) (40) and other literature (e.g. Menander, Euripides, Pindar) (41). Of this, the correspondences between Qoh. 9. 7 and the Theognidean corpus may be an example.

Theognis, probably composing in the second half of the seventh century (42), sounds the *carpe diem* note in terms which strongly evoke Qohelet. We note especially ll.567-70 and 877-84, offering the lines in the Loeb text, with their accompanying translation (43), with brief critical comment.

*Context:* These lines fall within the collection of verses addressed to Cynus, which at least one modern critic (West) has identified as the authentic core of the Theognidean corpus (44). The Cynus-verses develop symposial themes - the pleasure of wine, of male companionship, of youth's short season. Like other archaic poets composing in elegiac couplets, Theognis has adapted the language of Homeric epic to a new world of thought and feeling - the celebration of youthful, masculine beauty and popularity (45). Theognis' intention, however, was more than this, as we can deduce from the Suda's reference to his work:

"Theognis...wrote...addressed to Cynus...a collection of maxims in elegiac verse, and other ethical prescriptions" (46). Many of his couplets are indeed neatly turned prescriptions of traditional Greek morality: typically, respect for parents (131-32, 821-22), or strangers (143-44). Hence Theognis later became famed as a moralist, a sound adviser on human conduct (47). Theognis prescribed his ethos, his traditional code of behaviour, against a background of socio-political turbulence in late seventh-century Megara (48), where our poet may have suffered under the tyranny of Theagenes. He protests against the undermining of the old social order: against mixed marriage (of high and low born: 183-92), plutocrats (699-704, 713-18), bad leaders (41-52), the commons (847-50), land-confiscations (1197-1201), the latter reference suggesting that Theognis was a casualty of factional strife: "And my heart was struck dark with anger, to think that other men possess my fertile acres now; it is not for me that the mules pull at the curved yoke..." Possibly he went into exile (783-88); and, as a worsted aristocrat, would have been reduced to poverty, against which he inveighs (173-76). His "Calls" have, therefore, a grim edge of irony to them, highlighted by their contrast with Theognis' dark plea for vengeance on his despoilers (341-49).

Text: 567-70:

567-570

"Ἡβῆ τερπόμενος παίζω· δηρὸν γὰρ ἔνερθεν  
γῆς ὀλέσας ψυχὴν κείσομαι ὥστε λίθος  
ἄφθογγος, λείψω δ' ἐρατὸν φάος ἡελίοιο·  
ἔμπης δ' ἐσθλὸς ἰὼν ὄψομαι οὐδὲν ἔτι.

I play rejoicing in Youth, for long's the time I shall lie underground  
without life like a dumb stone and leave the pleasant light of the Sun; and  
for all I be a good man, shall see nothing more.

*Critical remarks.* Van Groningen remarks (49):

(1) Πάϊζω: "sens très generale, 'je m'amuse, je prends mon plaisir où je le  
trouve.'"

(2) λίθος: "le poet compare le mort à la pierre inerte et insensible..."

Elsewhere, λίθος is an image for stupidity or paralysed consternation: Plat.  
*Gorg.* 494 A; Aristoph. *Clouds.* 1202.

(3) ἀφθογγος: in death he will not enjoy his current vocal activities: singing,  
recitation, conversation.

(4) "...shall see nothing more" (ὄψομαι οὐδέν, complements the  
previous metaphor; and is there an allusion to the folk etymology of Hades  
(Ἄιδειν)? Probably not; there would be more reason to think that Hades  
were alluded to, if "Hades" was actually mentioned.

(5) This is a *drinking poem*, perhaps recited at a banquet by a guest,  
proclaiming his *joie de vivre*. It contrasts with the previous quatrain,  
which (like Provs. 23. 1-3) recommends a certain dining style: listening to  
one's (intellectual) superior; the alert imbibing of wisdom at a feast.

877-84:

877-878

Ἦβα μοι,<sup>3</sup> φίλε θυμέ· τάχ' αὖτινες ἄλλοι ἔσονται  
ἄνδρες, ἐγὼ δὲ θανὼν γαῖα μέλαιν' ἔσομαι.

879-884†

Πίν' οἶνον, τὸν ἐμοὶ κορυφῆς ὑπο<sup>4</sup> Τηϋ-γέτοιο  
ἀμπελοι ἤνεγκαν, τὰς ἐφύτευς' ὁ γέρων  
οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησι θεοῖσι φίλος Θεότιμος 881  
ἐκ Πλατανιστοῦντος ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ ἐπάγων'

τοῦ πίνων ἀπὸ μὲν χ' λειπὰς σκεδάσεις μελε-  
δώνας,<sup>1</sup>  
θωρηχθεὶς δ' ἔσειαι πολλὸν ἐλαφρότερος.

<sup>2</sup> Brunck: mss -σει, -ση <sup>3</sup> B: A ἠβανοι, others ἠβάοι,  
ἠβάοις, ἠβώοις: 1070A τέρπεύ μοι <sup>4</sup> Heck: mss-φῆ: ἀπο

1 cf. Theocr. 21.5

Play and be young, my heart; there'll be other men soon, but I shall be dead and become dark earth. Drink the wine which came to me of the vines that were planted in the mountain dells 'neath topmost Taygetus by that friend of the gods, old Theotimus, who led cool water for them from Platanistus' spring. If thou drink of this thou'lt scatter troublous cares, and when thou has well drunken be greatly lightened.

(1) Ἦβα: the verb has a general sense (cf. *Παίγω*), and also perhaps an erotic overtone.

(2) This couplet reappears in 1070 A-B: a commonplace, cf. (e.g.) Eur., *Alcestis*, 788f.

(3) Are 879-884 linked with the previous couplet? If so, Theognis is addressing his *heart*. But is the heart a suitable addressee of such an order? Maybe Πίν' οἶνον is rather the general, non-specific command of the proprietor of a vineyard where Theognis is a guest, as if to say, "my cellar is at your disposal"; the aorist imper. would indicate a special invitation: Van Groningen (p.336), however, expects too much of the grammar in drawing this distinction; cf. 763, where the sense of the present subjunctive is clearly "bottoms up!" (50).

*Conclusion.* The resonances between Qoh. 9. 7 and these Theognidean verses is indeed remarkable. But in view of our introductory remarks, and the literary frequency of the *carpe diem* call (51), we should beware of forging a familial link between them by virtue of their similarity alone (52). Our caution is further justified by the absence of proven Graecisms in Qohelet (53). The resemblances indicate, rather, one strand of the Greek literary web which may have fed Qohelet's thought. They point up the international nature of his theme, his sharing of the "concerns and attitudes of various philosophies known in the Hellenistic period, that focused on the achievement of happiness by an individual in an indifferent, if not inimical, universe" (54). Perhaps, too, they suggest, analogously, a convivial *Sitz im Leben*. for Qohelet's original verse.

4. *Hebrew Wisdom.* It is our contention that Qoh. 9. 7 acquires a sharper and, indeed, more comprehensible focus when read intratextually, i.e. within its B.H. context. This includes, first, the Hebrew Sapiential context, from which the writer excerpts two items: Provs. 23 and the Deuteronomic summonses to enjoyment; and, second, the intrabiblical resonances of his chosen lexemes, especially his stark order, 75.

(1) *Proverbs.* Viewed in the light of its probable compositional link with Proverbs and their ancient canonical connection (55), Qoh. 9. 7 commends an attitude towards eating and drinking which complements Proverbs' caveats against inappropriate versions of those activities: undiplomatic gluttony, drunken carousals and dining with a miser. It is therefore worth our while briefly to exegete sample passages (56) in Provs. 23, for it is these which largely delineate the attitudinal spectrum within which Qoh. 9. 7 is to be



understood.

*Good Manners: Dining with a Ruler: Provs. 23. 1-3.*

Text (BITS)

לִבְלִי יִי בִל לִבְלִי שׁ תְּמַאֲוִי. בְּחַדֵּר בִּל	1 23 כִּי־תֵשֶׁב לִלְחֹם אֶחָד־מוֹשֵׁל בֵּין תְּבִין אֶת־אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֶיךָ : 2 וְשִׁמְתָּ יָדְךָ בְּלֶעְדֶּי אֲכִיפֶל נַפְשׁ אֶתָּה : 3 אַל־תִּתְאָוֶה לְמַשְׁעֻמוֹתָיו וְהוּא לֶחֶם כֹּזְבִים : תְּמַאֲוִי Q <sup>Mss</sup> , תְּמַאֲוִי K 3    dub 2
---	--

Translation (RSV) **23** When you sit down to eat with a ruler, observe carefully what<sup>1</sup> is before you;  
<sup>2</sup> and put a knife to your throat if you are a man given to appetite.  
<sup>3</sup> Do not desire his delicacies, for they are deceptive food.

23. 1-3 suggest a firm constraint on appetite: ambition. The point seems to be: if you aspire to high office, you must not neglect the tiniest detail of your demeanour. As with a potential Fellow of All Souls', even your table manners must create the impression of interior poise. There are striking parallels with Egyptian Royal Instruction: *Amen-em-opet*, c.23 (57) ("do not eat bread before a noble...false chewings. Look at the cup which is before thee and let it serve thy needs."); with *Ptah-hotep* (58), *Kagemni* (59) and *Ani* (60). The *Amen-em-opet* prohibition recurs in Provs. 23. 1: "Observe carefully *what* is before you!" That is to say, one must not yield to the attraction of exciting *food* beyond one's immediate ambit, for to do so would seem gluttonous; it is diplomatic to focus on the limited plateful before one. So McKane (1970): Toy (1916), on the other hand, refers  $\text{רשע}$  to the aspirant's *superior*: "scrutinise well *him* who is present with you". Food

and drink must not distract him from the irksome task of assessing his future employer. They are "deceptive" (v.3), precisely because they can steal away his concentration on that task. 23. 2 is a pithy proverb which well conveys the basic instruction: "curb your appetite". There is no need to emend it, as Scott (1965) does, to a pedestrian aphorism, "use a knife to eat with".

*Do not eat with a miser: Provs. 23. 6-8.*

Text (BHS)

תתאיר. בחדו של וחדו חס

יא בסערים בשלש ססרים

ה של בליס

ב. >

6 אֶל-תִּלְחֶם אֶת-לֶחֶם יַעַן עֵין וְאֶל-תִּתְאֵר לְמִטְעַמְתָּיו:

7 כִּי כְמוֹ-שָׂעִר בְּנִפְשׁוֹ כִּן-הוּא:

אֲכַל וְשָׂתָה וְאָמַר לְךָ וְלִבּוֹ בַל-עֲמֹד:

8 פִּתְחֵךְ-אֲכַלְתָּ תִקְוֹאָנָה וְשִׁחַתְתָּ דְבָרֶיךָ הַנְּעִימִים:

6<sup>a</sup> > Ms Vrs, frt dl || <sup>b</sup> K תתאיר, Q תתאיר || 7<sup>a</sup> Ⓢ(S) *epiza* = שער; 1 שער cf doctrinam Amenemope cp 11 || <sup>b</sup> בנפשו || <sup>c</sup> ins ו כמו מר בצואר || cf doctrinam Amenemope cp 11 || 8<sup>a</sup> prp ו שחת דבריו || 10<sup>a</sup> אלקנה cf doctrinam Amenemope cp 6 ||

Translation (RSV)

<sup>6</sup> Do not eat the bread of a man who is stingy;

do not desire his delicacies;

<sup>7</sup> for he is like one who is inwardly reckoning.<sup>m</sup>

"Eat and drink!" he says to you; but his heart is not with you.

<sup>8</sup> You will vomit up the morsels which you have eaten, and waste your pleasant words.

רעעין

The cramping company of an anti-social man, a stingy miser (is probably to be translated either "stingy" or "malevolent"), should also constrain one's appetite. A textual crux here is 23. 7a:  $\gamma\psi$ . Various solutions have been offered (61):

(a) In PBH (as a piel) and in Jewish Aramaic (as a pael)  $\gamma\psi$  = "to fix the price of goods". If we had the same verb here, it would be its only incidence in BH and would mean something like "estimate", "reckon". Hence Gemser (61a) suggests "as one who is full of calculations" (cf. RSV) while Scott renders  $\gamma\psi$  as "his appetite" and adds  $\gamma\psi$ , translating "as he

estimates his own appetite, so he will yours".

(b) L. Durr, in ZAW 43 (1925), pp.262-69, encouraged by Amen-em-opet v.11.7 (62) ("as for the property of a poor man goes, it is a blocking to the throat"), renders שׁוֹךְ ] by "Gurgel", "Kahle" (= "throat"). Adopting a similar translation, Widengren in VT 4, (1954), p.101 renders 23. 7a "for like something disgusting in the throat so is it" ("it" is incorrect; "he" is preferable.).

(c) The LXX, to McKane's liking, translates 7a ὄν τροπίον γὰρ εἰ τις καταπίοι τρίχα, [οὕτως ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει: "eating and drinking with him is as if one were to swallow a hair". שׁוֹךְ would seem here to be read for שׁוֹךְ

Whatever the precise nuance of 23. 7a, the overall message is "do not eat with a miser, for when his true nature emerges, it will make the recipient of his intended hospitality sick; such indicators of friendship as have been enjoyed during the meal will go sour and stick in the throat".

An inebriate's progress. 23. 29-33<sup>5</sup>

Text  
(BHS)

לְמִי אֵיזִי לְמִי אֲבוּי לְמִי מִדְּנֹנִים לְמִי שׁוֹךְ  
לְמִי פִצְעִים חֲנָם לְמִי חֲכָל־לוֹת שֵׁנִים:  
לְמֵאֲחָרִים עַל־הַגֵּן לְבָאִים לְחַקֵּר מִמֶּסֶד:  
אֶל־תִּרְא וְיֵן כִּי יִחְאָדֶם כִּי־יִתֵּן בְּכִיסֵי עֵינָיו  
יִתְהַלֵּךְ בְּמִישְׁרֵים:<sup>bc</sup>  
אֲחֵרִיתוֹ כִּנְחָשׁ יִעֲף וְכִצְפַּעְנֵי יִפְרֹשׂ:<sup>29</sup>  
עֵינָיו יִרְאוּ זָרוֹת וְלִבָּהּ יִדְבַר תְּהַפְּכוֹת:<sup>33</sup><sup>70</sup>  
וְהָיִיתָ כְּשֹׁכֵבִי בְּלִב־גֵּם יִכְשָׁכֵב בְּרֹאשׁ חֲבָלִי:<sup>34</sup>  
הַכּוֹנֵי בַל־חֲלִיתִי הַלְמוֹנֵי בַל־יִתְעַתִּי  
מִתִּי אֶקְוֶי אֹסִיף אֲבַקְשֶׁנוּ עוֹד:

Translation (RSV)

<sup>29</sup> Who has woe? Who has sorrow?  
Who has strife? Who has complaining?  
Who has wounds without cause?  
Who has redness of eyes?  
<sup>30</sup> Those who tarry long over wine,  
those who go to try mixed wine.  
<sup>31</sup> Do not look at wine when it is red,  
when it sparkles in the cup  
and goes down smoothly.  
<sup>32</sup> At the last it bites like a serpent,  
and stings like an adder.  
<sup>33</sup> Your eyes will see strange things,  
and your mind utter perverse things.  
<sup>34</sup> You will be like one who lies down  
in the midst of the sea,  
like one who lies on the top of a mast.  
<sup>35</sup> "They struck me," you will say,<sup>p</sup>  
"but I was not hurt;  
they beat me, but I did not feel it.  
When shall I awake?  
I will seek another drink."

<sup>29</sup> dub; אָבוּי, Θ(ΣΩ) ὄρυθος; || <sup>o</sup> cf 21, 19\* ||  
<sup>31</sup> \* K בְּכִיסֵי, Q Vrs בְּכֹסִים || <sup>b</sup>-<sup>b</sup> frt add ex Cant 7, 10 || <sup>o</sup> frt ins שֵׁנִים וְשֵׁנִים ||  
<sup>32</sup> \* Θ(V) + ὁ ἰός; ins רֹשׁ (hpgr) cf Dt 32, 32sq.  
<sup>34</sup> \* פרק 34 || קָרַכְבּ פרק 34 || Θ(Σ) καὶ ὡς περ κυβερνήτης ἐν πολλῷ κλύδωνι = וְכַחֲבֵל בְּסֶעַר גְּדוֹל;  
prb | וְכַחֲבֵל בְּרֹעַשׁ חֲבָל | פרק 35 || וְכַחֲבֵל בְּרֹאשׁ חֲבָל פרק 35 || Θ(ΣΩ) pr εἰς δέ || <sup>o</sup> frt ins  
מִסְבָּאֵי || Cp 24, 1 \* פרק תִּקְוָה - תִּקְוָה || <sup>o</sup> K תִּתְאָו, Q תִּתְאָו || <sup>o</sup> Θ(Σ) κρείσσω, l

Watson's methodological analysis systematically unravels the colometry, lexical distribution, (repeated and unusual words), poetic devices (structural and non-structural) and imagery of this two-strophe poem charting an alcoholic's circular career (64). Stanza one, its initially "riddlesome" (65) mood phasing into a declaratory one as the emergent subject is identified, adverts to alcohol's adverse effects and the drinker's desire; stanza two reverts to those phenomena (33a-35b; 35cd), having first focused on the wine's visual (66) and physical impact. Thus, macro-structurally, the poem reflects the alcoholic's circular career: craving - imbibing - bad effects - recover - craving....(67).

Of present interest is Watson's fourth (68) unusual lexeme,  $\eta) \text{ } \aleph \aleph \eta$ . Not only is this a rare and allusive item, recalling Gen. 49 (69) and therefore the speaker's Toranic *Imprimatur*, but its probable nuance ("lack-lustre", rather than "shadowy" or similar) (70) runs directly counter to a rare connotation of verbal  $\eta \Delta \psi$ . For, elsewhere, Greenfield (71) has distinguished specific connotations of  $\eta \Delta \psi$  from its regular overtones of rejoicing. Recognizing the exegetical tradition highlighted by Perles and Seeligmann that  $\eta \Delta \psi$  occasionally resembles  $\Delta \eta \gamma$  in meaning, he points to some polysemous Semitic cognates. In Akkadian, for example, we meet *samahu*, "to grow, flourish" (which may, however, be cognate rather with  $\eta \Delta \chi$  than with  $\eta \Delta \psi$ ). More significantly for us, the Ugaritic cognate generally indicates  $\text{ } \aleph \eta \aleph$ , "laughter," but once apparently means "to shine":  $\text{ } b \delta \eta \epsilon (\ell)$   
 $\text{ } p \eta \eta \eta \text{ } t \text{ } s \eta \eta \eta \text{ } \text{ } \eta \aleph \eta \text{ } \text{ } \eta \aleph \eta$ . Ginsberg translates: "Daniel's face lights up, while above his forehead shines".

Greenfield links this instance to possibly similar usages of  $\eta \Delta \psi$ : in Provs. 13. 9, he recommends the translation (pace RSV) "the light of the righteous shines brightly". For Pss. 107. 42 and 119. 74, he argues that our rendition of  $\eta \Delta \psi$  should be influenced by verses intimating that

radiance adorns the faces of those who gaze at God, such as Ps. 34. 6 or Is. 60. 5.

May חמח in Qoh. 9. 7 (the addressee's prescribed "consumption-mood"), against this semantic background, have been intended as a tacit correlate to חכלות, suggesting the result (a shining face) of appropriate, i.e. responsible carousing? On the other hand, where חמח collocates with ל or פ (in the hiphil or piel theme), it signifies "to broaden out an anguished i.e. constrained heart": Ps. 104. 15; Zec. 10. 7; Provs. 15. 13; 17. 22; Ps. 19. 9. חמח in hiphil or piel may mean "to raise, elevate" in Lam. 2. 17; Ps. 89; 43; 90. 15; 2 Chron. 20. 27 etc. חמח/שתה in Qoh. 9. 7, in this light, stands in direct antithesis to the prohibitions of Provs. 23. 1-3; 6-8: as an imperative which assumes that the addressee is free of the suffocating protocol of either a ruler's or a miser's table (71a).

(2) *Deuteronomistic Echoes in the Calls*: One cannot but help noting certain resonances in Qoh. 9. 7 with Deuteronomy's summonses to enjoyment.

Particularly notable in Deuteronomy is the collocation of verbal חמח with ideas of (a) communal labour; (b) corporate, cultic feasting: thus Deut. 12. 7 states (with reference to sacrificial offerings):

ואבלתם-שם לפני יהוה אלהיכם ושמתם בכל משלח ידכם אתם  
ובתיכם אשר ברכך יהוה אלהיך

משלח ידכם is to be compared with בעל (Qoh. 5. 17), etc.;

משלח ידכם is a Deuteronomistic idiom which denotes especially an agricultural undertaking (see also 12. 18; 15. 10; 23. 21) (72); חמח is used always in connection with sacred meals (73). Deut. 14. 26 (on tithing) likewise reads: (having

exchanged your tithe for silver, you shall spend it on) לבקר ובצאן  
וביין ובשכר ובכל אשר תשאגך נפשך ואכלת שם לפני  
יהוה... ושמת אתה וביתך

The meristic list (בבקר... ובכל... תשא: 7) exemplifies Deuteronomy's summarising method (75); does it represent a putative menu for the feast envisaged by *the Deuteronomist* - something Qohelet never provides in his Call? Again, on the Feast of Booths Deut. 16. 14-15 requires:

ושמחת בחגך יתה ובנך ובתך ועבדך... שבעת ימים תחג  
 ליהוה אלהיך... כי יברכך יהוה אלהיך בכל תבואתך ובכל  
 מעשה ידיך והיית אהל שמחה

Note the framing function of שמחה/שמחת; ה' seems to be a summative instruction - "the festival is to be an occasion of unalloyed joy for the blessing of Jehovah" (76).

It may be that these verbal correspondences are a further pointer, however tiny, to the interaction of wisdom literature with Deuteronomic thought and terminology, already charted by Weinfeld and Wilson (77). If, as Dell (after Wilson and Sheppard (78)), has recently stressed, Qohelet's Epilogue represents an initial stage - prior to Ben Sira - in the development of an explicit Wisdom - Torah link: if "in the light of the Epilogue, Ecclesiastes (as well as Proverbs) was ... read as encouraging people to keep the Torah," (79) perhaps Qoh. 12. 9-14 forced the Preacher's later addressees to read Qoh. 9. 7 as extensions or restatements of the Deuteronomic summonses to joy.

(3) 75 : *an intratextual reading*: The simple 75 introduces a catena of imperatives. Intratextual considerations (a review of its use in BH) indicate this terse order's typical urgency: it is the crisis-manager's rallying call.

(a) Gen. 27. 9: Rachel to Jacob. Her stratagem is launched with 75 . Note that the scene is food-oriented. Rachel's order is made with food-preparation in prospect. The imperative (the third in a sequence beginning in v. 8, with an imperative and feminine participle)

sounds "the insistent use of maternal authority" (80), and is reinforced by a repetition in v.13. Such a repetition hints, perhaps, at the dubious nature of Jacob's commission: Rachel's forcefulness parries his potential objections.

(b) *Gen. 26. 16*: Abimelech's expulsion of Isaac (and his camp), because he is stronger than Abimelech and the Philistines, is introduced by  $\text{וְיָשׁוּב}$ . This sounds the "itinerary note" (81) picked up in the next sentence: v.17. So it marks a narrational shift to an account of Isaac's nomadic lifestyle.

(c) *Gen. 19. 32* <sup>$\text{וְיָשׁוּב}$</sup> ; initiates the incest of Lot's daughter with her father, a move based on two crucial factors, which she announces in v.31 (his seniority and his need of help). That is, impending domestic catastrophe drives her to it: "there must be posterity at any cost" (82). Note the linking of the imperative (a) to another order, to get Lot drunk, and (b) (indirectly) to Lot's ignorance, induced by drink, of their sex act (v.33).

(d) *Gen. 37. 20*:  $\text{וְיָשׁוּב}$ , prefaced by  $\text{וְיָשׁוּב}$  announces Joseph's brothers' rapid, inferential decision (i.e. based on what they have seen: BDB p.774a: 2b) to ensnare him. It is a call to unanimous action, in reference both to the plot itself, and to the hiding of it as Westermann notes (83).  $\text{וְיָשׁוּב}$  ironically answers to the ageing Jacob's behest to Joseph:  $\text{וְיָשׁוּב}$  - "go then ... and see if all is well with your brothers and the sheep ..." (v.14), which is an emphatic entreaty (84). This prepares the ground for their swift response - which they link to their ready excuse for Joseph's disappearance, his alleged death through a wild beast.

(e) *Num. 23. 13*:  $\text{וְיָשׁוּב}$  represents Balak's order to Balaam to switch positions, that he may see Balak's Israelite foes and denounce them. The proposal is a persistent one (and, we note, prefatory to sacrifice by Balaam):  $\text{וְיָשׁוּב}$  stresses the urgency of his need, echoing his earlier pleas.

(f) *Jud. 19. 13*:  $\text{וְיָשׁוּב}$  expresses the Levite's decision not to abide for the

night at Jebus, but rather in an Israelite town. The preceding narrative has included repeated instructions (by the father of the Levite's concubine) to eat, drink and be merry (vv. 4,5,6-7,8,9), and the addressee's appropriate (i.e. positive) responses. It is intriguing that the imperative  $\text{לך}$  in v. 13 is sounded in the context of the speaker's having *refused* further sustenance.

(g) *Ru. 1. 8*: Naomi's pessimistic embargo on her widowed daughters-in-law accompanying her:  $\text{לך}$ , "Go back .....". ("Naomi bids adieu to her daughters-in-law, fully expecting them to begin a new life in their own homeland"). The imperative's urgency is reinforced by her pleas in v. 12  $\text{שׁוּבוּ}$   $\text{לך}$  "Turn back, my daughters, just go!" (85). Hence in *Qoh. 9. 7* we may legitimately wonder whether  $\text{לך}$  has not an urgent, even strident ring to it.

The situation there is complicated, however, by the addition of two further orders:  $\text{לך}$  and  $\text{לך}$ . BDB (86) categorises *separately* the imperative of  $\text{לך}$  where it is followed by *another* second person imperative or equivalent.

An interesting example, in reference to *Qoh. 9. 7-10* is *Hos. 1. 2*:

$\text{לך}$  , "Go, take a wanton for your wife"; is this a reference which sheds light on how we are to read *Qoh. 9. 9*?  $\text{לך}$  in *Hos. 1. 2* is a *pivotal* command, shaping the book's *introduction*: "... the command for Hosea to marry is absolutely essential as an introduction, with its sentence structure indissolubly connected with that which follows" (87). For it is the first of Yahweh's four orders to Hosea in this section (the others being in vv. 4,6,9 with reference to the naming of the  $\text{בְּנֵי זְנוּנִים}$  , "children of whoredom", i.e. of the unfaithful wife, cited in v.2).

Another instance of the coupling of  $\text{לך}$  with further instruction(s) is in *Exod. 4. 19*: Yahweh's order to Moses to return to Egypt to start his commission as Israel's spokesman:  $\text{לך}$  "Go back .....". This reiterates his



earlier commands in 3. 10,16. Moses' objection in v.11 ("Who am I...?") having been answered, God now (in 4. 19) urges Moses into action. The imperatives mark a *new stage* in his career, the completion of his preparation. "He is now fully equipped to begin" (88).

... A final case of such coupling, where לך has, again, initiatory force is Gen. 12. 1. לך לך מארצך ומגדולד תך This, the momentous order to Abraham in a crisis, to leave his father's land (89), was originally, Westermann surmises, a divine behest aimed at rescuing the Abrahamic group, to be understood in the context of Abraham's nomadic lifestyle: it is an offer of help, not a severe command to uproot from settled habitat. *Conclusion:* Thus we may further enquire whether לך in conjunction with לך and וּשְׂתַחַו is not initiatory of a fresh stage in Qohelet's musings - an intensifying of his summons to enjoyment in answer to the work-world's futility (90). Yet we must beware over-stressing the initiatory, pleading role of לך. BDB (91) note that לך's force has often been attenuated to that of a "mere introductory word". See, for example, Gen. 31. 44: לָכֵן נִכְרַתָּהּ "Come, let us make a compact" NEB; 1 Sam. 9. 9:

לָכֵן וְנִלְכָה עִד-וּר הַיָּהוּ: "come, and let us go to the seer".

5. Qoh. 9. 7-10 (but especially 9. 8-9) is reminiscent of the *Egyptian Royal Instruction* in both content and form. We examine a sample of relevant documents in turn.

(1) *Similarities in Content:* (a) *Ptah-hotep* (92): Purportedly written c. 2450 BCE, during the era of the Old Kingdom, this document comprises a body of authoritative instruction from a retiring vizier of Pharaoh to his son and successor (93). It amounts to an educational manual for aspiring public officials, and its directives are geared to answering the question: how will particular conduct affect an official's career? Among them are certain

which parallel the recommendations of Qoh. 9. 9: an official must care for his wife, a stable homelife being vital if he is to manage the strains of public life (94); and he must avoid reputation-sullyng liaisons (95). Such advice has been implied (96) to reflect the spirit of a mature and relatively stable civilization, where crude behaviour will be taken to indicate personal unreliability. Nor is it merely pragmatic, for it typifies Egyptian statecraft's rules of conduct, the sagacity of an Old Kingdom mandarin. It is, self-evidently, for an elite addressee who will inherit the mantle of a proven statesman. It is drawn from an accumulated store of political wisdom, to be imbibed and consciously imitated (97).

(b) *Ani* (98) adumbrates scribal virtues: reticence, discretion, deference, careful choice of friends. Again, worthy of note as recalling Qoh. 9. 9, are suggestions concerning women: the addressee is warned against involvement with foreign women (99) and taught to relate sensitively to his own wife - not to treat her like a petty bureaucrat, but to acknowledge her efficiency, admire her silently, and prize domestic harmony (100).

(c) *Papyrus Lansing* (101) likewise recommends the scribe's life, focusing rather on the rewards of scribthood, in terms suggestive of Qoh. 9. 8 (although by no means parallel): "Be a scribe, so that thy body may be bright, and so that thy hand may become soft..." (102).

(d) More overtly hedonistic, and evocative of Qoh. 9. 8 is the *Intef Song*, one of the oeuvre of "harper's songs" (103): "the song which is in the House of King Intef the triumphant" (104), a studied call to pleasure by a "singer with the harp": "Follow thy desire, as long as thou shall live. Put myrrh upon thy head and clothing of fine linen upon thee, being anointed with genuine marvels of the gods' property." (The refrain, furthermore, evokes the spirit of Qoh. 9. 10: "Make holiday, and weary not therein! Behold, it is not given to a man to take his property with him.")

(e) *Merikare*, composed c. 2200 BCE, between the Old and Middle Kingdoms, by contrast expresses a cultic ethos (couched in a ruler's advice to his heir). The following sentiments strikingly resemble Qoh. 9. 7-8, and (perhaps) suggest the possibility of a cultic *Sitz im Leben* for those verses (105): "a man should do what is of advantage to his soul: the monthly service of the priests' putting on the white sandals, visiting the temple, revealing the mysteries, having access to the shrine, and eating bread in the temple."

(2) *Similarities in Form*

McKane (106) usefully summarises the linguistic components of the Egyptian Royal Instruction:

(a) The *imperative*, in negative, jussive or virtual (polite) form.

Particular subjects will often contain several imperatives, grouped in series, each series separated from the next by a motive and / or final clause.

(b) The *conditional* clause. McKane notes (107) that nearly all the individual directives in *Ptah-hotep* translated in *ANET* are initiated by a conditional clause. Indeed, several conditional clauses precede the first imperative (e.g. *ANET*, p.413) (108). The clause's purpose is to delimit the parameters of the imperative's application; it has a central role in Ancient Near East legal drafting, where draftsmen were concerned to define the precise circumstances of a law's application (109).

(c) The *motive* clause commends the imperative and its reasonableness. In *Ptah-hotep*, the motive clauses tend to be asyndetic. McKane lists various examples (110) and stresses their importance, as underlining the non-arbitrariness of the imperatives. The fledging diplomat has to appreciate the rationale of his inherited lore, the accrued sagacity of elder and previous statesmen.

(d) The *consequential* clause (111) shows the effectiveness of the imperative (e.g. *ANET* (p.412: "...and so it will be very pleasing to his heart etc.")). We find the above clauses combined in various patterns. Thus in *Merikare* imperatives may vary from one to seven in number in a single passage: they may combine with one or more motive and / or consecutive clauses. A feature of *Merikare* (and other documents) is extended motivation, where the motive clause is buttressed by argument (112); and we find, in *Merikare*, that consequential clauses often precede the motive clause.

*Duauf* and *Papyrus Lansing* also creatively combine the standard clauses (113). The present writer notes one example (already cited) from *Papyrus Lansing*: "Be a scribe (imper.) so that thy body may be bright (conseq. cl.: cf. Qoh. 9. 8) and thy hand become soft (conseq. cl.), and that thou mayest not smoke like a lamp, as doth one whose body is weak (conseq. cl.). For there is no bone of man in thee (motive cl.). Thou art tall and weedy...thy body would be in evil case (expanded comment on the motive cl.)".

*Ani* (114), as already noted, *contains* some instructions intriguingly similar to those in Qoh. 9. 9. The following clause combinations emerge:

- i. "Take to thyself a wife etc." (115): imper. + circumstantial cl. + conseq. cl; imper. + circ. cl.; imper. + asyndetic motive cl. + explication of the motive cl.
- ii. "Be on thy guard against a woman from abroad" (116): imper. + imper. + imper. + asyndetic motive cl. (metaphorical, with the application of it simply juxtaposed).
- iii. "Thou shouldst not eat bread" (117): polite imper. + circum. cl. + extended motivation cl; imper + extended motivation.
- iv. "Act not the official over thy wife" (118): imper. + condit. cl. + explication of the imper.; jussive + conseq. cl. + extended motivation cl.

We may now conveniently compare the clause combinations of Qohelet 9. 7-10:

9. 7: imper. + imper. + imper. + motive cl.; 9. 8: imper. + imper.; 9. 9: imper. + circum cl. + circ. cl. + circ. cl. + circ. cl. + motive cl. + motive cl. + circ. cl.; 9. 10: circ. cl. + imper. + motive cl. + extended motivation (i.e. expansion or explication of the motive cl.)

*Conclusion* The *resemblances of the Sebayit* ("Instructions") to our Call is suggestive: is Qoh. 9. 8-9, for example, a species of Royal Instruction, in the mould of *Merikare* (Qohelet's royal advice to his trainee statesman, perhaps) (119)? Against this is Qohelet's failure to sustain the royalty claim (a literary fiction) after chapter 2 (120), and his non-provision (explicitly, at least) of a legacy for descendants. Nevertheless the verses may well be best read as a variation on that theme: as a well-to-do sage's (121), advice to his protégé, even, perhaps, (on the *Merikare* analogy) with a cultic flavour. They would then, further to 4. 17 ff., primarily define appropriate conduct in a *liturgical context* - that is, regular Jerusalem Temple worship (122).

#### NOTES

- (1) Murphy, 1992, p.xlii.
- (2) Cf. on 9. 7, *below* pp. 56ff.
- (3) Cf. Murphy, 1992, p.xlii. *Topoi* treated by Qohelet and other biblical / non-biblical works: e.g. joy, riches, royalty.
- (4) So Murphy, 1992, p.xlii, also Gottwald, 1985, p.566.
- (5) We omit, for example, reference to Sumerian aphorisms: see E.I. Gordon, *Sumerian Proverbs: Glimpses of Everyday Life in Ancient Mesopotamia*.

New York: Greenwood Press. Pub., 1968; also J.J.A. van Dijk, *La Sagesse Sumer Accadiene*. Leiden: Brill, 1953, 5-6; and G. Lambert, "Morals in Ancient Mesopotamia". *Jaarbericht* (1957-58), p.187<sub>1/2</sub> <sup>(and G. Lambert, 1960).</sup> Cf. B. Alster, "Paradoxical Proverbs and Satire in Sumerian Literature", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 27 (Oct. 1975), pp.201-02.

(6) N.K. Sandars, 1960, pp.97ff., *ANET* pp.88b ff.

(7) The Akkadian Epic of Gilgamesh, probably dating from c. 2000 BCE, survives in various non-Akkadian versions: for its transmission and literary relationships, see *ANET* pp.726-736. Gilgamesh's conversations are charted in four pre-first millennial recensions, of which only two (an Old Babylonian and an Assyrian) are substantially intact: see Speiser's textual discussion in *ANET*, p.89b. *ANET* records the Siduri-Gilgamesh exchange in the Old Babylonian version.

(8) Sandars, 1960, p.102; cf. *ANET* pp.89b-90a.

(9) Cf.  $\eta \text{ ) } \gamma \text{ } \eta \text{ } \nu \text{ } \gamma$  Qoh. 2. 26, etc.

(10) Cf. Barton, Ginsberg, Murphy.

(11) Pace Barton, who twice refers to Siduri's advice (1908, pp.39, 62) and even surmises that the Hebrew may be a partial translation of the Babylonian; Ginsberg thinks that his identical order of ideas indicates Qohelet's "literal" if not "direct" dependence upon Gilgamesh ("The Quintessence of Qohelet", in *Biblical and Other Studies*, ed. A. Altmann. Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies: Studies and Texts, vol.1, Cambridge: Harvard U.P., 1963, pp.47-59).

(12) Siduri's words have a *sabitu's* (innkeeper's) authority: note that she is not a mere barmaid, having a brewer's (or winemaker's) equipment: the golden bowl and vats from the gods. For the *sabitu's* importance during the Old Babylonian period, cf. Harris, 1990, p.224, n.26. Both the *bit astammi* (of which Siduri was a stewardess) and the *bit sabiti* offered alcohol and

prostitutes' company. The *bit astammi* perhaps doubled as a hotel, besides having a link with the goddess Ishtar. Rahab, also exemplifying the innkeeping - prostitution link, enjoys a status like Siduri's: Josh. 2; 6. 17, 25, and see Gottwald, 1979, pp.557 ff.

(13) Siduri's specific emphases (clean clothes, washing, wife / child care) may echo Mesopotamian commendation of family life over against (males') extra-marital liaisons with prostitutes: cf. R. Westbrook, *JAOS* 104 (1984), pp.753-66, cited by Harris, p.222, n.16.

(14) Shamhat subverts the staple Mesopotamian image of prostitutes as saboteurs of domestic stability (for which see, e.g., Lambert, 1960, p.102.)

(15) Harris, p.223, citing Sherry Ortner in Michelle Z. Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture and Society*, Stanford: Stanford U.P., 1974, pp.67-87.

(16) "Wine": so Sandars; Harris (p.224 n.22) opts for "beer".

(17) Cf. Qoh. 2. 26, etc; *below*, p. 182.

(18) Cf. <sup>*below*</sup> pp. 181 ff.

(19) An accessible edition is A. Herdner, *Corpus des tablettes en cuneiformes alphabetiques découvertes à Ras Shamra - Ugarit de 1929 à 1939*, Paris, 1963: = CTA. See, for ready reference, J.C.L Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Second Edition. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1978.

(20) I.e. from the second half: 1450 BCE or later.

(21) Mainly preserved in CTA 2: see Gibson, 1978, pp.2-8, for an account of its fragmentary state, and for interpretation; pp.37-45 for a transliterated text, translation and commentary.

(22) Cf. Gibson, 1978, pp.8-14, for interpretation of the relevant tablet, CTA 2.3-4; pp.46-67 for the text.

(23) CTA 5-6: Gibson, 1978, pp.14-19 and pp.68-81.

(24) So Gibson, 1978, pp.59-60. We have placed the pleasure-call in its

immediate context.

(25) The reader / addressee is almost anticipating such an overture after Athirat's thoughts of amorous dalliance with El as she works by the seashore: *CTA* 4. ii. ll. 1-11 (Gibson, 1978, p.56 and n. 9).

(26) Cf. above, p. 20.

(27) E.g. (as recorded in C.H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook: Grammar, Texts, Glossary*, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965 [=UT]), UT 51. IV. 35-7; 52.VI. 71-2; 67.I.24-5; 126.III.14-15.

(28) Cf. M. Dahood and T. Penar, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Word-pairs", in *Ras Shamra Parallels, vol.1*, ed. LR. Fisher et al; (AO 49), Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1972, pp.73-88.

(29) See *above*, p.23

(30) Cf. P. Craigie, "Progress and Regress in Fifty Years of Ugaritic Study", in *Ugarit in Retrospect: Fifty Years of Ugarit and and Ugaritic*, ed. C.D.Y. Young, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1981, pp.99-111. (His divergence from Dahood gives us a tiny "taster" of scholarly debate concerning the source of word-pairs and their mode of transmission.)

(31) Cf. Loretz, as cited above, p. 38, n. 5

(32) For Qohelet's putative link with Hesiod's gnomic thought, cf. Ranston, 1925: so also for his acquaintance with Theognis, examined below *à propos* 9. 7.

(33) The older commentators doggedly scrutinized our author's relationship to Greek philosophy: cf. Hengel, 1981, I, p.115; II, p.77, n.52 for a bibliographical survey. Thus Barton (e.g.) finds it necessary to discuss the issue of Qohelet's dependence on Stoicism, *inter alia* positing the thoroughly Semitic, non-stoical provenance of Qoh. 3. 1-9. For a modern reassessment of Qohelet's link with Stoicism, see (e.g.) J.G. Gammie, "Stoicism in Qohelet", *HAR* 9 (1985), p.169. Gammie, noting that Qohelet was



probably the contemporary of Chrysippus (c. 280-207 BCE) and successor of Cleanthes as head of the Stoa, compares Qohelet's teaching with Stoic physics, logic and ethical teaching. He finds, *inter alia*, that Qohelet takes a Stoic's interest in the polysemy of key terms (hence his exploitation, for example, of the nuances of  $\text{דָּוָא}$  : see Ceresko, 1982 ), and verges on a Stoic-like affirmation of a cosmic principle;

but also that he is anti-Stoic in (e.g.) his assertion that everything is ungraspable (rather a Cynic or Sceptic view), and in his perception of death: so (for example) he rejects (as at 9. 10) the Stoic's optimism in fame's durability.

(34) As Loretz does, preferring to focus on common ground between Qohelet and Mesopotamian counterparts: *Qohelet und der Alte Orient: Untersuchungen zu Stil und theologischer Thematik des Buches Qohelet*, Freiburg: Herder, 1964, pp.45-134, cited by Murphy, 1992, pp.xliii-iv; but for caveats against this and G. Hölischer's earlier (1922) "anti-Hellenistic influence" monograph, cf. Hengel, 1981, II, p.78, n.55.

(35) Hengel, 1981, II, p.77, n.52 cites systematic critiques of earlier attempts at such derivation.

(36) As defined by (e.g.) Braun, *Kohelet und die frühhellenistische Popularphilosophie*, BZAW, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1973, p.130 or Hengel, 1981, I; pp.115 ff., esp. pp.126-7; or Lohfink (e.g.) *Kohelet*, DNEB, Würzburg: Echtr, 1980, pp.7-15.

(37) Thus Lohfink (1980, p.9) argues for Greek syntactical and lexemic influence on Qohelet's Hebrew, somewhat over-specifically attributing his prose - poetry combination to the Cynic philosophical idiom of Menippos of Gadara (first half of 3rd c. BCE: serio-comic prose interspersed with verses - see *O.C.D.*, s.v.)

(38) So Hengel, 1981, I, pp.126-7.

- (39) Murphy, 1992, p.xliv.
- (40) Thus Braun, 1973, p.170 on the basis of many alleged stylistic and thematic parallels between Qohelet's and Hellenistic thought - two-thirds of which are, perhaps, improbable: cf. Murphy, 1992, p.xliv.
- (41) So Lohfink, 1980, *passim*.
- (42) M.L. West (1989, p.172) suggests (*contra*, e.g., A.R. Burn, 1960, p.248) that Theognis composed c. 640-600 BCE - a century or so earlier than the commonly suggested date. (Burn: c. 548-540).
- (43) Edmonds, 1931.
- (44) How much of our Theognidean text is by Theognis? The question is a long-running one. West (1989, pp.172ff.) has identified an acceptable core of authentic verses by restricting himself to those which (a) contain Cynus' name, and (b) are referred to as Theognis' work by fourth century authorities: e.g. Plato, *Meno* 95 d, e, quoting 33-36 and 434-38. He indicates them by a symbol, ⓪, in his text of the Theognidea: they amount to around 300 lines. Quite probably the Theognidean *corpus* is an anthology or miscellany, based on the Cynus verses (heavily redacted, concentrated in lines 19-254, with others spread out through the remainder). Through the miscellany, accretions have crept in, from other archaic poets: Mimnermus, Tyrtaeus, and Solon, whose own work is extremely fragmentary. Moreover, Theognis' original text has been swelled, during the transmission-process, to its present bulk and arrangement by the addition (editorial) of parallel and contrasting material (see *CHCL*, 1985, pp.136ff.).
- (45) For such adaptation, see, e.g., lines 237-247, 251-54: the vocabulary is almost entirely Homeric, the passage a mosaic of Homeric phrases and formulae, some slightly adapted, some unchanged, (see *CHCL*, 1985, p.141).

The homo-erotic love poetry is concentrated in the speciously-titled "second book" anthology probably excepted from the Theognidean *corpus* in

the ninth or tenth centuries CE (West, 1989, p.173) - although a few of the love poems (which were probably once distributed throughout the collection) remain in the first book.

(46) CHCL, p.139.

(47) Isocrates, for example in *Ad Nicolem* 43 ranks him as among *ἐπισημοὺς συμβούλους τῷ βίῳ τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*: "The best adviser for the conduct of human life" : West, 1985, p.140.

(48) West, 1985, p.138.

(49) Van Groningen, 1967, pp.223-24.

(50) So T.G. Rosenmeyer in his review of Van Groningen, *AJP* 89 (1968), pp.215ff.

(51) Hengel, 1981, II, p.83, n.132.

(52) Cf. Ranston, 1925, who raises this point in connection with Theognis' putative dependence on the epic of Gilgamesh. Ranston, who believes Theognis' thought has directly coloured Qohelet's Call passages, objects that it is arbitrary to assume one such relationship of dependence (Theognis - Gilgamesh), while not countenancing others (e.g. Solon-Gilgamesh; Hesiod-Gilgamesh). See also Hengel's succinct dismissal of Loretz's arbitrary selection of Gilgamesh as Qohelet's "forerunner" in the matter of his "*carpe diem*" statements: "This and similar topics are too general for one to construct relationships of dependence from them" (1980, II, p.83, n.129).

(53) So Hengel, 1981, I, p.115; II, p.77, n.54; Murphy, 1992, p.xliv, comparing Loretz and Braun on the matter. Braun thinks Qohelet's choice of certain terms ( *יִשְׂרָאֵל, הַכֹּל*, etc.) is Greek-driven. Murphy, siding with Loretz, specifically discounts a Greek underlay for *תָּחִית הַשָּׁמַיִם* (p.6, on 1.3 ) and *יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶשְׂרֵי עוֹלָם* (p.47, on 5. 17). Qohelet is, rather, topheavy with Aramaisms: Hengel, 1981, I, p.115; II, p.78, n.54; Fredericks, 1988, p.225ff.

(54) Fox, 1989, p.16.

- (55) G.R. Wilson has argued for the intimate relationship of the two texts, in a study affirming, *inter alia* Proverbs. dependence on Deuteronomy:1. The link between Proverbs and Qohelet is suggested by their superscriptions (Qoh. 1. 1; 12.8; Provs. 1. 1; 10. 1; 11. 17; 24. 23; 25. 1; 30. 1; 31. 1) which in Proverbs, at least, reflect a collection-process: they introduce separate, aphoristic collections.
2. Qohelet was aware of this collection-process. Its reference to the ("words of the wise") in 12. 11 signifies his acknowledgement of a collection of sayings which exceeds the limits of his own work.
  3. Qohelet wishes to restrict the collection-process: he views the wise mens' words as an established source of guidance (12. 11), assured, self-contained possessions which require no supplements (12. 12).
  4. Additional linkage is provided by the text's common attribution to Solomon (Qoh. 1. 1; Provs. 1. 1.).
  5. Provs. 1. 2-8 announces a hermeneutic - a hierarchy of instruction, a programme which culminates in the wise man's edification (1. 5). Qoh. 12. 9-14 recognizes the completion of the programme (note the verbal echoes).
  6. Interestingly, all early arrangements of Proverbs and Qohelet are consistent: they are always together, and in that order, regardless of the wide sequence-variation of other hagiographa: Wilson directs us to the relevant chart in H.E. Ryle, *Canon of the Old Testament*, London: Macmillan, 1892, p.229. This consistency's significance as an indicator of the texts' linkage was recognized as early as the second century BCE by B. Bathra 14b. (cf. S.Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of the Hebrew Scripture*, Hamden: Achon, 1976; Wilson, 1984, p.191, n.27); the later arrangement, found in the MT (Proverbs, Ruth, Song of Songs, Qohelet) came, suggests Wilson, from a need for a ready-reference arrangement of the five Scrolls, for the purposes of Jewish festivals.

Thus the editors of the canon may have intended that Proverbs and Qohelet be read together. If so, then we should consider them in each other's light: for example, Proverbs' statements on drink, food and women should be assumed to qualify those in Qohelet. For the moment, we shall proceed on this assumption.

(56) Cf. also 23. 19-21, against consorting with drunkards and gluttons.

(57) *ANET* p.424a. Wilson (*ANET*, p.421a) refers to the way this document (very resonant with Provs. 22. 17-24) differs from earlier Egyptian wisdom in its "humbler, more resigned, and less materialistic outlook." The date of our main papyrus source is said to be anywhere between the 10th and 6th centuries BCE. Its proximity to *Amen-em-opet* suggests to most commentators the direct or indirect dependence upon it of the Hebrew Book of Proverbs.

(58) Cf. p. 63f below; *ANET* pp.412-14: 412b reads "If thou art one of those sitting at the table of one greater than thyself, take what he may give, when it is set before thy nose. Thou shouldst gaze at what is before thee. Do not pierce him with many stares, (for such) an aggression against him is an abomination to the *ka* (i.e. the guiding vital force of a man - his social mentor). Let thy face be cast down until he addresses thee, and thou shouldst speak (only) when he addresses thee. Laugh after he laughs, and it will be very pleasing to his heart...."

(59) *Kagemni* (c. 2600 BCE?). A son is being prepared for office by his father, a retiring vizier (on the instructions, perhaps of the aged king): this is, suggests McKane, an "educational manual for apprentice officials". Two of its five directives concern table manners (the following summary follows McKane, 1970, pp.65-67).

1. Do not be greedy at a public meal - restrain a keen appetite, for otherwise the diner exposes his limitations, his lack of self-mastery. "It

taketh only a brief moment to master oneself, and it is disgraceful to be greedy...He is a miserable man that is greedy for his body." (So A. Erman [tr. from the German by A.M. Blackman], *The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians*, London, 1927, p.66.)

2: "If thou sittest with a greedy person, eat thou only when his meal is over, and if thou sittest with a drunkard take thou only when his desire is satisfied" (So Erman, 1927, p.66.) i.e., perhaps, "Don't provoke the glutton's or drunkard's irritation by taking food or drink which he might have relished". Alternatively, the directive might mean: "If thou sit with a glutton, eat with him, then depart. If thou drink with a drunkard, accept (drink) and his heart shall be satisfied. Refuse not meat when with a greedy man. Take that which he giveth thee: set it not on one side, thinking that it will be a courteous thing" (so B. Gunn, *The Instruction of Ptah-hotep and the Instruction of Kegemni*, London, 1909, p.63), i.e. "In general eat moderately, but exceptionally, if consorting with a glutton or a drunkard, conform to his practice".

(60) *Ani* is probably a scribal manual dating from the New Kingdom period (1580 - 1085 BCE), although mainly preserved in a papyrus of the Twenty or Twenty-first Dynasty (1100-800 BCE). As well as recommending a catena of scribal virtues (deference, reticence, careful choice of friends, respect of one's wife), it specifically warns against gluttony: *ANET* p.421a: "Thou should'st not eat bread when another is waiting and dost not stretch forth thy hand to the food for him. It is here forever. A man is nothing. The one is rich; another is poor, while bread continues ... Be not greedy to fill thy belly."

(61) See McKane, 1970, pp.384-85.

(61a) In *Sprüche Salomos*, 2nd. ed. *HAT* 16, 1963.

(62) *ANET*, p.423.

(63) A passage which Watson minutely analyses (1986, pp.20-30), under the wryly alliterative title "Hangovers are Horrible", in order to demonstrate his methodology (adapted from literary critics' procedures: p.15; and see above, pp. 9ff for Hebrew poetry-reading.

(64) Other negative criticism of gluttony / drunkenness:

1. Is. 5. 22ff.
2. Eccclus. 31. 12: drunkenness is again portrayed as *socially* unacceptable (bad etiquette). The immoderate consumption of wine leads to social disorder (quarrels).
3. *Test XII Pats: Judah*: excessive wine is bad because it induces *promiscuity* (11. 2; 12. 3; 13. 6; 16. 1, 14ff.); a link between drinking and promiscuity is also made in Issachar 7. 2, 3.
4. In the Gospels, drunkenness is associated with non-vigilance (Matt 24.49 //Lk. 12. 45); it is an *eschatological* sin.
5. The Pauline *corpus*: at Eph. 5. 18, drunkenness again is a symptom of *folly* (cf. Provs. 23. 19-21) and of the dark life; cf. I Thess. 5. 5-8, Ro. 13. 12-13. At Titus 1. 12, we find gluttony levelled as a *quasi-political* charge against the circumcisionists, for they are caricatured as "liars, evil beasts and lazy gluttons". Elsewhere, drunkenness especially is seen as socially unacceptable in a special sense: it is *subversive to church order*. Thus at I Tim. 3. 8, drunkenness is said to be inappropriate for deacons: at I Cor. 5. 11; 6. 10, it has no place in the Christian fellowship or the Kingdom of Heaven.

(65) McKane's term, on v. 29.

(66) "The man is a devotee" (Toy, 1916, on v. 30).

(67) Watson, 1986, p.26.

(68) Watson lists another eight: 1986, p.24.

(69) *This* is otherwise only found in Genesis 49. 12, where Jacob uses

it (in its adjectival form) in the context of his blessing of Judah, although not of Judah himself: it applies to the blessed ruler who is to come in future time. For 49. 10-12, see Westermann (1986, pp.221, 229-30) who believes it to be akin to a tribal saying from the Judges' period, with its life-setting indicated by Jud. 5. The wine imagery appears to denote the fertility which will mark this ruler's advent, for his person and accoutrements are explicitly linked to the vine or its produce. Whereas in Provs. 23. 29  $\text{נִשְׂכָּר}$  seems to be a pejorative, in Gen. 49. 12 the term is complimentary, a tribute to the king's facial beauty: just one manifest effect of the divine blessing bestowed upon him.

(70) So Watson, 1986, p.28, after McKane, 1970, p.393.

(71) Greenfield, 1959, p.141ff.

(71a) See Appx. 3 for wider discussion of  $\text{נִשְׂכָּר}$  in its BH context.

(72) Driver, 1902, *ad loc.*, p.143.

(73) Weinfeld, 1972, p.346.

(74) Weinfeld, 1972, p.322.

(75) Thompson, 1974, *ad loc.*, p.182.

(76) The Jewish Publication Society's translation of the Torah (1967) explicitly equates  $\text{נִשְׂכָּר}$  in Deut. 12. 7 with *happiness*: "(you shall be) happy in all (your) undertakings". Contrast this M. Fox's equation of nominal and verbal  $\text{נִשְׂכָּר}$  in Qohelet, with non-happy pleasure or pleasure-performance: see below pp. 183ff

(77) Weinfeld, 1972, pp.260ff. demonstrates wisdom content in Deuteronomy: e.g. Deut. 19. 14 (cp. 27. 17): cf. Provs. 22. 28; 23. 10; Deut. 25. 13-16; cf. Provs. 11. 1; 20. 23. Deuteronomy's didactic temper is said to parallel that of Proverbs: Deut. 6. 7-8 (cp. 11-18); 6. 9; 11.20: cf. Provs. 6. 20-22 (cp. 1.9); 3. 3; 4. 9; 7. 3. The "distinctive pedagogical consciousness" of both works is echoed in their shared vocabulary: e.g.  $\text{נִשְׂכָּר}$  occurs in Deut. 4.



36; 8. 5; 11. 2 etc; and Provs. 19. 18; 29. 17; 13. 1 .

Wilson, 1984, notes particularly the similar use in Proverbs and Deuteronomy of  $\text{לִי יְיָ}$ : Provs. 3. 1-2 compares with Deut. 5. 1-2; Provs. 4. 4 with Deut.4. 40; Provs. 6. 23; 7. 1-2, with Deut. 4. 1; 5. 28-29; 6. 6-9; 8. 1-2. He suggests that Deuteronomic reflection has re-evaluated the Proverbial statements (p.189) within a broader context, as essentially Toranic - as "in some sense, the very commandments of God" (p.183).

(78) Dell, 1994: G.T. Sheppard, "The Epilogue to Qohelet as Theological Commentary" (*CBQ* 39 (1977), pp.182-89, argues that Qoh. 12. 13-14 "represents a fairly sophisticated theological interpretation of sacred wisdom in relation to an authoritative Torah".

(79) Dell, 1994, p.313.

(80) Westermann, 1985, *ad loc.*, p.438.

(81) Westermann, 1985, *ad loc.*, p.426.

(82) v. 32, Westermann, 1985, *ad loc.*, p.313.

(83) 1985, *ad loc.* p.41.

(84) Cf. BDB p.609a.

(85) Sasson, 1989, p.22.

(86) p.234

(87) Wolff, 1974, *ad loc.*, p.10.

(88) Childs, 1974, *ad loc.*, p.77.

(89) Westermann, 1985, *ad loc.*, p.148.

(90) For further examples and discussion of conjoined imperative clauses, see Andersen, 1974, pp.108-09. In order to exemplify their effect he analyses Jacob's speech in Gen. 43. 11-14 (which has an elaborate tripartite structure) detailing seven commands: (1) get delicacies, (2) take down the present, (3) get double money, (4) return original money, (5) get Benjamin, (6) arise, (7) return to the man (Andersen's summary). These are not,

however, issued in their performance-order: (1), (3), (5), (6), (7), (2), (4).

(6) is a link-move between (1)-(5) and (7)-(4).

(91) p.234a, 1f. (2).

(92) *ANET*, pp.412-24.

(93) Probably more as a matter of literary convention than historical circumstance.

(94) *ANET*, p.413f.: "If thou art a man of standing, thou shouldst ... love thy wife at home, as is fitting. Fill her belly; clothe her back. Ointment is the prescription for her body. Make her heart glad as long as thou livest. She is a profitable field for her lord."

(95) *ANET*, p.413f.: "If you want to perpetuate friendship in any home to which you have access, "beware of approaching the women. It does not go well with the place where that is done."

(96) E.g., by McKane, 1970, p.53.

(97) So McKane, 1970, pp.51-2..

(98) *ANET*, p.420f.

(99) Particularly those separated from their husbands: for "a deep water, whose windings one knows not, a woman who is far away from her husband." (*ANET*, p.420a).

(100) As well as advising respect for wives, *Ani* also condemns selfish gluttony (*ANET*, p.421): Cf. Provs. 23.2, 20 etc. The extent of the parallel with Qoh. 9. 9 is blurred. First, is Qohelet speaking of his wife? Second, how positively does he view women as such? With regard to question one, we note his anarthrous use of  $\eta\omega\kappa$  : is that noun thereby undetermined ("any woman")? See Appx. 4. for further discussion of these issues.

(101) *ANET*, p.435.

(102) Cf. the *Instruction of Duauf*, *ANET*, pp.432-4 which extensively reviews other trades, and their inherent drudgery, before commending to the

assiduous schoolboy the scribal career as a passport into an elite club. This document's title is, in fact, misleading, for it actually transmits the advice of Duauf's *son* to *his* son. It survives in numerous sources, mostly dating from the nineteenth dynasty (1350-1280 BCE).

(103) For a seminal discussion of this oeuvre, see M. Lichtheim, "The Song of Harpers", *JNES* 4 (1945), pp.178-212.

(104) A. Wilson bases his *ANET* translation (p.467) on a MS of c. 1300 BCE, which ascribes the original song to an Intef king: Wilson accordingly dates its composition to (just?) before or (just?) after the Intef (i.e. twelfth) dynasty (c. 1991-1786 BCE).

(105) *ANET*, p.416.

(106) McKane, 1970: p.82 (*Ptah-hotep* and *Merikare*), pp.90-91 (*Duauf* and *Lansing*), pp.99-102 (*Ani*), pp.110-17 (*Amen-em-opet*).

(107) McKane, 1970, p.76.

(108) *ANET*, p.413.

(109) Cf., for example, G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, *The Babylonian Laws, II*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.

(110) McKane, 1970, p.76.

(111) McKane, 1970, p.78.

(112) *ANET*, p.416.

(113) McKane, 1970, pp.90f.

(114) McKane, 1970, pp.99f.

(115) *ANET*, p.420.

(116) *Ibid.*

(117) *ANET*, p.421

(118) *Ibid.*

(119) G. von Rad (e.g.), *Wisdom in Israel*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1972, p.226, has overstressed Qohelet's similarity to Egyptian *Königstestament*, "Royal

Testament".

(120) The "king" fiction, grounded in the author's self-description at 1.1-1.12, dominates Qoh. 1.12 - 2.11, encompassing his general statement of intent (a search for wisdom: 1.12-18) and his pleasure-experiment (2.1-11), and arguably extends to 2.26 (so if we retain the first person suffix: see de Waard, 1979, for argument). It is generally felt not to stretch beyond chapter 2 (Murphy, 1992, p.12; Whybray, 1989, p.4).

(121) See above, p. 1 for the idea of Qohelet's "bourgeois" status in Ptolemaic Palestine, as a pedlar of elitist  $\eta\lambda\lambda\eta$ , whether within or out - with an official school or student following.

(122) For the probability of a Jerusalem *locale* for Qohelet's composition, cf. Whybray, 1989, p.13.

### CHAPTER III

#### TQ 9. 7-10: Generic Transformation of the Masoretic Text.

*Introduction:* The writer now intends to define TQ's modifications of Qoh. 9. 7-10 (MT), in the text and co-text, and to account for these (primarily referring to 9. 7) in terms of the targumist's dogmatic assumptions and his generic transformation of the Hebrew material.

Our targum text is Knobel's (1). It is an eclectic text: a "conflation of the manuscripts" (2). He has not chosen to follow one MS with variants (a "diplomatic" text), but has, rather, relied on the Yemenite MSS as the basic text, supplementing them by readings from the European MSS and the first Rabbinic Bible (Bomberg), 1517 (3). For Knobel's method, it is worth quoting the author's own analysis (4):

"I have attempted to present a grammatically 'correct' text....There, however, has been no systematic correction according to any theory of the editor. I have also tried to provide a maximum text which often includes more than one version of the Targum to a particular verse. This method provides the largest number of phenomena to be studied. In some cases it may be possible to argue that one version is older than another, but for the most part, it is not possible to decide. There is no way on the basis of the available material to re-establish the 'original' targum, if such ever existed."

Not all critics have welcomed Knobel's text-critical procedure (5); but Knobel unashamedly defends his decision. It provides him with a greater bulk of exegetical examples - and is therefore more useful for the student

of rabbinic interpretation - than would just one manuscript with variants (5a).

1. *The Targum Text and Translation:*

9.7 דִּאֲחַעְעִיד בְּעֵלְמָא הִדִּין הָחוּת סִכְסָא: אֲכַר הִלְכָה בְרוּחַ בְּבוּאָה סֹן  
 קָדָם יי עֵהִיד טְרִי עֵלְמָא לְכִיכָר לְכָל צְדִיקָא וְצְדִיקָא בְּאֲנָפִי נֹן  
 אִיזִיל<sup>(6)</sup> סְעִים בְּהַרְוָה לְחִכְךָ דְּאֵהִיב לָךְ עַל לְחִכְךָ דִּיהִבְתָּ<sup>(6)</sup> לְעֵנִי.  
 דְּהִכִּינָא דְהוּא<sup>(6)</sup> כְּנִין וְהֵי בְּלָב<sup>(6)</sup> סָב הִכְרָךְ דְּאֲצַעֲנַע לָךְ בְּנֹן עֵד  
 הִלָּךְ הִכְרָךְ דְּכֹזְנָהּ לְעֵנִי וְהִכִּינָא דְהוּא זָהִי אָרוּם הָא סָבָר  
 אַחֲרַעִי קָדָם יי עוֹזְרִי סִכְסָא:

9.8 בְּכָל עֵידִן יְהוּזִין כְּטוּהָר<sup>(6)</sup> חִיּוּרִין כְּכָל סוּאֲבַת חוּבְתָא וְסָכָא סָבָא  
 דְּכַחִּיל לְכַסַּח דְּבוּהָא קְנִי בְּנִין דִּיכְסוּן בִּירְכֹן עַל דִּיכְךָ זְעִיבוּחָךְ  
 9.9 לֹא יִחַסֵּר: הוּי הִיּוּן סְבִין עִם אִיהֶא דְרַחֲמִיכֶא כָּל יוֹפִי הִיּוּ  
 הִבְלוּחָךְ דִּיהִב יי לָךְ בְּסוּלָךְ אָרוּם הוּא חוּלְקָךְ בְּהִיךְ וּבְסִרְחוּחָךְ  
 דְּאֲנַמָּא טָרַח בְּעֵלְמָא הִדִּין הָחוּת סִכְסָא:

9.10 כָּל דְּסַפְקָא יִדְךָ לְכַעֲבֵד צְדִיקָהּ עִם כְּסִינָא בְּכָל הִילָךְ  
 עֵייד אָרוּם זָחַר כּוּהָא לִיח לְבִיכָר לְוִזְרָא דְחוּסְבִנָא וְסַנְדִּיקָא

דְּהִכְכִּהָא זָכִית קְבוּרָהּ דְּאֵה אֲדִיל לְהִנֵּן דְּלֹא יִסְחִיעוּן לָךְ  
 9.11 אֲלֵהִין עוֹזְרִין סְבִין וְצְדִיקָהּ בְּלֹאֲדִיהוּן: אֲכַר הִלְמָה כְּלָמָא

## Text - Critical Apparatus.

9.7 אכר) כל צער; ברוח נבואה) אד בנבואה; קדם) ח קדם; לכ  
 ח לביכר; צדיקא) א צדיקא; וצדיקא) א חסר; באנפי) סכ  
 באפי; איזיל) ס איזיל, כ איזיל, ל איזיל; סעים) א חסר,  
 סעום, חסיכל סעום; בחרוה) ד בחרוה; דאחיהיב) ז דאחו  
 חסיכל דאיהוּחב; לחכך) כבהכיכ להכא; דיהבת) ז די יהב  
 חי די יהבמא, ס די יהבמא, כ דייהבמא, ל די יהבמא; לעני

חל לעניא, י לעניא; וחסיכא א וְהִשְׁבִּיא, ז והיכא, כיכ וְהִשְׁבִּיא;  
 ל וְלַחֲסוּקָא; דהוה) אד דְהוּא, ל דְהוּו; כפיז) ו לְפִיז, חסיכל כְּפִיז;  
 וְחִי) בגדה וְחִי, ו וְסָחִי, סי וְסָחָה; בלב) אה בְּלָב, כ בְּלָבָא; טג)  
 ל טב; חכר) גסיכל חְכָרָא; דאצטנע) אבו דְאַצְנַע; הלף) ז חולף,  
 ס חלף, יכל תלף; לעניא) חל לעניא, י לעניא; וחסיכא) אדה ולחה  
 ז וחסיכא, חסיכל וְחִסוּקָא; דהוה) ו דהוה הוּא, ל דְהוּו; צחי) ס  
 זכר בגל" צחי; אהרעי) א אֵהִי דְעִיּוּן, ב אֵהִי דְעִיּוּן, ג אֵהִי דְעִיּוּן  
 אֵהִי דְעִיּוּן, ו אֵהִי דְעִיּוּן, ז אהרעיין, סי אַהֲרַעֲיִין, כ אַהֲרַעֲיִין; קדס)  
 ח קדס; עובר) ס עוֹבֵר; טביא) ס טְבִיָּין

9.8 עידן) חל עִיּוּן; יהוין) ו יהוין, ז יהוון, חי יהוון, ס  
 יהון, כ יהון, ל יְהוּוּן; חיוורן) א חִיּוּרִין, ג חִיּוּרִין, ז  
 חיוורין, חסכל חִיּוּרִין, י חוּרִין; ככל) זחכיל סז כל; סואנת)  
 ז סואבות, חסיכ סוֹאֲבֹת, ל סוֹאֲבֹת; חובתא) יכ הוֹבְתָא; וסכא)  
 אדהו סְכָן; טבא) ד סב; דכחיל) אדה דכִּיל, ס דְכָל; קני)  
 אדו קְנָא, ח קְנִי, י קְנָה, כ קְנָא, ל קְנִי; דיכטון) חסיכל  
 די יְכָסִין; בירכז) כ בְּרָכּוּן, ל בְּרָכּוּן; וסיבות) ג וְסִבּוֹתָךְ,  
 ב וְסִבּוֹתָךְ, ל סיבנת; יחסר) ח יְחַסֵּר, חס יְחַסֵּר, ל יְחַסֵּר;  
 9.9 חזי) אטכל חוּזִי, ז חמי, י חֲמִי; איתתא) אהכ אֵהָא, ז איתא;  
 דרחיכתא) כ דְרַחֲמִיתָא, ל דְרַחֲמִיתָא; חיי) י חִי; דיהב) ח דְיָהִיב;  
 בכולר) ו בְּכֹלְךָ, ז בכולא, חסל בְּכֹלְךָ, י בְּסוֹלְךָ, כ בְּכֹלְךָ;  
 הוא) ז היא חיל היא; חולקר) ס תְּגַלְקֵר; בחייר) ל בְּחִייר;  
 בטרחות) ס וּבְרַחֲטוֹן, ל בְּסוֹרְחֻמְךָ; דאנתא) דחילך דְאַנְתָּא, ז  
 דאנה, ס די אַת; טרח) ס טְרַחַת, ל טְרַחַת; הדין) אבגהחסיכ חסר;

9.10 ידר) ס לך ידר; לכעבד) חי לְכַעֲבֵד, כ לְכַעֲבֵד; דקתא) גכ  
 דְקָתָא, ל סיבו ודקתא; כסינא) ב כְּסִינָא, כ קְסִינָא;  
 עביר) אחסיכ: עֵבִיר, גְּלֵבִיר, ז עִיבֵר, ל עֲבִיר; נחר) חסכ  
 בְּחָר; לגבר) חכ לְגַבְרָא; עוברא) והסיכל עוֹבְרָא; וחוסבנא)  
 ו דְהִסְבִּנָא, ס וְחֻסְבָּנָא; וכנדקא) ס וְכַנְדָּקָא; וחכמתא) בגו  
 דְהוּכְמָתָא, ז וחוכמתא, חסיכ וְחֻכְמָתָא; אויל) חל אֹיִל; להזן)  
 חסיל הסן, כ הַסֵּן; אלהין) ח אֱלֹא הוּ בְּגַל אֱלֹהִין, סי אֱלִילִיּוּן;  
 כ אֱלִילִיּוּן; עוברדין) וחסיכל עוֹבְרִיּוּן; ודקתא) אבגדו ודְקָתָא;

9.7 Solomon said by the spirit of prophecy before the  
 Lord, The Master of the Universe will say to each and  
 every righteous one individually, Go eat in joy your  
 bread which was given to you for the bread which you  
 gave to the poor and needy who were hungry, and drink  
 with a happy heart your wine which is hidden for you  
 in the Garden of Eden in exchange for the wine which  
 you mixed for the poor and needy who were thirsty.  
For already your good deeds are accepted by the Lord.

9.8 Always let your garments be white without any stain of sin and acquire a good name which is compared to anointing oil, so that blessings may come upon your head and your goodness will not be lacking.

9.9 See, a good life with a wife whom you love all the days of your futile life which God gave you by your providence. For it is your portion in your life and in your labor wherein you labor in this world under the sun.

9.10 Whatever charity your hand finds to do for the needy do it with all your strength, for after death a man has neither work nor reckoning nor knowledge nor wisdom in the grave where you are going and nothing will help you but good deeds and charity alone.

## 2. The Targumic Modifications.

9.7 (1) The three imperatives in v. 7 are prefaced by their attribution to Solomon: he utters them, in prophetic mode.

(2) Solomon in turn attributes the imperatives to the source of his prophetic inspiration - the Master of the Universe.

(3) The imperatives' addressees are specified: the righteous.

(4) The bread and wine which they are to consume is defined: "bounty-food", their reward for charitable conduct (i.e. in this world). The putative scenario of the Master's instruction is thereby implied to be judgement (or a similar occasion) in the world to come.

(5) The wine is further defined as primordially secreted, in anticipation



of the addressees' arrival before the Master.

(6) The justification clause (כִּי נִבְרַךְ צֶהֱהָהּ) is modified by the switch from active to passive (אֶתְרַעֲי לְרַעֲי : 3 m.s. itpe.)= "to desire", "be accepted"); and the "deeds" in view are said to be "good". The Master's words, quoted by Solomon, appear to finish at the end of 9. 7, the text then reverting to Solomonic speech.

9. 8 (1) The garments and oil of MT v.8 become, apparently, metaphors in the targum. They represent, respectively, moral purity (7) and integrity of reputation.

(2) In TQ v.8 the prepositional phrase, "upon your head", becomes detached from its MT subject, "oil", acquiring as a new subject "blessings" - the fruit of the behaviour enjoined in the previous clause's metaphorical imperatives.

(3) In TQ "oil" is also distanced from its MT governing verb יִתְּנֶה. As with בְּרַעֲי this is tucked into a purpose clause with a new subject - "goodness".

(4) The unadorned double imperative of MT v.8 is thus transformed in two moves: it has become an encoded call to moral probity (its ciphers, the garments and oil, being duly deciphered in terms of what they signify); and it spills over into a double purpose clause. This is, perhaps, ambiguous. To which of the imperatives does each half of the clause correspond? Are "blessings" envisaged by the targumist to flow from sinlessness, and "goodness" to answer an unsullied reputation? Or are they a package, representing the interior and exterior benefits of acting as enjoined?

9.9 (1) MT 9. 9 is also expanded. The addressee's futile life-span is defined as a divine gift: תְּנִינָה (literally "in your planet" i.e. "Providence"). His "labour" is designated as mundane labour - of this world.

(2) The targumist converts the MT's energetic imperative in 9. 10 into a plea for charitable action, and, further, amplifies the justification-clause by the rider that this-world charity is the giver's sole *post-mortem* protection.

(3) A query perhaps arises as to the extent of Solomon's *inspired* utterance: is it merely in 9. 7 that he speaks prophetically; or through 9. 7-10? (8)

### 3. *Changes in the co-text.* (9).

TQ seems to forge a fresh link between 9. 7 and its preceding co-text. MT 9. 5-6 concludes Qohelet's resumé of death's levelling impact by stressing the complete negation of all living in death; and then, in v.7, launches into an optimistic recommendation of this-worldly pleasure. TQ 9. 5, however, differentiates firmly between the sinner and the righteous, with reference to their mentality and experience. Interestingly, the comparison does not consist of symmetrical correlates. We might expect the targumist's terse summation of righteous attitudes and conduct (an awareness of sin's consequences, and a resultant reluctance to sin / tendency to contrition) to be mirrored by his directly contrasting castigation of sinful mentality and behaviour (non-awareness of sin's results, and a resulting tendency to unrepentant misconduct).

But instead of such a symmetrical contrast we find an intriguing inversion of the relationship between attitude and conduct: the sinners' ignorance (= "non-experience" perhaps?) of "anything good" (in this world, and *post-mortem*) is attributed to their sinful activity - to their mundane wickedness. Further, their situation is defined more extensively: their *post-mortem* negation (or rather their marginalization, for they do not appear to be regarded as altogether perishing) is spelt out. Thus *they* lack

the attributes listed in MT 9. 5 (reward and remembrance). The loss of relational life, characterized by its driving emotions, which in MT 9. 6 is predicated <sup>of</sup> by all dead, is in TQ 9. 6 restricted to the wicked. The "portion" of MT 9. 6 is likewise in TQ denied to the wicked alone, and is qualified as being a "portion with the righteous in the world to come" rather than "in what is done here under the sun." This dismemberment by Solomon (in the first person) of the sinners' prospects in the world to come paves the way for the shift to the narrator in 9. 7.

The fate of the righteous in 9. 7 is mediated to the hearer / reader from the Master of the Universe, through Solomon via the narrator - i.e. at a double remove, whereas he learns of the sinners' destruction from Solomon direct.

TQ 9. 7-10 is probably marked off as a discrete unit by the narrator's intrusion in v.11. If there were any doubt as to the extent of Solomon's prophetic utterance, there is no doubt that, at v.11, he speaks in his regal, non-inspired mode.

#### 4. *The Impetus for Modification: (1) Dogma. (a) anti-anthropomorphism?*

In his concluding volume's second chapter (10) Sperber summarises the reasons of changes and additions to MT in the targums to the Pentateuch and the Prophets. These include reasons for dogma and belief: the targum's aim, according to Sperber, is to eliminate all possible anthropomorphic phrases and to replace them with other expressions "better suited" <sup>for the more</sup> refined ideas concerning God of the later generations (our quotation marks). ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> So, for example, targum avoids Biblical expressions which suggest that God has a human body and, in reference to Him, substitutes for parts of the body the action they perform - e.g. to "serve the Lord" rather than "to walk before Him" (11). This observation is, we note in passing, by no means universally true. TQ itself provides some contrary examples: e.g. 2.

24 ("to walk in straight paths before Him").

We might also add a comment about the seemingly innocuous preposition **קדמ** (9. 7 and often). Is this, as some think, a "circumlocutionary device" (i2) for avoiding direct contact between humanity and God? Klein adduces several targumic instances where this appears *not* to be the case. Firstly, he offers some Pentateuchal examples of its use: *TO/Ps-J Gen.* 17. 18 ("And Abraham said before [<sup>י</sup>] the Lord"); *TO/Ps-J Deut.* 1. 41; *Ps-J Exod.* 10. 8 ("Go serve before [<sup>י</sup>] the Lord"); *TN Exod.* 16. 8 ("Your complaints are ... before [<sup>י</sup>] the lord"). Is it, Klein asks, due to the targumist's awareness of God's incorporeality, of his detachment from human activities, that **בדק** interposes between the verb and its divine object? Is it anti-anthropomorphic? He then cites evidence tending against the idea. In Aramaic Daniel commoners speak before [<sup>י</sup>] the king (2. 9,10,11,27,36 etc.); Daniel is brought before [<sup>י</sup>] him (2. 24,25; 3. 13 etc.) **בדק** appears to mark their deference in the royal presence - and Daniel's before his God, as at 6. 23: "as before [<sup>י</sup>] thee, O king, I have done no wrong". Again, in the targums **בדק** is a deferential particle used in human settings; it is the translational equivalent of various Hebrew propositions **לפני**, **לפניו**, **לפניהם**, **לפניה** : see, for example. *Ps-J Gen.* 43. 15 ("And they stood before Jacob") or 18. 22 ("And they stood before the Lord"); and of semantically similar phrases, such as **לפניהם** (e.g. *Gen.* 42. 24; *Ps-J*: "And he bound him before them"). Especially where **לפניהם** replaces the *nota accusativi* in phrases with **עבד** is its deferential nuance evident; this replacement occurs in both human and divine contexts: *Ps-J Gen.* 27. 29,40; 39. 15,18 etc. (human); *TN Exod.* 20. 5 (divine), etc. The targums also use **בדק** to replace **לפניהם** in phrases with verbs of crying, begging and praying before God (e.g. as at *Num.* 11. 1,18; 14. 28): is this an anti-anthropomorphic usage? No, because the targums treat the idiom the same way in human

contexts also, at least fourteen times: for example, *TQ Gen.* 20. 8; 23. 10. In these cases, **דָּן** is clearly regarded as figurative.

(b) *A contrasting assumption: TQ 2. 24-6.* We might conveniently contrast another Call-passage exemplifying the targums dogmatic underlay: 2. 24-6, where the Aramaic betrays the targumist's assumption of *Scripture's internal coherence*: its parts cannot contradict one another. Any apparent inconsistencies are erased by adjustment of the offending texts and their textual neighbourhood: their co-text.

There is in the MT an apparent dissonance between Solomon's down-playing of pleasure in Chap. 2 (2. 1-3) and his later calls to enjoyment. TQ must harmonize this clash of sentiments, and he intervenes by appropriately modifying the Call passage, rather than 2. 1-3 which receive minimal surgery in the targum. The MT sentence structure is adjusted to absorb new elements: the basic structure is preserved, but new elements are inserted into it. Their purpose is to specify or elucidate Solomon's rather bald, unqualified MT recommendation of pleasure. This specification differentiates the pleasure in view from the unqualified rejoicing which Solomon has condemned in his earlier testimony (TQ 2. 1). *The targum text and translation of TQ 2. 24-6 are as follows:*

2.24 הַרְהוּרֵי לַיְמָה אִף דִּין הַבְּלוּ הוּא: לִית דְּסִפּוּר בְּאַנְפָּא אֲלֵהִין דִּוּיָּלוּ  
וְיִסְהִי וְיִחְזִי יֵת נְפִשְׁיָה שְׁבַּ קָדְשׁ בְּנִי אַנְפָּא לְפַעֲבָר יֵת פְּקוּדֵיָא דִּי  
לְכֹהֵן בְּאֹרְחָן דְּהַקְנֵן קְדָמוּהִי בְּנִין דִּיוֹסֵב לֵיהּ כֵּן סוּרְחִיָּה אִף דִּין  
הָזִית אֲנָא דַּגְבָּר דְּכַצְלַת בְּעֵלְכֶסָא הָדִין כֵּן יִדָּא דִּי הוּא דְאַחֲזָר לְכַהוּי  
עֲלוּהִי:

2.25 אַרוֹם שֵׁן הוּא דִּיעֲסוֹק בְּפַתְגָּמֵי אֹרִיָּחָא וְכֵן הוּא בְּזַר דְּלִית לֵיהּ הַלְלָא  
2.26 כֵּן יוֹם דִּינָא רַבָּא דְּעַהֲדִד לְסִיחֵי בְּרַ בְּנִי: אַרוֹם לְאַנְס דְּהַקְנֵן עוֹבְדֵינֵי  
קָדְשׁ יֵי יֵהֵב הוֹכְפַחָא וְכַנְדֵּעָא בְּעֵלְכֶסָא הָדִין וְחִדְרָה עִם עוֹדִיקֵיָא לְעֵלְכֶסָא דְּהַ  
וְלִנְכָרָא הִילֵיבָא יֵהֵב בְּרוּן בִּישׁ לְפַכְלֵס כְּפֹון וְלַפְצֵבָר קַנְיִן סְגִי לְכַהוּי  
פַּתְגָּמֵיב פְּנִיָה וְלַכַּהוּי פַּתְיֵהִיב לַגְבָּר דְּסִפּוּר קָדְשׁ יֵי אִף דִּין הַבְּלוּ  
לְהִילֵיבָא וְחַבְיִרוֹת רֹחֵמָא:

2.24 (כאנסא) אבגד בני אנסא, ה בבני אנסא, ח לאינסא, כ כאינסא; אלתי  
 הי אילתיז, כ אלתיו; ויחתי) ז ויהסי; נפסיה) ח נפסי בה"ש ה;  
 טב) בג טב טביו, ל פכ; קדכ) בג חסר, ח קדם, י קדם; אנסא) ח  
 אינסא; לכעבד) ד לכעבד, י לטעבד; פקודיא) יל פקודיא כ פקודיא  
 לכהר) ה ולפינה, טיל ולפינה, כ ולפינה; האורחז) סי באורחז, ל  
 באורחז; דהקנז) חכ דהקנז, ל דהקנז; קדכויה) ז קדכויה; דיוטי)  
 חסי דהיב, כ דוסב, ל דיוסיב; סורחיה) חס סורחיה, י סורחיה;  
 א, ל סורחיה; אף) ז אור, ח אף; חזיה) ז חכיה, כ חזיה, ל חויב  
 אנא) ככ אנא; דגבר) כ דגבר; דאגור) כ דאגור; עלויה) אגת  
 חסר, ז עלוי;

2.25 (ארוס) כג ארי; כז) ז כאן, ככ פאן, יל כז; הוא) אד חסר; דיעסוק)  
 חסיכ דיעסוק, ל דיעסוק; וכוז) ז וכאן, טיל ופן, כ ופאן; הוא) ז  
 ההוא; גבר) כ גבר; ל גברא; דליח) כגזחל דאיה; חסא) ד חסא;  
 יום) אגדה יוכא, ט סיוכא; דינא) בג דרינא; בר) יל בר;

2.26. לאנס) חכ לאינה, ל לאנס; דהקנז) היכל דהקנז; עובדויה) כדה עובדויה  
 ז עובדוי, ט עובדויה; קדם) ח קדם, י קדם; יהב) ח יהיב; חוכמת)  
 ה חכמה, טי חכמה, כ חכמה; וחדוה) גהל וחדוא, ח וחדוה בה"ש א;  
 עס זדיקיא) אבגד לצדיקיא, כ עס צדיקיא; ולגברא) היכל ולגברא;  
 יהב) ה יהיב; גון) כ חסר, טיל גון; ביס) ז ביסא; למכנס) חכ  
 למכנס; ולכזבר) א וכזבר; מהנסיב) חסיכל כהנסיב; מהיהיב) חסל  
 מהיהיב; לגבר) כ לגבר; דספיר) ז דספיר כיניה, ח בגל כיניה;  
 אף) ז אור, ח אף; הבלו) דיל הבלו; וחכירות) א ולחכירות;

2.24 There is nothing worthwhile for a man except that he  
eat and drink and enjoy himself before people, to obey the  
 commandments of the Lord and to walk in straight paths  
 before Him so that He will do good to him for his labor.  
Also this I saw that a man who succeeds in this world, it  
is decreed from the hand of the Lord that it be so for him.

2.25 For who occupies himself with the words of Torah and  
who is the man who has no fear<sup>1</sup> of the great judgment day  
 which will come besides me?

2.26 For to a man whose deeds are straight before the Lord,  
He has given wisdom and knowledge in this world and joy  
with the righteous in the world to come. But to the guilty  
man He has given an evil way to gather money and to collect  
much property to be taken from him and given to a man who  
is pleasing before the Lord. This also is futile to the  
guilty and breaking of the spirit.

<sup>1</sup>The Hebrew יחוס from the root חוס meaning "enjoy" is translated by the targumist as if it were חס "fear".

*The Targumic modifications:* 2. 24. The "pleasure-package" initially prescribed is qualified by the insertion of a referent: "before people", and an infinitival clause (which may be epexegetic). It, perhaps, therefore, defines the *ideal* nature of this public enjoyment now laid on the addressee. Labour's reward is now presented as God's beneficence in response to such obedience.

In 2. 25 TQ modifies MT more radically. He replaces a Hebrew lexeme  $\text{...} \text{...} \text{...}$

, "eats") with a non-literal Aramaic equivalent  $\text{...} \text{...} \text{...}$  ("busies himself") and elucidates this by adding an object which coheres with the idea of Toranic lifestyle enjoined in 2. 24 - "with the words of Torah". Secondly, TQ interprets the Hebrew  $\text{...} \text{...} \text{...}$  ("enjoys", from  $\text{...} \text{...} \text{...}$ ) as if it were from  $\text{...} \text{...} \text{...}$  "fear" - thus  $\text{...} \text{...} \text{...}$  (13) - and again supplies an apposite object. The targumist finds no problem with the MT's final adverbial phrase, and its first person suffix, referring this to the speaker, Solomon: he is the archetypal Torah-student and righteous man.

2. 26. In TQ 2. 26 we find the unqualified  $\text{...} \text{...} \text{...}$  of MT elucidated, but its imagined context is slightly different from 2. 24's: it is with the righteous in the hereafter. The remainder of the verse contrasts such contentment with the futile acquisitiveness of the wicked: there is minimal tinkering with the MT.

## (2) *Generic transformation.*

Prompted by Fishbane's pleading that certain non-oracular Pentateuchal sayings have later acquired an oracular guise (14), the present writer wishes to argue that Qoh. 9. 7, a poetic pleasure-summons, may have been transformed by the targumist into a solemn oracle. MT's unalloyed, poetic instruction (15), unencumbered with an explicit setting or background, has

developed into a portentous invitation from God to the righteous (who are essentially Torah-observers), issued through Solomon. It is portentous because it is invested with a solemn context, an eschatological setting culled from the Hebrew Bible's manna and Eden mythography. It looks forward to the (exhausted?) Torah-student and charity-worker enjoying the fruits of Eden refound.

The signal for this generic transformation is the prefatory formula of 9. 7, "Solomon said by the spirit of prophecy" (16). The very name of Solomon (the wise king who answered the Queen of Sheba's enigmatic questions in 1 Kgs. 10), reinforced by the declared fact of his prophetic inspiration, prepares us, and the targumist's audience, for an oracular remark (17).

We might ask if there are other apparent cases of generic transformation in targum. One example in TQ could be the conversion of Qohelet's remarks (MT 1. 4) about the recurrence of natural processes within a stable context (the earth's continuity) into an oracular comment on atonement: "King Solomon said through the spirit of prophecy'...the good generation of righteous ones depart from the world because of the sins of the evil generation of wicked ones who will come after them. The earth stands forever to bear the punishment which comes upon the world because of the sins of men."

We offer two other instances, one in targum and one in midrash, where a Biblical imperative (which may or may not be "portentous" or "numinous" in its own context) is invested with an evidently solemn setting. One is *Ps-J Gen. 27. 9*; another is *Mekhilta* to Ex. 16.25. Firstly, MT Gen. 27. 9: (Rebecca is addressing Jacob) "Go to the flock and pick me out two fine young kids, and I shall make them into a savoury dish for your father, the kind he likes" (REB). *Ps-J* reads (17a): "Go now to the sheep shed and bring



me from there two fat kids, one for the Passover and one for the festival offerings, and I will make of them dishes for your father, such as he loves". This episode is linked by the targum with Passover: Isaac calls Esau to him on 14 Nisan and tells him that this is a holy night: "my son, behold, tonight the heavenly beings praise the Lord of the world, and the storehouses of (the dews) are opened" (v.1). In v.6, Rebecca issues the same reminder or disclosure to Jacob. Rebecca's command is thus in a numinous setting. It is made with the Holy Spirit's involvement (compare Solomon's oracular utterance in TQ 9. בריח (ב)אז): in v.5 Rebecca "heard through the Holy Spirit while Isaac spoke with his son". She is a prophetess. The point is that if Rebecca knew through the Holy Spirit, she was not spying. Again, at *Ps-J* 27. 42, Esau's words are relayed to Rebecca by the Holy Spirit.

Secondly, at MT Exod. 16. 25 Moses says: "Eat it [the manna] today, for today is a Sabbath to the Lord". This specific instruction is transformed in Mekhilta (*ad loc.*) into a portentous prediction about the end-time (17b). "R. Joshua says, 'If you will succeed in keeping the Sabbath, the Holy One, blessed be He, will give you three festivals, Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles.' In this sense it is said 'And Moses said...'. R. Eleazar of Modi'im says: 'If you will succeed in keeping the Sabbath, the Holy One, blessed be He, will give you six good portions: the land of Israel, the future world, the new world, the kingdom of the house of David, the priesthood, the Levites' offices....'. R. Eliezer says: 'If you will succeed in keeping the Sabbath, you will escape the three visitations: the day of Gog, the suffering preceding the advent of the Messiah, and the great judgement day'."

Finally, we might justly enquire into the *purpose*, the *rationale* of TQ's generic transformation of Qoh. 9. 7. The present writer suggests that

Solomon's prophetic, inspired speech in TQ may be a refinement of the Hebrew Bible's pro-Solomonic propaganda. Briefly surveying the latter, we may first note (18) the historical tradition's emphasis on Solomon's *personal reputation for wisdom*, especially the semi-scientific kind of categorizing of plant and animal life attested in contemporary Egypt by the Onomastica (1 Kgs. 4. 31-4). Elsewhere, 1 Kgs. remarks on his *insight* (3. 3-15, 16-28), its *resultant benefits* to his rule and his awesome performance before the Queen of Sheba as an answerer of enigmatic questions. The tradent s' pro-Solomonic wisdom anecdotes derive, so Clements argues, (19) from their felt need to square the unpalatable fact of his bad conduct (the heavy exactions on his subjects), which led to rebellion during his lifetime and then the division of the kingdom, with the Davidic dynasty's election by God. Secondly, this reimagining-project arguably assumed a new aspect in the *wisdom literature*, especially in Qohelet. Qoh. 1. 12 - 2. 25 focuses<sup>s</sup> on Solomon's reputation for *wisdom and success*. Its reflections are rooted in, *but also modify*, the claims already made for Solomon by 1 Kgs. Thus his insight (1 Kgs. 3) is the basis of Qohelet's reflections on the use of wisdom (Qoh. 1. 12-18); and his renowned polygamy, presumably, lies behind the Preacher's musings on sensual pleasure (2. 1-11) - and perhaps behind his cautious recommendation in 9. 9 that the addressee enjoys life with a woman whom he loves! And the 1 Kgs. general picture of Solomon's mixed experience of success and failure grounds Qohelet's analysis of folly, success and failure in 2. 18-26.

May not Solomon's *prophetic* sage-status in TQ, which complements his afore-attested wisdom and prosperity, be primarily significant as marking a further stage in his rehabilitation-programme?

*Conclusion.* Having analysed the targumist's generic transformation of MT (its premises, character, and possible purpose) the writer finally poses a blunt but necessary question: why were the modifications acceptable? The answer lies in the fact that targums were effectively policed. The Hebrew text was ever-present in the user-community, as a yardstick against which to check their extravagances (20); the  $\{ \text{א} \} \text{ר} \text{ו} \text{ו} \text{ו} \text{ו}$  was constrained in his rendition (a) by tradition, and (b) by the rabbis. As to (a), traditional interpretations would have dictated his rendering. Regarding (b), the rabbis sought to control targumic content through *general advice*, (21), *critique* (22) and even *proscription* (23) of specific translations (24). We can posit these influences upon the creation of TQ 9. 7-10.

#### NOTES

(1) 1976.

(2) Knobel, 1991, p.8.

(3) For a brief description of both the Yemenite and European MSS used by him. see Knobel, 1976, pp.5-12. Corrés' 1953 text derives from a Yemenite / MS: Or. 1302 of the British Museum; save for his occasional references to Or. 2375 of the British Museum and the text of the rabbinic Bibles.

(4) Knobel, 1976, p.4.

(5) Cf., e.g., Van der Heide, 1981, p.20.

(5a) But both the diplomatic and critical or eclectic text-methods are prone to be misused by editors. For example, BHS, an exemplar of the *diplomatic* method, has glaring weaknesses. Cook (1988, pp.55-6) cites Eissfeldt's treatment of the MT of Gen. 1 and 2, which frequently displays "inconsistent, incorrect, unclear and incomplete utilization of textual data". Among other things, Eissfeldt's apparatus does

not suggest that he spotted the LXX translator's overriding desire to harmonize or erase the discrepancies in chapters 1 and 2. A *critical* text, on the other hand, is said to be methodologically sounder, for it is more comprehensive, and therefore, less subjective in its editorial decisions. Thus the Hebrew University Bible Project, already in progress for more than two decades, presents comprehensive apparati [four different apparati, in fact: (1) data from the ancient versions; (2) data from the Qumran Scrolls combined with rabbinic quotations; (3) medieval biblical MSS data; (4) masoretic data]. But its very comprehensiveness has proved to be the project's major disadvantage: its published fruits are scarce. Cook recommends a modification of the HUBP approach: a slimmer critical apparatus, which excludes the medieval data, and is based on the editor's contextual analysis of all his material.

(6) In view of TQ's figurative use of  $\text{לָּנָח}$  (see n.7), we may ask: to what extent are other key words in TQ 9. 7-10 used metaphorically?

Concentrating on TQ 9.7, with Jastrow as our chief dictionary source, we find the following:

1.  $\text{לָּנָח}$ : For the imperative, cf. *TO Num.* 22. 20, and often. There is a metaphoric sense: "to depart this life", "to die" - e.g. *J. Hag.* 11. 77d: "This one committed a sin, and died for it". But in two memorable talmudic reflections on the question / notion of going to eat and drink, it is not interpreted metaphorically.

(1) At *B. Ber.* 42b it occurs in a rabbinic discussion about table-manners: Rabbi has died; his disciples consider, abortively, whether the instruction "let us go and eat bread at a certain place" is equivalent to "let us recline". An old man assures them that it is.

(2) At *B. Erub.* 54a Samuel tells R. Judah, in a sapiential instruction reminiscent of a Menander fragment (cf. Kock, 1888, pp.481ff.; Allinson, 1921,

p.442; Gomme and Sandbach, 1973, pp.709-11);

"Shinena, hurry on

and eat, hurry on and drink [ed's. note: i.e. don't postpone pleasure-seeking], since the world from which we depart is like a wedding feast." Is Solomon's emphasis perhaps on the idea of reclining, or taking one's decorous ease?

Or rather on relishing, fully enjoying the pleasures in store?

(replace by טעם)

2. טעם : Jastrow again lists a metaphorical sense: e.g. at *J. Sheb.* 7. 38a

it means to "gnaw at" i.e. to absorb, take away, where a man's interests are said to absorb his property.

3. טעם "to examine, taste, test, try, experience". Note the Talmudic use

of the verb in reference to forbidden tastes: e.g. *B. Yoma* 22b. "He never

tasted the taste of sin". *B. Ber.* 35a, "one mustn't taste food when

cooking..."; *B. Hull* 98b. (The taste of a forbidden thing is as forbidden as

the substance itself) Is TQ commending the tasting of something - his

bread in the world to come - as if it were forbidden, i.e. with the same

furtive relish?

4. ענין : Has this overtones of poverty in Torah? Generally, used of

material poverty: cf. *B. Ned* 64b, *J. Ber.* 9. 13b, *B. Metz* 71a etc. But

sometimes there is a metaphorical sense: e.g. *B. Ned.* 41a: "Only he is poor

who lacks knowledge". ענין is again used almost exclusively in a non-

metaphorical sense, to judge from Jastrow: cf. *Tg. Ezk.* 18. 12; *Tg. 2 Sam.* 13.

4; *Tg. Ps.* 72. 23 and often.

5. צעם : basically means "to bend", and comes to mean "to starve, or pine

for food": cf. *Tg. Ps.* 34. 11; *Tg. Gen.* 141. 55 and often. An interesting

reference is an urgent command to eat while hungry: *B. Pes.* 107b(?). Does

Solomon's call therefore have an urgent ring about it? "Eat as if you were

hungry, like the ones you fed", he might be saying - i.e. "waste no time in

responding to my call".

6. לבטב ] לב can mean "innermost heart, thought, inclination, mind" etc., cf.



How is  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$  distinguished from  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$ ? Sometimes, the two are virtually indistinguishable: cf. e.g. *B. Sheb.* 26a: "Thy heart has carried thee away against they will", etc.  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$ : Jastrow lists two basic meanings: (1) "good, precious", cf. *Tg. Gen.* 2. 9; *Tg. Jud.* 5. 26 etc. (2) "Value, worth", *J. Ket.* 4. (end), 29b etc. Neither really seems to fit  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$  in *TQ* 9. 7. Something akin to "kind-hearted", "affable", "generous", "charitable" (Alkalay) would be more appropriate - perhaps more so than Knobel's "happy", for it would accord with the characteristic which earned the addressee his invitation - charitableness.

(7) This figurative value of  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$  is preceded in BH at *Is.* 11. 18 and *Ps.* 51. 9, where verbal  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$  (hiphil) likewise denotes the addressee's / psalmist's purity from sin. Such a state answers to their prior contrition, and is Biblically indicated by the penitent's dark attire (cf. *Ps.* 35. 13, 14). Joshua's assumption of rich, clean apparel (not labelled  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$ ) for filthy rags at *Zec.* 3. 5 similarly marks his moral cleansing. A covert idea in these passages may be that certain clothing can of itself be purificatory: cf. E.R. Dalglish, *Psalms Fifty-One*, Leiden, Brill, 1962, p.137, n.229.

White apparel's emblematic function in post-Biblical Judaism is strikingly discussed by E.R. Goodenough (1966), with particular reference to third-century CE Dura Synagogue figures. The presence of the *pallium* (Goodenough's Latin short-hand for the Greek  $\chi\iota\tau\omega\upsilon\upsilon$  and  $\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon$ ), white / light-coloured, on Toranic heroes who manifest God's power at a poignant moment of the Jewish *Heilsgeschichte* (e.g. Moses leading the Israelites from Egypt; Samuel, anointing David; Elijah, sacrificing in competition with the Baal priests) seems to mark it out as a *sacred uniform, indicative of personal sanctity*.

(8) See below, p. 91 .

(9) For the phrase "co-text" rather than "context", cf. e.g. Samely, 1993,

p.5.

(10) Sperber, 1973, p.37.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Klein's phrase; cf. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of Ruth*, Rome, 1973, p.90:  $\text{p}^{\text{is}}$  is the "only characteristic anti-anthropomorphic phrase used in Jewish Aramaic in extra-targumic literature".

(13) Knobel, 1976, p.156. De Waard, 1979, discusses the etymology of  $\text{p}^{\text{is}}$

(14) Fishbane, 1985, pp.500ff. For example, he examines Jacob's farewell blessing in Gen. 49. 10-11 as the basis of two transformations: the first in Zec. 9. 9-11 (a "royalist-messianic reflex", a royalist expectation couched in terms of a future Davidic line), the second in Ezek. 19 - a dirgelike forecast of the reversal of hopes for Judaea.

(15) See above, chap. 1.

(16) This formula (cf. 1. 1; 4. 15) and the parallel attributions to Solomon of inspired speech (1. 2,4; 2. 13; 8. 12, 14) indicate the targumist's sympathy for those authorities who regarded Qohelet as an inspired work (cf. *B. Sot.* 48a-b; *M. Ed.* 5. 3; *QR* 1.1). The *locus classicus* of rabbinic debate on the issue is *M. Yad* 3.5, where we receive a digested discussion concerning the hand-defiling nature of Qoheleth and Song of Songs: cf. *ARN(A)* 1. 4; *B. Shabb.* 30b; *FR* 18.30. For the concept of hand-defilement *vis-a-vis* inspiration, see S. Leiman *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture, the Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence*, Hamden: Achon, 1976. Interestingly, the formulae seem always to lead into theodical comment in relation to the hereafter or past wrongs of Israel. This is perhaps more than coincidental. For tannaitic and amoraic traditions discouraged other-worldly speculation (Ginzberg, 1922). R. Aqiba, for example, insisted that his own centre of gravity was very much in *this* world (*ARN (A)* 2. 30-67). Is Solomon, perhaps, implicitly sanctioned by the prefatory formulae to speak about

topics within the *prophet's* domain, but beyond the normal parameters of sage-discourse? Solomon's prophetic status is even more apparent in Gregory *Thoma's* paraphrase of Qoh. 1. 1 - an interesting contrast with our text's stylization of the monarch; *inter alia* this may intimate, suggests Jarick, *ad loc.*, the *current* importance of an ultra-wise prophet's remarks, vitally directed at the heart of each *Christian* hearer.

(17) See Fowler *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genesis and Moses*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982, chap. 5, for a discussion of generic names in *English* literature.

(17a) Targum-translation from Hayward, 1989-90.

(17b) Targum-translation from Samely, 1993.

(18) Cf. Clements, 1988, p.78.

(19) Clements, 1988, pp.79-80.

(20) So Barr, 1979.

(21) Cf., e.g., *Tos. Meg.* 4.41.

(22) Cf., e.g., *M. Meg.* 4.9.

(23) Cf., e.g., *B. Meg.* 25a-b.

(24) For this topic, to which the writer owes the previous three references, see especially Alexander, 1985.



## CHAPTER IV

### Contextual Analysis: The Thematic Locale of TQ 9. 7-9.

*Introduction:* This chapter considers the targumist's modification of Qoh. 9. 7-9 (MT) in two distinct contexts: rabbinic theology and rabbinic pedagogy.

#### A. TQ 9. 7 in the Context of Rabbinic Theology.

The present writer suggests that the *dominant motifs* of the targumic version of Qoh. 9. 7 are the *Messianic Banquet* and the Torah-student's *eleemosynary* duty. Complementary to the first, but *assumed* rather than overt, are the rabbinic notions of the *world to come* and *Torah-renewal* in the Messianic age; and, to the second, the ethical priority of *Torah study*.

1. The *mythographical background* to TQ 9. 7 is rich and complex. Rival (or complementary?) claimants to the honour of generating this verse's pithy "refreshment" imagery (1a) may be: first, the inner-biblical manna tradition; second, the Messianic banquet tradition in rabbinic literature; and, third, the latter tradition in inter-testamental literature.

(1) One element in the background may be the Biblical idea of *hidden manna*, a share of which is promised to the Victor in Rev. 2. 17. Rabbinic legend taught that the manna given in the desert had been preserved in a golden jar in the Holy of Holies (1b). Compare Heb. 9. 4, the context of which reference is a pericope describing the cult of the old covenant. This pericope draws on the tradition present in Exodus about the wilderness tabernacle (Exod. 35. 1-40. 15), and describes the contents of the Ark within the inner tabernacle, behind the "second veil" which separates the inner from the outer tabernacle (1c). The Ark features in all Scriptural accounts of the inner sanctum both of the Mosaic tabernacle and of

Solomon's temple. Its gold covering is also a Biblical feature (cf. Exod. 25. 11). The items in the Ark ( $\text{עֲרֹכָב}$ ) refers to the Ark, not the tabernacle, which is too far removed from it to be the antecedent) are, however, an extrapolation from Jewish tradition. Scripture mentions only the tablets of the  $\text{טָבֻחַ}$  (=  $\text{δίαθηκη}$ ) as explicitly in the Ark (2). Jewish tradition expanded the contents, although not as here (3). The manna jar (Exod. 16. 33-34) and Aaron's staff were, according to Exodus, in the inner sanctum, although not in the sanctuary. The idea of a golden jar for manna is also found in Philo *Congr.* 11.

This manna (in its jar?) was supposedly hidden by Jeremiah in 586 BCE, at the destruction of the Temple; at the start of the Messianic era, it was believed, it would re-emerge from heaven (2 Macc. 2. 4-8), to be eaten by those who had reached the consummation of time (cf. 2 Bar. 29. 8; *B. Hag.* 12b).

(2) More pertinent may be our observation that in the rabbinic tradition, *bread and wine* are sometimes supernatural substances linked to the eschaton. Thus in *Ps-J Gen.* 27. 25, the archangel Michael brings Jacob wine that has been stored up in its grapes since the start of the world; Jacob took it to his father (4). The targum to the Song of Songs (8. 2) points to the eschatological function of such wine: "I will lead thee, King Messiah .... and thou shalt teach me to fear the Lord ..... and (in my temple) we shall partake of a Leviathan feast and drink old wine which has been preserved in the grape since the days of creation, and eat of the pomegranates and fruits which have been prepared for the righteous in the Garden of Eden". Elsewhere such primordial wine plays a pivotal part in the Messianic banquet. We refer especially to *Num. R.* 211. 21: a great table will be spread, which idolaters will see to their shame (5). This will be the banquet-table for the righteous in the day that God shows his glory to

the seed of Isaac. After the eating and drinking, the patriarchs will be offered in turn a cup of grace. All will refuse it because of Toranic impediments, until David finally accepts it (6). The wine which he drinks from this grace-cup (and, we presume, the wine drunk throughout the banquet) will have been maturing since the sixth day of Creation (7). Two points may be worth making about this wine. First, it is an extraordinary wine: *B. Keth.* 111b says: "and you, his people, drank red wine from the juice of the grape" (Deut. 32. 14). The world to come is not like this world. One grape, put in a corner of one's house, will be used as if it had been a large wine cask, its timber will be used for cooking-fires. No grape will contain less than 30 kegs of wine, for it is said 'thou drinkest foaming wine': for 'foaming' read '30 kegs' "

Second, there is a strain in rabbinic tradition that attributes to wine the role of an apperitif (8): "does wine sustain? Did not Rabba used to drink on the eve of passover in order that he might get an appetite and eat unleavened bread? A large quantity gives an appetite...." Bread, on the other hand, was traditionally associated with sustenance in its own right: *B. Ber.* 35b continues: "Is it not written, 'And wine that maketh glad the heart of man ... and bread which sustains, not wine?'"

(3) In inter-testamental literature, we find a trend towards *identifying this primordial wine with Toranic wisdom or the Torah itself*. Ginzberg (9) cites the command of the sixty angels who stop at the head of each righteous person on their admission to Paradise: "Drink of the wine preserved in the grape since the six days of Creation, for thou has busied thyself with Torah and she is compared to wine". Again, Ecclesiasticus, although not explicitly identifying the wine with Torah, equates Toranic wisdom with food and drink (15. 1-3; 24. 19-33): in the latter passage, it

is compared to an expanding watercourse intended to irrigate an orchard (v.31), and is said to "pour forth instruction like ..... the Gihon at the time of vintage" (v.27). *IV Ezra* (14. 37ff.) also depicts wisdom as secreted in wine-like liquid, this time water the colour of fire which imbues the sage with wondrous insight into recherché lore (he dictates secret books to be given to the wise, containing "the spring of understanding, the fount of wisdom and the stream of knowledge"); it is not, however, explicitly Toranic wisdom. With this passage it is instructive to compare the *Od. Sol.* 11. 7-9. Here, the devotee is "established upon the rock of truth ..... speaking waters touched my lips from the spring of the Lord generously. And so I drank and became intoxicated from the living water that does not die ..... I abandoned vanity and turned towards the Most High, my God, and was enriched by his favours" (10). The "water" here would seem to be, in fact, wine; compare *Ode* 30, which celebrates the Lord's living water - perpetually pleasing and sparkling, more refreshing than honey, flowing from the lips of the Lord.

None of these examples, however, equate Torah itself with miraculous, revitalising wine. For such an equation we have to look again to the Rabbinic literature. *PR* 51 (a homily on Lev. 23. 40) remarks: "You have not drunk enough of the wine of Torah". And *Gen. R.* 43. 6 describes how Mechizedek revealed Torah to Abraham in bringing him bread and wine; cp. 98. 10 (the descendants of Judah have eyes red with wine: i.e. they possess the strength to study Torah).

A further pertinent reference to the Messianic Banquet in extra-Biblical literature is *Sib. Or.* 3. 740ff., where the good ~~a~~waiting (righteous) mortals - grain, wine and oil - mirrors that which was given by the charitable in the Jewish city that is praised from 3. 218ff.. This is a strikingly similar exchange to that promised by the "Master of the Universe"

to the righteous in TQ 9. 7.

*Conclusion:* The portion to which Solomon anticipates God will call the righteous in the world to come (joyful eating and drinking) is surely a "carrot" to encourage faithful listeners to Torah-study and good deeds. The element is quite possibly part of a "programmatic" picture (11) of what the future holds, a sample of the targumist's eschatological beliefs; he highlights, in the form of an oracle on Solomon's lips, a prime element (the Messianic Banquet) from among his "package of expectations" about the nature of the end time (12).

2. *Underlying* the Messianic Banquet (and perhaps the Hidden Manna) imagery (i.e. not overt) are the related motifs:

(1) *The world to come* features boldly in rabbinic thinking about the two concerns we shall shortly examine, Torah-study and good deeds, and receives similar priority in TQ's treatment of those topics. The phrase is problematic: it is one of an array of eschatological terms (13): "end of days", "the end", "days of the Messiah", "the future to come", "the new world". All these are loosely linked with the idea of redemption. "The world to come" is specifically linked with the problem of reward and punishment. We can briefly draw the following distinctions which may clarify the conceptual background of TQ's use of the phrase. First, the idea of post-mortem reward and punishment appears in rabbinic theology as early as 30 BCE: see Urbach, 1975, pp.436ff.; *B. Shabb.* 152b. Secondly, a belief in the general resurrection of the dead at the end of days had probably crystallised before 70 CE; *M. Sanh.* 10. 1; *M. Ber.* 5. 2; II Macc. 7. 14. Thirdly, referring to the world to come and the resurrection, *M. Sanh.* 10. 1 states that those who have no share in the world to come include those who deny the resurrection of the dead. The "resurrection", according

to Urbach, in this context refers to the return of the soul to the body, and is not linked to Hellenistic ideas about the soul's immortality. Fourthly, Dan. 12. 2-13 places the resurrection of the dead chronologically before reward and punishment in the world to come.

(2) *Torah-renewal in the Messianic age*: TQ's emphatic link between *Torah-study* and the *world to come* sounds the same eschatological note that we find in much rabbinic thinking about Torah (14). Urbach distinguishes between the "anti-messianic" and the "pro-messianic" views of Torah. On the one hand, some sages regarded Torah as utterly unchangeable, even for the Messiah's advent. Thus we find hyperbolic statements about the authority of sages' assertions: God is bound by them (15). R. Aqiba supposedly said "just as they debate *halakha* on earth, so they debate *halakha* in heaven" (16). It was said that Torah did not belong to heaven after Moses had captured it for humanity: "nothing thereof was left in heaven" (*Deut. R.* 8. 6, which goes on to say: "say not that another Moses will arise and bring us another Torah from heaven" (17)).

On the other hand, it was widely believed that the Messiah's advent would transform Torah and Torah-study. An apocalyptic *baraita* (*Sg.R.* 2. 14. 4) proclaims that, Torah having been forgotten and scholars having decreased, in the fifth year of the septennium in which the Messiah will come "there will be great abundance, and people will eat and drink and rejoice (cf. TQ 9. 7); the Torah will return to its pristine state and renew itself unto Israel": see *B. Sanh.* 97a ("and the Torah is restored to its students"). The teacher of this pristine Torah will presumably be the Messiah: "when he of whom it is written 'lowly and riding upon an ass' etc. (*Zec.* 9. 9) comes, 'he will wash his garments in wine' that is, he will compose for them Torah teachings :....." (18). We must note other dicta, however, to the effect that God Himself will teach Torah, as in *Tg. Sg.* 5. 10 etc. (19). *The thrust of these passages just cited, and many similar*

ones, is that the Torah of this world is as nothing compared with that of the next: QR 11. 8, cf. 2. 1; and R. Avin's teaching (20): "the lowest form of heavenly wisdom is Torah" (i.e. earthly Torah, for the Torah that the Messiah will teach is far superior).

Moreover, it is supposed that Toranic precepts will be explained in the world to come, the language of food storage being <sup>used,</sup> for example in *PRK*, p.72 and, especially Provs. R. [reference unlocated]: "If you have succeeded in storing up words of the Torah, I shall sate you with stored-away good that I have laid up for the hereafter". Could this not be the import of TQ 9. 7's reference to hidden wine in Eden? Though there it is promised in return for good deeds - the fulfilment of Torah - rather than for Torah-study as such. And, in the Messianic age, Torah will be totally be fulfilled. Hence decisions were made about the Temple and its holy things, in the belief that it would soon be rebuilt: *B. Sanh.* 51b. In any case, even in the pre-Messianic age Torah was studied in heaven just as in the earthly one (21); in fact, the rabbinic academies conformed to a heavenly model (22).

3. The second *explicit* motif in TQ 9. 7 is that of *eleemosynary duty* (22a). Apart from Torah, the Torah-student was also vitally preoccupied with good deeds (22b). His concern is firmly echoed by our targumist in TQ 9. 7, who pays a lot of attention to the subject. Thus at 3. 22 he orders his addressee to rejoice in good deeds; eat and drink; at 4. 8 he notes the sorry state of the workaholic isolate, who unreflectively denies himself the joy of giving charity in this world, and (implicitly) of righteous companions in the world to come; at 5. 9-10 he remarks on the fact that the acquisitive receive no reward in the next world unless they are essentially

charitable; and at 5. 12, that wealth unused for charitable purposes in this world is stored up for the culprit to condemn him in the next; 6. 6 pronounces that without Torah and good deeds one goes to Gehenna.

To seek to do charity in order to gain life in the world to come or *post-mortem* life for one's children was, in the sages' eyes, an acceptable project; such a person was wholly righteous (*B. Rosh Hash. 4a*, and parallels). Good deeds, broadly understood as Torah-observance, were certainly rewarded in the world to come; there are many dicta to this effect. For example, R. Tarfon in *M. Aboth. 2. 16* states: "and faithful is the master of your work, who will pay you the wages of your toil; and know that the giving of the reward to the righteous is in the time to come". It is instructive to compare this with a remark in the same tractate at 5. 19: "the disciples of Balaam the wicked go down to Gehinnom .... but the disciples of Abraham .... enjoy this world and inherit the world to come". R. Abaye and other sages stressed the need for a proper balance between Torah-study and good deeds (23): "'And thou shalt love the Lord thy God' - this means ..... that a man should study Scripture and Mishnah ..... and conduct his business courteously with people in the market place. What will people say then of him? Happy is this person who has learnt Torah ..... Woe to the people who not learnt Torah! This man ..... see how noble are his his ways, how perfect are his actions! But if one studies - and does not know how to conduct his business (properly) in the market place, and does not speak courteously to people, what do people say of him? Woe to this man who learnt Torah ..... have you seen how bad are his ways, how ugly his deeds?"

Charity occupied a special place in the law of Torah-observance (24). There was an old idea among the sages that it was not possible to be a *D.T.S* (a righteous person) without outstanding acts of charity. In *Esth. R.*



6. 1, for example, it is argued that the continual doers of righteousness in Ps. 106. 3 are ones who bring up orphans in their homes. Whereas the term generally applies to those who do God's will, who accept and obey Torah, such a person is specifically one who gives charity. In giving it he imitates the Holy One in His acts of graciousness and compassion: "just as the Holy One is called *saddiq*" ..... so you too must be *saddiq* (25). The *amoraim* extravagantly praised charity; it could atone for sin, although not if the sin was perpetrated with the intention of later atoning through good deeds (26). Thus popular homilies arose which opposed a "book-keeping" attitude to sin and charity (27).

4. *Implicitly* parallel to the charity-motif is the addressee's *duty of Torah-study*, which is more than once mated by TQ with טבין (עבד(הי)ע), "good deeds", and which resonates through the targum.

Firstly, Torah-study is a prerequisite for the world to come: 1. 3 (Torah-study is necessary for one's *post-mortem* reward); 1. 15 (lack of Torah bars one from Eden); 2. 25 (the man of Torah is without fear on the Judgement Day); 5. 11 (Toranic wisdom will dog the student in his grave); 6. 6 (without Torah-study [and good deeds] one goes to Gehenna); 6. 8 (the pauper may learn from Torah-study how to conduct himself in the world to come); 8. 1 (the wise man's wisdom will make his face brilliant among the righteous); 9. 1 (the righteous and Torah students are in God's hand). Secondly, "joy in the Torah" is mentioned: 2. 10 (Solomon's joy in the Torah); 3. 12 (Solomon, by the prophetic spirit, said that there is nothing good save to rejoice in the Torah's joy and to do good during one's life). As we have previously noted, there is a juxtaposition of enjoyment with obedience to God's commands in 2. 24. Thirdly, TQ is not blind to the pitfalls before Toranic man. He notes the risk of sin (10. 1: the י > יר > betrays the sage),

and that Torah is an antidote to sin (10. 4). Finally, the targumist's final orders stress the priority which his addressee should give Torah-Study: occupy a long life with it (11. 8; 12. 12).

This protective aspect of Torah-study recalls the Babylonian rabbis' claims for it. The protection afforded by study was well known in the academies. It made their students immune to death (28). The repetition of words of Torah had a prophylactic effect, marvellously protecting the rabbis not only against sins but against the manifold dangers of a dark world: in *B. Sot.* 21a, Torah is compared to the dawn which guards one from all previously hidden dangers. Indeed, there was a flourishing mythology about the quasi-magical properties of Torah and the Toranically-derived gnosis and supernatural power of learned rabbis, which Neusner discusses in loving anecdotal detail (29).

Further, the joy consonant with Torah-study, and rabbinically enjoined, implicitly parallels the charitable addressees' prospective joy in TQ 9. 7. Torah-study, as a prime key to salvation, should be pursued both remorselessly and joyfully. Solomon's "joy of the Torah" (2. 10, 24) reminds us of the sages' "joy of the precept", which Urbach documents at length (30). The sheer pleasure of study in third-century Babylonia is communicated in *B. Pes.* 68.b: "Every thirty days R. Sheshet would stand and lean at the side of a doorway, having reviewed his learning, and say, 'rejoice my soul .... for you have I studied Scripture, for you have I learned Mishnah'". The sage's pleasure came both from understanding and obeying the precepts of Torah. Even when a precept was performed without his knowledge he could feel joy. To obey Torah with joy was considered excellent; the halakhic midrashim valued it highly, noting the joyful response of two patriarchs - Moses and Aaron - to God's commands (32).

The *amoraim*, accordingly, tackled the contradiction in Qoh. (8. 15<sup>o</sup> vis-a-

vis 2. 2) as follows (33): "R. Judah, son of R. Samuel b. Shiloth, said in Rav's name 'the sages wished to hide Ecclesiastes ... because its words are self-contradictory [... and of joy ... what does it accomplish?]- this alludes to joy that does not issue from the fulfilment of a precept. Thus Scripture teaches you that the divine presence does not rest [upon a person] either when he is in a melancholy, or indolent, or frivolous mood ... but only when he is inspired by a joyful cause". According to *Seder Eliahu Rabba* 27, p.144, the act of observing precepts with joy was itself a righteous act. And joy, rather than inferior incentives (e.g. ambition), should drive the Toranic devotee to obey them in the first place (34).

B. TQ 9. 7-9 in the Context of Rabbinic Pedagogy: their Putative Socio-Historical Background.

1. *TQ 9. 7 in relation to rabbinic dietary advice:* May the formulaic instruction in Qohelet to eat, drink and rejoice have - in its targumic guise - been received in the same spirit as medical advice? Especially since the rabbis did issue dietary prescriptions to the sick: so Rav Judah (35); Mar'Uqba (36); R. Hisda (37). We quote R. Hisda's advice as an example: "A broth of beets is good for the heart and ..... eyes, and all the more so for the intestines". Such advice was part of their medical teaching (see above); it included general dicta about particular foods' healing power (38), and earthly maxims like R. Judah's, in reply to the query as to how one procures a long life in this world - by praying, eating, and relieving oneself slowly. Because these dicta came from the rabbi's store of (supposedly) Toranically-derived *gnosis*, for which he was popularly revered (see above), they would have been reverently received: as insightful aphorisms rather than as mere commonplaces (39).

Again, the "eat, drink" formula may, in its targumic context, have evoked

ancestral (?) memories of the "blessings of enjoyment", the blessings and prayers which the Babylonian sages recited before and after meals (40). "With joy" might then be shorthand for "with a blessing of enjoyment". R. Samuel said that it was sacrilegious to partake of any worldly benefit without first asking a blessing; the sages spent much time debating precisely which foods needed blessing. Perhaps at TQ 9. 7, where Solomon predicts the divine call to feast, that prediction serves as a specific reminder to the aspiring righteous to dine in *this* life with the appropriate benedictions - literally, as well as metaphorically on Torah-study and good deeds!

2. *TQ 9. 8 in relation to personal hygiene and reputation*: Personal hygiene was a sine qua non of rabbinic discipleship. R. Hisda provided a manual of hygienic behaviour, with dietary and sanitary advice (41). There was a recommendation to keep one's personal clothing bleached - "when a scholar buys linen (i.e. ~~un~~derwear), he should .... bleach it every thirty days ...." - and to wash one's clothes privately, lest one's host saw private articles. May the "stain of sin" in TQ 9. 8 originally have had these or similar domestic connotations? Such dicta on personal deportment were, of course, universally applicable, not merely to tyro sages. But they would, if observed, mark out a sage's disciple; greater-than-average cleanliness, for example, would show him to be detached from the great unwashed. Hygienic behaviour was thus an integral part of rabbinic ritual.

So too a *proper respect for ones' elders and betters; modesty* was vital in a Torah-student. A good student was *humble*: he respected his master to the extent of providing him with personal service (42), never called his colleagues by nicknames, never walked up filthy alleys.

If he failed to observe this etiquette, he won a *bad name*, not only for

himself but also for his academy, and accordingly was punished. Thus Rav Judah excommunicated a student whose learning the academy valued (43); the student died later of a wasp's sting. If a *good name* was like anointing oil (TQ 9. 8), then, clearly, a *bad name* was ven<sup>o</sup>erous to its possessor. The blessings of etiquette-observance included the opportunity to become a "living Torah", a paradigmatic sage both in learning and in deed who drew other Jews into conformity with God's will.

### 3. TQ 9. 9 in relation to rabbinic sexual mores.

TQ 9. 9 recommends a long life with a loved *woman*. Yet the rabbis evinced an ambivalent attitude towards woman. Thus R. Samuel was definitely hostile: "one may make no use of a woman whatsoever" (44). Even to hear a woman's voice might induce licentiousness (45). Rav Judah refused any contact with R. Nahman's wife. R. Hisda (46) told his daughters not to eat with their husbands or to use the same toilet facilities. Nor was it decent to talk to one's wife in the street (47).

The sages regarded women as the source of immoral behaviour, as being more eager for it than men and as ever liable to arouse sexual desire: so the very mention of Rahab's name induces a seminal emission (48). Hence sages never walked behind women in the street, for to do so would encourage lewd attention to them; a certain Manoah was considered a boor for walking behind his wife (49). By the same token, however, they encouraged early marriage among their children: R. Hisda thought that his own marriage at sixteen had reduced Satan's hold over him (50); and generally the rabbis preferred youthful wedlock. To cite R. Hisda again (51); if a man marries before twenty, he begets children until he is forty; but if at forty, then never.

Neusner notes that Babylonian rabbis' fear of licentiousness is fully

paralleled in the Palestinian Talmud; and also in third century Christian monasteries in Syria and Iran; Arthur Voöbus has identified virginity as a central monastic ideal, an ideal that extended to the avoidance of direct contact with women, and even to the refusal of all feminine hospitality (52).

*Conclusion.* Concluding his brief survey of the targumic rendition's "thematic locale", the writer qualifies it in a manner consistent with his earlier disclaimer of "dependency-relationships" between MT and its Ancient Near Eastern parallels: he stresses the provisionality of his source-attribution for TQ's 9. 7's refreshment imagery, heeding Sandmel's caveat (53) against "parallelomania", "that extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction" (54). In dealing with similarities (such as those between TQ 9. 7 and the banquet traditions), we can find both significant and insignificant parallels. Excerpts can seem parallel out of context, and lose their parallelism when viewed in context (55).

#### NOTES

(1a) Exemplifying a scholarly, non-sensual, ataractic vision of the hereafter, over against this slightly cruder (popular?) one in TQ 97, Corré (1953, pp.13-15) cites *B. Ber.* 17a.

(1b) So Caird, 1984, p.42, citing 2 Macc. 2. 4-8; 2 Bar. 29. 8; *B. Hag.* 12b.

(1c) The second tabernacle's precise designation varies as between MSS, as does the first's: see Attridge's textual notes to 9. 2. (Attridge, 1989, p.230).

- (2) Deut. 10. 2 // Kgs. 8. 9; 2 Chron. 5. 10.
- (3) Cf. Attridge, 1989, p.236 and n.75.
- (4) For a discussion of this verse in the light of comparable texts, see Hayward, 1989-90, pp.18-19, who there supplies the translation to Tg. Sg. 8:2; for other Rabbinic references to the wine's origin / nature, see, for example, R. Le Deaut; *Targum du Pentateuch: Traduction des Deux Recensions Palestiniennes Complètes avec Introduction, Parallels, Notes et Index. (Vol.1: Genese)* Les Editions du Cerf: Paris, 1978, p.260.
- (5) Cf. Ps. 23. 5; Is. 65. 13.
- (6) Cf. *Exod. R.* 25. 8; *B. Pes.* 119b.
- (7) *B. Sanh.* 99a.
- (8) *B. Ber.* 35b.
- (9) 1909 *et seq.*, I, pp.19-20.
- (10) Charlesworth, 1985, II, pp.744-45.
- (11) Barton, 1986, p.215.
- (12) Barton applies the phrase "package of expectations" to Mishnaic and Talmudic eschatology which, he notes, would have included the Messiah's advent, an "armageddon", the Gentiles' conversion and the general resurrection: he cites by way of secondary evidence for these notions e.g. G.F. Moore, 1927, *et seq.* II, pp.279-395.
- (13) Urbach, 1975, pp.649ff.
- (14) Urbach, 1975, pp.304ff.
- (15) Cf. *B. Git.* 6b; *B. Mez.* 86a.
- (16) *Tanh. Exod.* 18, cf. *B. Ber.* 8a, 63b etc.
- (17) The visualisation of the Messiah as another Moses was a stereotyped motif of much messianic *haggadah* - for references, see Urbach, 1975, p.821, n.68.
- (18) *Gen. R.* 98.9.

(19) For references, see Urbach, 1975, p.823 n.83.

(20) *Gen. R.* 17. 5; 44. 17.

(21) God donned phylacteries: Neusner, 1968, IV, p.285.

(22) See, e.g., below, p.162, n.14.

(22a) What constituted charitable food provision in the post-Talmudic era in Palestine? On this question (pertinent to the socio-historic context of both TQ 9. 7 and QR 9. 7), Schürer, 1973 *et seq.*, p.437, n.45, refers us to S. Krauss, *Talmüdische Archäologie* III (1912), pp.66-74; Schürer summarises synagogal charity-provision for his own period (p.437). Evidently, during the early Roman era, *charity* would have been, conceptually, inseparable from *tithing*: see, for the latter topic in relation to the biblical requirements (Deut. 14. 22-7; Lev. 27. 30-2; Num. 18. 21-32), Sanders, 1990, pp.43ff.

TQ cashes out 9. 7 with a concrete example of food-donation (and its reward), in its rendering of Qoh. 11. 1:

אֹשֵׁשׁ לְחַיִּים פְּרִסְנוֹתָךְ לְעַנְיִין  
 דְּאֵזְלִין בְּסַפִּינָן עַל אִפֵּי מֵיָא אַרוֹם בְּתַר עֵידָן יוֹכִיזן סְגִיָאִין  
 תְּשַׁכַּח אֶגְרִיָּה לְעַלְמָא דְּאַתִּי

"Extend your nourishing bread to the poor who go in ships on the surface of the water, for after a period of many days you shall find its reward in the world to come." (Knobel)

(22b) Corré, 1953, p.7, stresses this, as being the practical outcome of Torah-study. He suggests that in TQ good deeds are semi-personified, with a concrete character (see, e.g. 11. 10).

(23) *B. Yoma.* 86a; Urbach, 1975, p.360.

(24) Urbach, 1975, pp.483ff.

(25) *Siphre* on Deut. s. 49. 114 etc.; Urbach, 1975, p.901 n.84.

(26) See, for instance, *Tests. XII Pats! Asher* 2. 8; *B. Ber.* 61a; Urbach, 1975, p.901 n.89.

(27) E.g. *Midr. Mishle* 11. 21.

(28) Neusner, 1968, III, p.106.



- (29) Ibid., pp. 102-26.
- (30) Urbach, 1975, pp.390ff.
- (31) *Tos. Pe'ah* 3. 8.
- (32) E.g. *Siphre* on Num., s.141, 187.
- (33) *B. Shab.* 30b.
- (34) See *Siphre* on Deut. 11. 22; Urbach, 1975, pp.855-87.
- (35) *B. Ab. Zar.* 28b-29a.
- (36) *B. Git.* 70a.
- (37) *B. Ber.* 39a.
- (38) E.g. *B. Shabb.* 109a.
- (39) Neusner, 1968, III, p.115.
- (40) Neusner, 1968, III, p.153; and at length in II, pp.167-76.
- (41) *B. Shab.* 140b.
- (42) E.g. *B. Ket* 61a.
- (43) *B. Mo. Qat.* 17a.
- (44) *B. Qid.* 70a-b.
- (45) Neusner, 1968, III, p.142.
- (46) *B. Shabb.* 140b.
- (47) *B. Ber.* 43b.
- (48) R.Isaac at *B. Meg.* 15a.
- (49) *B. Ber.* 61a
- (50) *B. Qid.* 30a.
- (51) *B. Bab. Bat.* 119.
- (52) A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient. A Contribution to the History of Culture in the Near East. I. The Origin of Asceticism. Early Monasticism in Persia.* Louvain, 1958, pp.82-3.
- (53) Sandmel, 1962, p.1.
- (54) Sandmel, 1962, pp.4,5. So, e.g., with Paul and rabbinic Judaism.

Sandmel notes that even a plethora of parallels (which there is not) would not entail significant *agreement* between them.

(55) Cf., e.g., Shinan's careful critique of Levine's catalogue of parallels to the aggadic traditions in Ps. J. and TN<sub>L</sub> <sup>[reference unlocated]</sup>. As well as citing parallels over-selectively, incompletely / misleadingly (or, indeed, not at all), Levine occasionally cites *irrelevant* references in rabbinic literature.

## CHAPTER V

QR. 9.7.1: Thematic Unity, Hermeneutical  
Dexterity and Generic Transformation.

[For text and translation of QR 9. 7-10, see Appx. ... 5]

*Introduction*

The present writer wishes to argue that QR 9.7.1 is an allusive treatment of the *Aqedah* theme. With reference to the *Aqedah* story proper, the Abba Tahnah tale and the exposition of Daniel's conversation with Gabriel, he will try to show that each alludes to (and indeed explicates) different motemes within the *Aqedah* tradition, which find fuller treatment elsewhere in rabbinic literature - not only in the relevant midrashic passages, but also in the targums and rewritten Bible (Jubilees). Relevant hermeneutical techniques, he further suggests, are *trigger* or *catch words*, each word of Qoh. 9. 7 becoming a springboard for QR's midrashic treatment of a specific *Aqedah* moteme; *irony* and *verbal resonance*, achieved through deft lexemic choice; *seres*, an ingenious tool of Alexandrian exegetes (early CE), which entailed the reorganizing of Scriptural verses' constituent elements in the interests of logic. His final contention (independent of the previous two) is that the Abba Tahnah pericope may be a case of *Χρῆσις* - naturalization. We now seek to demonstrate our claims made above.

1. *Thematic Unity: The Aqedah as the Thematic Base of QR. 9.7.1*

pp. 113a (Heb.), line 8 - b, line 3.

The *Aqedah* version:] (1) The self-oblationary aspect of the story (Abraham and Isaac's unanimity), found in the targums (1) and *Gen. R.* (2) is not stressed. Are we not rather presented with an alternative tradition,

reflected in Isaac's report to Sarah which suggests that Abraham's initiative held sway? That, firstly, Abraham was not altogether happy (we note the interior struggle which he underwent - "R. Judah b. R. Simon said: Abraham felt some uneasiness...": ר' יונה בן סימון } אמר היה יאבר הם . See n.6), and that, secondly, Isaac was a reluctant party to the project?

The stress on his vulnerability in the conditional clause, "if.....slain (אִלּוּ) לָא בַּאֲשַׁחֲוֵי) maybe hints at this reluctance. Nor is Sarah party to, or retrospectively agreeable to the intended sacrifice: her reaction, omitted in *Gen. R.* and *Num. R.*, to Isaac's report bears this out. Perhaps her shock would be implicitly linked by the ancient reader / audience, to their realization of what such a sacrifice would mean - Ishmael's inheritance of Isaac's rights, and his subversion of Isaac's destiny, a point made by *Gen. R.* 56.4, in Samael's remark to Isaac ("Shall all those fine tunics which thy mother made be a legacy for Ishmael, the hated of her house?" ) and reinforced by the footnote's alternative rendering (Freedman's translation, p.494, n.2): "Shall all the steps taken by thy mother against Ishmael have been for nought, and he, the hated of the house, be the heir?".

(2) Secondly, Isaac is unequivocally identified as the victim. QR does not draw on the tradition found, for example, in the Tosefta targum fragment (3), that the victim's identity was in doubt.

(3) Thirdly, is Sarah's grief (4) intended to remind the audience of the grief-theme in the Aqedah tradition, stressed in *Gen. R.* (56.5 refers to the angel's grief, 56.8, to Abraham's).<sup>2</sup> If so, why, in QR and *Lev. R.*, is the grief transferred to Sarah? Is the transfer perhaps a blow struck for mothers? A New Testament parallel might be the women's weeping for Jesus in Lk. 23.8. However, the implications of Sarah's death-cry and grief are not drawn out by QR. What are these? We suggest, firstly, that the

midrashist intended irony, which would be picked up by a post-Second Temple reader / audience: a time will come when the barren woman, which Sarah had been, will be judged happy in her lot - an idea familiar to them from Is.

54. 1 (the barren woman will be taken back to her husband's, Yahweh's heart.)

We suggest, secondly, that this touching incident evokes, intentionally, other notable *womanly grief-scenes* in the Hebrew Bible, especially in relation to national calamity: see Jer. 9. 1. 17ff. for an instance. Perhaps, further, Isaac's near-demise is meant to foreshadow these, as typical of Israel's future pain and suffering.

(4) Next QR picks up two issues dealt with by the targums: the *Aqedah's* notional perfection and validity as a sacrifice, stressed by the targums (5), and the problem of how Abraham identified the sacrifice's locale. There is, however, a difference: in QR, Abraham's doubts about the sacrifice's fitness seem to arise, retrospectively, after the event - is this significant? (6)

(5) What does the "high and lofty mountain" (הר אחד גבוה) [תלול] signify?

We suggest that it may be a proleptic reference to God's promise, as sounded in Ezk. 17.22, to plant a "young twig" on a "high and lofty

mountain": ולקחתי אני מצמרת הארץ הרמה ונתתי עליה

ינקותן רך אקטף ושתלתי אני על הר-גבה ותלול

It is tempting to regard Isaac as the "young twig", an earnest of Israel's eventual God-ordained establishment on this mountain. Perhaps this allusion resonates with R. Isaac's hope in *Gen. R.* 56.2 that this place, having been alienated from God and His people, will one day return to Him and them.

(6) *Qoh. 9. 7*: "eat and drink". We finally suggest that the invocation of *Qoh. 9. 7* may be a cipher for "conclude your life contentedly": compare *Jubs. 22*, where the end of Abraham's life is marked by a celebration of first fruits and a family reunion (vv. 3ff): Rebecca presents Abraham with

new grain-cakes "so that he might eat and bless the Creator of all before he died." Further, according to the same passage, Isaac sent his father a thank-offering that he might eat and drink: "And he ate and drank and blessed God most high who created heaven and earth and who made all the fat of the earth and gave it to the sons of man so that they might eat and drink and bless their Creator." There follow Abraham's pre-death blessings for Jacob (vv. 10-30), before he finally dies in ch. 23. Is QR's use of Qoh. 9. 7 a compressed reference to this tradition? It would be convenient to think so: it would nicely counter-balance the death and grief of Sarah.

*The Abba Tannah Pericope: the Portrait of an Abrahamitic man?*

*Hypothesis: Abba Tannah exhibits Abrahamitic qualities and emotions which are alluded to in Gen. R. 56 and elsewhere. : p.130<sup>(Heb.)</sup>, lines 16-27*

First, there is his *compassion* towards the petitioner. Compare *Gen. R.* 56.4, where Samael induces Isaac to arouse his father's compassion (already apparent from, for instance, his hospitality at Mamre in *Gen. 18*), by stressing to him their familial bond. But there are differences between the status of compassion in the Abba Tannah tale and in *Gen. R.* There the aroused compassion is, implicitly, criticised as a stumbling-block to Abraham's obedience; in the Abba Tannah tale, the Abba's compassion is a keynote quality - to be imitated, it is stressed (implicitly if not explicitly). Again, in QR, the hero's compassion extends to a "victim" (a boil-afflicted cripple) who is blemished *ab initio*, whereas in *Gen. R.*, it is dominated by Abraham's concern for ritual propriety: the brief allusion to his compassion is overshadowed by his determination to offer an unblemished sacrifice.

Secondly, the tale credits to the Abba the kind of *hospitality* which Abraham demonstrated in *Gen. 18* at Mamre (18.1-8), and which the angels

attribute to Abraham in *Gen. R.* 56.5 ("Does not Abraham show hospitality to travellers?") with corroborative scriptural quotations, namely Is. 33. 8 and Gen. 18.11.

Thirdly, there is the element of *prevarication*, which, in QR, is represented by the conflict of the  $\text{אלהים יצ'}$  and  $\text{אלהים יצ'}$  (finally resolved in the latter's favour: Abba Tannah does his duty according to the dictates of his conscience). This matches Abraham's retrospective (?) agonising, in the *Aqedah* version (Cohen's translation, p.232) over Isaac's fitness for sacrifice (was or was he not blemished?). *Gen. R.*, interestingly, attributes such uncertainty to God (in 56.8, R. Aha quotes Abraham's accusation, "Surely thou too indulgest in prevarication! Yesterday thou saidest ... thou didst then retract ... now thou biddest me: Lay not thy hand upon the lad! said the Holy One ..." Freedman's translation, p.498) while also stressing Abraham's unflinching devotion to duty, his sorrowful-joyful non-hesitation: "the tears streamed from his eyes.....prompted by a father's compassion.....Yet even so, his heart rejoiced to obey the will of his Creator" (7).

Fourthly we note the motif of *burdenbearing*. Does Abba Tannah's shouldering of his burden on the Sabbath-eve correspond to Abraham's raising of his burden (the wood for sacrifice), which is explicitly linked by *Gen. R.* 56.3 to the idea of a victim's shouldering of his execution-stake? (8)

*Conclusion:* Abba Tannah thus appears to be an Abrahamic figure, presented, it may be, as one of those to whom R. Liezer alludes in his reading of the repetition "Abraham, Abraham", in Gen. 22.11 (*Gen. R.* 56.7): a man like Abraham, arising in a later generation. He imitates Abraham's philanthropy: for Abraham typifies the philanthropic spirit which will survive in future

times, just as Jacob, Moses and Samuel typify, respectively, the service of God, Torah and Civil justice (Freedman's translation, p. 497 n.)

(176),  
*The Danielic Pericope: pp 113b, line 27- 114a, line 3*

We suggest that the Daniel of the QR narrative, is also an Abrahamic figure, *vis-a-vis* the Abraham of the Aqedah narrative of *Gen. R.*, but with signal variations.

Firstly, Abraham, like Daniel is "a man *greatly beloved*" (of Yahweh): a feature of his relationship with God which *Gen. R.* is not afraid to emphasise: R. Hiyya (56.7) interprets the angel's repeated invocation of Abraham as "an expression of love and encouragement". The good angel, Gabriel, counter-balances the evil Samael in *Gen. R.*: he authentically interprets God's will for Daniel, rather than trying to seduce him from his foreordained path.

Secondly, both heroes are rewarded for their humble fidelity. But QR highlights a difference in the *timetabling of Daniel's reward* compared with Abraham's. Twice it cites scripture which stresses the *advance* decision to heed Daniel's supplications: Dan. 9.23 and 10.12; Abraham's final assurance of the Holy One's goodwill is received only *after* the closure of the Mt. Moriah visit.

Thirdly, whereas Abraham is assured *visually* by God Himself (i.e. immediately) of the initial building of a Temple (which the Holy One himself prayed for, according to R. Berekiah), as well as of its later destruction and rebuilding in the Messianic era (see *Gen. R.* 56.10: the alternative interpretation), Daniel is *orally* promised by God through an angel the rebuilding of a Temple already destroyed. What is happening here? The two midrashim may be presenting alternative but complementary ways in which an "Abrahamic" man can perceive God's will: *visually* (i.e. in a vision) - so *Gen.*



R. 56.10; or audially, via *verbal* prayer - so QR. Abraham is gifted with a *vision* of the Temple's life-story (its main crises), Daniel, with a *verbal* assurance, following prayer, of its eventual rebuilding. This contrast - between the alternative routes to perception of the divine will - is perhaps brought out by a slight grammatical adjustment which is made at a crucial point in each midrash. In *Gen. R.*, the additional interpretation is reached by shifting the key verb in *Gen. 22:14* (אֲנִי אֶלֶּה) <sup>perhaps אֶלֶּה</sup> from qal to hiphil. Thus God shows Abraham the temple built, etc.: this is an extension or donation to Abraham of God's own futuristic vision. In QR, however, a key verb in *Dan. 9:22* (אֲנִי אֶלֶּה), hiphil ) is interpreted as אֶלֶּה, qal; and the subject of this adjusted verb, apparently, is God, not the angel. The adjustment is the reverse of that just noted in *Gen. R.* Does God not thereby play a more intimate part in the proceedings? For now it is His perception of Daniel's situation which prompts His despatch of the angel to talk with Daniel. At the risk of being anachronistic, we might say that His empathy with Daniel is slightly more apparent in this two-stage procedure (understanding followed by an angelic message) than it is with Abraham, the disclosure of His will slightly less unilateral.

## 2. *Hermeneutical Dexterity.*

(1) *Trigger words: D. Noy's hypothesis* In discussing the "oicotype laws" (9) or axioms which govern the transformation of a universal tale-type into a local, ethnic version, D. Noy comments on the narrator's need to "capture" his audience at the outset. He quotes a modern Yemenite story-teller: "These first three minutes are the most important, as I know by then whether the audience is good and understanding" (10). A prime device for "capture", evident in midrash, is the raconteur's anchorage of the plot of the tale to well-known scriptural verses (Noy is speaking of a Semitic

audience) which will awaken the addressee's intellectual pride, sense of cultural heritage and natural curiosity (11). A given verse (say Qoh. 11. 1) can trigger various deviations by the narrator from the basic tale-type, depending on its auidial associations for his Scripture- soaked audience. The narrator must exploit the verse's word-tallies (through *paronomasia*, allusion etc.) with other scripture: these will largely dictate his story's flow, i.e. its narrative motifs and functional moves (12). Adopting Qoh. 11. 1 as an example, Noy suggests that this is the basis for the diversification or "oicotypification" of a universal tale, "The Animal Languages," into twelve Jewish versions (13). He discerns five guiding words in 11.1 which give leads for the story's development:

(a) *מִשָּׁשׁ* would immediately evoke, for the Hebrew ear, Deut. 22.7 - "thou shalt (surely) let the mother go ( *בַּיּוֹם-הַשֵּׁשִׁי מִשָּׁשׁ מִשָּׁשׁ* ), but the young thou mayest take unto thyself"; and Gen. 8. 10 - "he sent ( *מִשָּׁשׁ* ) the dove out of the ark"; and possibly Provs. 30.17 about filial duties - the eye mocking to parents will be pecked out by ravens. So *מִשָּׁשׁ*, potentially, could trigger three narrative motifs.

(b) *מַיִם* and *חַסְדִּים* particularly connotes the conjunction of "charity" and "waters". Scripture evoked would include Gen. 21.14 (Abraham's bestowal of bread and water on Hagar), II Kgs. 6.22 (Elisha's advice to the king to provide bread and water for captives: cf. Am. 8.11, Provs. 25.21 etc.).

(c) The homonymy between *יָמִים* ("days") and *יָמִים* ("seas") might well be exploited by the narrator, and linked with the latter rather than the former: *יָמִים* is a more concrete image (and therefore better suited to a folk-tale), with convenient connotations of fertility / abundance: Deut. 33.19 etc.

(d) **אוצרות** connotes, *inter alia*, the discovery of treasure-trove, plunder: Jud. 5. 30; Ps. 119. 162 etc.

Thus the narrator has at his disposal a thesaurus of connotations: he can detach one or more of the guide-words from its home-verse and follow its lead. A midrashist or preacher would concentrate, perhaps, on just one "lead", one guide-word's associations in order to drive home his homiletic message (14).

QR 11.1 exemplifies this procedure: (15) here are a set of stories which selectively utilize Qoh. 11.1's leads. For example, R. Aqiba's story follows the evocation of sea-travel by **ב'יָם** (taken as **ב'א'ר')** and of charity by **א.ת.ס**. The R. Eleazar story, on the other hand, works in the motifs of charity, sea and treasure-trove, following three of the home-verse's leads:

(2) *Trigger words in Qoh. 9.7.*

(a) **א.ל.ל** and **ו.ש.ו**: to the Hebrew mind, the conjunction of 'א.ל.ל' and 'ו.ש.ו' might evoke several contexts, positive and negative: for example:

Neh. 8.10-12 'א.ל.ל' and 'ו.ש.ו' symbolize celebration in response to the Torah-reading. At Ps. 104. 15, they betoken *divine blessing*; in

Gen. 43.31ff, Joseph dines with his brothers - a "postlude" to weeping and a token of reunion. But in Is. 22. 13 they signify impious self-indulgence (**י.ל.ר')**

**ו.ה.נ.ה ש.ש.ו.ן**; compare Jud. 19 where eating and drinking, figuring in a refrain-like sequence of imperatives (vv.4, 5-6, 8, 21), sound the prelude to gross impiety. Similarly, in 1 Kgs. 21. 7, a command to eat ( Jezebel's to Ahab) precedes Naboth's murder.

(b) **א.ת.ס** *inter alia* connoted charity (Gen. 18. 5 etc.);

but wine (and drunkenness) are often denounced: a *locus classicus* is Provs. 23. 29-35, critiquing the physical effects of drink (see above pp. 77f).

Other passages highlight other byproducts: Provs. 23. 19 (folly); 21.17 (poverty); 23.21 (destitution) etc. (see above, p. 79)

(c) **ל** and **ט** often figure in "consumption" contexts - this link would have been known to the midrashist's reader / audience: see Jud. 19 (vv. 7, 9, 22) where enjoyment is enjoined along with eating and drinking; or Neh. 8.10-12, again. Other notable situations of "merry-heartedness" include those mentioned in II Chron. 7. 10 (also in connection with a religious feast), Prov. 17.22 (a merry heart is medicinal) or 15.13 (a merry heart indicates a glad spirit). The fundamental importance of enjoying God's bounty would be connoted by passages such as Deut. 28. 47-48, where a failure to enjoy it is threatened with the proscription of divine blessings including food and drink: **אשר לא עבדת את יי' בשמחה וכטוב לבב... ועבדת את איביך**  
Compare Is. 65. 14, where restored blessings (on the faithful) of sustenance will accompany rejoicing and gladness of heart: **הנה עבדי יאכלו... ישתו... יישאחו... ירנו מטוב לב**.

(d) **ל** would lead the reader / hearer to think of manifold Biblical situations: *Meal* contexts (Rebecca telling Jacob to go to the flock and fetch two fat kids); *Worship* situations: Exod. 8. 24 (Go and sacrifice to God: **ואמר פרעה אנוכי אשלח אתכם ונבחתם ליהוה אלהיכם**); 10.24 (Go and worship the Lord: **לכו עבדו את-אדני**); *Divine commands* to act, in various settings: to prophesy (Jer. 3.12. etc.);

from a prophet to a petitioner (II Kgs. 5. 10); to meet someone (Exod. 4. 27, Num. 22. 20, 35; 23. 5); to start a journey (Gen. 22. 2). Perhaps this latter passage would be particularly memorable, because of Abraham's patriarchal stature.

(e)  $\text{לָמַד}$  might, *inter alia*, evoke two situations where Yahweh did *not* approve the people's works:

- i. Jer. 14. 10 (  $\text{לֹא רָצָה עִתָּהּ יִזְכֵּר עֲוֹנָם וַיִּפְקֵד חַטֹּאתֵם}$  )
- ii. Hos. 8. 13 - also in a "consumption" context (  $\text{צָבָחַי הִכֹּה בִי יִדְבַחוּ כֹשֶׁר וַיֵּאָכְלוּ לֹא רָצָה עִתָּהּ יִזְכֵּר עֲוֹנָם וַיִּפְקֵד חַטֹּאתֵם הִמָּה אֲעַרְיִים יִשׁוּבוּ }$  )

*Conclusion:* We suggest that these lexemes have each (separately, or in combination) triggered the midrashist's telling of the particular stories which "major" on *Aqedah* motemes. Thus the *Aqedah* version could be responding to the "lead" or "trigger" offered by  $\text{לָמַד}$ , picking up Gen. 22.2, where  $\text{לָמַד}$  really leads into the *Aqedah*. Secondly, the *charitable* evocations of  $\text{לָמַד}$  could have triggered the charity-tale about Abba Tahnah. Further, the connections of  $\text{לָמַד}$  and  $\text{שִׂמְחָה}$  (combined) with *pious rejoicing* could have triggered the concern for ritual propriety which we find in the *Aqedah* and the charity-tale. Fourthly,  $\text{לָמַד}$  expresses an attitude (*whole-heartedness*) which dominates the *Aqedah*-retelling, the sage-tale and the Danielic pericope. An additional word-tally which could have triggered the *Aqedah* version might have been  $\text{לָמַד}$  = eat/ $\text{לָמַד}$  = knife: As Heinemann (15a) says: "the *similarity of sounds* enables the preacher to construct an entire edifice of ideas, both daring and penetrating..."

(3) *Seres*.

(a) *David Daube on Seres:* Long ago (1953), Daube argued for the impact of

Alexandrian hermeneutics on the rabbis' handling of *aggadah* (15b). One of the devices which he shows them to have exploited was *seres*, whereby a seemingly illogical verse is made logical by the rearrangement of its parts. Theological implausibilities may thus be ironed out. Examples of *seres* include *Siphre* on Num. 9. 6, where Josiah (second-century CE) suggests that the order "Moses and Aaron" be inverted - for Moses, the senior mediator with God, would be his puzzled petitioners' final court of appeal. Again on 9. 1, *Siphre* considers that an incident recorded in ch. 9 in fact occurred before one in ch. 1. The presumption behind such rearrangement is that scripture does not always reflect historical event-order. Daube quotes a rabbinic dictum to this effect: "There is no before and after in Scripture" [reference unlocated].

(b) *QR 9..7.1*: The Aqedah. In QR's recounting of the *Aqedah*, there seems to be a compressing of the Biblical narrative. QR omits the episode (Gen. 22.13-end) which follows the angel's first cry to Abraham; we move straight to Isaac's dialogue(?) with Sarah and her shock and death. Moreover, the midrash has to attribute an altered meaning (or, at least, force) to the Hebrew verb, *לָבַח*, in 23.2 in order to associate Abraham's movements after the Aqedah with Sarah's demise. Whereas, in the MT, *לָבַח* seems to be first in a triad of ritual actions (the other two being denoted by the infinitive constructs *לָבַח* and *לָבַח*) proper to mourning a family member - "he went in to her" - QR uses the verb to denote transition, travel from one destination to another. Its motive force in the latter text is stronger, for the midrashist uses it to stress Abraham's movement from Moriah to Sarah's death-bed. Where in the MT *לָבַח* is ritualistic, in QR it is utilitarian.

Why does QR thus "collapse" the Genesis narrative? Not, we suggest,

because of any notional illogicality in it but in order to gain a homiletic point. The midrashist may well be exploiting his rabbinic awareness of the non-chronological nature of Scriptural event order (15) so as to forge a link between the *Aqedah* and Sarah's death.

(4) *Irony: the Aqedah.* Why does the midrashist insert Qohelet 9.7 after Abraham's mourning for Sarah and the rabbinic reference to his unease about Isaac's fitness for sacrifice? Is he partly implying that Abraham has been eating "mourners'" bread ( לחם על-אבל ) and drinking the cup offered to them - and that these are now to be converted, through divine

affirmation of his sacrifice, into a celebratory meal? The custom of a mourner's meal is documented by (e.g.) Jer. 16.7 (ולא-יפרסו לחם)

על-אבל לנחמו על-מת ולא-ישקרו אותם כוס תנחומים  
על-אביו (ועל-אמו)

Holladay notes Jerome's reference to the custom: "It was usual to carry provisions to the mourners and to prepare a feast which the Greeks call

~~πατρικία~~ and which we commonly call *parentalia*, since the ceremonies are

carried out for parents" (16a). We should also recall that mourners' bread

was Toranically unclean: this is implied by, e.g., Deut. 26.14: (לא אכלתי)

באני ממנו ולא בערתי ממנו בטמא : "I have not eaten of it in my mourning." So

a mourner's consumption of tithe-bread while בטמא (unclean through corpse-

contact) would render the whole tithe unclean. There would be fine irony in

the midrashist's sequence of ideas (mourning- unease- Qoh. 9. 7) if he

were implicitly presenting Abraham, anxious about his sons's ritual

disqualification, as himself ritually unclean through consuming the bread of mourners.

(5) *Lexical Analysis: Resonances and Irony in the Midrashist's Choice of Words. Some Examples.*

(a) *The Aqedah: p.113a (Heb.)*

line 3. רִיחַ נִיחוּהָ: "an odour of satisfaction, i.e. sweet, agreeable."

(Gesenius, p.548a); Gen. 8.21; Lev. 1.9; Nos. 28.6. BDB (p.629b) prefers

"soothing, tranquillising odour." This Pentateuchal phrase, perhaps

particularly associated in Hebrew minds with the post-diluvian sacrifice of Noah, takes us back to patriarchal times, preparing us for the atoning sacrifice *par excellence*: the *Aqedah*.

line 13. ...וְיָדָעְתָּ: In BH ...וְיָדָעְתָּ commonly draws attention to a fact on the basis of which one will act: cf. Gen. 29.7; 30.34. (BDB, p. 243b). Does it, then, here reinforce the idea of the protagonists' unanimity: of Isaac's compliance?

line 15. וְעָמַר: Is the opacity of the ass a humorous touch? An ironic reminder, perhaps, of the Balaam-story (Num. 22. 21ff)? Or (more subtly) a sardonic echo of Gen. 49.14. There Issachar is described as "a strong ass...He saw how good it was to take his ease, how pleasant was the country, so he bowed his shoulders for the load, he became a slave."<sup>(REB)</sup> Perhaps the midrashist is gently reminding his addressees how Isaac's "vision" (in the Biblical account), like Issachar's, actually blinded him to his situation's reality, his reduction to servility, to a beast of burden who bears fuel for his own sacrifice.

line 23 צוֹרוּחָה: From ...צוֹרוּחָה: The only BH example, in Is. 42.11,

has a joyful connotation: יִרְנַן יְשׁוּבֵי עַל מַרְאֵשׁ הַרִים יְצוּחוּ

Again, is the midrashist being ironic?

וְדַבְּרָה: Is there ambiguity here? Does *וְדַבְּרָה* mean "cry" or "words"? Is there a pregnant incompleteness of utterance?

(b) *Abba Tannah: p. 113b (Heb.)*

line 17 אֶל כַּתְּפוֹתָם: Shoulder-blade. Burden-bearers (those who carry loads

on their shoulders) who would be known to reader / audience include heroes



such as Samson (Jud. 16.3), who carried Gaza's doors and door-posts; Ezekiel (Ezk. 12.6-7) who carries his baggage out through the wall, on his shoulder, in sight of the people. In QR 9. 7. 1, Abba Tannah enters the city, again in sight of the people. Do we here see traces of a folkloric motif (burden-bearing)? Elsewhere in BH, burden-bearing is in a sacred context: Num. 7-9 (the sons of Kohath are charged with holy things which they must carry on their shoulders); I Chron. 15. 15 (the Levites carry the Ark on their shoulders: cf. II Chron. 35. 3).

line 18 .....} ~~7W~~ Boil. In BH (e.g. II Kgs. 20. 7 - Hezekiah's boil, healed by Isaiah), the term appears in a *theodical* context. Thus Satan's torments for Job includes his affliction with boils. (Jb. 2. 7 and cf. Exod. 9. 9-11: boils are God's punishment on Egypt.) It also surfaces in *purity-law*: typically, the Levitical instructions about leprosy (Lev. 13. 18ff.: all lepers were to be quarantined outside the camp: v.46.) This background perhaps points to one socio-historic aspect of the story, lending it a semi-sacred, almost numinous ambience.

3. *Generic Transformation: Abba Tannah as Chriic Folktale.* In his analysis of "Joseph Who Honours the Sabbaths" (17), Cohen notes the paucity of structural analyses of aggadic narratives (18). He tries to elucidate, after Propp (19), his chosen tale in terms of its folkloric characteristics. There are three stages to his examination: establishment of the tale's historical purpose and context; appreciation of its structural and verbal artistry; summary of its didactic force. We propose to adopt this procedure as the basis for our own treatment of the simple Abba Tannah story in QR 9.7.1

(1) Considering first *the socio-historical context*, we find that *the protagonist*, Abba Tannah remains unidentified. There is no rabbi of this name listed by Strack and Stemberger, although they do mention a Rab Tanna (20), a son of Rab Hinena: he died in 515 CE, one of the early Saboraim - i.e. of the post-Amoraic generation. Yet he presumably reflects the storyteller's / midrashist's context, in his belief and actions. To grasp this at all, we must examine the socio-historic *realia* (Cohen's term, p.169): the socio-historic stimulants for it. In "Joseph..." Cohen identifies the central socio-historical issue as the application of astrology to the Jews; here it seems to be the ethical primacy of charity-provision. It is therefore relevant to adumbrate amoraic attitudes to this question - just as Cohen briefly discusses amoraic opinions of astrology.

We have, in fact, already summarised the general position, in relation to TQ: good deeds were of paramount importance in the tannaitic and amoraic world-view. (21) R. Tarfon's dictum (22) was their motto in this regard. To this we might add citations of QR's own recommendations about good deeds - though these do not specifically address our question: e.g. on 4.8 (Cohen's translation, pp.116, 118). A secondary, related theological interest of the story-teller is the eternal tension between *הרע* and the *טוב*. In TQ this is well expressed at 10.1 *גרים מותה בעלמא* *על דאסר חכמא בעידן דחטי ואחבל שאה טובא*...

"And the evil inclination ... causes death in the world because it betrays the sage when he sins" (Knobel). In QR we find references to it at (2.1 (Cohen's translation, p.51); 3.11.3 (Cohen's translation, p.91); 4. 13-14 (Cohen's translation p.123). Finally, a third motif is the Sabbath-eve (elsewhere in QR, at 1.15, granted an allegorical significance), which imposes pious obligations potentially (and here, *actually*) in conflict with the devotee's practical duties. It is

largely the tension between these two issues which generates the story's dynamic and inherent interest.

(2) *Artistry and didacticism: the story's possible chriic character.*

Our contention is that the pithy ethical tale has a distinctive generic flavour: that it displays some hallmarks of the cynicizing  $\chi\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}$  adapted for Semitic addressees.

(a) *What is a  $\chi\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}$ ?*

In seeking a general definition of the classical  $\chi\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}$ , we may conveniently quote Fischel, who has charted chriic elements in rabbinic sage-tales. "The chriia in general, is a terse, realistic anecdote, originally and usually on a sage-philosopher, that culminates in meaningful action or truth in form of a gnome, apophthegm or proverb. The ..... cynicizing chriia distinguishes itself by the odd, extreme, and often even burlesque action (or basic situation or final statement) of the central sage-hero that becomes the basis for a demonstration of Cynic ideals and values. The climactic finale is usually witty, approximating<sup>to</sup> a 'punch-line'. *Bouble entendre*, invective and altercation abound. It was thus an ideal vehicle for the teaching of the non-conformist ideas of the Cynics, for their task of  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron$  to 'falsify' (i.e. remind) the coin (of convention)." (23)  $\chi\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}$  recommended, above all, rationality as a "short-cut to virtue" (24) and its concomitants:  $\alpha\ \tau\omicron\beta\alpha\ \xi\acute{\iota}\delta$ , self-discipline, the simple life, non-emotionalism. They also functioned as memorials of Cynicism's founding fathers: (25) Socrates, Antisthenes, Diogenes, Crates; Zeno and Cleanthes (founders of the related Stoic school) (26) and others. Diogenes, the patron saint of so-called "practical cynicism", remained the "star" of  $\chi\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}$  through their developmental history. (27).

(b) *Are there Hebrew  $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$ ?*

It is Fischel's contention that there is a distinctively Hebrew form of  $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$  structurally and thematically similar to the classical  $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$ . It shares the latter's styles, situations, moods, key-words, social values, gnomic punch-lines and, indeed, purpose - the elevation of a founder-sage, in this case (principally) Hillel the Elder. (28) He has argued (29) that a corpus of  $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$  have gathered around Hillel (30) which, although not strictly biographical (31), certainly indicate "the existence of a sage-like figure and innovator, be he a scholar, philosopher, bureaucrat-administrator, or lawgiver." (32). Others whom Fischel identifies as "affected by chrization" (33) include Eliezer ben Hyrcanus (fl. 70-100) and, rather less, R. Aqiba (c. 50-135)

(c) *An intercultural  $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$ .*

In his 1968 article, Fischel analyses variant versions (34) of an intercultural  $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$

(i.e. one that is preserved in tannaitic as well as classical literature), which he calls "The Spoiled Meal." The versions share a simple narrative plot: food is to be served at a sage's home; but it is always served late or not at all because of the sage's (unsuitable) wife's temper-tantrum. The resulting embarrassment to the sage's guests is lightened by the *mot juste* of their imperturbable host (35).

Although Abba Tahnah's story is not of the same type, Fischel's analytical framework may prove helpful. He examines the nine Graeco-Roman versions, and one tannaitic, with reference to the following motifs (36) and their related motemes, (37): i. *the meal's setting*; ii. *the meal itself*; iii. *the food*; iv. *the guests*; v. *the sage's wife*; vi. *the wife's motivation*; vii. *the wife's emotion*; viii. *animal comparisons* (especially with the wife); ix. *the meal's outcome*; x. *the gift-aspect* (in some examples, the food to be

consumed at the meal has been donated); xi. the *embarrassment* entailed, both for the guests and the sage, through his treatment at his wife's hands: *his* resultant inability to host properly, *their* observance of the disruption and non-consumption of a suitable food (a vital element, since it allows the host to display his Cynic qualities:  $\chi\tau\alpha\lambda\gamma\acute{\alpha}$ , etc.); xii. the *gnomic finale* in Fischel's examples, this is often at the wife's expense; xiii. the *chriic value-system*.

(d) "Abba Tahnah": a  $\chi\pi\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ?

We suggest that xi. and xii. are elements which appear in the Abba Tahnah tale. Thus Abba Tahnah is confused, and inwardly embarrassed, in his ethical dilemma, but (cynic-like) he resolves his confusion by apposite action. There is, further, a return of his interior embarrassment, provoked by the surprised reaction of the populace to his entry at sunset: "he too felt uneasy in his heart".

His embarrassment is, perhaps, reminiscent of Socrates' and Alcibiades' in the Stobaeus account of "The Spoiled Meal" (37a), although *they* sit in silence and cover their faces in shame. Again, the *finale* to Abba Tahnah, the appropriation by the midrashist of Qoh. 9. 7, has the force, in view of the Abba's preceding question, "enjoy your sustenance (Torah-study and good deeds - i.e. "sustenance" symbolically understood?) NOW; don't worry about your past, approved deeds nor - implicitly - about future events." Is this a coded summons to Cynic  $\chi\pi\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ? Compare the lines of Jesus' teaching in Lk. 12. 22ff. // Matt. 6.25ff., and the dictum attributed to R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus in *B. Sot.* 48b (38): "Whosoever has a piece of bread in his basket and says 'what shall I eat tomorrow', is of little faith."

In addition, we find some elements of the chriic value-system as discernible in the Meal- $\chi\pi\acute{\iota}\alpha$  variant versions. This, in its full-blown guise would recommend the following: i. *hospitality*, ii. *frugality*, iii. *self-*

*discipline*; iv. *wit*; v. *laconic brevity of speech* (compare Plato *Protag.* 334 E. *Gorg.* 449c); vi. *harmony*; vii. *an appeal to a higher order* (the State, God, Reason - *Ἔσθ* examples contain implicit appeals to reason as the sage's guiding light). In Abba Tahnah, we can detect some of these, albeit in modified form: notably i. (the Abba's *hospitality* to the beggar); and iii. (his *self-discipline* (i.e. his wrestling with and mastering of the Evil Inclination). Further, *harmony* is implicitly restored by the end between the Abba and his fellows and his final vindication, declared by the  $\text{שׁוֹרֵן שׁוֹרֵן}$ , stems from his oblique appeals to the *Holy One*: his two questions, in neither of which is the addressee explicit.

(e) "Abba Tahna": a naturalized  $\text{Χρῖς}$

In the same article, Fischel explores the Hebraisation of  $\text{Χρῖς}$  within rabbinic literature, with reference to the Hillel- $\text{Χρῖς}$  cycle. He concludes that a number of things happen. For example, the  $\text{Χρῖς}$  becomes *naturalized* - that is, reflective of Jewish cultures; it is often *halakhised* (the scenario is treated as an ethical-legal test-case); often a *testimonium* is cited (e.g. a Biblical quotation) which emphasises Jewish values; the story-line is also, commonly, *divinized* (39) - i.e. "brought into contact with a divine order, which, e.g., reshapes the proselytizing effort of the Cynic Sage toward the true way of life into Hillel's proselytizing effort toward Heaven, Torah and the World-to-Come" (40). Finally the scenario tends to be *humanized*, beggars, for example, receiving greater sympathy, fewer sarcastic jibes, than they do in Greek  $\text{Χρῖς}$ , which stress their arrogance rather than their plight.

This  $\text{Χρῖς}$ -naturalization process is evident in Abba Tahnah. Thus the scenario is certainly Jewish (though whether Palestinian or diaspora is unclear). There is even a hint of *halakhization*; the precedent implicitly established, and undergirded by a hagiographical quotation, is that the

Sabbath is desecrated by a refusal to act charitably. The context is that of the Sage's struggle for piety, for "heaven, Torah and the world-to-come". And, finally, we may note the Abba's touching humanity towards the beggar. He is prepared to jeopardize his reputation for the sake of a suffering fellow-creature.

Conclusion. 1. In citing *parallels* between QR and other midrashim (material which can be aptly tabulated, as in Kagan, 1971), we do not assume a redactional relationship between the documents, but treat them synchronically.

2. The contents' *arrangement* may be significant as betraying the midrashist's *dialectical approach*, his desire to integrate and highlight heterogeneous material "by stressing the contrast between different interpretations and thus (to create) a relationship between them of thesis and antithesis" (41).

3. A question lingering over our entire passage (QR 9.7-10), and not least over this, the initial section, concerns *function*: in view of its haggadic nature (and therefore, in Heinemann's terms, its didacticism), to what extent is it formally *homiletic*? Does it (for example) include the homily-constituents carefully identified by Goldberg (1985)? And what other expository techniques, from the realm of either Graeco-Roman rhetoric or rabbinic exegesis, remain to be unearthed?

## NOTES

- (1) Also in Philo, *de Abrahamo* 172 (so Hayward, 1980-81). See, for this feature, e.g., *FT* on Gen.22. 8 (Vermes, 1973, pp.194-5, and Hayward, 1980-81, who discusses the targum's *Aqedah*-theology in detail, building on Vermes' study of targumic *Aqedah*-treatments.
- (2) *Gen. R.* 56. 3-4.
- (3) The writer, unable to locate this, finds it quoted by Vermes, 1973, p.196 "Abraham [having, Vermes suggests, left home unsure which of his three sons God desired of him - Eliezer (adopted), Ishmael or Isaac] said to his servants: 'Do you see anything at all?' They answered: 'We see nothing.' He answered and said to Isaac his son: 'Do you see anything?' He replied: 'Behold, I see a column of cloud from the heavens to the earth.' Then the father knew that Isaac was chosen for the burnt offering."
- (4) We assume that the death-cry of Sarah implies her grief as well as her shock: cf. Israelstam's and Slotki's translation of *Lev. R.*, p.253 n.4 (the alternative translation of Sarah's exclamation): "Alas.....for the son of a hapless woman" becomes "Alas.....for the son of a woman drunk with grief".
- (5) Cf. *TN* to Gen. 22. 10: "Come, see two Unique Ones in my world.....the one who slays does not refuse, and the one who is being slain stretches out his neck." The sacrifice's perfection is implied by the protagonists' unanimity. Vermes draws attention to other passages in midrash which underscore the sacrifice's validity: *Gen. R.* 56. 5; *Tanh Gen.*, *Vayyera*, 23; *Lev. R.* 20. 2 etc. (Abraham hid Isaac while preparing the altar, lest Isaac be maimed by Satan and disqualified as a victim.)
- (6) It is suggestive that the comment of R. Judah b. R. Simon surfaces only after the *Aqedah* account is finished. And the wording of Abraham's



reflection (perhaps there was:

[p.113b [Heb.], line 1].

פסלית היה ולא נתקבל  
 - - - (יצתה ב"ק) indicates that

it is retrospective.

(7) Cf. *Gen. R.* 56. 7: Abraham's resolution to strangle Isaac, after the knife has been dissolved by his tears.

(8) See Freedman's translation, p.493, n.4.

(9) Noy, 1971, p.171. The neologism "oicotype" is adopted by Noy from Carl von Sydow's "Geography and Folktale- Oicotypes", in *Selected Papers on Folklore*, ed. Laurits Bodker, Copenhagen, 1948, pp.44-53.

(10) Noy, 1971, p.174 (cf. D. Noy, "The Universe Concept of Yefet Shvili, a Jewish-Yemenite Story Teller", *Acta Ethnographica* (Budapest) XVI (1965), pp.259-275).

(11) Noy, 1971, pp.173ff.

(12) For functions in a tale, cf. Propp, 1968, pp.26ff.

(13) Noy, 1971, p.17ff.

(14) Noy, 1971, p.188.

(15) Noy, 1971, pp.185ff. QR 11. 1: for the Hebrew, see pp.124a ff.

(15a) Heinemann, 1971 (Proem), p.103.

(15b) Daube, 1953.

(16) Cf. QR. 1.12.1: "The fact is that Torah does not follow a chronological order" (Cohen's translation, pp.37-8), a refrain which permeates this section.

(16a) Holladay, 1986, p.471, quoting Jerome's commentary: (*Hieronymi Presbyteri in Hieremian Prophetam, Libri Sex*, ed. S. Reiter, CCSL, 74; Turnhout: Brepols, 1960.), *ad loc.*

(17) Cohen, 1982.

(18) We have, however, (Cohen notes) parallel analyses: e.g. motif-indexing

(D. Neuman [=Noy], *Motif-Index of Talmudic and Midrashic Literature*,

Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bloomington, 1954).

- (19) Propp, 1968.
- (20) 1991, p.109. Variant: Rab Tahima.
- (21) See above, pp. 111 ff
- (22) See above, p. 112
- (23) 1968, p.373. For general treatments of the  $\chi\rho\iota\alpha$  see the works listed at n.3.
- (24) Fischel, 1968, p.374.
- (25) Ibid.
- (26) Stoicism: related, but (initially) hostile to Cynicism. There was, eventually, reconciliation.
- (27) Over one thousand  $\chi\rho\iota\alpha$  on Diogenes probably exist: Fischel, 1968, p.374.
- (28) c. 41-4 BCE
- (29) 1968, p.375; cf. 1969, p.67
- (30) 20-5 stories, of tannaitic origin.
- (31) See below, pp 148ff.
- (32) Fischel, 1968, p.375.
- (33) Fischel, 1969, p.68.
- (34) For the list, see p.376. His sources span the history of Cynicism and its literature: early 4 cent.BCE (Xenophon) to c. 225 CE (Diogenes Laertius).
- (35) Fischel, 1968, p.385.
- (36) Fischel, 1968, pp.385ff.
- (37) By "moteme", Fischel means "the smallest independent thematic element ... all structural and thematic detail encountered in the  $\chi\rho\iota\alpha$ , such as *personae*, settings (*locale*), simple actions, moods, key words, significant numbers, exclamations, segments of utterances, and within these, repetition, juxtaposition, contrast, and many others." (Fischel, 1968,

p.385).

(38a) Fischel, 1968, pp.380-82.

(38) Fischel, 1968, p.401 and n.5.

(39) Fischel coins the term "transcendentalized"; see 1968, p.410.

(40) Fischel compares Sagen-oracles, e.g. those *relating* to Hillel, which are also partially chriic, he claims: *1968*, p.410, n.2.

(41) Heinemann, 1971, p.149.

## CHAPTER VI

## QR. 9.10.1-3: Paranetic Sage-Tales.

*Introduction: The "problematic" of Rabbinic Biography.*

Can we treat the dream stories of QR 9.10 as, in any sense, biographical?

(1.) Green has issued a sane caveat against so regarding aggadic material in rabbinic literature. Contrary to other ancient religious traditions, rabbinic Judaism does not, suggests Green, provide biography or hagiography of its sages (1). Features of a given sage's life are, rather, scattered through diverse rabbinic documents with their own ideological agenda. These documents are constructed within a framework which, in each case, makes for consistency, coherence and the purposeful juxtaposition of contrasting pericopae. A particular document's agenda is not co-terminous with one sage's teaching, although it may certainly refer to such teaching; Green notes, for example, how rabbinic documents commonly follow a thematic, topical arrangement of material rather than centering on one sage's dicta (2).

Moreover, the haggadic chronicling of sage-incidents often exhibits traces of ideologically-motivated manipulation (as does, points out Green (3), the legal or exegetical material in the Mishnah; the traditions of the Jabnean masters have been tinkered with by redactors as distant as two generations from them). Thus tradents of sage-sayings have passed on only what they want us to know of their heroes' life and dicta, appropriately revised so that we will read them in the way the tradents want us to read them - in the light of their literary context. It follows that the primary context for our interpretation of sage-stories and sayings is the document(s) in which they appear, not their putative historical setting (4).

Often, the agenda prompting the recast sage story or saying is an ethical one: many rabbinic stories are told in order to convey a precise cultural or ethical value, as D. Ben-Amos has taught us: "The haggadic exemplum is a narrative form at the core of which lies an ethical value" (5). In these stories the sage's identity and personality are incidental to the main message. Thus a tale of a sage's devotion to Torah-study which wins him, after privations, reward, carries its point regardless of the particular *tanna*'s identity (Hillel, Aqiba etc.). Indeed, the same tale may be applied to different *tannaim* or *amoraim*, with an adjustment of incidental details. The date and provenance of the original version will generally, claims Green, be hard, if not impossible to define.

(2.) *Contrary Opinions.* Nonetheless Green does admit the lack of scholarly agreement in the matter of *haggadot qua* biography. Some writers are readier to see them as a biographical resource. Green summarises for us a sample of contrary opinions:

(a) A virtually "fundamentalist" position seems to be held by Herr (1971), who stresses the verisimilitude of the documented conversations between rabbinic and Roman dignitaries (e.g. between Rabbi and Antoninus, or Johanan b. Zakkai and Vespasian), and Urbach, who assumes the basic reliability and historical origin of the *sage-haggadot* (1968, 1975). Safrai (1971) also claims a genuine historical core for the *haggadot*, while admitting their embellishment.

(b) H. Fischel (1973) reads the rabbinic sage-stories within a broad late antique context, especially against the background of Graeco-Roman material. He seeks a particular comparison between the sententious or gnomic *χρῆμα* which we meet (for example) in Plutarch's *Moralia*, in Xenophon, Theocritus, Cicero, Seneca and Lucian, and certain Hebrew sage-stories (notably about

Hillel the elder). In his suggestive study of a Hillel-tale in *Derek Erets Rabbah* (200-550 CE), which he examines in the light of other, classical "spoiled-meal" ~~χρῆσις~~, he argues for the similarities between the classical and semitic narratives (6). They share the same thematic orbit, a comparable structure, similar motemes and stylistic devices. The *Derek Erets Rabbah* tale comes from the same "stable" as the others, but has been transformed, adapted to Semitic cultural norms: as we might say, "enculturated".

Green remains, finally, intrigued but unconvinced by Fischel's thesis: "comparativist" research like his is valuable as a means of locating rabbinism within a broad, Hellenistic cultural context, provided it does not overstate its case. Green feels Fischel exaggerates his claims as when, for example, he argues that certain Epicurean ideas were common knowledge among Greek and Aramaic speakers in antiquity and played a significant part in the shaping of the "scholar-bureaucrat" phenomenon in the classical and Judaeo-Christian worlds. Fischel, in this case, argues from an over-slim data-base: a few *haggadot* about four sages which do not convincingly exhibit Epicurean influence on their (rabbinic) thought-pattern. So Epicurean ideology's importance to early rabbinism is (as Green laconically states), "difficult to specify"(7).

(c) We also meet uncritical, so-called "biographies" of sages which simply collate diverse materials from different sources: for example, L. Finkelstein's on R. Aqiba (1936, 1970), J. Podro's on Joshua ben Hananiah (1959), and the "biographical" articles in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. These authorities apparently proceed, faultily, from the assumption that the sage in question actually uttered the majority of dicta attributed to him (8). Moreover Podro, for instance, relies too heavily on his own contributions because of scarce historical data ("the plot line for Joshua's life provided

by all the available narrative material about [his life] has all the complexity and interest of a Dick and Jane story" (9)).

(3.) *Conclusion. QR 9.10.* So what is the value of the aggadic sage-stories? Green concludes that they do, at least, reflect rabbinic redactors' reading of the sages' thoughts and thought-processes. They also focus the persistent rabbinic concern with name-preservation (10): these names enable us to chart, diachronically, the development of certain sage-traditions. This fact steers us to the heart of rabbinic biography's "problematic" - how rabbinic traditions develop over time (11). It is to do, above all, with the "dynamic of tradition". For Green, then, the correct way to read rabbinic "biographical" items is from this premise: that "the figures of the past (are liable to be) continually remade and reimagined by later tradents".

In the following sections, we briefly contend that QR 9.10 exemplifies this dictum in two ways. First, it paranetically presents to would-be sages (among the readership / audience) something of their rabbinic heroes' interior life - their religio-psychology - in *general*. Secondly, it contains traces of the moulding of a *specific* sage-tradition: the holiness of Rabbi.

### 1. *The Dream-Stories*

(1) *Genre.* In QR 9.10 we find a catena of dream-stories which can be generally categorised with fair precision. Zabdi b. Levi's encounter with Joshua b. Levi may be termed a *pronouncement-story*: an anecdote which climaxes with a wise, memorable witticism. Stern (1993) cites the example of Aqiba's remark which concludes the tale in *Lam. R.* (159) (12) of his journey to Rome with the rabbis: when they wept at the sound of Gentile rejoicing, Aqiba laughed and said, in response to their surprise: "If those who anger God rejoice this way in this world, then think how much more so

will those who obey God rejoice in the world to come." (13) Joshua b. Levi's comment would seem to be of the same kind, although admittedly not as pointed or witty.

The dream of R. Ze'ira would also appear to be a pronouncement-story. R. Jose b. R. Hanina's closing riposte to his query about the place of R. Johanan in the heavenly academy's seating plan (14) is both memorable and cryptic.

R. Simeon b. Laqish's (eventual) dream-conversation with R. Hiyya apparently combines the two sub-genres: the pronouncement-story and the "anti-sage story". R. Simeon's interlocutor utters a final waspish apophthegm: which reminds R. Simeon, obliquely, of his inadequacy as a Torah-scholar, but this occurs within the framework of an anecdote which stresses his unimpressive failure to teach (as opposed to learn) Torah in exile (15). An emphasis on unimpressive sage-deeds or characteristics is, according to Stern, typical of anti-sage stories in rabbinic literature. We might compare *Lam. R.* 142-43, where R. Zechariah b. Evkolos' modesty led to the Temple's destruction, "modesty" being here equated with moral cowardice; or the underscoring of Shammai's impatience in contrast with the legendary patience of Hillel, in *ARN (A)* 45 (16).

*Martyr-stories* illustrate the self-sacrificial behaviour of sages in their adherence to the law, especially under persecution: Stern cites as examples the stories in *Lam. R.* (78-87, particularly that of the mother and her seven sons (84-5)); and the tale of R. Aqiba's death in *B. Ber.* 61b (17). R. Haggai's preoccupation with the burial of R. Huna the exilarch is self-sacrificial, and maybe is a variation on the martyr theme. Certainly, the notion of reward which figures prominently in that story (his years are doubled for him) is an integral part of the rabbinic martyr-story. We shall regard this as a "dream-story" also, (for it includes an element of



visionary experience), although not, strictly, about a *dream of Haggai*.

In an *example-story*, the sage performs a paradigmatic, deeply meaningful deed. This deed may have implications for halakhic discussion; it may even be treated as a legal precedent, as in *M. Baba K. 7.6* (18). The anecdote about R. Nahum's death and the covering of the statues' faces is, perhaps, an *example-story*: R. Nahum's deed is highly symbolic, representing his obedience to the Levitical command (Lev. 19.4).

## (2) *Structure*

(a.) The *basic elements* of the dream-stories of *QR 9.10* are fairly recurrent. In each case we find (i) an expression of the recipient-sage's desire - to see and hear from a beloved and deceased mentor (an exemplar or teacher); (ii) his desire's fulfilment - his vision of the mentor; (iii) the mentor's sagacious communication to his enquirer - for example, R. Alexandri's (visual) display to R. Aha of the position of the "slain of Lydda" in the next world and his reminder about the blessedness of those whose learning remains in their possession.

(b.) *Sequence*. Are the dream-tales, perhaps, also arranged in an ascending order of reliability, or, maybe, importance? That is, are the least impressive rabbinic authorities cited first, "the best wine" being saved until last? The first dream-story involves R. Aha of Lydda (later of Tiberias) (PA 4): among other things, he is thought to have been a respected teacher of *haggadah* (19). His interlocutor, R. Alexandri (PA 2), is said to have transmitted the data of Joshua ben Levi (PA 1), another inhabitant of Lydda, an eminent *amora* in the first third of the third century CE and another haggadist of renown (20). The latter appears, in the second dream cited, to R. Zabdi b. Levi (PA 1) who did, in fact, speak with and outlive him (21).

The third, fourth and fifth dream-tales (Cohen's translation, pp.239-241)

have as their would-be dreamer's "target" R. Hiyya: of an earlier generation (T 5), of Babylonian descent, and, by contrast with R. Aha and R. Joshua b. Levi, a redactor and halakhic specialist - a famed collector of *mishnayot*, of whom it was said (*B. Hul. 141a*): "every baraita not edited by Hiyya or Oshayya is unreliable", and (reportedly) the author of *Siphra* (22). The fourth dreamer's teacher is cited as R. Johanan bar Nappaha ("the smith's son") (PA 2, d 279 CE), <sup>A</sup> contemporary of Resh Laqish (23) and a teacher at Sephoris and Tiberias, who reputedly headed an academy for eighty years, <sup>he</sup> was likewise noted as a redactor, talmudist (according to Maimonides, he redacted the Jerusalem Talmud) and midrashist (Lauterbach, in the introduction to his edition of *Mekhilta de R. Ishmael*, suggests that Johanan's schools, if not Johanan himself, may have been responsible for one of the revisions and redactions of the *Mekhilta*). Thus, for dreams three and four we have moved from the purview of haggadists to that of halakhists! Meeting in dream six (Cohen's translation, p. 241) R. Ze'ira (who also sides with R. Johanan), we may be faced with somebody reputedly anti-haggadic - for this person is quite possibly to be identified with R. Ze'ira I

(PA 3), a Babylonian emigré to Palestine, the teacher of R. Haggai, and quoted as saying (*J. Maas. 3.51a*): "The *haggadot* can be turned this way and that, and we learn nothing (practical) from them (24)".

This dream-sequence paves the way for the two "death-stories" which conclude QR 9.10: the deaths of R. Nahum and Rabbi. These are both relatively "foundational" authorities for rabbinic Judaism: R. Nahum, being a "half-*tanna*" (a fifth generation *tanna*), bridges the gap between the tannaitic and amoraic periods (25); his older contemporary, Rabbi (R. Judah ha-Nasi, T4) was, traditionally, born on the day of Aqiba's death and the final redactor of the *Mishnah* (26).

Is it merely coincidence that our authorities appear in the order that they do? May we not be given, in the very sequence of the sage-anecdotes in QR 1.10, a coded prescription for reading Torah: "digest *haggadah* before *halakah* but only as an entree to it"; and "revere the founding fathers of Torah-study; look back to the quarry whence you were hewn".

(3) *Function: Paranesis, Apology and Humour.*

(a). *Stern: sage-stories in general.* Stern (27) ~~underscores~~ Green's point about the essentially non-biographical nature of "biographical" sage-tales. He agrees, he says, with the scholarly majority who read them as ideological statements rather than as historiographical or hagiographical documents: they are paranetic, included to encourage the faithful to imitate their sages. Yet he balks at defining the precise perspective to be used in approaching the narratives: are the sages, for instance, to be understood as socio-political (28) or as religio-psychological types? (29) This question can trigger our enquiry into the dream-stories' function in QR 9.10.

(b). We suggest that they are both *paranetic*, and *apologetic*. They present the sages under review in *religio-psychological* terms. The sages are being shown as model combatants in the religio-psychological struggles which the rabbinic life entails. Almost to a man, they tackle their self-appointed tasks wholeheartedly - in accordance, that is, with Qoh. 9. 10, the very verse in connection with which they are cited. Thus R. Assi and R. Simeon b. Laqish both fast vigorously before their visions of R. Hiyya. R. Haggai, again, responds to his challenge - to carry R. Huna's corpse into its tomb, next to R. Hiyya - with no half-measure. He resists the initial criticism (about his motives), requires himself to be bound (as a token of his serious intent?) and - perhaps as a reward for his single-mindedness - is privy to a three-way conversation between R. Hiyya, his son and R. Huna

which has its own moral. Finally, on exit from the grave, he is rewarded by a lengthening of life. Bar Kappara's response to Rabbi's death (not in a dream context) is also singularly wholehearted (he defies the townsmen's death-threats, and initiates the mourning for Rabbi by his own declaration and example). Similarly, the citizens' devotion to Rabbi's funeral procession and, finally, Kazra's, wins them their reward (an extension of the Sabbath-eve). The implied message to the rabbinic reader throughout is: "respond devotedly to the calls upon your faith, especially in relation to your mentors. Answer their demands unstintingly."

The stories appear also to recommend more generally: "*do not be afraid of dreams; be prepared to learn from them*". This *apologetic* role may be in part a response to *anti-dream* attitudes expressed elsewhere in Hebrew literature, not least in Qoh. itself (5.2, 5.6): and Zec. 10.2; compare also Ben Sira 34.1-5 and certain Talmudic items. (30) If our suggestion has any substance, our midrashist would be agreeing with an alternative school of Hebrew thought which *did* regard dreams as significant. Such would be apparent in the detailed dream of Mordecai in the Greek supplement to Esther; and Josephus' account of two dreams (of Archelaus, the son of Herod, and of Glaphyra, Archelaus' sister-in-law: *JA* 17.13.3). Josephus cites these because they are salient to his purpose: they concern royalty, and (in Archelaus' case) symbolically confirm the immortality of the soul and the operation of providence. Philo's *Quod a Deo mittantur somnia* also suggests that dreams, especially those of Jacob, may be basically symbolic, requiring interpretation: Zeitlin compares the dream-stories which circulated about Julius Caesar and the night before his death (31).

The Talmud also hints at the acceptability and relevance of dreams as a medium of divine communication. According to *B. Ber.* 55b, there were twenty-four professional dream interpreters in Jerusalem (i.e. during the

tannaitic period), and *J. Ber.* (ibid.) tells us that the dream-reading of three *tannaim* - R. Ishmael b. Jose, R. Jose b. Halafta and R. Aqiba - were particularly reliable (32). The same Talmudic passage states that later rabbis took dreams to be ominous - for good if pleasant, for ill if unpleasant, and cites an apotropaic evening prayer meant to avert bad dreams (33).

Indeed, Jerome's commenting on Is. 65.4, reminds us that some people went as far as to spend the night in graves, communing with the dead, in order to inspire good dreams. He refers to those "who sit in tombs and spend the night in secret places" as being, in fact, those who "sit or dwell in sepulchres and sleep in shrines....that they may learn the future by way of dreams, as the heathens do in certain temples, even down to this day" (34). May not the curious tale about R. Haggai's determination to enter R. Hiyya's grave with R. Huna's corpse - and to stay there - be reminiscent of this practice, and even be slyly intended to encourage it?

Our understanding of the midrashist's view must also be set against the broader testimony of midrash. It coheres with what we find elsewhere in QR: e.g. on 1.1., in reference to Solomon's dream at Gibeon (I Kgs. 3.5). R. Isaac said: (p.63b [Heb.] <sup>line 25:</sup> ) יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיְיָ אֱלֹהֵי הַכּוֹכָבִים, and demonstrated the reliability of the king's dream. We may, however, contrast it with other remarks in Midrash Rabbah which play down the relevance of dreams as being, for example, a non-Jewish mode of receiving the Holy One's will: see *Lev. R.* 1.13, where R. Jose and "the rabbis" each state that God appears to the "heathen nations of the world" only at night; the rabbis add, in their explication of the  $\zeta \omega \beta$  illustrating this point, "to the prophets of Israel, however, He appeared by day, as it is said...." And in *Lev. R.* 1. 14 we learn that Moses, the Israelite prophet *par excellence* could (when, apparently, wide-awake) see prophetic visions clearly through just one

polished *specularium*, according to R. Judah, whereas lesser prophets needed nine *specularia* or "the ministry of angels" - and hence received only blurred visions or similitudes of God. The implication is that Moses beheld God's similitude directly, with no media intervening.

(c) We also suggest that the dreams have a *humorous* function: they are intended to amuse - perhaps, partly, as light relief for an audience of varied intellectual and educational attainments: comparably, Hirshman suggests (35) that the phenomenon of multiple  $\delta's\psi's$  in QR may mirror (e.g. in reference to 1. 14) the variety of audiences, typically, different "guild" audiences, synagogues being sometimes arranged around guilds (36) for whom Qohelet was expounded. *Hirshman* also stresses the audience-variety facing midrashists in Hellenistic Palestine: "intelligent academicians....or unlearned craftsmen, petty tradesmen or vendors in market places, who formed the bulk of the population of the oriental towns or....the simple-minded, unsophisticated peasants of the small settlements" (37), and compare the remarks of Macmullen (38), who mentions John Chrysostom's complaints about audience's ignorance of scripture and inattentiveness: the prolix rhetoric of his pulpit style made for this (39). Amusing stories would have helped to sustain the wandering thoughts of the great unwashed; Hirshman can wryly comment (40): "The Rabbis were clearly bent on amusing their reader-listener with a good tale and its fine exegetical flourish".

### 3. *The Fashioning of a Sage-Tradition: The character of Rabbi (QR 9.10.1) in relation to the "Antoninus Questions"*

#### (1) *Rabbi's Holiness and Antoninus*

The tradition seems to have regarded Rabbi as holy primarily because he refused to avoid contact with the Romans, served the needy and generally epitomised the worthy sage (*M. Ab.* 6.8). Thus he was revered as a great

student (*M. Ket* 104a), humble (*M. Sot* - 9.15), self-disciplined, self-confident, possessed of good judgement (*M. Ket* 103b). Of particular interest are his conversations with Antoninus, which form the subject of many *haggadic* stories. One of these encounters is indicated in *QR* 9. 10: a specific example of Rabbi's holiness, which can, we suggest, be best understood with wider reference to the "Antoninus questions" corpus.

*Wallach on the Antoninus questions.* Wallach, who has examined the corpus in detail (41) detects Stoic influence behind a good many of them: typically, those in *J. Meg.* 72b, *M. Sanh.* 91a,b and *B. 'Ab Zar.* 10a (42). Enquiring into the source of such questions, he finds it in one prior to (yet consonant with) Marcus Aurelius *Contemplationes*. This source was, he reckons, shared by Seneca (43) and is to be identified with Poseidonius of Apameia (Syrian, fl. c. 135-150 CE).

These Stoic-type questions, put by Antoninus to Rabbi, are far from being generically unique. They are, stresses Wallach, typical of Hellenistic literary biography; he cites the example of Alexander the Great tackling the Indian sage Calanos (44). They have certain distinctive features. First, they largely consist of ἀπορίαι - commonplaces which relate to metaphysics, biology and eschatology. Secondly, they are fictitious questions, asked by Antoninus in an effort to win a dialectical victory over Rabbi - platforms on which the sage can demonstrate the superiority of Jewish wisdom (45). Thirdly, they are thoroughly interrogative: the tradition has transmitted them as questions through framing them with interrogative particles (46).

The question then arises whether *QR* 9.10's reference to Antoninus / Rabbi was, in fact, originally constructed as another "Antoninus question". That is, was Antoninus' instruction to Rabbi originally posed interrogatively, and then transmuted into an imperative? We might here

extend Wallach's concept of a two-stage development in the questions-tradition. Stage 1 was perhaps the preservation of a question: part of a (fictitious) dialectical disputation, with Antoninus manoeuvring for victory. Stage 2 would see Antoninus finally captive to Jewish wisdom and seeking to appropriate it, even to become a proselyte. Might not QR 9.10 exemplify a *third* stage: Antoninus' "testing of the water" with his rabbi, his discovery (as a proselyte) of the limits of master-pupil protocol? He has, after all, been already circumcised; he speaks (*prima facie*) from within the Jewish, not the Stoic perspective. Rabbi's reply would then indicate the lesson (sensitivity, delicacy) which Antoninus must learn.

(2) *Rabbi and idolatry*

Another aspect of Rabbi's holiness may be alluded to in the preceding pericope about *R. Nahum's reluctance to look on idolatrous images*, especially those on statues (their faces) and coins. This may be an oblique contrast with the habits of Rabbi: *J. Ab. Zar.* 3.1, 42c expressly tells us that the household of Rabbi's uncle used seals with human faces on them. Perhaps the midrashist is stressing that Rabbi's holiness consisted in other, more fundamental observances than *R. Nahum's*.

(3) *Rabbi's Preference for Outdoor Teaching: R. Hiyya's argument with R. Judah b. Nasi.* It was a bone of contention between *R. Hiyya* and *R. Judah b. Nasi* whether rabbinic teaching of Torah could occur out of doors. *Fraenkel* draws our attention to the two sages' contrasting attitudes: an exemplary tale in *B. Mo'ed Qat.* 16a-b (47) highlights their differences. Rabbi banned open-air teaching (48) to increase general respect for Torah study and for the sages; *R. Hiyya* contradicted Rabbi's ban (and is known elsewhere in Talmud for teaching in public: see especially *B. Bav. Mez.* 85b, which paraphrases the citation to *R. Laqish* about *R. Hiyya* in QR 9.10.1. *R. Laqish* is told: "Torah like his you have not taught". Compare *J. Kil'ayim* 9.32b end,



where R. Laqish is told: "He taught more Torah in Israel than you."). Is it possible that traces of this debate are preserved, albeit faintly, in our first QR text concerning Rabbi's death (49)?<sup>2</sup> We might draw attention to Bar Kappara's squeezing himself, rent garments and all, through a window in order to proclaim, obliquely, Rabbi's death to assembled hearers *within doors* and teach a Scriptural lesson. Bar Kappara may be implicitly shown as championing Rabbi's preferred method: we cannot overlook the local context of his climactic utterance (...~~ל~~...~~ל~~...) - within doors, nor the build-up to his entry: he went... looked ... squeezed himself in (p. 116 a [14b], lines 9-10: ~~ל~~...~~ל~~...~~ל~~...) It is stressed by this tri-verbal crescendo.

Conclusion. Our approach has been chiefly one of generic definition: the dream-stories were found, conveniently, to fall into sub-categories of the sage-tale and, as such, were structurally analysed, with special attention to their paranetic function. A complementary study would be a thematic one: of the sage-dreams in their thematic context (as one phenomenon among several: for example, *miracles* (50), or as a species of *religio-psychological* experience (51)).

#### NOTES

- (1) Green, 1978, p.79 cf. C.W. Votaw, *The Gospels and Contemporary Biographies in the Graeco-Roman World*, Philadelphia, 1970; cited by Green, p.91, n.16.
- (2) 1978, pp.80,91, n.17.
- (3) 1978, pp.81-5.
- (4) Green, 1978, p.80.
- (5) D. Ben Amos, *Narrative Forms in the Haggadah: Structural Analysis*.

University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, 1967, p.163, quoted by Green, 1975, p.92, n.35.

(6) Fischel, 1968; and see above, pp. 139ff

(7) Green, 1975, p.94.

(8) So Green, 1975, p.87.

(9) Green, 1978, p.87.

(10) Green, 1978, p.80.

(11) Green, 1978, p.90.

(12) Stern, 1991, p.243.

(13) For examples and discussion of pronouncement-stories in rabbinic literature see G. Porton: "The Pronouncement Story in Tannaitic Literature: A Review of Bultmann's Theory", *Semeia* 20, 1981, pp.81-99. (Cited by Stern, p. 334, n.9).

(14) The amoraic rabbis more than once spoke of the world to come in terms of a *heavenly academy* with a definite seating plan. In this academy in Aramaic there is talmudic discussion; we discover the depth and *recherché* nature of God's teaching, and His students' seating arrangements: see, principally, *B. Pes;* *B. Baba M.* 85a; *PRK*, 107a, *etc.* There is clearly an echo of this amoraic concern in QR 9.10.2. The spelt-out positioning of the sages may, we suggest, be akin to (if not actually) a *transmissional sorite*, i.e. "a chain of well-known personalities or places" (Fischel, 1973, p.124). A prominent Graeco-Roman model, popularized, e.g. by Quintilian *Institution* 9.3.57, was *Il.* 2. 102ff: "Hephaistos provided to King Zeus, Zeus provided the Argeiphontic Courier [Hermes], Lord Hermes provided the horse-driver Pelops" (Fischel's translation).

*P. Ab.* 1. 1 (cf. *ARN(A)* 1ff., a variant version) offers an early Rabbinic example: "Moses received the Torah from Sinai, and delivered it to Joshua;

and Joshua to the Elders; and the Elders to the Prophets; and the Prophets to the men of the Great Assembly." (Fischel, 1973, p.119). As with the latter, we find in QR 9.10.2, a repeated key phrase, this time the prepositional ( $\text{בְּיָמָיו} [\text{146}] \text{לְמַעַן} \text{לְעַמְּךָ}$ ) ~~לְעַמְּךָ~~. According to Fischel (p.120) the repeated element may be a word or phrase (e.g. noun, verb, adjective; rarely an adverb.) Fischel conveniently classifies the *sorte* and their antecedents.

(15) The brusqueness of his rejection points us in the direction of an intriguing aspect of rabbis' treatment of their protégés: their occasional (sometimes even habitual) dismissiveness and willingness to censure the latter. So Rabbi was renowned on this score - even though he claimed to have learnt more from his pupils than from his colleagues and teachers. (*B. Yev. 9a*, and compare *B. Makk. 10a*). We have some contemptuous remarks of Res Laqish about Rav (*B. Hull. 54a*). R. Tarfon summarised R. Aqiba's teaching that priests who blew *shofars* had to be physically perfect as "groundless teaching....I cannot tolerate it any longer"; he changed his mind, however, later in the discussion, and is attributed with saying "...be happy, O Abraham, ....that Aqiba went forth from your loins...." (*Siphre* on Numbers 375. 70): see Urbach, 1975, pp.620-30.

(16) We might also compare the "Characters" of Theophrastus - the pupil, collaborator and successor of Aristotle, (c. 370 - 288-5 BCE). This work is a collection of thirty philosophical descriptions of deviant behaviour; they characterise an entire class of person. Unlike these, the anti-sage story highlights an adverse quality in a single sage, and depicts it artistically rather than analysing it philosophically.

(17) Stern, 1991, p.243, and see G. Cohen, "The Story of Hannah and the Seven Sons in Hebrew Literature", in *Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume* (New York, 1953), Hebrew section, pp.109-122, etc. (Cited by Stern, p.334 n.10).

- (18) For general discussion of example-stories' form, see especially A. Goldberg, "Form und Funktion des Ma'aseh in der Mischna", *FJB I*, 1974, pp.1-38. (Cited by Stern, p.334 n.7).
- (19) Strack and Stemberger, 1991, p.103.
- (20) Strack and Stemberger, 1991, p.92.
- (21) Strack and Stemberger, 1991, p.93.
- (22) Strack and Stemberger, 1991, pp.286-87.
- (23) Strack and Stemberger, 1991, pp.37, 94f. (R. Johanan) and p.95 (R. Laqish).
- (24) Strack and Stemberger, 1991, p.99. This Ze'ira is not to be muddled with a late Palestinian *amora* (PA 5) of the same name (Strack and Stemberger, 1991, p.106). Note that L. Bank, "Rabbi Zeira and Ra. Zeira", *REJ* 38, 1899, 47-63, distinguishes three men of the same name.
- (25) Strack and Stemberger, 1991, p.91.
- (26) Strack and Stemberger, 1991, p.89.
- (27) Stern, 1991, p.242.
- (28) So, for instance, J. Neusner, in "Story and Tradition in Judaism", in *Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah*, Chicago, 1981, pp.307-28. (Cited by Stern, p.334 n.6).
- (29) This is the view of, for example, Jonah Fraenkel, "Hermeneutical Questions in the Study of the Aggadic Story" (Heb.), *Tarbiz* 47, 1977-78, pp.139-72, etc.; cf. H.A. Fischel, "Story and History", in *American Oriental Society Middle West Branch, Semi-Centennial Volume*, ed. D. Sinor, Bloomington, Ind., 1969, pp.59-68. (Both cited by Stern, p.334 n.6).
- (30) For example, *B. Git.* 52a: R. Meir and R. Nathan responded differently to dreams telling them to pacify R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. Nathan went, but Meir did not because dreams were, he thought, of no consequence. The two

negative references to dreams in the Hebrew text of the *Qohelet* are neatly interpreted in QR so as, the present writer suggests, to avoid any clash with the positive view of dreams apparent in its rendering of 9. 10:

1. 5. 2:           כִּי בֵּא הַחֲלוֹם בְּרַב עֲנִין וְהוּל כִּסִּיל בְּרַב דְּבָרִים

By *וּסְאִיקָטוּס* (the transposition of letters or syllables of a word to form other words), the phrase           כִּי בֵּא הַחֲלוֹם           is made to

indicate "all pains": (p.91a, 1.23 [Heb.1]): כָּל הַבְּלִיָּם  
וְיִסְוֵרִין שֶׁבֵּיָא הַקַּב"ה עַל דְּנֹר הַפְּלִגָּה בְּרַב . . .

So the verse is made to bear upon the pains which the Holy One has, from time to time, brought upon the Children of Israel, and not upon dreams as such at all. *וּסְאִיקָטוּס* is merely *one* hermeneutical device, used in rabbinic Jewish dream-interpretation: for this see especially Lieberman (1962), 69ff., esp. 73-77.)

2. 5.6:           כִּי בְּרַב חֲלִימוֹת וְהַבְּלִיָּם וּדְבָרִים הַרְבֵּה

Rabbi is credited with advice on how to avert dreams of ill-omen (cf. *B. Ber.* 55a where R. Hisda says that dreams must be interpreted, for an uninterpreted dream is like a letter unread. An evil dream (i.e. one of bad omen) is better than a good one, because it produces repentance. There is no dismissal of dreams as such). The bulk of this passage (QR 5.2 - 6) is devoted to a discussion on the rabbinically-approved methods of annulling "evil decrees" (received through dreams, *inter alia?*), and a review of Hezekiah's exchange with Isaiah (Is. 38. 1ff).

(31) Suetonius, *De Via Caesarum: Divus Iulius*, 81e; Plutarch, *Caesar*, 63: Zeitlin, 1975-76.

(32) The passage tells us that their interpretations would be fulfilled in accordance with Gen. 41. 13: "As he interpreted for us, so it came to pass."

(33) Cited from *B. Ber.* 55b in *EJ* 6, cols. 209-10.

(34) Cf. also Vergil, *Aen.* 7. 88-90, a reference to one sleeping on the

fleeces of sheep, seeing phantoms, conversing with gods and speaking with Acheron. *Tos. Shab.* 6. is also interesting, speaking of those who sit on brooms at night to dream as courting a heathenish practice.

- (35) Hirshman, 1988; cf. the affirmative remarks of his later article (1991) where he notes, however, the paucity of explicit rabbinic comment about audience-composition.
- (36) *EJ* 15, col. 582.
- (37) Hirshman, 1991, p.161.
- (38) Macmullen, 1989.
- (39) *De Ferendis Reprehens* 3.3 and *passim*: PG 51. 135 etc.
- (40) 1988, p.161.
- (41) Wallach, 1940-41.
- (42) Wallach, 1940-41, p.269.
- (43) Cf. e.g., Seneca *Ep.* 102.21ff.; 65.16ff.; 92.20ff. and 117.13f. which nicely resonate with the four "Antonius questions" posed in *B. Sanh.* 91.a b: Wallach, 1940-41 pp.271ff.
- (44) Wallach, 1940-41, p.261: cf. W.W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, Cambridge, CUP, 1938, p.429.
- (45) Wallach, 1940-41, p.263.
- (46) Wallach, 1940-41, pp.264-5.
- (47) Fraenkel, 1971.
- (48) Cf. Buchler, 1913-14, for a detailed review of this practice in Palestine in the early Christian era, and S. Krauss, "Outdoor Teaching in Talmudic Times", *JJS* 1 (1948-49), pp.82ff.
- (49) QR 9.10.3: Cohen's translation, p.242.
- (50) For a systematic survey of this topic see Guttman, 1947.
- (51) Katz's discovery of "empathy" in rabbinic literature, where he finds its processes implicitly (rather than explicitly) described and validated

(1959) usefully applies the thematic approach to the study of religious psychology in rabbinic literature.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

Having reached the end of this survey, the writer is conscious of some lingering issues in regard both to his method and his conclusions.

One concerns his perhaps excessive stress on the *poetism* of the masoretic text: an isolated analysis of 9. 7-10 says little about the overall place of poetry in the book of Qohelet, and (to be fully appreciated) should be compared with its other identifiable verse-passage (1) and their techniques. Specifically, he has yet to define either the conceptual or the functional relationship between 9. 7-10 and the Enjoyment-Calls in general (2). At the outset of his research he believed that they might be shown originally to have constituted a strophic drinking-song (3) (with each Call stressing a distinct aspect of the subject), either created or appropriated by Qohelet and later fragmented in the redactional process (4). Practical constraints directed his attention to just one of the putative fragments; but his initial hypothesis remains suggestive, and (maybe) a springboard for further poetic analysis of the MT Call-texts (5).

Second, the writer is now inclined to be diffident about the inclusion of comparative material relating to MT 9. 7-10. In view of the oft-repeated caveats (6) against "parallelomania", we are bound to doubt MT's notional dependence (direct or indirect) on the literature cited, and hence the latter's relevance except as a source of orientation to the Calls and their content: by its resonances we are patently reminded that the enjoyment-theme and its inherent motifs are not unique to Biblical wisdom literature (7).

Third, we might have extended our definitional task *vis-a-vis* MT 9. 7-10 to TQ's oracular reading of those verses: how does it relate to the other



targumic Enjoyment-Calls and their co-textual modifications of MT? We could, for example, begin our enquiry by simply observing that, if we turn to TQ's enjoyment-references, we find significant (?) variants where there is virtual repetition in the MT. Thus:

3. 12 MT:.....nothing good...save to rejoice  
 TQ:.....nothing good...save to rejoice in the joy of Torah.
3. 13 MT:.....that everyone should enjoy himself, in all his labour.  
 TQ:.....that everyone should enjoy himself in all his days...
3. 22 MT:.....man should rejoice in his work...  
 TQ:.....man should rejoice in his good deeds...
5. 17 MT:.....it is fitting to ... enjoy himself in his labours here.  
 TQ:.....what is comely ... that they enjoy themselves in all  
 their labour which they labour in this world...
5. 18 MT:.....everyone to whom God gave ... the power to rejoice in  
 his labour.  
 TQ:.....everyone to whom God gave ... the power to rejoice in  
 his labour with the righteous.
8. 15 MT:.....nothing good for a man ... except to rejoice.  
 TQ:.....a man does not have good in this world ... except to  
 rejoice in his labour and his portion...

We suggest that each time TQ may be making a separate point, in a connected organic argument concerning this-worldly and other-worldly work:

1. 3. 12 Torah - and good deeds - are of primary benefit to humanity.
2. 3. 13 The divine bounty includes the capacity for enjoyment and ongoing toil (i.e. toil which is bequeathable as a "going concern") - that is, for coping with the work-world.
3. 3. 22 Man should relish his charitable work as an entrée to the hereafter.

4. 5. 17 A Toranic life (obedience to its precepts and compassion) will facilitate enjoyment of work - i.e. mundane work, this-worldly tasks.
5. 5. 18 The gifts of God include the power to enjoy the reward of one's portion in the next world, and one's work with the righteous.

This crude precis evokes the kind of query which might advance our generic investigation: could the reiterated "consumption" disclaimer, **וְעָבַדְתָּ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים** etc., be functioning as a kind of targumic **שֵׁנִי** - a lapidary statement which, for pedagogical purposes (i.e. as *aides memoires*) summarises and concentrates TQ's work-ethic (8)?

Fourth, we should, perhaps, have elucidated both TQ's rendition and QR's multi-generic deployment of MT 9. 7-10 by judiciously continuing our "comparative midrash" project into the arenas of (a) patristic (9) and (b) medieval rabbinic exegesis.

#### NOTES

- (1) For examples, see Loretz, 1993.
- (2) See p. 7 above.
- (3) Cf. Loretz's characterisation (1993) of Qoh. 9. 7-10.
- (4) This idea stems from that of a "dislocations" theory: see Barton, 1908. Certain (19) scholars explained Qohelet in terms of a theory of dislocations: the original consistent, logical and progressive arrangement of his material had been disturbed in some way. Bickell exemplifies this approach. His elaborate hypothesis starts from the assumption that Qohelet's text was written on fascicles. The binding string broke and they fell out, before being incompetently reassembled by an unqualified person.

From this textual *melee* our current MSS. of Qohelet have come. Bickell believed he could restore the original order of the archetype. It is notable that Bickell would *juxtapose* 9. 7-10 and 11. 7-10, thus, seemingly, stressing the contrast between the reader's *task* (present enjoyment and his destiny (darkness / judgement)).

Bickell's dislocation theory is, again, ingenious but conjectural. It remains untestable. Indeed, historical evidence tends to undermine it. Bickell is among those scholars (see Barton, p.22) who believes that Qohelet was composed around 100 BCE (against the current consensus of mid- third century BCE). Leaving the issue of date aside, we observe that the scroll form (of papyrus or leather) was still, in 100 BCE, very much in the ascendant as a medium for literary work. The codex, comprising parchment or papyrus leaves (Bickell's fascicles?) bound together in book form, was not invented until the first century CE (cf. Wurthwein, 1980, p.9). Bickell's theory, therefore, probably falls at the very first hurdle: the soundness of his initial premise. Even if codices, or at least loose-leaf arrangements of parchment pages, were not unknown earlier, perhaps from about 200 BCE, the likelihood is that Qohelet would have been written on a scroll.

(5) For an exemplary structural analysis of one other Call, 5. 17-19, see Fredericks, 1989: he detects there both chiastic and parallel structures, and suggests his approach will complement "exhaustive" exegeses.

(6) Cf. Sandmel, 1962: also Charlesworth, 1985, II, p.486: "If it is important in dealing with any question of literary comparison to distinguish between parallels and influence, it is doubly important when treating material from the realm of wisdom and folklore. Folk themes, figures of speech, and entire proverbs migrate across geographical or cultural boundaries which are often possible to trace or document. Parallels, even quite close ones ..... may indicate nothing whatever about the direct

knowledge of one document by the author of another. In every case, the burden of proof is on the one who would claim to see signs of literary influence."

- (7) Cf. Clines, 1989, p.ix.
- (8) See Gerhardsson, 1961, pp.141, etc.
- (9) Hirshman's 1989 article is a good starting-point: a convenient resumé of key Fathers' exegetical styles (e.g. Procopius of Gaza's vis-a-vis Q's haggadic exposition.

**APPENDICES**

## APPENDICES

1(a) A Textual Crux in Qoh. 9. 9

ה'י : *ketibh*; ה'ו) : *qere*.

1(b) Text-Critical and Grammatical Analysis of Qohelet 2.24 (MT)

2 The Semantic coloration of ה'בל in Qohelet's Call-passages.

3 ח'ש' : A Case of semantic ambiguity

4 ח'ש' : Why is ח'ש' anarthrous?

5 The Text (in Hebrew, with Cohen's translation) of QR 9. 7-10

## Appendix 1(a)

*A Textual Crux in Qoh. 9. 9*

כִּי יִיָּדָע : *ketibh*; כִּי יִיָּדָע : *qere*.

Although the *qere* is notionally the preferable reading (i) is the *qere* necessarily superior to the *ketibh* in Qoh. 9. 9c? There are no additional witness citations by BHS (or BHK) to lend support to either side; we must therefore consider some internal evidence.

1. The *ketibh* may refer to the woman of v. 9a, with whom Qohelet's addressee is enjoined to cohabit;
2. The *qere* alludes, more appropriately, to the entire enjoyment procedure summarised in v. 9a-b: it is doing duty for the neuter pronoun (as reflected in  $\alpha\lambda\theta\iota\sigma$  of the LXX). *Prima facie*, therefore the *qere* is preferable.
3. But the *ketibh* may also be read as neuter, with a general reference. Examples in the Hebrew Bible at large of כִּי יִיָּדָע and / or כִּי יִיָּדָע (as well as כִּי יִיָּדָע and / or כִּי יִיָּדָע) in neuter guise appear at Jud. 14. 4; Pss. 118. 23; Jb. 9. 22; Provs. 18. 13; and, in Qohelet itself at 3. 13; 5. 8 and 5. 18. Thus in 5. 8 כִּי יִיָּדָע is *ketibh* again demoted to the apparatus by BHS. The text is obscure, especially the last three words, but renderings such as Murphy's ("an advantage for a country in every way is this: a king for the tilled land"), represents the *ketibh* as neuter. So, too, at 3. 13 כִּי יִיָּדָע adverts to the total pleasure-package gifted by God (compare in 2. 24: see  $\delta\epsilon\lambda\omega$ ). Likewise, in 5. 18, the concluding כִּי יִיָּדָע encapsulates the totality of the divine gift denoted by the list;  $\text{עֲשֶׂה לְךָ בְּעֵינַי וְלֹא יִשָּׂא לְךָ אֶת־עֲוֹנוֹתֶיךָ}$ . We therefore infer that at 9. 9c כִּי יִיָּדָע may also be retained - as a neuter.

## Appendix 1(b)

*Text-Critical and Grammatical Analysis of Qohelet 2.24 (MT)*

1.  $\text{בְּפָנָיו}$  Pc. S. A few Masoretic MSS. and the Peshitta read this. Text-critical principles demand that the burden of proof is on the rejector of the MT to prove its inadequacy - to examine every possible interpretation of the vexed reading before jettisoning it, on grounds of linguistic or substantive-faultiness, or another text's superiority.

The critic must first, however, examine the traditional text, weighing the external evidence (i.e. the MSS. and versions); the old tag is to be observed: "*manuscripta ponderantur, non numerantur*" (2). Accordingly "pc [MSS]" is a "vague, quantitative indication" (3): can we define the MSS and their quality? "pc" (=pauci) means "3-10 codices manuscripti" (BHS p.xlvii), drawn from a masoretic MSS. pool (over-whelmingly medieval) established by the successive variant-collations of Kennicott, de Rossi and Ginsburg (4). Goshen-Gottstein's preliminary comparison of these with pre-Masoretic MSS. (i.e. pre - 150 CE) suggested that they were, firstly, uniform reflections of a "central current" tradition (established circa 100 CE) - no MS "weighing" significantly more than another - (5) and, secondly, owed their textual variants overwhelmingly to scribal error (e.g. harmonization) rather than to non-Masoretic traditions (6).  $\text{בְּפָנָיו}$  may typify such an error: that is, the harmonization of Qoh. 2. 24 to 8. 15.

On the other hand, the Peshitta, whose textual history is complex (7), may reflect the LXX's influence (8): its support for  $\text{בְּפָנָיו}$  agrees with the variant LXX text preserved by codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus; the two witnesses, S and G are therefore effectively one at this point. What significance lies in this? Not, it would seem, a great deal: the LXX's text is not necessarily an older witness than the MT (9), and (even if it were)



not necessarily a better witness, for its underlying Hebrew text may be a popular recension for Diaspora Jews, that of the MT a more scholarly one (10).

Will the MT stand, then, on its own merits? To answer this question we must examine internal probabilities: linguistic and contextual factors. Linguistically,  $\text{לֹא}$  can yield an acceptable reading, either if its constituent phrase  $\text{לֹא יִשְׁׁרָא}$  is rendered "It is not in a man's power" (11), with  $\text{לֹא}$  being understood collectively (12); or if the relevant phrase is read interrogatively. Contextually, both readings fit fairly snugly with the Deuteronomic stress, both in this unit and elsewhere in the Calls (13), on humanity's reliance on God for enjoyment. They do, however, assume a conservative solution to the second text-critical problem in Qoh. 2. 24: should the comparative  $\text{לִּ$  prefix  $\text{וְ}$ ? To this we now turn.

2. 24]  $\text{וְ}$  S.T. Most modern commentators (14) prefix the first verbal phrase of v.24 with a comparative  $\text{לִּ$ , on the basis of comparable statements in 3. 12, 22 and 8. 15. Evaluating once more the external evidence, we find this variant attested not only by the Peshitta and Targum, but also Codex Ephraemi of the LXX, and the Old Latin Version. Again: do they preserve the authentic text or a facilitative reading, designed to assimilate the text to 3. 22?

$\text{וְ}$  minus  $\text{לִּ$  may indeed be the *lectio difficilior*: we must therefore consider internal evidence. By analogy with 3.22, commentators favouring  $\text{לִּ$ 's inclusion commonly attribute its absence to haplography, the scribe's eye having omitted the second of two consecutive  $\text{לִּ$ 's: so Murphy, Crenshaw and, earlier, Barton (15). Others envisage the omission not of  $\text{לִּ$ , but another, excluding particle (16). But  $\text{לִּ$  could equally be a product of editorial insertion, as with certain other small words (17) -

perhaps either to support an easier reading, in itself possible, which softens the stress on incapacity; or to make a smooth text (18). The present writer therefore provisionally opts to read לְיָדָיו without the comparative אֲדָ, and (consequently) to retain the preceding phrase's problematic אֲדָ אֲדָ

3. 2.24 אֲדָ-אֲדָ אֲדָ, found 58 times in Qohelet (19) performs a variety of functions: emphasis, contrast, addition may all be signalled by this particle (20). Schoors suggests it has additive force here, following many modern commentators (e.g. Barton, Crenshaw, Murphy); Gordis' translation ("indeed" - 1968, p.152) renders it emphatically. Perhaps its nuance is best described as "developmental", which combines the additive-emphatic aspects: it draws on the verse's logic to a new, explicitly theological level. The rendition "What is more" seems to convey this (21).

4. אֲדָ אֲדָ: The question confronting the interpreter here concerns the relationship between the presence of personal pronoun and the tense or aspect of אֲדָ (1 sing. qal, pf.).

(1) אֲדָ, the regular first person personal pronoun in Qohelet (cf. 1. 12, 16 (2); 2. 1, 11, 12; 5. 17; 8. 15), in place of אֲדָ (22), is commonly used by him with the simple pf. (e.g. 1. 16, 2. 1, 5. 17), as noted, for example, by Fredericks (23).

אֲדָ is in these cases, regularly posterior to the verb. Whereas אֲדָ in anterior position is conventionally recognized as emphatic (so GKC #35b, 135a) it has been suggested that Qohelet's post-verbal use of it is pleonastic (24). Fredericks, refining earlier work (such as S.R. Driver's and T. Muraoka's), challenged this assumption by relating the issue to the

question of Qohelet's tense-usage (25).

(2) Fredericks notes the ambiguity of the perfect or suffix conjugation in Qohelet (26): do we render it as *perfective* or *preterite*? The translations indicate the problem: e.g. (2. 24): Barton offers "I saw", Lys. "I noticed", but Hertzberg, "I have seen" (so also Gordis). And for  $\text{וַיְהִי}$  in 8. 15, Barton has "I praised" (so also Gordis, Crenshaw, Murphy), Hertzberg, "I have praised", and Lys, "I praise". As Fredericks laconically observes, "it would be a great advantage if somehow this ambiguity were reduced." (27).

Fredericks in fact reduces it by hypothesising that Qohelet added  $\text{וַיְהִי}$  to the conjugated pf. "when (he) wished to describe an act or thought as *simple past*" (28), in reference to the particular quest under consideration (such as pleasure): so, e.g. in 1. 16; 2. 1,11-15; 17...24; he is stressing the *specificity* of his analysis. But where posterior  $\text{וַיְהִי}$  is absent (e.g. 3. 12, 14, 22), the tense (aspect) remains in doubt: we may keep our options open. Tentatively accepting Fredericks' distinction, we take  $\text{וַיְהִי}$  to signal Qohelet's theological validation of his  $\text{וַיְהִי}$  advice in v.24a: such activity is divinely given.

5.  $\text{וַיְהִי}$  ...  $\text{וַיְהִי}$  The substance of Qohelet's theological inference. The role of  $\text{וַיְהִי}$  is slightly puzzling. Is it a *nominalizing* particle, i.e. does it simply head the object clause, as is normal after verbs of cognition or perception: compare 2 Sam. 11. 26; Gen. 3. 11, etc. (29)? Or is it not rather *emphatic*, as Schoors conjectures, comparing Gen. 1. 4; which he would render "God saw light: it was really good". The resulting parataxis would be nicely Hebraic. Emphatic  $\text{וַיְהִי}$  at 2. 24 would highlight the divine underwriting of Qohelet's prescription; it is, therefore, an attractive option, which we tentatively accept (30), rendering: "And this I saw: this situation really is from God's hand".

6.  $\aleph \text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  }  $\aleph \text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  Mlt *MSs*, Edd.

The *external* evidence for the variant  $\aleph \text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  reposes in many masoretic codices (31) and editions of the Hebrew text (following the text-variant collections of Kennicott, de Rossi and Ginsburg). This being hardly decisive, we must turn to consider *internal* criteria, which (in this case) basically concern "transcriptional probabilities". The feminine vocalization of the *demonstrative* pronoun  $\text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  is presumably related to the feminine form of the *personal* pronoun. Given this, we can appreciate how the variation arose: the original text lacked vowel signs, *matres lectionis* - to Dahood (32) an indication of its Phoenician orthography; the resulting ambiguity, in an unvocalized text, between  $\text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  (m), and  $\text{'} \text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  (f), each of which recurs in Qohelet, would in turn make for scribal ambivalence over the gender of the *personal* pronoun. The latter ambiguity would be heightened by the pre-Masoretic orthography of the personal pronoun, whether this was originally  $\aleph \text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  for both gender forms (as e.g., Dahood thinks, again analogizing with Phoenician orthography), or whether  $\text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  and  $\text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  were used to differentiate them: their close similarity would render them easily confused in transmission. Accordingly, our pronoun would have been transmitted in both its masculine and feminine guise.

Functionally,  $\aleph \text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  (or  $\aleph \text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$ ) appears to render the neuter, in reference to the "pleasure package" summarised in 2. 24a. This is one of the pronoun's attested functions, in both its gender forms (33). Consequently, the transmissional difference just discussed bears little on the semantics of v. 24; either  $\aleph \text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  or  $\aleph \text{ } \text{'} \text{ } \aleph$  is acceptable.

## Appendix 2

*The Semantic coloration of לָבַד in Qohelet's Call-passages.*

In the Hebrew Bible לָבַד is a polyvalent word, perhaps of onomatopoeic origin, which occasionally preserves a figurative-concrete sense of breath, vapour, mist, smoke (e.g. Is. 30. 7; Provs. 21. 6). But in BH generally it regularly collocates with lexemes in the field of "vanity" or "emptiness" (e.g. קָרָן, "empty": Is. 30. 7; אֵין, "nothingness": Is. 49. 4; שָׁרָר, "deceit": Zec. 10. 2; Provs. 31. 30; אֵין וְאֵין, "falsity": both Zec. 10. 2). This shows it to be primarily an *abstract* evaluation, an expression of worthlessness or "vanity" (34).

In Qohelet (which records 38 of its 73 Biblical instances), it is said (35) to be, predominantly, a "critico-polemic" term, connoting "null, vain, unproductive": it stands in radical antithesis to אֵין אֵין and its semantic field. Thus it devalues, especially in the rash of compound phrases in Chapter 2, the wisdom-project (see 2. 1, 15, 19, 21, 23, 26; 4. 16): אֵין אֵין acts as a destructive judgement; a defamation of the wisdom ideal of life.

Granted this, may we differentiate לָבַד in Qohelet's usage, from its kindred lexemes? M. Fox argues (*contra* proponents of a basically non-polemical definition - "mysterious", "incomprehensible" (36)) that it means "absurd": to too Michel (37). But they disagree on the nuance. For Fox אֵין indicates, in its multiple contexts, the "manifestly irrational or meaningless (38)"; Michel regards it as "meaningless", but with reference to the world's unknowability, its opacity: "for Qohelet the human will to know runs up against a will that does not let itself be seen through" (39). Thus he also (with, e.g., Pennacchini, Murphy) (40) virtually equates it with "incomprehensible". While we prefer this, if only because Fox's attribution

to Qohelet of the semantic categories "rational / irrational" seems anachronistic, we *appreciate* the rendering "absurd" since this seems to reflect the direct, code-word flavour of **הבל**. For Qohelet it is an elastic term, universally applied: to human behaviour (particularly toil and its products: 2. 11, 19, 21, 23, 26 etc.); to pleasure: 2. 1; 6. 9; to wisdom: see references above; to speech: 6. 11; 5. 6; to times of life, creatures' careers: 3. 19; 6. 12; 7. 15; 9. 9; 11. 10; to death: 11. 8; to divine justice: 8. 10. 14; to everything: 1. 2; 12. 8.

**רע / רע** (41) is a phrase unique to Qohelet, nearly always (42) supplementing a **הבל** - judgement. Both its etymology and import concern the exegete of Qohelet. Does <sup>רע</sup>**רע** (43) stem from **רע** (4) "pasture, tend, graze" (44), or from **רע** (5) "take pleasure in, desire" (45)? The derivation is uncertain (46): both roots have been championed. In favour of the latter are the LXX's **ἡ προσήκουσιν**

, "choice / will", and certain BH precedents (47) including, possibly, Hos. 12. 2, where **רע** (48) (paralleling **רד**) may mean "to strive for, pursue" - a sense extended by some modern commentators to Qohelet's **רע** (48).

The pasturing / grazing image may, however, be no less appropriate - either in Qohelet, or, indeed, at Hos. 12. 2 (49): it is preferred by Symmachus (50) and some moderns (51).

Whether **רע** is rendered in terms of **רע** (4) or **רע** (5), we must ascertain the phrase's implication. It has commonly been regarded (52) as a metaphor for futile, self-delusive behaviour. But Fox plausibly assigns **רע** a *subjective* force: it persistently signifies, in its manifold applications, not so much the *object's* (wind's) elusiveness (and so the project's utter futility), as the *experient's* (pursuer's / shepherd's) state of mind-vexation (53). This attractive explication approximates to certain versional renderings: e.g. TQ (**רע**) and the Vulgate (afflictio *spiritus*) (54), derived (apparently)

from Aramaic  $\text{רעץ}$ , "crush, shatter" (55).

*Conclusion.*  $\text{רעץ הנה$  demonstrably complements  $\text{הכבד}$ . It would seem to be a vivid metaphor, however derived and interpreted, perhaps with a subjective emphasis, which balances the objective connotation of  $\text{הכבד}$ . Their collocation is appropriate, emotive, and may, therefore, be regarded as constituting a "depth-charged" formula (56).

### Appendix 3

#### $\text{הנה$ : A case of semantic ambiguity.

A comparison of Fox's treatment of  $\text{הנה}$  with BDB's illustrates the term's ambiguity. The nuances of this verbal noun, common in Qohelet, are elusive.

1. BDB (57) define it generally as "joy" (e.g. of heart), "gladness", "mirth" (e.g. in festivity: Provs. 14. 16, etc.): but also as personal, subjective "gaiety" or "pleasure" - and this is the sense they find in Qoh. 2. 1, 10; 8. 15; 9. 7. BDB also note its corporate dimension, as religious or cultic joy, especially in Ps. (e.g. 45. 16) and Chron. As for the <sup>riches</sup> verb's nuances, BDB (58) offer "rejoice" for commonplace contexts, with an object (Qoh. 3. 11) or without (Qoh. 3. 12 etc.), distinct from the triumphalist "exult", "gloat" or *pious* rejoicing (59) - senses which they also identify.

2. M. Fox, however (60), although agreeing that it has a wide semantic range, from "deep joy" (Is. 30.29; Ps. 21. 7 etc.) to mere "merrymaking" (as in Esth. 9. 17 or 1 Sam. 18. 6) believes that, in Qohelet it *never necessarily* implies subjective "happiness". In support of his claim, he points out that the propositions linked with  $\text{הנה}$  do not accord with its rendition as happiness". So at 2. 1-2, where Qohelet reflects on his

testing of  $\text{ש}$ , and finds it to be  $\text{לב}$ , "happiness" cannot readily be thus described. In Qohelet, Fox argues, rather means either the "feeling-tone" or *sensation of pleasure* or *object of pleasure*, a pleasure-generator, such as wine or music. Stressing the ambiguity of Qohelet's usage, he finds the first, subjective sense, at 2. 10a, 26; 5. 19; 9. 7 and 10. 19, and the second, objective sense, at (e.g.) 2. 1, 2, 10b. Fox expectedly links the verb,  $\text{שש}$ , with pleasure-performance - e.g. at 11. 9, rendering its *qal* imperative as "do pleasurable things".

3. Locating nominal and verbal  $\text{שש}$  within its *BH semantic field*, we gain a clearer idea of its niche in the "pleasure" / "rejoicing" spectrum. From AF and BDB we find it to collocate regularly with lexemes connoting the latter:

(1)  $\text{שש}$  glossed as "rejoice" by both lexica, in Psalmic references to rejoicing in Yahweh and his blessings (with a human or non-human subject), several times (in the *qal*) parallels  $\text{שש}$ , as it does *outside* the Psalms: for example, in an Isaianic summons to rejoice in Jerusalem (Is. 66. 10).

(2)  $\text{שש}$ , like  $\text{שש}$  a predominant Psalmic term, glossed by BDB as "give a ringing cry", and by AF as "rejoice", also pairs (in the *piel*) with  $\text{שש}$  in Psalmic contexts (6. 7-5 etc.).

(3)  $\text{שש}$ , a term of exaltation in Yahweh (again, largely Psalmic), also corresponds to  $\text{שש}$  (Ps. 5. 12, etc.), as does the more negative  $\text{שש}$ , used of gloating over Israel's foes and the wicked: see, e.g., Jer. 50. 11.

(4)  $\text{שש}$  partners the rare  $\text{שש}$ , "cry shrilly" (BDB), "rejoice" (AF), in Esth. 8. 15, in the context of Susa's rejoicing.

But the same cannot be said of  $\text{שש}$  *vis-a-vis* the regular BH "pleasure" terms. In fact Qohelet is a subdued user of these: for example  $\text{שש}$  (n), glossed "delight, pleasure" by BDB, occurs only seven times in the Hebrew Bible at large; but Qohelet only once uses verbal  $\text{שש}$ , found some 80 times in



BH .

*Conclusion.* These findings may be suggestive for our exegesis of Qohelet. BH's linkage of  $\text{נחש}$  with joy forces us to question Fox's attribution to the author of a restricted concept of the term. We would retain "pleasure" in our rendering of the Calls, *with* not assuming it to apply in Fox's limited sense.

#### Appendix 4

##### $\text{נחש}$ : *Why is $\text{נחש}$ anarthrous?*

Is Qohelet referring to his addressee's wife? Not necessarily. Various scholars have highlighted his periodic omission of the article in cases where conventional BH requires it. M. Dahood analysed this sin of omission under four heads (61).

1. Qohelet's failure to apply the article to nouns prefaced by an object-marker (e.g. 3. 15; 4. 4; 7. 7; 9. 1);
2. His occasional failure to use it with an adjective that modifies a noun (e.g. 6. 8 ) .
3. His fluctuating use of it with nouns that occur in sequence. One noun in the sequence often has the article, while another may not (e.g. 2. 8; 3. 17; 4. 4; 4. 9-12;
4. Demonstrative  $\text{ה}$  is found 26 times and its feminine form six times (61a). Never do we find the article with either form. Although possibly symptomatic of Phoenician (62) or Aramaic influence (as Gordis suggests (63)) it is not outside the pale of BH usage: it reflects an inconsistency found elsewhere in the language, and, increasingly, in MH (64). Anarthrous  $\text{ה}$

in 9. 9 may exemplify this phenomenon, requiring to be read as if it were determined - as if Qohelet specifically meant "wife".

The woman (or wife) here figures in a pleasure-list, formulated (according to Lohfink), from a male perspective: sweet wine, good food, clean laundry and hair oil are primarily manly pleasures. Qohelet here indicates his masculine cultural context. Yet *אִשָּׁה* is by no means an innately negative term in BH; when its nuances are less than favourable, it tends (in Biblical Hebrew) to be qualified. Thus we find *אִשָּׁה זָנָיָה* ("adulteress": Provs. 30. 20); *אִשָּׁה זְנוּנִים*

("whore", "wife of prostitution" [JB]: Hos. 1. 2); *אִשָּׁה זְנוּנָה*

("harlot": Jos. 2. 1, etc.); *אִשָּׁה נְכָרִית*

("foreign women": 1 Ki. 11. 1; Ezr. 10. 2 etc.); *אִשָּׁה לֵץ* ("evil women":

Provs. 6. 24). And it may be that Qohelet is here echoing the *laudatory* view of woman found in *Genesis and Proverbs*. Qohelet's presentation of as both part of his addressee's a divine *gift* - *and beloved* (note how the imperative is controlled by the two parallel relative clauses before being further explicated by the summative 9. 9) amounts to a recommendation of male-female partnership, reminiscent of Gen. 2. 18, 22-24. Eve is a complement for Adam; this "complementarity" notion may be implicit in Qohelet's prescription - just as other Genesis motifs may lie behind certain of his claims: about nature (1. 5-8, *vis-a-vis* Gen. 8. 21f.); humanity (from clay: 3. 20; 12. 7 *vis-a-vis* Gen. 2. 7; 3. 19); humanity's evil (7. 20; 8. 11; 7.29; *vis-a-vis* Gen. 2. 9, 16f.; 3. 14f. [the fall]; and especially 6. 1ff.) (65). Possibly Qohelet is reinforcing his homely illustration of the folly of toil in solitude, in 4. 11 (one of a batch of examples in vv. 9-12, topped off by what may be a traditional proverb, in v. 12b) (66). There, however, he is not necessarily referring to the solidarity of a married

couple, but simply offering "a practical instance of how two people can combine for the purpose of warmth" (67): compare 1 Ki. 1. 1-2.

Also implicit in Qohelet's advice may be *Proverbs*' fulsome praise of wifely integrity (31. 10ff.). Qohelet may be commending to his trainee the *ideal* woman there painted. Notable is ~~the~~ non-attribution to her of intellectual activities. The achievements which it lauds are those pertaining to housewifely efficiency and economic productivity: her industry, sagacious management, compassion, confidentiality. She is the idealized counterpart of the cerebral sage.

But in tension with 9. 9 is Qohelet's sharper reflection in 7. 26-28. 7. 26 seems to be a replaying of a traditional *topos* elaborated elsewhere in wisdom literature: Provs. 22. 16-19; 5. 1-4; 7. 3-27 etc. Perhaps by way of illustrating a point already made in vv. 23-25, Qohelet warns against *adulteresses* (God ordains mens' proclivities for her: errant ones are caught; those whom he approves escape her wiles) rather than issuing a blanket condemnation of women. This reading assumes, however, that  $\text{לְשׂוֹאֵת}$  is functioning *relatively*. We can render it *explicatively*, "because, for", and translate: "I found more bitter than death - woman: for her heart ..." (68). "Woman" generally would then be his target. If this were correct, then 9. 9 would be ironic - an undercutting of his *positive* advice in vv. 7-8, perhaps (for woman's company would hardly be pleasurable), or a specification of the "vanity" (or "absurdity") of human life - part of the package which, as a whole is  $\text{לְבַד}$ .

Against this view is, however, v. 28:

אִישׁ עוֹד־בְּקוּשָׁה נִפְשִׁי וְלֹא חָצֵאתִי אָדָם אֶחָד חַיֵּלָה  
חָצֵאתִי וְאִשָּׁה בְּכָל-הָלָה לֹא חָצֵאתִי

Some commentators have found in this verse a misogynistic jibe: Qohelet discovered one good man but no good woman, <sup>אִישׁ</sup> relating back to  $\text{חֲשֹׁבֵן}$  which immediately precedes it. However,  $\text{אִישׁ}$  may in fact refer forward to the

opening phrase of v.28:  $\text{הַאֲנָשִׁים הַזֵּאתִי}$ , and introduce the definition of his discovery, intimated in v.27 - namely, the untruth of a conventional (?) *dictum* (itself misogynistic) which differentiated between men and women in an unspecified respect (69). The advantage of this "minority" (70) reading is twofold: it accommodates the somewhat elliptical grammar of vv.27-28;  $\text{הַאֲנָשִׁים}$  etc. becomes a quotation, reminiscent of Provs. 20. 6, (cf. 31. 10), of the unproven aphorism. Further, it coheres with v.29's moral judgement that all - i.e. men and women - (equally) - are basically sinful seekers out of

$\text{תְּשׁוּבָה וְיִשְׁרָאֵל}$ , devices despite being created  $\text{יְשׁוּבָה וְיִשְׁרָאֵל}$ , "pious, righteous".

*Conclusion.* If the 7. 26 is a specific quip against adulterous (or otherwise immoral) women, 9. 9 may be a complementary, although tacit, approbation of the model woman - the addressee's suitable partner.

#### NOTES to APPENDICES 1 - 4

- (1) For a simple demonstration of the *qere's* general superiority, see Schoors, 1982:  $\text{הַאֲנָשִׁים}$  pass. part.  $\text{הַאֲנָשִׁים}$ , has gerundival force. GKC #17a.
- (2) Würthwein, 1980, p.114.
- (3) de Waard, 1979, p.513.
- (4) Würthwein, 1980, pp.38-39.
- (5) Goshen-Gottstein, 1967, p.288.
- (6) Goshen-Gottstein, 1967, p.275.
- (7) Würthwein, 1980, pp.80ff.
- (8) Cf. Würthwein, 1980, p.81: the Peshitta's frequent agreement with the LXX is said to be explicable by the latter's intrusion into the Peshitta text.

- (9) For uncertainty over the dating of individual books of the LXX, see H. Redpath, "A Contribution towards Settling the Dates of the Translation of Various Books of the Septuagint", JTS 7 (1906), pp.606-15.
- (10) See, e.g., H.S. Nyberg's study of the text of Hosea: *EAW* 52, 1934, p.254.
- (11) So de Waard, 1979, p.519; Schoors, 1992, p.197.
- (12) See, e.g., Whybray, 1989, p.38, on 1. 3.
- (13) See, e.g., de Waard's text-criticism of 2. 25.
- (14) E.g., Murphy, 1992, p.24; cf. RSV.
- (15) Weingreen, 1982, pp.60, 62, offers examples of scribal haplography.
- (16) E.g. Ibn Ezra, on the analogy of a Talmudic idiom  
= "it is unnecessary": Gordis, 1968, p.225.
- (17)  $\text{נ} \cdot \text{כ}$ , etc.: Würthwein, 1980, p.109.
- (18) Cf. Metzger, 1992, p.210.
- (19) Schoors, 1992, p.129.
- (20) Ibid.
- (21) Ibid., citing C.J. Labuschagne, "The Emphasising particle *gam* and its Connotations", in *Studia Biblica et Semitica* T.C. Vriezen, Wageningen, 1966, pp.193-203.
- (22) Schoors, 1992, p.47.
- (23) Fredericks, 1988, p.63.
- (24) Barton, 1908, pp.53,99.
- (25) Fredericks, 1988, pp.63ff.
- (26) Fredericks, 1988, pp.65ff.
- (27) Ibid.
- (28) Fredericks, 1988, p.69.
- (29) Schoors, 1981, p.254.
- (30) Cf. *ibid.*

- (31) Schoors, 1988, p.277, says more than 100; *BHS*, more than twenty.
- (32) Dahood, 1952
- (33) Cf. *BDB*, p.216b; *and above*, p.17s'.
- (34) As noted, e.g., by *TDOT* p.317 (drawing attention to the lament and polemical [Deuteronomistic] contexts), and Ogden, 1987, pp.17ff.
- (35) *TDOT*, p.319.
- (36) E.g. Staples, 1943, pp.96ff., who argues that  $\text{לְבַב}$  outside Qohelet was originally laden with the idea of cult mystery, thus connoting something esoteric, unknowable: Fox rejects Staples' reasoning as wholly ill-founded.
- (37) D. Michel, *Untersuchungen zur Eigenart des Buches Qohelet (mit einem Anhang von R.G. Lehmann, Bibliographie zu Qohelet)*. *BZAW* 183, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989, p.44.
- (38) Fox, 1989, p.34.
- (39) Michel, 1989; p.43.
- (40) B. Pennacchini, *ED* 30 (1977), pp.491-510, esp. p.496; Murphy, 1992, p.lxi.
- (41) Occurring at 1. 14; 2. 11, 17, 26; 6. 9. Only at 1. 17 and 4. 6 does it not collocate with  $\text{לְבַב}$
- (42)  $\text{רַעֲיוֹן רָחֵם}$  is apparently synonymous with  $\text{רַעֲיוֹן רָחֵם}$ , which in our discussion refers to both: cf. Fox, 1989.
- (43) *BDB*, p.944b.
- (44) *BDB*, p.946b.
- (45) So, cf. Fox, 1989
- (46) So Fox: Murphy, 1992, p.11, on 1. 14 would render "occupation with".
- (47) *Ezr.* 5. 17; 7. 18; *Ps.* 37. 3; *Provs.* 15. 14.
- (48) So Fox, Murphy.
- (49) So Crenshaw, 1988, p.73; Whybray, 1989, p.50.

- (50) Symmachus' rendering is *βασίλισσιν*, quoted by Jerome CCHSL 72, pp.259-60.
- (51) E.g. Crenshaw.
- (52) So, e.g. by Whybray, 1989, p.50; Murphy, 1992, p.13, on 1.14.
- (53) Fox, 1989.
- (54) Found at 1. 14, 17; 2. 17; 4. 16. Alternatives occur at 2. 11; 1. 26; 4. 4 and 6. 9: Fox, 1989.
- (55) BDB p.1113a.
- (56) See *above*, pp. 28ff.
- (57) p.970b.
- (58) p.970a.
- (59) Cf. Lenowitz, 1987.
- (60) 1989, pp.64-5.
- (61) Schoors, 1992, pp.164ff., citing Dahood, 1952, pp.127-201.
- (62) Cf. Dahood, 1952.
- (63) Cf. Gordis, 1968, p.60.
- (64) Thus, for example, the articles's absence before demonstratives and after an object-marker introducing collective nouns *is* preceded in BH: Cf. GKC # 117c.
- (65) Forman, 1960.
- (66) Murphy, 1992, *ad loc.*, p.42.
- (67) *Ibid.*
- (68) Whybray, 1989, p.125.
- (69) Cf. Whybray, 1989, p.126.
- (70) *Ibid.* Cf. Murphy, 1992, pp.74, 75.

מדריש קהלת ט רבתי

נשבעתי לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב לאמר וגו'. האבות לא אשר אלא  
 לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב אמר למה צא ואמר להו שבעה טעמים דרבי  
 להם קיומיהם שנאמר (ע) לורידך אתנגה. ורשעים קריים טעיה דרבי  
 (ויחזיקו) אם אהפוך במות הבת וזי דמת מת אלא אלו הרשעים שאפי'  
 כהיהו קריים טעים. אל ברוך שלומי מדיש ונשקן על ראשו. גם  
 אהבם שהיה לעז' שלהם יותר מן הקב"ה. גם שנאמם שישואין  
 לדקב"ה כמעשה יורהם. גם קנאמם שקנאוהו בעז' שלהם שנא' (וימסגו)  
 יקניאוהו בורים. והלך אין להם עוד לעולם אבל ישראל יש להם חלק  
 ושכר טוב שנא' לך אכול בשמחה להפוך:

סדרא תליתאה

- (א) אכול בשמחה להפוך. א"ר הונא ברבי דר אהא בשעה  
 שהתינוקת נמריין מבית רבן ב"ק יוצאת ואמרת להם לך  
 אכול בשמחה להפוך נתקבל הכל פיכם לפני כהן ביה נידוה. ובשעה  
 שישראל נמריין מבתי בנותיה ומבתי מדרשות ב"ק יוצאת ואמרת לך  
 אכול בשמחה להפוך וזו פרשת חלה. ושתה כלב טוב יינך זו פרשת  
 אכול בשמחה להפוך זו פרשת חלה. ושתה כלב טוב יינך זו פרשת  
 נסכים. כי כבר רצה האלהים את מעשיך זו הכנסת ישראל לארץ שני'  
 (נחמי טו) כי תבוא אל ארץ: (כ) ר' עוריה בש"ר יהודה בר כספון פתח  
 קרייה באברהם אבינו כשא"ל הקב"ה (נחמי טו) קח נא את כהני  
 יהודך ביום הראשון לא ראה כלום ולא בשני. ביום השלישי את  
 בו (ע) וירא את המקום מרוחק. מה ראה. ביום השלישי את  
 אמר דומה שוה הדד שא"ל הקב"ה להעלות את יצחק בני עלי. אל יצחק  
 בני רואה אהה מה שאני רואה. אל חן. אל מה אהה רואה. אל ענן  
 בשור על ההר. אמר הארי ואין אהם רואים כלום וההסור אינו רואה כלום  
 (ע) שבו לכם פה עם החמור עם דומין להמור. או חוה נטל את יצחק  
 והעלהו לדאש הר אחד נבזה ותלול נבנה וסדר מערבה ועקרו עליו  
 ונטל המאכלת לשוחמו. ואילולא שכא מלאך וא"ל (ע) אל השלח ידך  
 אל הנער כבר שהמו. ובשכא אל אבו אמרה לו היכן היית בני. אל  
 20 טלני אכא והעלני הדים והירדני בענית והעלני להר אחד ובנה מוכה  
 סדר מערבה ועקרי עלי ונטל מאכלת לשוחמו ואינו לא בא מלאך אהר  
 מן השמים וא"ל אברהם אברהם אל השלח ידך אל הנער כבר הייתי  
 שרוש. כיון ששמעה שרה אהו כך צווחה ולא הנפיקה לנפטר את הדבר  
 עד שיצתה לשמרה דרביי (נחמי טו) ויבא אברהם לספור לשרה ולבנותיה.  
 25 מוכין בא סדר המורה נה. ר' יהודה בר' כספון אמר היה אברהם  
 סתרתי

מתנתו כהנה  
 מלמד טל ואמר חסמי מי: לאברהם מי: למתע טעם חיי וקיימים עמיו ובני ט  
 כהמי יליף ליה מדחמי ונמינו מן יודיע מן ליה ט: לך אכול בשמחה: עם דומיה לרבי:  
 מין זה כפי טו וטקלה דכא מן: כו: נבערה. פלוקי גיטא קטום ועין כפי ט  
 כ

מדריש קהלת ט רבתי

- סדרה כלבו ואומר האמר שמא פסלות היה כבני ולא נתקבל יצתה ב"ק  
 ואמרה לו אברהם אברהם לך אכול בשמחה להפוך וגו' כי כבר רצה  
 האלהים את מעשיך רצה האלהים את קרבך: (ג) מונא דשאב ור'  
 ירושע אהבתי בשר' לוי פהר קרייה בר'ה וביה"כ. משל מדינה  
 שהיתה הייתה לופסין לטלך שלח המלך נבאי שמינון לבנותה. ברותק ה' סילין  
 סילין יצא: גדולי המדינה וקלסוהו והחרי להם שלישי. ברותק ה' סילין  
 ונשמו וטף וקלסוהו וקלסוהו והחרי להם שלישי. כשקרב יצאו לקראת אנשים  
 ולהלך הוא חושבנא. קר ער"ה גדולי הדור מתעניין הקב"ה מתיר להם  
 שלישי מענותיהם שנאמר (נחמי טו) כי עמך הפליחה לפען תורא. א"ר 10  
 אחא מר"ה סליחה מתקנת לך. למען תורא שתה יראתך על ברוחך.  
 ואתן רימים שכין ר"ה ליה"כ הוחידים מתעניין והקב"ה מתיר להם עוד  
 שלישי מענותיהם. וביה"כ מתעניין בילן והקב"ה מתיר להם עוד שלישי  
 מענותיהם עד שמתעניין אנשים ונשים וטף מולא להם הקב"ה את הכל.  
 ואומר מה דאול אול מן הכא ולהלן הוא הושבנא. יצתה ב"ק ואמרת 15  
 להם לך אכול בשמחה להפוך כבר נשמעה הפלגתם: (ד) אבא חתנה  
 הבריא נכנס לעירו ערב שבת עם השיחה והכיליה מונתה לו על בתפי  
 ומצא מוכה שהין אחד מוכה בפרישת דרביס. אל רבי עשה עמי נדקא  
 והנביט לעיר. אמר אם אני מניח תכילתי מדין: אתפרנס אני וביתי.  
 ואם אני מניח את מוכה שהין אני מתחייב בנפשי. מה עשה המליך יצ"ט 20  
 על יצ"ר והנביט מוכה שהין לעיר. ובה ונטל את הכיליה ונכנס עם  
 הדומיה המה. והיו הכל תמוהין ואומרים הוא האב התנה וסמיה  
 אף הוא הרהר כלבו ואמר תמוה שמה הלמתי את השבת באותה שעה  
 הווחי הקב"ה את החמה דכהיב (נחמי טו) וזרה לכם ראי שמי שמש  
 צדקה וגו'. באותה שעה הדרר כלבו ואמר האמר שלא נתקבל שכרי. 25  
 יצתה ב"ק ואמרה לו לך אכול בשמחה להפוך ושתה ככ טוב יינך כי  
 כבר רצה האלהים את מעשיך נתקבל שכרך: (ה) ר"ה לך אכול בשמחה  
 להפוך מדבר כדניאל איש המדות שנא' (נחמי טו) ועוד אני מדבר בתפלה  
 והאיש כדניאל אשר ראיתי כהוון בתחלה מיעף כיעף טיים וחור וטיים.  
 (ע) ויבן וידבר עמי ר' חגי בש"ר יצחק אמר תניאל איש המדות אמר ידע 30  
 הקב"ה שנשמתי תפילתי ושלח המלאך דבר עמי שנא' ויבן וידבר עמי.  
 ומה דבר עמי אל בתחלה התנוניך יצא דבר אמר לי גורה גורה שיבנה  
 בה"ק' וסמלא שאלתך אמרתי בתחלה התנוניך כי המדות אתה שהיה  
 מתואה לתפלתו. ר' שמואל בר אבניא בש"ר אהא כ"ס כתיב ככאן  
 המדות חסרות. אל דיך בוראך מתחד לך פמליא שלו מתחד לך 35  
 וחרותו

מתנתו כהנה  
 אסיבת אסורים  
 ליה: משל למדינה עמיו זה טקלה דכא מן. אהבתי חמלה מענותי מ"ט. (נחמי טו) ש"ה ט"ו  
 ל: והתיר. מל המדינה: מדרבמי המס. ע' כפי ופי"ט ט' שלם כאל מלית טעם ושלם  
 קרוב לטקלה טקלה ודכו ככלי טכמה. כל מעתי ל"ט ושלם מן כדיתום ומיתום כ"ד  
 ט"פ: זהו למה מן. כמיהת למה טה טכס  
 כל קל למה מן המדינה ט"פ: שלא נתקבל שכרי. יל טמלא לא נתקל משל לחלמי עליו טכס  
 טחמסק



והיחוד מתחדש לך. דכתיב כי מן היום הראשון אשר נחית את לך להבין ולהקנות לפני אלהיך נשמעו דבריך נשמעה הפליך. יצתה ב'ק ואמרה לו דך אבול בשמחה לחפך כבר נשמע תפילתי: (1) ככל עת יהיו בנדיך לבנים ושמן על ראשך אל יחסר. א"ך יוחנן בן זכאי אם בבנים לבנים הכתוב מדבר כמה בנדים לבנים יש להם לעולם ואם בשמנים מוצים הכתוב מדבר כמה שמנים מוצים יש לעולם. הא אינו מדבר אלך במצות ומעט ובתורה. ר' יהודה הנשיא אמר להם לבי ורחצו ונהגו וסבו והחצו יעשה סעודה ויזמן אצלו אורחים אמר להם לבי ורחצו ונהגו וסבו והחצו בנדיכם והרקינו עצמיכם לסעודה ולא קבע להם זמן אימתי יבואו לסעודה והיו הפקדון מטיילין על פניה פלמין של מלך אמרין כלום פלמין של מלך הכר כלום. הפפשין שבתיק לא השניחו ולא הקניו על דבר המלך. והכרה אלו לאלו. והלך הסייד לפידו ויוצד לשימו נח לפחמה כוכב לכת אצורו שפופנו להדיש במעורת המלך כלום יש סעודה שאין בה הפוח הבשרה שלא. פהאום אמר המלך יבוא הכל לסעודה. מהרם. אלו כאו בכורה ולא כאו כניוולם. שמה המלך על הפקדון שיקימו דברו של מלך ולא עוד אלא שבכדו פלמין של מלך. וכעס על הפפשין שלא קיימו את דבר המלך וניוולו פלמין של מלך. אמר המלך אלו שהתקינו עצמן לסעודה יבואו ויאכלו במעורת המלך ואלו שלא התקינו עצמן לסעודה לא יאכלו במעורת המלך. יכול ילכו ויפטרו להם הור המלך לומר לאו אלא יהיו כמשעריים. כך על הרוב שישעיה אומר (שפי ספ) הנה עבדי יאכלו ואחם תרעבו. וזוהאי אמר משום ר'ם אלו מסוכין ואוכלין ושוחין ואילו מסוכין לא אוכלין ולא שוחין לא דומה צערן של זה שהוא עומד לצערן של זה שהוא מיסב. זה שהוא עומד לא אוכל ולא שוחה דומה למשמש. זה שבינותיה בענין אינו כאו בפני מי את מקשתת עצמן. אמרה להן בעלי מלח דוא אם יודמנו לו מעט רוח תכף יבא ונמצא עומד למעלה בראשי לא מושב שיראה אותי בכבודי ולא בניוולי. כך בכל עת יהיו בנדיך לבנים לא העבירות ושמן על ראשך אל יחסר מצות ומעט. תני ושוב יום אחד לפני מיתתך שאלו תלמידיו את ר"א אמרין ליה רבי וכו' אדם יודע אימתי הוא מת שיעשה תשובה. אמר להם לא יוש לבש יושב

היום  
 סתנות כרוונה  
 סתמקס וסתי כמה סתות הקלה החמה כעליו נבוח למח הגיה שמה ומקבל ובסוף לא  
 נמקל: בכל מה יהיו בנדיך לבנים: משללו מלך כ"י ע"ז נמסכה כמח (קנה): כלום  
 מלבי כ"י. ממיה ודכי וחלמי הכל מוכן ומיהו נקבלים פחלים לבנים מקושטים לפני מלך  
 המלך: המרח מוכח ומנכה. למד ולמדו יאמרו הלא ישנו הקולות מצות מערות א"ס  
 לל למי: סייך. לומן סתם מלמח כ"י. סהרדם. פניו המלך אלץ ומכילים חומס  
 כעלו מוכר הם לסעודה כהלך: זולתאי. שם חס: בולדרים. מושל ובעט ומעטו ממל  
 לעל (כ"י): מלח. ממן מולך הספיה כד"ל ידעו המלמים זווה: תני שוב יום אחד כ"י.

היום שמה יסות למת של אהריו ונמצאו כל ימיו בתשובה לך נאמר בכל עת יהיו בנדיך לבנים: (1) ראה היום עם אשה אשר אהבת. א"ר משום ערה קדושה כנה לך אומנות עם התורה. פה מעמא ראה היום ונ"י. למה הוא קורא אותה ערה קדושה שמה היו רבי יומי בן מישולם ור"ש בן מנסיא יהיו משלשין היום שליש התורה שליש לתפלה שליש לפלאכה. ויש אומרים שהיו יענין בתורה בימות ההורף ובמלאכה בימות הקיץ. ר' יצחק בן אהרן היה קורא ל' יהושע ברה דר' סיפי ור' בורקי ערה קדושה. שהיו משלשין שליש לתורה שליש לתפלה שליש למלאכה. תני אבל אביר להנבים לו אשה עד שלשים יום ר' יהודה אומר עד שבערו שלשה תלמים זה אהר זה כנגד ג"פ שבתוב היום היום. כ"א ר' כשיש לו בנים אבל אין לו בנים או שהיו לו בנים קטנים מותר ספני מינוע פריה ורביה ופונתמן. ומעשה שמחה אשתו של ר' מרפון ובשבתם הוגלל אמר לאהותה בתוך האבל הכנס ונגלי את בני אחותך ואע"פ שבשבת לא נהגה בה דרך ארון אלא לאהר ל' יום: תני אבל אמר לילך לבית המשתה עד ל' יום: תני מצות האב חיוב בבנו לפלו ולפדותו וגם ללמד: (1) הור וללמדו ואומנות ולהשיאו: אשה ור' אף להשימו בנתי. לפולו מנין שנא' (נמלתי י) וכן שמונת ימים ימול לכם לזכר. לפדותו מנין שנא' (נמלתי י) וכל בבור אדם ובבניך הפדה. ללמדו תורה מנין שנא' (נמלתי י) ולמדתה אותם מנין. לפדותו אבותיו בנין שנא' (ספ) וברדת בנהי' ליגא אשה מנין שנא' (נמלתי ספ) קחו ששים ורולדיו בנין וסבות וקדו לבנים נשים. להושימו בנתי מנין שנא' (ספ) וברדת כהי'. וכל מי שאין לו אשה שריו בלא טוב בלא עוד בלא שמה' בלא ברכה בלא כפרה: בלא טוב מנין (נמלתי ג) לא טוב היות האדם לבדו. בלא עוד מנין אעשה לו עוד כנניו. בלא שמה מנין (נמלתי ד) ושמהו אהה וביהיך. בלא ברכה מנין (נמלתי ה) דהנית ברכה אל ביתך. בלא כפרה מנין (נמלתי ו) וכפר בערו ובעד ביתו. ריב' ל' אומר אף בלא חיים שנא' ראה היום עם אשה אשר אהבת. בלא שלום שנא' (נמלתי ז) ואהה שלום ובירך שלום. ר' הייא בר נמדא אמר אף אינו אדם ע"ל שנא' אדם אין שניהם כאחד אין קדיין אדם. ויש אומרים אף מפעם בדמות שנא' (ספ) כי בצלם אלהים עשה את האדם: (ח) כל אשר תמצא ידך לעשות בבקר ונ"י. ר' מנחם בשר' בון מסרם הדין קרייה. אם יודע את שאין מעשה וחשבון ודעת וחכמה כשאל אשר אתה הולך שמה כ' אשר תמצא ידך לעשות בכרך עשה. ר' אהר הוה מתחדם למימתי אפי' דר'

סנתות כרוונה  
 גם זה נמסכה כמח סתות הקלה החמה כעליו נבוח למח הגיה שמה ומקבל ובסוף לא  
 לומנות עם הכתוב מה מעט ראה היום ונ"י: אבל אמר כ"י ע"ז ע"ז ואלו מלמח (כ"י):  
 להבנים לו אשה נדם: ד"ז מ ע"ז פריה ורביה. מהר לון לו ננים וסעס פידכמן מוכ  
 על ננים קפיה וע'. כבדק ואלו מלמח: ר' פקטון. כפרק עלו מלמח נדם יוסף הכסן:  
 תני מנות הכס כ"י. ככר קמח דקדושין: וכל מי שאין לו אשה כ"י. כדמות כבדק הכס  
 כ"י יבמחו: כר למח המלח: אם יודע לח כ"י. ל' ל' יקבלו ממך הכסן על מטעך לו  
 ככר כ"י מלך ממן: סתחדם היה עומד ונמלתי ללוח כחמס חת מ"ז ורבי אלכסנדרי



מדרש קהלת ש רבת

יהוהו כחיוהי . אפשר דתה סחסי יתהו . א"ר אשיאו אין בין צדיקים  
 לרשעים אלא דיבור פה בלכד . רשב"ל אמר אין בין צדיקים לבין אלא  
 דיבור פה בלכד . א"ר ועורא דתה שומע קיומפ סמוך אונג כסן הולום :  
 ולמה קורין אותו נחום איש קדש קדשים שלא הכיש צורת מלכע כל  
 ימיסו . א"ר הייא (ויקרא טו) אל תפנו אל האלילים אל תפנו לעובדו . א"ר אל  
 תפנו לראותו ודאי . ולמה קורין אותו רבינו הקדוש שלא הכיש במילתו  
 כל ימיסו . אנמלסום הוה גויר א"ל לרבינו חמי כהנא נוחי . א"ל בשלי  
 לא הסתכלתי מימי ובידך אנא מסתכל : (י) כך דכך ר' בציפורין הוון  
 אמרין צפוראי כל דאהא ואמר דכך ר' אנן קמלין ליה . אול בר קפרא  
 ועלל כבוותא ודייק ליה ווישיה מיכרז ומניה בועינן . אמר רבינו בני  
 ידעיה שמעוני אראלים ומצוקים אהו יך כלותה הכרית כברה יין של  
 אראלים וחטפו את הלוהות . אמרין ליה דכך ר' . אמר לן אהון אמריתון  
 אנא לא אמינא . ולמה לא אמר קדיתיה עד גובתהה מהך שלשה מילין  
 קרעון מניהו עד דהוי קליה דקדיתיה עד גובתהה מהך שלשה מילין  
 נמיס נעשו באותו היום . ערב שבת הוה ואהכנתו לביית שיעוריה להספידא  
 דר' ואשרוניה בתמיני עשרי מישראל לביתו ואהכנתו לביית שיעוריה להספידא  
 יומא עד דמטא כל דרודח מישראל לביתו ואהכנתו לביית שיעוריה להספידא  
 ומלא לו הכית של מים עד שעשה האודון שבתו שקעה ויהמה וקרא  
 שלא תעצל בהספון של ר' מוזמן לחיי העוה"ב בר מן קצרה דהוה חסן  
 ובחבובת דע"ז כולתו עובדי דחסידו : (יא) שבתה וראה חתה השמש כי  
 ולא אתא . כיון דשמע כן פליק לאיגרא ומלק גבתי מן איגרא ונפר ומת .  
 יצתה ב"ק ואמרה אף קצרה פוזמן לחיי העוה"ב (כתיבין בנישין ירושלמי  
 וכתובות דע"ז כולתו עובדי דחסידו) : (יא) שבתה וראה חתה השמש כי  
 לא לקלים המרוץ וני . כי לא לקלים המרוץ זה יעקב אבינו . אתמול  
 (נחמ"ט ט) וישא יעקב תגיו . היום כהרב (ס"ט) וישא יעקב ויגל את האבן  
 ולא לבורים המלחמה זה יעקב . אתמול (ס"ט) וישא יעקב ויגל את האבן  
 א"ר יוהנן בארם שמעביר את הפקק מעל פי הצלוחית . והיום (ס"ט) וישא  
 בני ישראל את יעקב אביהם בנופואפי בנקלקא לא היה יכול להפוע .  
 30 ונס לא דחכמים להם זה יעקב . אתמול (ס"ט) ויבחר יעקב זבח כתר וני  
 ויבאכו

כמו שלא נראה אחריו כחיו : אפשר כי . וכלה היה מה וקף אם לא הוליקו לא ויכל להאוס :  
 אביר דבי לשון כר . בינמולי לא גרם ליה וכן ספון . ר' בנימין וי' שהלוקים כתיבס יס  
 לנס כר לוסוף עד פלמס כמורה ומלח מה חסכ לוסכ מיהו ומנו סלמרו ח"ל יס  
 טמס לחס על הכסעס ומעטס כוסים צערי מלכ מי עשיר וגם דיבור סה ס' כפיים מוכר  
 מן הכסעה ולא כן הכסעס של עד שמוקמין סקסום פוסמס בין ויין לוס סלמרו רק דערב  
 סה וא"כ נתלח סלון כון לזיס מן לזעס מי חלל דערב סה לפד וסלר הדיחות מלבים על  
 מעמס ככרלסוק : כדגרי ליש לקיס גרסוק בינמולי סין דיקוס לנינו : דר' . לומר  
 כממע : אנמלסום גרסוק . ווא חזקוניס וכו סוה בינמולי סין דיקוס לנינו וסכר בני  
 כממע : גזיר כו . סוה מל חס עמלו וסלר ר' כלה מילתי אמר ליה בבלי לא מסתלי מימי  
 וסלר חסכל כממיה : ע"כ זה לעל (ו' י') : שבתה וראה : שמעביר  
 חס הסק . ע"כ כלי ע' : בנקלקא . עניה מענה וקלי גומה וכו נוסוס חס סוקסס  
 31

סתנות כהונה

סתנות כהונה  
 כונו שלם חלה אחריו כחיו : אפשר כי . וכלה היה מה וקף אם לא הוליקו לא ויכל להאוס :  
 אביר דבי לשון כר . בינמולי לא גרם ליה וכן ספון . ר' בנימין וי' שהלוקים כתיבס יס  
 לנס כר לוסוף עד פלמס כמורה ומלח מה חסכ לוסכ מיהו ומנו סלמרו ח"ל יס  
 טמס לחס על הכסעס ומעטס כוסים צערי מלכ מי עשיר וגם דיבור סה ס' כפיים מוכר  
 מן הכסעה ולא כן הכסעס של עד שמוקמין סקסום פוסמס בין ויין לוס סלמרו רק דערב  
 סה וא"כ נתלח סלון כון לזיס מן לזעס מי חלל דערב סה לפד וסלר הדיחות מלבים על  
 מעמס ככרלסוק : כדגרי ליש לקיס גרסוק בינמולי סין דיקוס לנינו : דר' . לומר  
 כממע : אנמלסום גרסוק . ווא חזקוניס וכו סוה בינמולי סין דיקוס לנינו וסכר בני  
 כממע : גזיר כו . סוה מל חס עמלו וסלר ר' כלה מילתי אמר ליה בבלי לא מסתלי מימי  
 וסלר חסכל כממיה : ע"כ זה לעל (ו' י') : שבתה וראה : שמעביר  
 חס הסק . ע"כ כלי ע' : בנקלקא . עניה מענה וקלי גומה וכו נוסוס חס סוקסס  
 31

וואכו לחם . וכו אהוי הוו אח אחד הוה ליה והלואי כבירה והלא בניו  
 היו אלא כשהגיעו לשכמו לשכמו דומה אותן לו וקרא אותן לו אהים . והיום (ס"ט)  
 שובו שברו לנו מעט אובל וני . וגם לא לנביאים עשר זה יעקב (ס"ט)  
 וספרין האישי מאר סאר ר' סמונן בש"ר שמעון מלסן שהיה לו (דונמס)  
 סעון דונמס של עוה"ב המד"א (מס"ט) ענה הפורן לפניס . והיום  
 (נחמ"ט ט) ויכלכל ויכס את אביו וני . וגם לא ליודעים חן זה יעקב .  
 אתמול (ס"ט) ידעתי בני ידעתי יודע אני מעשה יהודה בהמס מעשה  
 ראיבן כבלהה מה אם דברים שלא נתגלו לך נתגלו לי דברים שנתגלו לך  
 עאי"ו . והיום א"ל (ס"ט) אם נא מצאני חן בעיניך וני אל נא תקברני  
 במצרים . ר"א כי לא לקלים המרוץ זה עשהאל שנא' (מ"ט) ועשהאל  
 קל ברנליו כאחד הצביים וני . ומה היה קלותו שרית ר"ן על עמי  
 שיבולאי ואינו שבתהו . אתמו ועשהאל קל ברנליו . והיום (ס"ט) ויכתי  
 אבני איש אחת וני כמון בישראל וני . דא"ר אפי משום מ' ויהנן נוח לו  
 לארס לחיו כותל בניו שש אמת בעובי סמחיו דגלו אחת של אבני .  
 והיום (מ"ט) הכמות נכל יומה אבני . וגם לא לחכמים להם זה שלמה  
 אתמול (מ"ט) ויהי להם שלמה ליום אחד שלישים כר מלת ויששים כר קמח  
 וכתיב עשרה כמך בריאום וני א"ר יוהנן וכן בכל יום ויום וכן כל אשה  
 ואשה עושה לו סעודה כסבורה שהוא סעד אצלה . והיום וזה היה חלקי  
 מכל עמלי א"ר קוריה וא"ר ר' זמיר דאמר קשרתיה . וגם לא לגביתו  
 עשרן זה איוב . אתמו (מ"ט) ויהי סקנתו שבעת אלפי צאן וני ונסקתו  
 פורן באיין א"ר יוסי כר' תנינא פרין גרוי של עולם . בכ"ס מנהגו של  
 עולם זאכיס הורגים את העוים כרם כאיוב העוים הורגים את האוכים .  
 והיום (ס"ט) חנוני תנוני אתם רעי וני . וגם לא ליודעים חן זה יהושע .  
 א"ר אחוה כרית דר' זורא שני דברים דבר יהושע בפני משה ולא נגמל  
 חן בעיני . ואלו חן . אחר במינוי הוקנים . ואחר במעשה העני . במינוי  
 הוקנים דכתיב (נחמ"ט ט) אדני משה כללם א"ל כלם והעבירם מן העולם  
 (ס"ט) ויאמר כך הלואי כל ישראל כיוצא כן (ס"ט) ופי יתן כל עם ה' נביאים  
 בני כיוצא כך הלואי כל ישראל כיוצא כן (ס"ט) ופי יתן כל עם ה' נביאים  
 וני . ואחר בעני שנא' עשתי (שמות נ) וישמע יהושע את קול העם כרעה . א"ל  
 משה יהושע ארם עשתי להנהיג שררה על ס' רבוא איני יודע להבחין  
 בין קול לקול . אין קול ענות נבונה המד"א (ס"ט) וגבר ישראל . ואין  
 קול ענות חלושה המד"א והלאש יהושע . קול ענות אנכי שומע א"ר אפי  
 קול

כנו שלם חלה אחריו כחיו : אפשר כי . וכלה היה מה וקף אם לא הוליקו לא ויכל להאוס :  
 אביר דבי לשון כר . בינמולי לא גרם ליה וכן ספון . ר' בנימין וי' שהלוקים כתיבס יס  
 לנס כר לוסוף עד פלמס כמורה ומלח מה חסכ לוסכ מיהו ומנו סלמרו ח"ל יס  
 טמס לחס על הכסעס ומעטס כוסים צערי מלכ מי עשיר וגם דיבור סה ס' כפיים מוכר  
 מן הכסעה ולא כן הכסעס של עד שמוקמין סקסום פוסמס בין ויין לוס סלמרו רק דערב  
 סה וא"כ נתלח סלון כון לזיס מן לזעס מי חלל דערב סה לפד וסלר הדיחות מלבים על  
 מעמס ככרלסוק : כדגרי ליש לקיס גרסוק בינמולי סין דיקוס לנינו : דר' . לומר  
 כממע : אנמלסום גרסוק . ווא חזקוניס וכו סוה בינמולי סין דיקוס לנינו וסכר בני  
 כממע : גזיר כו . סוה מל חס עמלו וסלר ר' כלה מילתי אמר ליה בבלי לא מסתלי מימי  
 וסלר חסכל כממיה : ע"כ זה לעל (ו' י') : שבתה וראה : שמעביר  
 חס הסק . ע"כ כלי ע' : בנקלקא . עניה מענה וקלי גומה וכו נוסוס חס סוקסס  
 31

סתנות כהונה

סתנות כהונה  
 כונו שלם חלה אחריו כחיו : אפשר כי . וכלה היה מה וקף אם לא הוליקו לא ויכל להאוס :  
 אביר דבי לשון כר . בינמולי לא גרם ליה וכן ספון . ר' בנימין וי' שהלוקים כתיבס יס  
 לנס כר לוסוף עד פלמס כמורה ומלח מה חסכ לוסכ מיהו ומנו סלמרו ח"ל יס  
 טמס לחס על הכסעס ומעטס כוסים צערי מלכ מי עשיר וגם דיבור סה ס' כפיים מוכר  
 מן הכסעה ולא כן הכסעס של עד שמוקמין סקסום פוסמס בין ויין לוס סלמרו רק דערב  
 סה וא"כ נתלח סלון כון לזיס מן לזעס מי חלל דערב סה לפד וסלר הדיחות מלבים על  
 מעמס ככרלסוק : כדגרי ליש לקיס גרסוק בינמולי סין דיקוס לנינו : דר' . לומר  
 כממע : אנמלסום גרסוק . ווא חזקוניס וכו סוה בינמולי סין דיקוס לנינו וסכר בני  
 כממע : גזיר כו . סוה מל חס עמלו וסלר ר' כלה מילתי אמר ליה בבלי לא מסתלי מימי  
 וסלר חסכל כממיה : ע"כ זה לעל (ו' י') : שבתה וראה : שמעביר  
 חס הסק . ע"כ כלי ע' : בנקלקא . עניה מענה וקלי גומה וכו נוסוס חס סוקסס  
 31

I. AS WELL THEIR LOVE (ix, 6), which they had for idolatry more than for the Holy One, blessed be He; AS THEIR HATRED in showing hatred of the Holy One, blessed be He, by the work of their hands; AND THEIR PROVOCATION<sup>1</sup> wherewith they provoked Him with their idolatry, as it is said, *They roused Him to jealousy with strange gods* (Deut. xxxii, 16); NEITHER HAVE THEY A PORTION FOR THE WORLD<sup>2</sup> [to Come], whereas Israel has a portion and a good reward, as it is said, GO THY WAY, EAT THY BREAD WITH JOY (ix, 7).

<sup>1</sup> E.V. 'envy'.    <sup>2</sup> E.V. 'for ever'.

(Ended is the Second Section.)

I. GO THY WAY, EAT THY BREAD WITH JOY. R. Huna b. R. Aha said: When the children leave their school,<sup>2</sup> a *Bath Kol* goes forth and says to them, 'GO THY WAY; EAT THY BREAD WITH JOY, the breath of your mouth has been accepted by Me like the sweet savour [of incense]. Likewise when the Israelites leave the Synagogues and Houses of Study, a *Bath Kol* goes forth and says to them, 'GO THY WAY, EAT THY BREAD WITH JOY, your prayer has been heard before Me [and was] as the sweet savour.'

Another interpretation of GO THY WAY, EAT THY BREAD WITH JOY: this refers to the section of the *hallel*<sup>3</sup>; AND DRINK THY WINE WITH A MERRY HEART: this refers to the section of the drink-offerings<sup>4</sup>; FOR GOD HATH ALREADY ACCEPTED THY WORKS: this refers to the entrance of Israel into the Land, as it is said, *When ye are come into the land of your habitations* (Num. xv, 2).

R. Azariah in the name of R. Judah b. R. Simon interpreted the verse as referring to our father Abraham. When the Holy One, blessed be He, said to him, *Take now thy son, thine only son* (Gen. xxii, 2) [and he went on the journey], on the first day he saw nothing and on the second day he saw nothing. What is written of the third day? *He saw the place afar off* (ib. 4). What did he see? He beheld a cloud lying on the mountain, and said, 'I think this is the mountain upon which the Holy One, blessed be He, has told me to offer my son Isaac.' He said to him, 'Isaac, my son, do you see what I see?' He answered, 'Yes.' 'What do you see?' he asked him, and he replied, 'A cloud lying on the mountain.' He asked Eliezer and Ishmael, his young men,<sup>5</sup> 'Do you see anything?' They answered, 'No.' He said, 'Since you see

<sup>1</sup> V. Introduction.    <sup>2</sup> To go home for their meal.  
<sup>3</sup> Num. xv, 17-21.    <sup>4</sup> *Ib.* 5 ff.    <sup>5</sup> V. Gen. xxii, 3.

out and greeted him; so he forgave them the whole amount, saying to them, 'What has gone has gone; from now onwards will be the reckoning.' Similarly on the eve of the New Year, the eminent men of the generation fast, and the Holy One, blessed be He, remits them a third of their sins, as it is said, *For with Thee there is forgiveness, that Thou mayest be feared* (Ps. cxxx, 4). (R. Aha said: [The meaning is,] From the New Year forgiveness is arranged by Thee, 'That Thou mayest be feared'; that the fear of Thee may be upon Thy creatures.) On the days between the New Year and the Day of Atonement individuals fast, and the Holy One, blessed be He, remits to them another third of their sins. On the Day of Atonement all fast, and the Holy One, blessed be He, remits to them another third of their sins; thus by the time the men, women, and children fast the Holy One, blessed be He, forgives them all their sins and says, 'What has gone has gone; from now onwards will be the reckoning.' A *Bath Kol* goes forth and says to them, 'GO THY WAY, EAT THY BREAD WITH JOY, your prayer has been heard.'

Abba Tahnah the pious was entering his city on the Sabbath-eve at dusk with his bundle slung over his shoulder, when he met a man afflicted with boils lying at the cross-roads. The latter said to him, 'Rabbi, do me an act of charity and carry me into the city.' He remarked, 'If I abandon my bundle, from where shall I and my household support ourselves? But if I abandon this afflicted man I will forfeit my life! What did he do? He allowed the Good Inclination to master the Evil Inclination, and carried the afflicted man into the city. He then returned for his bundle and entered at sunset. Everybody was astonished<sup>1</sup> and exclaimed, 'Is this Abba Tahnah the pious!' He too felt uneasy in his heart and said, 'Do you think that I perhaps desecrated the Sabbath?'

<sup>1</sup> God would punish him for refusing the request.

<sup>2</sup> At seeing this pious man carrying his bundle when the Sabbath was about to begin.

valleys, and took him up a high and lofty mountain. He built an altar, arranged the wood, bound him upon it, and took hold of the knife to slay him; and had not an angel come and told him, *Lay not thy hand upon the lad* (*ib.* 12), he would have slain him. When Isaac returned to his mother, she asked him, 'Where have you been, my son?' He answered her, 'Father took me, led me up mountains and down valleys, took me up a certain mountain, built an altar, arranged the wood, bound me upon it, and took hold of a knife to slay me. If an angel had not come from heaven and said to him, "*Abraham, Abraham, lay not thy hand upon the lad,*" I should have been slain.' On his mother, Sarah, hearing this, she cried out, and before she had time to finish her cry her soul departed, as it is written, *And Abraham came to mourn for Sarah and to weep for her* (*ib.* xxiii, 2). From where did he come? He came from Mount Moriah.

R. Judah b. R. Simon said: Abraham felt some uneasiness in his heart and thought, 'Perhaps there was some disqualification in my son, and for that reason he was not accepted [as an offering].' A *Bath Kol* issued forth and said to him, 'Abraham, Abraham, GO THY WAY, EAT THY BREAD WITH JOY . . . FOR GOD HATH ALREADY ACCEPTED THY WORKS, God hath accepted thy sacrifice.'

R. Mana of Shaab and R. Joshua of Siknin in the name of R. Levi interpreted the verse as referring to the New Year and Day of Atonement. It may be likened to a province which owed arrears of taxes to the king who sent a tax collector to collect it.<sup>1</sup> When he was ten miles away, the eminent men of the province went out and greeted him with praises; so he remitted a third to them. When he was five miles away, those of the middle class went out and

<sup>1</sup> In Lev. R. xxx, 7, it is the king himself who goes to collect it. This is preferable since he, and not his agent, had the power to remit taxes.

thy heart to understand, and to humble thyself before thy God, thy words were heard (ib. x, 12), thy prayer was heard. A Bath Kol went forth and said to him, 'GO THY WAY, EAT THY BREAD WITH JOY . . . FOR GOD HATH ALREADY ACCEPTED THY WORKS, thy prayer has been heard.'

I. LET THY GARMENTS BE ALWAYS WHITE; AND LET THY HEAD LACK NO OIL (ix, 8). R. Johanan b. Zakkai said: If the text speaks of white garments, how many of these have the peoples of the world; and if it speaks of good oil, how much of it do the peoples of the world possess! Behold, it speaks only of precepts, good deeds, and Torah. R. Judah ha-Nasi said: To what may this be likened? To a king who made a banquet to which he invited guests. He said to them, 'Go, wash yourselves, brush up your clothes, anoint yourselves with oil, wash your garments, and prepare yourselves for the banquet,' but he fixed no time when they were to come to it. The wise among them walked about by the entrance of the king's palace, saying, 'Does the king's palace lack anything?' The foolish among them paid no regard or attention to the king's command. They said, 'We will in due course notice when the king's banquet is to take place, because can there be a banquet without labour [to prepare it] and company?' So the plasterer went to his plaster, the potter to his clay, the smith to his charcoal, the washer to his laundry. Suddenly the king ordered, 'Let them all come to the banquet.' They hurried the guests, so that some came in their splendid attire and others came in their dirty garments. The king was pleased with the wise ones who had obeyed his command, and also because they had shown honour to the king's palace.<sup>1</sup> He was angry with the fools who had neglected his command and disgraced his palace. The king said, 'Let those who

<sup>1</sup> That the king must make long preparations for the banquet; consequently we must be ready at any moment to be called in.

<sup>2</sup> By preparing adequately for the banquet.

to shine, as it is written, *But unto you that fear My name shall the sun of righteousness arise* (Mal. iii, 20). He again felt uneasy and said, 'Do you think that my reward has not been received?'<sup>1</sup> A Bath Kol went forth and said to him, 'GO THY WAY, EAT THY BREAD WITH JOY, AND DRINK THY WINE WITH A MERRY HEART, FOR GOD HATH ALREADY ACCEPTED THY WORKS, thy reward has been received.'

Another interpretation of GO THY WAY, EAT THY BREAD WITH JOY: It speaks of Daniel, *The man greatly beloved* (Dan. x, 11), as it is said, *Yea, while I was speaking in prayer, the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly [i.e. flying and again flying]<sup>2</sup> approached close to me about the time of the evening offering. And he made me to understand, and talked with me* (ib. ix, 21 f.). R. Haggai said in the name of R. Isaac: Daniel, 'The man greatly beloved,' said: 'The Holy One, blessed be He, knew that I had finished my prayer<sup>3</sup> so He, sent the angel who spoke with me—as it is stated, "And He understood, and he talked with me"—and what did he talk with me? He told me, *At the beginning of thy supplications a word went forth* (ib. 23)—he told me, "It has been decreed that the Temple shall be rebuilt; and to fulfil thy request I said, 'At the beginning of thy supplications that thou art greatly beloved,' since He longs for thy prayer." ' R. Samuel b. Onia said in the name of R. Aha: Three times in this passage it is written *beloved* [for this reason: Gabriel] said to him, 'Enough for thee that thy Creator holds thee in love, His [angelic] retinue holds thee in love, and His Torah holds thee in

<sup>1</sup> That because God performed this miracle to vindicate me, I will receive no further reward for my benevolent act. M.K. mentions a reading which omits 'not', and this seems preferable.

<sup>2</sup> The Heb. is lit. 'being caused to fly in a flight', the word for 'flying' occurring twice. This is interpreted to mean that he covered the distance in two flights, resting in between. Cf. Ber. 4b.

<sup>3</sup> The Heb. for evening offering (*minhah*) also denotes the early evening (i.e. afternoon) prayer. *And he made me to understand* is interpreted as 'He (God) understood'.

lest he die the day after, and then all his days will be given in repentance. For that reason it is said, **LET THY GARMENTS BE ALWAYS WHITE.**<sup>1</sup>

**I. ENJOY LIFE WITH THE WIFE WHOM THOU LOVEST** (ix, 9). Rabbi [Judah ha-Nasi] said in the name of the holy brotherhood: Acquire a handicraft for yourself together with Torah.<sup>2</sup> What is the reason [for this teaching]? **ENJOY LIFE WITH THE WIFE WHOM THOU LOVEST.** Why does he call them 'the holy brotherhood'? Because it included R. Jose b. Meshullam and R. Simeon b. Menasia who used to divide the day into three parts—a third for Torah, a third for prayer, and a third for work. Others declare that they laboured in the Torah throughout the winter and in their work throughout the summer. R. Isaac b. Eleazar used to call R. Joshua b. R. Timi and R. Borkai 'a holy brotherhood', because they divided the day into three parts—a third for Torah, a third for prayer, and a third for work.

It has been learnt: One who mourns [the death of his wife] is forbidden to remarry until thirty days have elapsed.<sup>3</sup> R. Judah says: Until three Festivals<sup>4</sup> have passed, one after another, corresponding to the three occurrences of the word **LIFE** in this verse. When does this rule apply? If he has children; but if he is childless or if his children are young, he is permitted [to remarry without this interval] so as not to diminish procreation [in the first case] or so that they may be looked after [in the second]. When the wife of R. Tarfon died, after the grave had been filled in, he said to her sister during [the seven days of] mourning, 'Marry me and rear your sister's children.' But although he married her, he did not consummate the marriage until after thirty days.

It has been learnt: A mourner is forbidden to go to a

<sup>1</sup> Shab. 153a.

<sup>2</sup> Kid. 30b (Sonc. ed., p. 148). The thought is the same as in the aphorism:

'Excellent is the study of Torah together with a worldly occupation' (Ab. II, 2). For the Torah symbolised as a woman, v. p. 211.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. M.K. 23a. <sup>4</sup> Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles.

have prepared themselves for the banquet come and eat of the king's meal, but those who have not prepared themselves shall not partake of it.' You might suppose that the latter were simply to depart; but the king continued, 'No, [they are not to depart]; but the former shall recline and eat and drink, while these shall remain standing, be punished, and look on and be grieved.' Similarly in the Hereafter, as Isaiah declares, *Behold, My servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry* (Isa. LXV, 13). Ziwatai said in the name of R. Meir: These will recline and eat and drink, while the others will recline without eating and drinking; because the vexation of him who stands [at a banquet without participating in it] is not the same as of him who reclines [without participating in it]. He who stands without eating and drinking is like an attendant, but he who reclines and does not eat suffers very much more vexation and his face turns green.<sup>1</sup> That is what the prophet says, *Then ye shall sit<sup>2</sup> and discern between the righteous and the wicked* (Mal. III, 18).

Bar Kappara and R. Isaac b. Kappara said: It may be likened to the wife of a royal courier<sup>3</sup> who adorned herself in the presence of her neighbours. They said to her, 'Your husband is away, so for whom do you adorn yourself?' She answered them, 'My husband is a sailor; and if he should chance to have a little spell of [favourable] wind, he will come quickly and be here standing above my head. So is it not better that he should see me in my glory and not in my ugliness?' Similarly, **LET THY GARMENTS BE ALWAYS WHITE** [and unstained] by transgressions; **AND LET THY HEAD LACK NO OIL**: [let it not lack] precepts and good deeds.

It has been taught: Repent one day before your death. R. Eliezer was asked by his disciples, 'Rabbi, does any man know when he will die so that he can repent?' He answered them, 'Should he not all the more repent to-day

<sup>1</sup> With longing.

<sup>2</sup> *Weshabtem* (ye shall return) is read as *wiyshabtem* (ye shall sit). E.V.:

'Then shall ye again discern.'

<sup>3</sup> Who went on missions for his master which took him to foreign lands.

been learnt: It is incumbent on a father to circumcise his son, redeem him,<sup>1</sup> teach him Torah, teach him a handicraft, and take a wife for him. Some add, also to teach him to swim. 'To circumcise him'—how do we know it? As it is said, *And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male throughout your generations* (Gen. xvii, 12). 'To redeem him'—how do we know it? As it is said, *And all the firstborn of man among thy sons shalt thou redeem* (Ex. xiii, 13). 'To teach him Torah'—how do we know it? As it is written, *And ye shall teach them your sons* (Deut. xi, 19). 'To teach him a handicraft'—how do we know it? As it is written, *Therefore choose life* (ib. xxx, 19).<sup>2</sup> 'Take a wife for him'—how do we know it? As it is written, *Take ye wives, and beget sons and daughters; and take wives for your sons, and give your daughters to husbands* (Jer. xxix, 6). 'Also to teach him to swim'—how do we know it? As it is said, 'Therefore choose life.'<sup>3</sup>

A man who has no wife lives without good, help, joy, blessing, and atonement.<sup>4</sup> 'Without good'—how do we know it? *It is not good that the man should be alone* (Gen. ii, 18). 'Help'—how do we know it? *I will make a help meet for him* (ib.). 'Joy'—how do we know it? *And thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy house* (Deut. xiv, 26).<sup>5</sup> 'Blessing'—how do we know it? *To cause a blessing to rest on thy house* (Ezek. xliv, 30). 'Atonement'—how do we know it? *And make atonement for himself and for his house* (Lev. xvi, 6). R. Joshua b. Levi says: He also lives without life, as it is stated, ENJOY LIFE WITH THE WIFE WHOM THOU LOVEST. He lives without peace, as it is stated, *Peace be both unto thee and peace be to thy house* (1 Sam. xxv, 6). R. Hiyya b. Gamda said: He is also an incomplete man, as it is stated, *And blessed them and called their name*

<sup>1</sup> If the son is a firstborn. <sup>2</sup> Life is interpreted here as 'handicraft' as in the beginning of the Midrash to this verse.

<sup>3</sup> The Talmud gives as the reason: his life may depend on it. This passage is quoted from Kid. 29a et seq. (Sonc. ed., pp. 137 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Yeb. 62b (Sonc. ed., p. 418).

<sup>5</sup> House means 'wife'. Cf. Yoma 2a.

*ruam* (Gen. v, 2), i.e. when they were both as one [as the effect of marriage] they were called 'Adam', but when they are not both as one they are not called 'Adam'. Some say that [when unmarried] a man diminishes the Divine Image,<sup>1</sup> as it is stated, *For in the image of God made He man* (ib. ix, 6).

I. WHATSOEVER THY HAND ATTAINETH TO DO BY THY STRENGTH, THAT DO (ix, 10). R. Menahma said in the name of R. Bun: This verse must be revised [for its exposition]: If thou knowest that THERE IS NO WORK, NOR DEVICE, NOR KNOWLEDGE, NOR WISDOM IN THE GRAVE WHITHER THOU GOEST, THEN WHATSOEVER THY HAND ATTAINETH TO DO BY THY STRENGTH, THAT DO [while in this world].

R. Aḥa was longing to behold the face of R. Alexandri.<sup>2</sup> He appeared to him in his dream and showed him two things; one was that nobody had a place nearer to the centre<sup>3</sup> than the slain of Lydda<sup>4</sup> (blessed be He who removed the reproach of Julianus and Pappus),<sup>5</sup> and the other was that happy was he who came here [to the next world] with his learning in his possession.

Zabdi b. Levi was longing to behold the face of R. Joshua b. Levi. He appeared to him in his dream and showed him men whose heads<sup>6</sup> were erect and others whose heads were bent. He asked him, 'Why is it so?' He answered, 'Those whose heads are erect have their learning in their possession, while those whose heads are bent have not their learning in their possession.'

R. Simeon b. Lakish (another version: R. Joshua b. Levi) was longing to see R. Hiyya Rabbah [in a dream]. People told him, 'You are not worthy of this.' 'Why?' he asked, 'did I not study Torah as he did?' They answered, 'You did not teach Torah as he did; and not only that,

<sup>1</sup> By not begetting children.

<sup>2</sup> In heaven. Lit. 'there is no division since the latter was dead.'

<sup>3</sup> Nobody occupied a higher place than they in Paradise.

<sup>4</sup> For their martyrdom, cf. iii, 17.

<sup>5</sup> Lit. 'faces'.



he had to go into exile.<sup>1</sup> He said to them, 'And have I not been in exile!' They answered, 'You went into exile to learn, but he to teach.' He kept three hundred fasts, and then R. Hiyya appeared to him in his dream and told him, 'If one is a nobody [in knowledge of Torah] but conducts himself as though he were somebody,<sup>2</sup> better for him if he had never been created.'

R. Assi fasted thirty days to behold R. Hiyya Rabbah [in a dream] but did not see him. It was told him,<sup>3</sup> 'You are not worthy of this.' He said to them, 'Show him to me and let be what will be.' He then saw the steps [of R. Hiyya's heavenly throne], and his eyesight grew dim. Should you say that R. Assi was not an eminent man, [the following anecdote proves the contrary]. A weaver came before R. Johanan and said, 'I saw in my dream that the heavens fell and one of your disciples supported it with his hand.' He asked, 'Do you know him?' He replied, 'If you make them pass in front of me, I would recognise him.' They passed in front of him, and when he came to R. Assi he exclaimed, 'This is he!'

R. Huna the exilarch said to the Sages, 'When I die, carry me to [the tomb of] R. Hiyya Rabbah.' When he died, they conveyed him to the land of Israel, saying, 'R. Huna is worthy of being brought here by the side of R. Hiyya Rabbah. Who will enter [the tomb] and place his body there?' R. Haggai said, 'I will carry him in.' It was related [of R. Haggai] that he was eighteen years of age,<sup>4</sup> constant in his study, and never experienced seminal emission. They said to him, 'You want a pretext [for entering the tomb] because you are an old man, and if you die there you have no interest in life.' He said

<sup>1</sup> I.e. leave his home for the sake of the Torah, and the hardships he endured earned him merit.

<sup>2</sup> So M.K. 'E.J. renders: He who is somebody (i.e. learned) but keeps his learning to himself (does not teach).

<sup>3</sup> A message came to him from Heaven. He endangered himself if he beheld R. Hiyya.

<sup>4</sup> The text is corrupt, since he is described later as an old man. In M.K. a 5a the reading is: I will carry him in because I completed my study when I was eighteen and never experienced, etc.

to them, 'Do this thing for me. Fetch a cord and bind my legs together. If I come out, well and good; and if not, drag me out by my legs.' This was done to him; and he went in and found [on the tomb] three inscriptions,<sup>1</sup> 'Judah, my son, after thee there is none other.'<sup>2</sup> Hezekiah, my son, after thee there is none other. Joseph, son of [the patriarch] Israel, after thee there is none other.' [R. Haggai] raised his eyes to look around, but he was told, 'Lower your face.' He then heard the voice of R. Hiyya Rabbah saying to his son Judah, 'My son, permit R. Huna the exilarch to occupy [your grave space].' But [R. Huna] declined to occupy [R. Judah's] place. [R. Haggai heard heavenly voices exclaim, 'Since he declined to occupy R. Judah's place], therefore his seed shall never cease.'<sup>3</sup> [R. Haggai] came out from there aged eighty years, and his years were doubled for him.<sup>4</sup>

2. R. Ze'ira was longing to behold R. Jose b. R. Hanina. He appeared to him [in a dream] and R. Ze'ira asked him, 'Next to whom are you seated [in the heavenly Academy]?' He answered, 'Next to R. Johanan.' 'And R. Johanan next to whom?' 'Next to R. Jonathan b. Amram.' 'And R. Jonathan b. Amram next to whom?' 'Next to R. Hiyya Rabbah.' ('And R. Hiyya Rabbah next to whom?' 'Next to R. Johanan [worthy to sit] next to R. Hiyya Rabbah?') He replied, 'In the region of fiery sparks and flaming tongues, who will let the smith's son<sup>5</sup> enter?'

When R. Nahum, the man who was holy of holies, died, the people covered the faces of the statues with mats, saying, 'Let him not see them in his death as he did not look upon them in his lifetime.' But could he look

<sup>1</sup> The word in the original is of uncertain meaning and the text is doubtful. <sup>2</sup> None to equal him for piety. Judah and Hezekiah were the sons of R. Hiyya.

<sup>3</sup> The words in brackets are mainly added from the version in J. Kil. 32a.

<sup>4</sup> As a reward for occupying himself with the burial of R. Huna.

<sup>5</sup> M.K. and 'E.J. think that the bracketed passage should be deleted.

<sup>6</sup> R. Johanan's cognomen was Bar Nappuha, lit. 'the smith's son'. The paragraph is quoted from B.M. 85b (Sonc. ed., p. 491).

upon them [being dead]? R. Ashian said: There is no difference between the righteous and the wicked except the power of speech.<sup>1</sup> R. Simeon b. Lakish said: There is no difference between the righteous [when dead] and ourselves [while we are living] except the power of speech. R. Ze'ira said: The dead person hears the praise spoken of him in his coffin as though in a dream. Why was he called, 'Nahum, the man who was holy of holies'? Because he never looked upon the image on a coin. R. Hiyya said: [It is written,] *Turn ye not unto the idols* (Lev. xix, 4), i.e. do not turn to them for the purpose of worshipping them; but Rabbi [Judah ha-Nasi] said: Do not turn to them even to look at them.

Why was Rabbi called 'our holy Rabbi'? Because he never looked upon his circumcision. Antoninus had himself circumcised, and he once said to Rabbi, 'Examine my circumcision.' He replied, 'I have never looked upon my own, so shall I look upon yours!'

3. When Rabbi was dying in Sepphoris, the men of that town declared, 'Whosoever comes and announces that Rabbi is dead will be put to death by us.' Bar Kappara went, looked through a window, and squeezed himself in, his head being wrapped up and his garments rent, and exclaimed, 'My brethren, sons of Jedayah, hear me, hear me! Angels and mortals have taken hold of the tablets of the covenant. The angels were victorious and have snatched the tablets.' They cried, 'Rabbi is dead!' He said to them, 'It is you who have said it; I have not said it.' Why did he not say it? Because it is written, *He that uttereth a bad report is a fool* (Prov. x, 18). They rent their garments [so violently] that the sound of the tearing reached Gufta three miles away; and the text was applied to him, *The excellency of knowledge is, that wisdom preserveth the life of him that hath it* (Eccl. vii, 12).

R. Nehemiah said in the name of R. Mana: Miracles

<sup>1</sup> After death the faculties survive, except that in the case of the wicked they are deprived of speech. Accordingly R. Nahum would have been able to see the statues.—M.K. and 'E.J. delete R. Ashian's statement.

occurred on that day. It was the eve of the Sabbath, and the inhabitants of all the cities assembled for the mourning over Rabbi. They set his body down in eighteen Synagogues and then conveyed him to Beth Shearim, and the day was extended for them so that each Israelite had time to arrive home, kindle his Sabbath light, roast his fish, and fill his cask with water [before Sabbath]. When the last of them had done this, the sun set and the cock crowed. The people began to cry out, 'Woe, we have desecrated the Sabbath!' A Bath Kol issued forth and declared, 'Whoever did not stint himself in mourning for Rabbi is destined for the life of the World to Come, with the exception of Kaẓra who was there but did not accompany the funeral procession.' On hearing this, the man went up and threw himself from the roof, killing himself by the fall. A Bath Kol went forth and said, 'Also Kaẓra for [what he did on] the roof is destined for the life of the World to Come.'<sup>1</sup>

I. I RETURNED, AND SAW UNDER THE SUN, THAT THE RACE IS NOT TO THE SWIFT, etc. (IX, 11). THAT THE RACE IS NOT TO THE SWIFT: this alludes to the patriarch Jacob. Yesterday, *Jacob lifted up his feet* (Gen. xxix, 1)<sup>2</sup>; to-day it is written, *He gathered up his feet into the bed and expired* (ib. xlix, 33). NOR THE BATTLE TO THE STRONG: this alludes to Jacob. Yesterday, *Jacob went near and rolled the stone from the well's mouth* (ib. xxix, 10). (R. Johanan said: He did it like a man who removes a stopper from the mouth of a flask.) To-day it is written, *And the sons of Israel carried Jacob their father* (ib. xlvi, 5), i.e. [they conveyed him to Egypt] bodily, and he could not be carried even in a litter. NEITHER YET BREAD TO THE WISE: this alludes to Jacob. Yesterday, *Jacob offered a sacrifice in the mountain, and called his brethren to eat bread, and they did eat bread* (ib. xxxi, 54). (Were they, then, his brothers? He had only one brother [Esau] and

<sup>1</sup> Repeated from vii, 12, q.v. for notes.  
<sup>2</sup> Lit. E.V.: 'Jacob went on his journey.'

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alcalay, R. *The Complete Hebrew English Dictionary*. Massada: Ramat-Gan, 1963.
- Alexander, P.S. "The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules for the Delivery of the Targum" in *VTS* 36, 1965.
- Allinson, F.G. *Menander: The Principal Fragments with an English Translation*, (LCL) London: Heinemann, 1921.
- Andersen, F.I. *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, (Janua Linguarum 231). The Hague, 1974.
- Andersen, F.I. and Forbes, A.D. *The Vocabulary of the Old Testament*, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1989.
- Auffret, P. "Essai sur la structure littéraire des Psaumes CXI et CXII", *VT* 30, (1980), pp.257-79.
- Attridge, H.W. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Avishur, Y. *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literature*, (AOAT), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener-Verlag, 1984.
- Barr, J. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (NAWG), Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1979.
- Barton, G.A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes* (ICC), Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1908.
- Barton, J. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986.
- Bloch, R. "Note méthodologique pour l'étude de la littérature rabbinique", *RSR* 43 (1955), pp. 194-227. Translated by W.S. Green. Reprinted in *Theory and Practice*, vol. 1 of *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, edited by W.S. Green, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978, pp. 51-75.

"Midrash", *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément 5*, 1957.

Translated by M.H. Callaway. Reprinted in *Theory and Practice*, vol. 1 of *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, edited by W.S. Green, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978, pp. 29-50.

Brown, F., Driver, S.R. and Briggs, C.A. *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1979.

Buchler, A. "Learning and Teaching in the Open Air in Palestine", *JQR* 4 (1913-14), pp. 485-91.

Burn, A.R. *The Lyric Age of Greece*, London: Arnold, 1960; reprint, 1978.

Caird, G.B. *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*, Third Edition, Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1984.

Castellino, G. "Qohelet and His Wisdom", *CBQ* 30 (1968), pp. 15-28.

Ceresko, A.R. "The Function of *Antanacclasis* (ms' 'to find' //ms' 'to reach, overtake, grasp') in Hebrew Poetry, Especially in the Book of Qoheleth", *CBQ* 44 (1982), pp. 551-69.

Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (vol.1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments; vol. 2: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judaeo-Hellenistic Works)*, Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1985.

Childs, B. *Exodus: A Commentary (OTL)*, London: SCM Press, 1974.

Clements R. "Wisdom", in "It is Written". Scripture Citing Scripture, edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press,

1988, pp.67-83.

(lines, D.J.A. Job 1-20 (WBC)), Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1989.

Cohen, A. (tr.) *Midrash Rabbah*. Translated under the Editorship of Rab. Dr. H. Freedman and M. Simon. *Ecclesiastes*, London: Soncino Press, 1951.

Cohen, N.J. "A Structural Analysis of a Talmudic Story: Joseph-Who-Honours-

- the-Sabbaths", *JQR* 72 (1982), pp. 162-77.
- Cook, J. "New Horizons in Textual Criticism" in *Text and Context: Old Testament and Semitic Studies for F.C. Fensham*, (JSOTS 48), edited by W. Claassen, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. 51-61.
- Corré, A.D. *The Sources of Targum Qohelet*, Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Manchester, 1953.
- Crenshaw, J.L. *Ecclesiastes: A Commentary*, London: SCM Press, 1988.
- Culley, R.C. *Oral Formulaic Language in the Biblical Psalms*, Toronto, 1967.
- Dahood, M. "Canannite-Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth", *Biblica* 33 (1952), pp. 30-42, 191-221.
- Daube, D. "Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis", in Fischel, 1977, pp.165-82, reprinted from *Festschrift H. Lewald*, Basel, (1953), pp.27-44.
- Dell, K.J. "Ecclesiastes as Wisdom: Consulting Early Interpreters", *VT* 44 (1994), pp. 301-29.
- Driver, S.R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (ICC). Third Edition. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1902.
- Edmonds, J.M. (ed. and tr.) *Elegy and Iambus: Being the Remains of All the Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poets from Callinus to Crates, Excepting the Choliambic Writers. With the Anacreonta*: (LCL), London: Heinemann, 1931.
- Fischel, H.A. "Studies in Cynicism and the Ancient Near East: The Transformation of a Chria", in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, edited by J. Neusner, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968, pp. 372-411.
- "The Use of Sorites (Climax, Gradation) in the Tannaitic Period", *HUCA* 44 (1973), pp.119-52.
- Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*, New York: KTAV, 1977.

- Fishbane, M. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Forman, C.C. "Kohleth's Use of Genesis", *JSS* 5 (1960), pp. 256-63.
- Fox, M.V. *Qohelet and His Contradictions*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Fraenkel, J. "Bible Verses Quoted in Tales of the Sages", *SH* 22 (1971), pp. 80-99.
- Fredericks, D.C. *Qohelet's Language: Re-evaluating its Nature and Date* (ANETS 3), Lewiston, New York: Mellen Press, 1988.
- Freedman, H. (tr.) *Midrash Rabbah ... Genesis*, London: Soncino Press, 1951.
- Gerhardsson, B. *Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Translated by Eric Sharpe. Uppsala, Lund: G.W.K. Gleerup, 1958.
- Gevirtz, S. *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1963.
- Ginsburg, C.D. *The Song of Songs and Kohleth*, London, 1961; reprint, New York: KTAV, 1970.
- Ginzberg, H.L. "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogues towards the Apocalyptic Eschatological Writings", *JBL* 41 (1922), pp.115-36.
- The Legends of the Jews*. Seven volumes, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909-38.
- Goldberg, A. "Form-Analysis of Midrashic Literature as a Method of Description", *JJS* 36 (1985), pp. 159-74.
- Gomme, A.W. and Sandbach, F.H. *Menander: A Commentary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Goodenough, E.R. "Greek Garments on Jewish Heroes", in *Biblical Motifs : Origins and Transformations*, edited by A. Altmann, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

- Gordis, R. "The Social Background of Wisdom Literature", *HUCA* 18 (1944), pp.77-118.
- Koheleth: the Man and his World. A Study of Ecclesiastes. Third Edition.*  
New York: Schocken, 1968.
- Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts", *Biblica* 48 (1967), pp. 243-90.
- Gottwald, N.K. *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250-1050 BC*, Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Press, 1979.
- The Hebrew Bible: A Socio-Literary Introduction*,  
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Green, W.S. "What's in a Name? - The Problematic of Rabbinic 'Biography'", in *Theory and Practice* vol.1 of *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, edited by W.S. Green, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978, pp. 77-96.
- Greenfield, J.C. "Lexicographical Notes II: ix. The Root  $\text{מִשַׁח}$ ", *HUCA* 30 (1959), pp. 141-51.
- Guttmann, A. "The Significance of Miracles for Talmudic Judaism", *HUCA* 20 (1947), pp. 363-406.
- Harris, R. "Images of Women in the Gilgamesh Epic", in *Lingering Over Words. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of W.L. Moran* (HSS 37), edited by T. Abusch et al, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990, pp. 219-30.
- Hayward, C.T.R. "The Present State of Research into the Targumic Account of the Sacrifice of Isaac", *JJS* 32-3 (1981-82), pp. 127-50.
- "The Date of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Some Comments", *JJS* 40-1 (1989-90), pp. 7-30.
- Heide, A. van der *The Yemenite Tradition of the Targum of Lamentations: Critical Text and Analysis of the Variant Readings* (SPB 32), Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981.
- Heinemann, J. "Profile of a Midrash", *JAAR* 39 (1971), pp. 141-50.

- "The Nature of Aggadah", in *Midrash and Literature*, edited by G.H. Hartman and S. Budick, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Hengel, M. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Translated from the German by J. Bowden, London: SCM Press, 1974 (2 vols.); 1981 (1 vol.).
- Hirshman, M. "The Greek Fathers and the Aggadah on Ecclesiastes: Formats of Exegesis in Late Antiquity", *HUCA* 59 (1988), pp. 137-65.
- "The Preacher and His Public in Third Century Palestine", *JJS* 42 (1991), pp. 108-14.
- Honeyman, A.M. "Merismus in Biblical Hebrew", *JBL* 71 (1952), pp. 11-18.
- Holladay, W.L. *A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* (Hermonia) vol.1, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Israelstam, J.J. and Slotki, J. (tr.) *Midrash Rabbah ..... Leviticus*, London: Soncino Press, 1951.
- Jarick, J. *Gregory Thaumaturgos' Paraphrase of Ecclesiastes* (SBLSCS 29), Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Jastrow, M. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashim*, New York: Choneb, 1926.
- Jouon, P. "Notes philologiques sur le texte hébreu d'Ecclesiaste", *Biblica* 11 (1930), pp. 419-25.
- Kagan, Z. "Divergent Tendencies and Their Literary Moulding in the Aggadah", *SH* 22 (1971), pp. 151-70.
- Katz "Empathy in Modern Psychotherapy and in the Aggadah", *HUCA* 30 (1959), pp. 191-216.
- Klein, M.L. "The Preposition qdm('before'): a pseudo-anti-anthropomorphism in the Targums", *JTS* (n.s.) 30 (1979), pp. 502-07.
- Knobel, P.S. *Targum Qohelet: A Linguistic and Exegetical Inquiry*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Yale, 1976.



- Krauss, S. "Outdoor Teaching in Talmudic Times", *JJS* vol.1 (1948-49), p. 82.
- Kock, T. (ed.) *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta* vol. 3 *Novae Comoediae Fragmenta. Pars 2: Comicorum Incertae Aetatis Fragmenta. Fragmenta Incertorum Foetarum ...* Leipzig: Teubner, 1888.
- Kugel, J.L. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lambert, W.G. *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Lenowitz, H. "The mock-simha of Psalm 137", in *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry*, edited by Elaine R. Follis (JSOTS 40), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Levine, E. "The Biography of the Aramaic Bible", *ZAW* 94 (1982), pp. 353-79.
- Levy, A. *Das Targum zu Koheleth nach Jüdarabischen Handschriften herausgegeben*, Breslau, 1905.
- Lieberman, S. "Rabbinic Interpretation of Scripture" in Fischel, 1977, pp. 289-324. Reprinted from *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. Second Edition, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962, pp.47-82.
- Loader, J.A. *Ecclesiastes: A Practical Commentary* (TI), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Lohfink, N. "War Kohelet ein Fravenfeind? Ein Versuch, die Logik und den Gegenstand von Koh. 7, 23-8, 1a herauszufinden", *BETL* 51 (1979), pp. 259-87.
- Longman, T. "A Critique of Two Recent Metrical Systems", *Biblica* 63 (1982), pp. 230-54.
- Loretz, O. "Poetry and Prose in the Book of Qohelet (1:1-3:22; 7:23-8:1; 9:6-10; 12: 8-4)", in de Moor and Watson, 1993, pp. 155-89.
- McKane, W. *Proverbs. A New Approach* (OTL), London: SCM, 1970.
- MacMullen, R. "The Preacher's Audience (A.D. 350-400)", *JTS* n.s. 40 (1989), pp.

503-11.

Magne, J. "Répétition de mots et exégèse dans quelques Psaumes et le Pater", *Biblica* 39 (1958), pp. 177-97.

Metzger, B.M. *The Text of the New Testament: its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration*. Third Edition. Revised and enlarged, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Moor J.C. de and Watson, W.G.E. (edd.) *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT), Neukirchen-vluyn: Neukirchener-Verlag, 1993.

Moore, G.F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. 3 vols. Vol.II, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1927-30. Second Edition, 1954.

Murphy, R.E. *Ecclesiastes* (WBC 23A), Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1992.

Neusner, J. *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* (vols. 3 and 4), Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968, 1969.

*The Life-Traditions of R. Yohanan*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970.

*The Mishnah A New Translation*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Noy, D. "The Jewish Versions of the 'Animal Languages' Folktale (AT 670) - A Typological-Structural Study", *SH* 22 (1971), pp. 171-208.

Ogden, G.S. "The 'Better' - Proverb (*Tob-Spruch*), Rhetorical Criticism and Qohelet", *JBL* 96 (1977), pp. 489-505.

"Qoheleth's Use of the 'Nothing is Better'- Form", *JBL* 98 (1979), pp. 339-50.

"Qoheleth ix 1-16", *VT* 32 (1982), pp. 158-69.

"Qoheleth xi 7 - xii 8: Qoheleth's Summons to Enjoyment and Reflection", *VT* 34 (1984), pp. 222-30.

*Qoheleth*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

Porton, G. "Defining Midrash" in vol.1 of *The Study of Ancient Judaism*,

- Porton, G. "Defining Midrash" in vol.1 of *The Study of Ancient Judaism*, edited by J. Neusner, New York: KTAV, 1981, pp. 55-92.
- Propp, V. *The Morphology of the Folktale* Translated from the Russian by L. Scott. Second Edition. Revised and Edited with a Preface by Louis A. Wagner [and a] New Introduction by Alan Dundes (IURCAFL 10), Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968.
- Ranston, H. *Ecclesiastes and the Early Greek Wisdom Literature*, London: Epworth, 1925.
- Reif, S.C. *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Rostovzoeff, M. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Sacks, R. *The Traditional Phrase in Homer: Two Studies in Form, Meaning and Interpretation*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987.
- Safrai, S. "Tales of the Sages in the Palestinian Tradition and the Babylonian Talmud", *SH* 22 (1971), pp. 209-32.
- Samely, A. *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums. A Study of Method*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.
- Sanders, N.K. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1960.
- Sanders, E.P. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*, London: SCM Press, 1990.
- Sandmel S, "Parallelomania", *JBL* 81 (1962), pp. 1-7
- Sasson, J.M. *Ruth: A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and Formalist-Folklorist Interpretation*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Schäfer, P. "Research into Rabbinic Literature: An Attempt to Define the Status Quaestionis", *JJS* 37 (1986), pp. 139-52.
- Schoors, A. "The Particle *ki*", *OTS* 21 (1981), pp. 240-76.
- "Kethibh-Qere in Ecclesiastes", in *Studia Paulo Naster Oblata*,

II: *Orientalia Antiqua* (OLA 13), pp. 215-22, Leuven, 1982.

"Vowel Letters in Qohelet", *UF* 20 (1988), pp. 277-86.

*The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qohelet* (OLA 41), Leuven: Peeters, 1992.

Schurer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)* 3 vols. A New English Version Revised and Edited by G.

Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman, Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1973-87.

Scott, R.B.Y. *Proverbs. Ecclesiastes* (AB 18), Garden City: Doubleday, 1965.

Sperber, A. (ed.) *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts. Vol. IVA: The Hagiographa: Transition from Translation to Midrash; IV B: The Targum and the Hebrew Bible*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968, 1973.

Staples, W.E. "The 'Vanity' of Ecclesiastes", *JNES* 2 (1943), pp. 95-104.

Stern, D. *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Story, C.I.K. "The Book of Proverbs and North West Semitic Literature", *JBL* (1945), pp. 319-37.

Strack, H.L. and Stemberger, G. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*.

Translated from the German by M. Bockmuehl, Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1991.

[Updating of Strack, H.L. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. First English edition, Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1931].

Thompson, V.A. *Deuteronomy. An Introduction and Commentary* (TOTC), Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974.

Toy, C.H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* (ICC), Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1916.

Urbach, E.E. *The Sages: their Concepts and Beliefs*. 2 vols. Translated from the Hebrew by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975.

Vermes, G. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* Second, Revised, Edition. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.

- Waard, J. de "The Translator and Textual Criticism (with Particular Reference to Eccl. 2, 25)", *Biblica* 60 (1979), pp. 509-29.
- Wallach, L. "The Colloquy of Marcus Aurelius with the Patriarch Judah 1", *JQR* n.s. 31 (1940-41), pp. 259-86.
- Watson, W.G.E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOTS 26). Second Edition. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986.
- Watters, W.R. *Formula Criticism and the Poetry of the Old Testament*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1976.
- Weinfeld, M. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Weingreen, J. "Exposition in the Old Testament and in Rabbinic Literature", in *Promise and Fulfilment: Essays present to S.H. Hooke in Celebration of His Ninetieth Birthday*, edited by F.F. Bruce. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1963, pp. 187-201.
- Introduction to the Critical Study of the Text of the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- West, M.L. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati. Vol.1: Archtochus, Hipponax, Theognidea*. Editio Altera. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Westermann, C. *Genesis 1-50. A Commentary* 3 vols. Translated from the German by J.J. Scullion, Minneapolis: Augsburg Press. London: SPCK, 1984-87.
- Whybray, R.N. "Qohelet, Preacher of Joy", *JSOT* 23 (1982), pp. 87-98.
- Ecclesiastes* (NCG), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1989.
- Wilson, G. "'The Words of the Wise': The Intent and Significance of Qohelet 12.9-14," *JBL* 103 (1984), pp. 175-92.
- Wolff, H.W. *Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea* (Hermenia). Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Wright, A.G. "The Literary Genre Midrash", *CBQ* 28 (1966), pp. 105-38, 417-57.

"The Riddle of the Sphinx: The Structure of the Book of  
Qohelet", *CBQ* 30 (1968), pp. 313-34.

Wurthwein, E. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia  
Hebraica*. Translated from the German by E.F. Rhodes, London: SCM Press, 1980.

Yoder, P.B. "A-B Pairs and Oral Composition in Hebrew Poetry" *VT* 21 (1971),  
pp. 470-89.

Zeitlin, S. "Dreams and their Interpretation from the Biblical Period to the  
Tannaitic Time: An Historical Study", *JQR* 66 (1975-76), pp. 1-18.

*Note:* the writer has not always been able to trace the publisher of works  
cited in the notes only whose citation derives from one or other of his  
bibliographical items.

*Midrash Rabbah Edition.*

Jerusalem: Lewis Epstein, 1965.

לדרש רבה על ספר דברים

ומגילות איכה וקהלת

