

The Metaphor of Aging in Ecclesiastes 12:1–6: A Jewish Traditional Exegesis for Contemporary People

Sulistiono¹ , Jessica Elizabeth Abraham² , Tony Richie³ 

Sekolah Tinggi Teologia Nazarene Indonesia, Indonesia¹, Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Kharisma, Indonesia²,
Pentecostal Theological Seminary, Cleveland, United States³

sulistio@sttni.ac.id¹, jessicaabraham@sttkharisma.ac.id², trichie@ptseminary.edu³

Histori

Submitted : 20 July 2026
Revised : 01 October 2026
Accepted : 02 October 2026
Published : 04 October 2026

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.69668/juita.v3i2.221>

Description

This article is a research project that takes the topic of the metaphor of aging based on the book/letter/text Ecclesiastes 12:1–6, interpreted through classical Jewish traditional exegesis.

Citation

Sulistiono, S., Abraham, J. E. ., & Richie, T. . (2026). The Metaphor of Aging in Ecclesiastes 12:1–6: A Jewish Traditional Exegesis for Contemporary People. *Jurnal Ilmiah Tafsir Alkitab*, 3(2), 110. <https://doi.org/10.69668/juita.v3i2.221>.

Copyright

©2026 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.



Abstract

Ecclesiastes 12:1–6 is widely read in Western scholarship as a somatic allegory of decline, yet the Jewish exegetical tradition that first shaped its interpretation the Babylonian Talmud, Qohelet Rabbah, and medieval Hebrew philologists remains underused as an exegetical partner, so that the poem's syntactic architecture has rarely been read together with this tradition's metaphorical logic. This study reconstructs that architecture through Jewish traditional exegesis and articulates its theological relevance for contemporary readers confronting aging. A qualitative literary-exegetical method combines close reading of the Masoretic Text with intertextual analysis of Talmudic, midrashic, and medieval rabbinic sources. The findings show that each image darkened luminaries, a trembling house, a blossoming almond, a severed silver cord functions as a layered cosmic-somatic sign summoning the reader to zikkaron, remembrance of the Creator, rather than mere biological decay. The study concludes that Jewish traditional exegesis offers a corrective, covenantal hermeneutic of aging for contemporary theology.

Keywords: *Ecclesiastes 12:1–6; metaphor of aging; Jewish exegesis; Qohelet Rabbah; remembrance of the Creator*

INTRODUCTION

Aging is not merely a biological process; it is a hermeneutical event in which the self is compelled to reinterpret its own body, time, and relationship to the transcendent. Few biblical texts stage this hermeneutical event as densely as Ecclesiastes 12:1–6, the closing poem of Qohelet, in which the aging and dying body is rendered through a cascade of images: darkening luminaries, a trembling house, closing doors, a blossoming almond tree, a dragging grasshopper, and finally a snapped silver cord and a shattered golden bowl (Dunham, 2024). The urgency of this text is not confined to antiquity: in societies increasingly organized around the concealment and medical management of old age, a coherent theological account of aging that neither denies bodily decline nor empties it of

meaning is difficult to locate, which is precisely the interpretive problem this study addresses.

The poem has attracted sustained scholarly attention precisely because its imagery resists a single, stable referent, and the resulting debate can be organized around three broad interpretive families. The first reads the poem as a systematic allegory of the aging body, in which each image corresponds to a bodily organ or faculty trembling arms, bent legs, failing teeth, dimming eyes (Hahn, 2023). The second resists a one-to-one allegorical decoding and instead reads the poem as a composite, impressionistic depiction of cosmic and domestic dissolution (Cassels, 2021), cautioning against what is characterized as a non-falsifiable, reader-imposed grid of meaning (Sinykin & Winant, 2025). The third, more recent trajectory situates the poem within its ancient Near Eastern and wisdom-literary context, comparing it to Sumerian and Egyptian laments on old age and reading its imagery as culturally coded rather than strictly somatic (Keefer, 2022). Despite their differing conclusions, these three families share a common limitation: each engages the poem's imagery primarily through modern historical-critical categories, leaving largely unexamined the classical Jewish exegetical tradition that first shaped its interpretation.

What these three families share, despite their disagreements, is a tendency to treat the classical Jewish exegetical tradition as background color rather than as an active exegetical partner, mentioning it, if at all, only in passing. Yet this tradition is neither monolithic nor naively literalistic. The Babylonian Talmud already reads the poem's images as coded references to specific bodily and social diminishments accompanying old age, associating the trembling of the "keepers of the house" with the arms and the bending of "mighty men" with the legs, while lamenting that old age transforms what was once a "crown of roses" into a "crown of thorns" (b. Shabbat 151b–152a). Qohelet Rabbah develops this reading further through homiletical elaboration, embedding the poem within a broader meditation on repentance and the fleeting character of human vitality (Kiperwasser, 2007). Medieval Andalusī Hebrew philologists (tenth–eleventh centuries) sharpened this tradition further through careful lexical analysis of the poem's rare vocabulary the almond blossom, the dragging grasshopper, the failed caperberry treating philological precision as inseparable from theological meaning (Debel, 2010). Read together, the Talmud, Qohelet Rabbah, and the medieval philologists thus constitute not three isolated comments but a cumulative exegetical trajectory, each stage sharpening the same conviction that the poem's imagery is deliberately, not incidentally, precise.

Recent scholarship has begun to recover this material as a coherent theological discourse rather than a set of isolated comments. Russ Fishbane demonstrate that rabbinic literature of late antiquity developed a sustained and often theologically productive discourse on old age, addressing bodily appearance, cognitive change, family relations, and social status in ways that resist simple pathologization of the aging body (Russ Fishbane, 2022). Stefano further shows that medieval Jewish exegetes were themselves divided over whether Qohelet's meditations counsel ascetic withdrawal or a chastened embrace of life's pleasures, a tension bearing directly on how the aging metaphors of chapter 12 are theologically appropriated (Stefano, 2022). Lavoie's survey of Qohelet scholarship between 2012 and 2018 confirms,

however, that the reception history of the book, including its Jewish exegetical afterlife, remains comparatively underdeveloped relative to text-critical and structural studies of the passage (Lavoie, 2019). This underdevelopment is not merely a gap in the international literature; it carries particular weight for Indonesian theological scholarship, where a rapidly aging population intersects with a strong homiletical tradition of biblical exposition, yet where sustained exegetical engagement with the Bible's own aging metaphors let alone with the Jewish interpretive tradition that first shaped them remains largely absent from seminary curricula and published research. Within Indonesian and broader Christian theological scholarship specifically, engagement with Ecclesiastes 12 has tended to privilege either devotional-homiletical application or historical-critical exegesis conducted largely within a Christian commentary tradition, with limited direct engagement with primary rabbinic sources (Lavoie, 2019).

This state of the field discloses a genuine research gap: historical-critical scholarship tends to treat the Jewish exegetical tradition as a historical curiosity to be footnoted rather than a live theological resource, while homiletical and pastoral-theological literature on aging in Christian contexts rarely engages this tradition at all, reading the passage impressionistically rather than exegetically. No study to date has systematically reconstructed the poem's metaphors through the Talmud, Qohelet Rabbah, and medieval Jewish philology together and then translated that reconstruction into contemporary theological and pastoral terms; this study identifies that convergence, rather than any single tradition in isolation, as its point of entry. Addressing this gap, the study argues that the metaphors of Ecclesiastes 12:1–6, when the poem's own syntactic architecture is read through classical Jewish exegesis, disclose a coherent theological anthropology of aging centered on covenantal remembrance rather than mere bodily decline an anthropology this study reconstructs from Talmudic, midrashic, and medieval sources and then translates into pastoral terms for contemporary people confronting aging as a crisis of meaning. Accordingly, the study is guided by one question: how does Jewish traditional exegesis interpret the metaphors of Ecclesiastes 12:1–6, and what theological resources does this interpretation offer contemporary readers confronting aging and mortality?

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative literary-exegetical method situated within the broader framework of intertextual biblical hermeneutics, an approach appropriate to the study's aim of reconstructing a network of meaning spanning a biblical text and its classical interpretive tradition rather than testing a falsifiable hypothesis through empirical measurement (Correa, 2006). Three categories of data are used. The primary data consist of the Masoretic Hebrew text of Ecclesiastes 12:1–6 together with its major ancient versions, the Septuagint and Targum Qohelet, and the classical Jewish exegetical corpus itself the Babylonian Talmud tractate Shabbat 151b–152a, the aggadic midrash Qohelet Rabbah on chapter 12, and the commentary of Rashi as preserved in the *Miqra'ot Gedolot* treated as primary interpretive data rather than mere illustrative background. The secondary data consist of peer-reviewed

scholarly literature on Ecclesiastes 12 and on rabbinic constructions of aging, including recent critical reconstructions of medieval Andalusī Hebrew philology (Robinson, 2022) and studies of rabbinic discourse on old age (Knight, 2014), which supply comparative interpretation and a methodological check on the researcher's own readings. Other/supporting data are drawn from standard critical editions and established English translations of the Talmud and Targum, used to verify technical terminology and to cross-check the researcher's own rendering of the Hebrew and Aramaic against scholarly consensus.

The exegetical procedure follows three sequential stages, consistent with the standard sequence of textual description, intertextual analysis, and theological synthesis in qualitative library-based exegetical research (van Wieringen, 2020). First, a close reading of the Hebrew text identifies the poem's structural markers the repeated temporal particles "before" (*bēṭerem*) and "in the day when" (*bayyôm še-*) and establishes the poem's movement from cosmic imagery (12:2) through domestic imagery (12:3–4) to horticultural and mechanical imagery (12:5–6). Second, each image cluster is analyzed intertextually against classical Jewish exegetical sources, principally the Babylonian Talmud tractate Shabbat 151b–152a, the aggadic midrash Qohelet Rabbah on chapter 12, the commentary of Rashi as preserved in the *Miqra'ot Gedolot*, and the philological observations of medieval Andalusī Hebrew commentators as reconstructed in contemporary critical scholarship (Dunham, 2024). This stage follows the principle, drawn from Jewish exegetical method itself, that lexical precision (*peshat*) and homiletical elaboration (*derash*) are complementary rather than competing modes of reading. Third, the reconstructed Jewish exegetical reading is brought into theological conversation with contemporary discourse on aging, drawing on recent scholarship on rabbinic constructions of old age to articulate the pastoral and theological implications of the text for contemporary readers (Breuer, 2004). Data for this study consist exclusively of published texts the Hebrew Bible, Talmud, and midrashic literature in critical or standard editions, and secondary scholarly literature; no human subjects were involved, and the study therefore required no ethical clearance beyond standard citation integrity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Poetic Architecture of Ecclesiastes 12:1–6

Grammatically, Ecclesiastes 12:1–6 is not a sequence of six discrete images but a single periodic sentence whose main clause is completed in the opening cohortative-imperative, וִזְכֹּר אֶת-בּוֹרְאֶיךָ *û-zěkōr 'et-bōr'ekā*, "and remember your Creator" (12:1a). Everything that follows every image of cosmic darkening, domestic collapse, and bodily failure is not coordinated with this command but subordinated to it, suspended within a cascading series of temporal clauses introduced by the correlative particle עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא *'ad 'āšer lō* ("before... not," lit. "until which not"), repeated verbatim at 12:1b, 12:2, and again at 12:6, and reinforced medially by the parallel construction בַּיּוֹם *bayyôm še* ("on the day when," 12:3). No finite verb outside this chain of subordinate clauses interrupts the sentence until the poem's coda

in 12:7 (וַיֵּשֶׁב הָעָפָר *wěyāšōb he'āpār*). The entire poem, syntactically, is a single act of waiting for its own main verb to be obeyed.

This is not a stylistic curiosity but the argument's grammatical enactment. Hebrew syntax typically permits the temporal clause to precede or follow its main clause with little semantic consequence (Fassberg, 2013); Qohelet's choice to defer the imperative's fulfillment behind an accumulating wall of subordinate clauses is therefore a marked, rhetorically deliberate construction rather than a default word order. The effect is iconic: the syntax performs the very procrastination the poem warns against. Just as the addressee is urged to remember "before" (עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא *'ad 'āšer lō'*) the days of trouble arrive, the reader is made to wait clause after clause, image after image for the sentence itself to resolve, so that the experience of reading the poem's syntax mimics the experience of postponement it seeks to foreclose. The imperative *zēkōr* governs every subsequent image, so that the darkened sun, the trembling house, and the severed cord are not autonomous meditations on decline but subordinate clauses answering one implicit question: remember him before what? (Landy, 2004). Grammatically dependent, these images cannot stand as complete thoughts apart from the summons to remember; theologically, the poem therefore permits no reading of aging and death as self-contained tragedy.

A further layer of evidence for this reading lies in the verbal aspect shift at the seam between 12:1–2 and 12:3–6. The temporal clauses in 12:1–2 employ prefix (*yiqtol*) verbs of general or repeated aspect (יָבֹאוּ *yābō'û*, תִּהְיֶה *teḥšak*), appropriate to a still-open, still-avoidable future; but from 12:3 onward the verbs shift toward a narrated, scene-internal mode (יָזַעוּ *yāzu'û*, וְהִתְעוּתוּ *wěhit'awwētû*), depicting the crisis not as a possibility to be forestalled but as a scene already unfolding, viewed as if from within. This aspectual shift enacts, at the level of verbal morphology, the poem's own thesis: the "before" of verse 1 is not a fixed, distant boundary but a threshold that the syntax itself shows being crossed in real time, mid-poem, while the reader is still reading. The Masoretic disjunctive accentuation (the strong division at the *zaqeph/tifḥa* boundaries marking each עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא *'ad 'āšer lō'* clause) further supports treating 12:1–6 as a single accentual as well as syntactic unit, rather than a loosely strung inventory of proverbial images (Pitcher, 2023). Read this way, the classical Jewish exegetical instinct to treat the poem's imagery not as an autonomous catalogue of decay but as material subordinate to the command of *zikkaron* covenantal remembrance enacted before the window for such remembrance closes is not an imposition on the text but a recovery of what its grammar already argues.

The Darkening of the Luminaries (12:2)

Verse 2 supplies the first content clause governed by the עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא *'ad 'āšer lō'* construction established in verse 1, and its own internal syntax repays the same scrutiny: וְהָאֵשׁ וְהַיָּרֵחַ וְהַכּוֹכָבִים *wěhā'ôr wěhayyārēaḥ wěhakkôkābîm*, "the sun, and the light, and the moon, and the stars." The list is not merely poetic accumulation; its second term is

philologically anomalous. Having already named *הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ* *haššemeš* ("the sun"), the poet adds *וְהָאוֹר* *wěhā'ôr* ("and the light") as a distinct, ostensibly redundant fourth-word insertion before naming the moon and stars a duplication that has drawn sustained text-critical attention, with some critics treating *אוֹר* *'ôr* as a gloss and others defending it as original. This specific term is not a generic word for brightness but the very noun that anchors the Hebrew Bible's foundational cosmological vocabulary, which invites the comparison that follows: read against Genesis 1, where *אוֹר* *'ôr* is created on the first day (Gen 1:3) prior to and independent of the luminaries created on the fourth (Gen 1:14–16) (Bediako, 2025), the term's presence here is difficult to read as accidental. Qohelet's list names not only the celestial bodies but the primordial light itself, the very substance whose separation from darkness constituted the first act of creation. The verse's imagery therefore does not merely describe darkness falling upon the sky; it stages, in miniature, the undoing of creation's own inaugural distinction not a strict reversal of the six-day order (which would move from stars to sun to light), but an evocation of the same cosmological vocabulary in a mode of dissolution rather than emergence, what several commentators identify as an implicit "de-creation" motif in Qohelet's closing poem (Debel, 2010). This reading should nonetheless be advanced with appropriate caution: Qohelet never cites Genesis 1 explicitly, and the shared vocabulary of *אוֹר* *'ôr*, *שֶׁמֶשׁ* *šemeš*, and *יָרֵחַ* *yārēaḥ* may reflect the common cosmological lexicon of ancient Hebrew more broadly rather than a deliberate authorial allusion to the creation account specifically; the argument here rests on lexical and structural convergence rather than on any confirmed citation.

Classical Jewish exegesis reads this cosmic vocabulary as inseparable from its somatic referent, correlating the darkening of the "light" with the diminishment of the eyes and the countenance the loss of both physical sight and the inner luminosity of vitality that Scripture elsewhere associates with a person's "face" (b. Shabbat 151b–152a; readers consulting the Talmudic passage directly will find the tradition maps each of the poem's cosmic and architectural terms onto specific organs with a precision this study can only summarize, not fully reproduce, here). What matters theologically is the interpretive move itself: the tradition refuses to let "sun," "light," "moon," and "stars" remain purely external, atmospheric phenomena. The cosmos darkens because the instrument of perception darkens body and world are read as a single continuous field, so that the poem's opening image already forecloses any reading of old age as something that merely happens around a person rather than within the very capacity by which a person has a world at all.

This somatic reading gains further support from a second, underexamined feature of the verse: the recurrence of the root *שוב* *šûb* in *וְשָׁבוּ הָעָבִים אַחֲרֵי הַגֶּשֶׁם* *wěšābû he'ābîm 'aḥar haggāšem*, "and the clouds return after the rain." *שוב* *šûb* is not a neutral verb in Qohelet; it is the book's own leitwort, introduced programmatically in the opening meditation on futility *וְשָׁבוּ הָרוּחַ אֶל־דָּרוֹם וְשָׁבוּ אֶל־צָפוֹן... שָׁב הָרוּחַ עַל־סִבְיָתוֹ* *hārûaḥ hōlēk 'el-dārôm wěsôbēb 'el-šāpôn... šāb hārûaḥ 'al-sēbîbôtāyw*, "the wind goes... and the wind returns on its circuits" (1:6),

and כָּל־הַנְּחָלִים הַלְכִים אֶל־הֵימָם ... אֶל־מְקוֹם שֶׁהַנְּחָלִים הַלְכִים שָׁם הֵם שׁוֹבִים לָלֶכֶת *kol-hannēḥālīm hōlēkīm 'el-hayyām... 'el-mēqôm šehannēḥālīm hōlēkīm šām hēm šābīm lāleket*, "all the rivers flow to the sea... to the place where the rivers flow, there they return again" (1:7) and it recurs, decisively, in the poem's own final line, וַיָּשֹׁב הָעָפָר עַל־הָאָרֶץ כְּשֶׁהָיָה *wēyāšōb he'āpār 'al-hā'āreṣ kēšehāyāh*, "and the dust returns to the earth as it was" (12:7). Read against this inclusio, the "return of clouds after rain" in 12:2 is not an isolated meteorological detail but a deliberate reactivation of Qohelet's own keyword, positioned at the structural midpoint between the cosmic futility of chapter 1 and the dust's final return in chapter 12 (Fox, 1988), on the ring composition linking 1:4–7 and 12:1–7). What in chapter 1 was presented as impersonal cosmic cycle morally neutral, if wearying is here relocated into the register of personal affliction: the rabbis' reading of the recurring clouds as unrelenting grief, in which sorrow no longer clears like youthful rain giving way to sunshine (b. Shabbat 151b–152a), thus rests on a textually grounded intuition. The same root that once described the indifferent circuits of wind and water now describes a grief that keeps returning, and will, by the poem's final verse, describe the dust's own irreversible return to the ground from which it came.

The theological weight of verse 2, then, does not rest on cosmic imagery alone, nor on somatic correlation alone, but on the convergence of both within a single lexical thread inherited from the book's opening argument. The poem's first content clause already binds cosmos, body, and Qohelet's governing vocabulary of "return" into one image, so that the darkening it describes is never merely atmospheric: it is the first movement of a single sentence syntactically subordinate to the command to remember, lexically bound to the futility diagnosed in chapter 1, and theologically aimed at the dust's final return in 12:7 in which world, body, and word darken together.

The Trembling House (12:3–4)

The transition from verse 2 to verse 3 is not merely thematic but lexically bonded: the same root *h-š-k* that described the sun and light going dark, *תִּהְיֶה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְהָאוֹר* *teḥēšak haššemeš wēhā'ôr* (12:2), recurs almost immediately in the description of failing sight, *וְהָשְׁכּוּ בְּאֲרָבוֹת הָרְאוֹת* *wēḥāšḥû hārō'ôt bā'arubôt*, "and those who look through the windows grow dark" (12:3) (Harvey, 2023). This is not loose thematic echo but the identical verbal root repeated within four cola of Hebrew poetry, and it supplies textual, rather than merely interpretive, warrant for the classical Jewish reading examined above: the poem itself insists, at the level of its own vocabulary, that the darkening of the cosmos and the darkening of the eye are a single event narrated twice. What verse 2 stages macrocosmically, verse 3 restages microcosmically, using the same word to do it.

This lexical bond opens onto the verse's more elaborate architecture. Ecclesiastes 12:3 catalogues four failing agents in two grammatically paired sets: *שֹׁמְרֵי הַבַּיִת* *šōmērê habbayit* ("keepers of the house") and *אֲנָשֵׁי הַחֵיל* *'anšê heḥāyil* ("men of strength") are masculine plural participles and nouns, while *הַטְּחֹנָנוֹת* *haṭṭōḥnôt* ("the grinding ones") and *הָרְאוֹת* *hārō'ôt* ("the

seeing ones") are feminine plural participles used substantively, without an explicit noun of their own. This is not incidental variation; the verse's grammar itself performs an envelope structure, moving from masculine outer figures (guards, strongmen) to feminine inner figures (grinders, watchers) and back out again to the plural, gender-unmarked "doors," דְּלָתַיִם *dēlātayim*. This dual form Hebrew marking paired body parts and paired objects alike with the dual number already anticipates the household's decoding as a body composed of paired organs, before any interpretive tradition supplies the correlation. The Talmudic tradition renders this correlation explicit, associating the "keepers of the house" with the arms, the stooping "men of strength" with the legs, the ceasing "grinders" with the teeth, and the darkened "watchers at the windows" with the eyes (b. Shabbat 151b) a mapping this study reports as the tradition's own systematic claim, which readers are encouraged to verify against the Talmudic text directly rather than take on summary alone. What matters for the present argument is that the grammar of the verse its gendered participles, its dual-form doors already predisposes the text toward exactly this kind of paired, organ-specific reading; the rabbis are not imposing an allegory foreign to the syntax but articulating what the syntax's own structure of pairs and genders makes available.

Qohelet Rabbah extends this domestic imagery homiletically, reading the closing of the "doors" not narrowly as the cessation of hearing or appetite but as a broader withdrawal from social and communal participation the aging person increasingly closed off from the transactions of ordinary life (Spieckermann, 2020). This extension is itself licensed by the verse's own figure: a house is not merely a body but a threshold between interior and communal space, and its doors regulate not only ingestion and speech but who may enter and be received. Read this way, the ceasing of "the sound of the mill" and the closing of the doors "onto the street" (12:4) name not only physical decline but the diminishment of the aging person's exchange with the surrounding community the house grows quiet not because it has been vacated, but because its transactions with the world beyond its threshold have slowed.

What is theologically decisive in this rabbinic reading, and in the verse's own grammar, is a shared refusal of two opposite temptations: neither romanticizing the losses of aging as merely metaphorical, nor allowing those losses to void the house of habitation altogether. The poem describes deterioration of function trembling, stooping, ceasing, darkening, closing never demolition. Grammatically as well as theologically, the house still stands; its inhabitant is diminished but not evicted. This distinction matters for what follows in the poem: the "house" of chapter 12 anticipates, but is carefully distinguished from, the "eternal home," בֵּית עוֹלָם *bêt 'ōlāmô*, to which the person departs only in verse 5. Until that departure, the aging body-as-house, however faltering its mechanisms, remains in the terms established by this poem's own syntax of subordination to the command *zēkōr* a dwelling still summoned to remember, not yet a ruin exempted from address.

The Almond, the Grasshopper, and the Caperberry (12:5)

Verse 5 marks the poem's third and final image cluster, shifting from the domestic register of verses 3–4 to a horticultural and psychological one, and it opens with a term that quietly closes a lexical circuit begun two verses earlier. *הַשֶּׁקֶד יִגָּאץ* *yānē'š haššāqēd*, "the almond blossoms," derives from the root ש-ק-ד *š-q-d*, which in its verbal form *šāqad* means not merely "almond" but "to watch, to be wakeful, to keep vigil" a wordplay Jeremiah exploits explicitly, *פֶּה-שֶׁקֶד אָנִי עַל-דְּבָרִי* *peh-šāqēd 'ānî 'al-dēbārî*, "I am watching over my word" (Jer 1:11–12) (Tantlevskij, 2019). Read against this root sense, the blossoming almond does not merely supply a visual figure for white or graying hair, as the medieval Andalusí philologists carefully established through comparative lexicography (Martínez Delgado, in Gómez Aranda, 2021); it also completes, etymologically, the trajectory of "watching" introduced by *הָרְאוֹת בְּאַרְבוֹת* *hārō'ôt bā'ārubbôt*, "those who look through the windows," in 12:3. The eyes that darkened two verses earlier now find their vigilance displaced onto a tree: what the aging body can no longer to do keep watch is enacted instead by the almond's white flowering, itself an image of wakefulness without the capacity to act on what is seen. This is not asserted by any commentator consulted for this study; it is a lexical observation available directly from the root's attested usage, and it is offered here as this study's own contribution, to be weighed independently by the reader.

The two clauses that follow extend the pattern of philological density the medieval commentators first identified. *וַיִּסְתַּבֵּל הַחֲגָב* *wēyistabbēl heḥāgāb*, "and the grasshopper drags itself along," employs a rare hitpael reflexive form of a root elsewhere meaning "to bear a burden," so that the grasshopper is an insect whose lightness is proverbial (cf. Num 13:33, where the spies describe themselves as grasshoppers before giants) is here made to carry itself as though weighted, a grammatical irony the Andalusí philologists read as an image of the labored, burdened gait of the elderly (Debel, 2010). Similarly, *וַתִּפֹּר הָאֲבִיּוֹנָה* *wētāpēr hā'ābiyyônâ*, "and the caperberry fails," plays on a root (א-ב-ה *'-b-h*, "to desire") embedded in the very name of the plant traditionally associated with appetite stimulation; its failure is therefore not incidental botanical detail but a term whose Hebrew name already encodes the loss of desire it is made to signify (Fox, 1988). Taken together, these three images the almond that watches without seeing, the light insect made heavy, the desire-plant that fails to rouse desire do not simply catalogue physical decline; each operates through a specific grammatical or etymological reversal in which the thing named enacts, in its very word-form, the loss of its own defining function. This is the same interpretive discipline demonstrated in the Talmudic correlation of house and body examined above: images are not chosen arbitrarily but because their Hebrew names already contain the argument the poem wishes to make.

Verse 5 then pivots from horticultural to psychological register in a way nothing earlier in the poem has done: *גַּם מִגְבָּה יִרְאוּ וְחַתְחָתִים בְּדַרְדָּר* *gam miggābōahh yîrā'û wēḥatḥattîm baddārek*, "they are also afraid of heights, and terrors are in the way." This is the poem's first

explicit naming of an emotion. Verses 2–4 catalogue failing faculties sight, strength, teeth, hearing entirely in the third person and the passive voice of decline; verse 5 shifts, however briefly, to name a felt interior state. This shift matters for the argument developed across this study's reading of the poem's syntax: if the entire unit is grammatically subordinate to the command *zēkōr*, "remember," then the poem's one moment of named fear occurs precisely at the structural point furthest from that command's utterance immediately before the final image of catastrophic breakage in verse 6 (Russ Fishbane, 2022). The psychological register intensifies, in other words, exactly as the syntactic distance from the imperative that governs the whole sentence grows greatest, dramatizing at the level of composition what the content already claims: memory deferred breeds fear.

The verse closes with two clauses that complete this reorientation from body to destiny: *כִּי-הֹלֵךְ הָאָדָם אֶל-בֵּית עוֹלָמוֹ* *kî-hōlēk hā'ādām 'el-bêt 'ôlāmô*, "for man goes to his eternal home," and *וְסָבְבוּ בַשּׁוּק הַסְּפָדִים* *wěsābēbû baššûq hassōpēdîm*, "and the mourners go about the street." Both phrases deliberately recall earlier vocabulary while marking its transformation. *בֵּית עוֹלָמוֹ* *bêt 'ôlāmô*, "his eternal home," is the poem's second house, set against *הַבָּיִת שֶׁמְרִי* *šōmērê habbayit*, "the keepers of the house," in 12:3; where the first house was a dwelling of failing but still-functioning faculties, this second house is reached, not inhabited-in-decline the destination toward which the trembling house of verse 3 was always tending (Russ Fishbane, 2022). And *וְסָבְבוּ* *sābēbû*, "they go about," reactivates once more the root *שׁוּב/סָבַב* *šûb/sābab* of return and circuit traced from 1:6–7 through 12:2's returning clouds: but where that root earlier described indifferent cosmic cycles and then personal, recurring grief, it now describes mourners circling in the street human motion organized entirely around an absence. The house that closed its doors onto the street in verse 4 (Sovran, 2013), on Qohelet Rabbah's reading of social withdrawal) here receives, in the street itself, the community's answering procession: what had been the aging person's diminishing traffic with ordinary life becomes, in death, the town's circling grief for what has been lost. Read cumulatively, verse 5 thus does more than add further images of decline to those already catalogued; it names, for the first time, the fear that decline provokes, identifies the destination toward which the poem's entire syntax has been moving, and prepares both thematically and lexically for the catastrophic ruptures of verse 6.

The Silver Cord and the Golden Bowl (12:6)

Verse 6 supplies the third and final occurrence of the correlative *עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא* ("before... not") that structures the entire poem *זָכֹר... עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא-יִרְתַּק חֶבְלֵי הַכֶּסֶף*, "remember... before the silver cord is snapped." This is not merely one image among several; it is the syntactic terminus of the very sentence whose grammar this study traced from its opening imperative. The clause chain that began in 12:1a (*עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא-יָבֹאוּ יְמֵי הָרָעָה*) and continued through 12:2 (*עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא-תִחַשֵּׁד הַשָּׁמַיִם*) reaches, in 12:6, its final subordinate clause before the sentence's

one main verb still, remarkably, זָכַר, uttered thirty-one words earlier is finally permitted to rest. Everything the poem has catalogued, cosmic, domestic, horticultural, psychological, has been content awaiting this closure; verse 6 is where the "before" finally arrives at what it was postponing.

The verse offers four images of breakage organized as two tightly parallel pairs, each governed by a distinct verb of destruction: וַתִּתֵּק חֶבֶל הַכֶּסֶף וַתִּרְץ גִּלְתָּ הַזָּהָב, "the silver cord is snapped and the golden bowl is crushed," followed by וַתִּשָּׁבֶר כַּד עַל-הַמְּבוּעַ וַתִּרְץ הַגִּלְגָּל אֶל-הַבּוֹר, "and the pitcher is shattered at the spring and the wheel broken at the cistern (Tantlevskij, 2019)." The four verbs are not synonyms loosely varied for poetic effect; רָץ denotes a snapping under tension (the cord that was stretched taut), רָץ a crushing under impact, שָׁבַר a shattering into fragments, and the second רָץ (נָרָץ) again a violent breaking of the wheel's mechanism together describing four physically distinct modes of failure (severance, impact, fragmentation, mechanical collapse) rather than a single generic "breaking" repeated for emphasis. This precision matters because it forecloses a reading of verse 6 as vague poetic intensification; each verb names a specific catastrophic mode, and the specificity itself marks a decisive shift from every prior image in the poem. Verses 2–5 without exception use verbs of gradual diminishment חָשַׁךְ ("darken"), זָעַזָּע ("tremble"), בָּטַל ("cease"), נָמַךְ ("stoop"), נֶאֱנַח ("blossom," of decline) processes with duration, extension in time. The four verbs of verse 6 are, by contrast, punctiliar: they name instantaneous events with no interior temporal extension. The poem's grammar itself performs the difference between aging, which the text has shown to be a process, and dying, which it here shows to be an event.

The two pairs are further organized by a chiasmic logic connecting them to earlier images in the poem. The silver cord and golden bowl, drawn from the technology of ancient oil lamps a bowl suspended by a cord, so that its rupture extinguishes whatever flame the vessel sustained (b. Shabbat 152a; Targum Qohelet 12:6) complete the poem's arc of images concerning light and sight opened in 12:2's darkened sun and 12:3's darkened watchers at the windows: what began as darkening now culminates in the destruction of the vessel that produced light in the first place (Debel, 2010). The pitcher and the wheel, drawn from the technology of drawing water at a well, correspondingly complete the poem's arc of images concerning sustenance and function opened in 12:3's ceasing grinders and 12:4's quieted mill: what began as diminished nourishment now culminates in the destruction of the mechanism that supplied it. Light and water, the two most basic figures of sustained life in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Ps 36:9–10, "in your light we see light"), are broken in a single verse, and the poem arranges their instruments in the same luminous vessel first, water-vessel second that it used to introduce them across verses 2 through 4.

This structural precision bears directly on the poem's final movement, which the wordplay of verse 6's own vocabulary quietly prepares גִּלְתָּ הַזָּהָב, "the golden bowl," and חֶבֶל הַכֶּסֶף, "the silver cord," are, in the tradition's reading, ordinary household objects rendered in precious metal, gold and silver, materials whose value is nowhere incidental to the poem's

argument. The tradition's insistence that these are costly, not merely functional, vessels licenses a reading in which their breaking is mourned as the loss of something dignified rather than treated as confirmation that life was *hebel*, "vapor," in the sense of worthless (Fox, 1988). The verbs of shattering in verse 6 thus complete, rather than contradict, the theological anthropology this study has traced from the poem's opening command: a body construed throughout as a dwelling worth keeping (12:3–4), a vigilance worth maintaining even in its failing (12:5), and now, at the last, a vessel valuable enough that its breaking constitutes genuine loss and not merely the expiration of something inherently negligible. The poem's closing images do not soften death into gentle fading, as verses 2–5 might if read in isolation; they name it as fracture. But they name it as the fracture of gold and silver, and that valuation wordless, embedded entirely in the choice of metals is itself the tradition's most economical argument that the aging and dying body remains, to its final rupture, an object of worth, addressed by the command to remember precisely because what will be lost is precious enough to be worth remembering.

***Zikkaron*: Remembrance as the Theological Center of the Poem**

The preceding analysis converges on a single conclusion: Ecclesiastes 12:1–6 is not a catalogue of decline but one sentence, grammatically and thematically, in which every image cosmic, domestic, horticultural, and mechanical remains subordinate to its opening command, זָכֹר, "remember." The poem's own syntax, its recurring root שׁוּב, and its closing valuation of the aging body as gold and silver rather than refuse together resist reading old age as either denial-worthy decline or theological blank space. Aging is grammatically what the text makes it: the last occasion for remembrance before the sentence, and the vessel, finally breaks. Hebrew *zākar* rarely denotes mere recall; it denotes covenantal fidelity enacted in the present, mirroring the God who "remembers" his covenant (Exod 2:24). Read this way, the poem trains rather than merely warns: the very faculties it shows failing sight, strength, hearing, desire are the faculties through which remembrance was meant to be practiced while they still functioned. This reading corrects two contemporary tendencies at once. A youth-oriented culture that treats aging as a condition to be concealed severs the body from meaning once vitality recedes; a fatalistic piety that treats aging as mere waiting empties it of theological weight altogether. Classical Jewish exegesis offers neither: it names every loss the poem catalogues without flinching, yet insists the house still stands, the almond still watches, and the vessel, gold and silver until it breaks, remains worth remembering until it does.

CONCLUSION

This study answers its guiding question by showing that classical Jewish exegesis reads Ecclesiastes 12:1–6 not as a catalogue of decline but as a single sentence grammatically subordinate to one command: remember the Creator. In pursuit of its first objective, the study finds that the Talmud's organ-specific decoding, Qohelet Rabbah's homiletical extension, and the medieval philologists' lexical precision converge on a coherent theological anthropology,

the aging body as a dwelling still addressed and a vessel still valuable until its final rupture. In pursuit of its second objective, the study finds that this tradition offers a corrective largely absent from contemporary discourse on aging: it names bodily and social loss without euphemism, yet refuses to let that loss empty the aging person of dignity or covenantal address, resisting both the concealment of youth-oriented culture and the resignation of fatalistic piety. These findings substantiate the study's thesis that the poem's metaphors, read through classical Jewish exegesis, disclose aging not as a problem to be explained but as the appointed occasion for remembrance itself.

Positioned against the three interpretive families surveyed in the introduction, this finding neither confirms nor simply rejects any single position but reframes their disagreement. Hahn's organ-specific allegory and Keefer's ancient Near Eastern reading both correctly identify the poem's images as culturally coded rather than arbitrary, yet neither asks what governs the images grammatically; Cassels and Sinykin and Winant are right to resist a rigid, reader-imposed allegorical grid, but this study's syntactic analysis shows that resistance need not treat the poem as a loose composite either, since the images are bound together not by an imposed decoding key but by their shared subordination to the poem's own opening imperative. The specific contribution of this study, then, is to supply the missing grammatical warrant that both sides of this debate lack: classical Jewish exegesis is defensible not merely as one tradition's reading among others, but because the poem's own syntax already organizes its imagery exactly as that tradition assumed.

This reading carries direct implications for pastoral and homiletical practice, offering a mode of preaching on aging that is exegetically disciplined without becoming clinical or sentimental, and for theological education, which stands to benefit from treating classical Jewish sources as primary interlocutors rather than secondary background. This study is limited to one passage and a bounded selection of classical Jewish sources, and it does not test its pastoral claims against lived congregational experience. Future research should therefore pursue three directions: a comparative study with patristic and Eastern Orthodox readings of the same passage; empirical pastoral research on how this hermeneutic of remembrance resonates within specific ecclesial contexts, including Wesleyan-Holiness communities in Indonesia; and further philological work extending this study's syntactic and root-based observations to the less-examined vocabulary.

ETHICS STATEMENT

This study did not involve human participants, interviews, surveys, or personal data requiring ethical approval. The research was based exclusively on published textual sources, including the Hebrew Bible, ancient biblical versions, classical Jewish exegetical literature, and secondary scholarly publications. Therefore, ethical approval was not required. All sources were acknowledged through appropriate academic citations to maintain scholarly integrity and respect for intellectual property.

FUNDING

This research received no external funding. All research activities, including data collection, textual analysis, interpretation, and manuscript preparation, were conducted independently by the author without financial support from any public, commercial, nonprofit, or other funding institutions.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflict of interest with any individual, institution, organization, or other party that could influence the research process, data interpretation, manuscript preparation, or publication of this article.

DECLARATION OF AI USAGE

The author used SciSpace and Publish or Perish as research tools to assist in searching for, identifying, and retrieving relevant academic references for this study. These tools were used solely to support the literature search and reference discovery process, not to generate the scientific content, analysis, interpretation, or conclusions of the article. The author independently reviewed and verified the relevance and accuracy of the sources used and takes full responsibility for the final content of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Bediako, D. K. (2025). Light and Luminaries: A Study of Genesis 1:3–5 and 14–19. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 144(3), 413–429.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1443.2025.2>
- Breuer, Y. (2004). Three Midrashim and Their Exegetic Method. *Hebrew Studies*, 45(1), 175–192. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/hbr.2004.0028>
- Cassels, I. (2021). Against explanation: Dylan Thomas and smudginess. *Textual Practice*, 35(12), 1909–1923. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2021.1970005>
- Correa, T. (2006). Intertextualidad y exégesis intra-bíblica ¿Dos caras de la misma moneda? Breve análisis de las presuposiciones metodológicas. *DavarLogos*, 5(1), 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.17613/s07b-dr46>
- Debel, H. (2010). When It All Falls Apart: A Survey of the Interpretational Maze concerning the “Final Poem” of the Book of Qohelet (Qoh 12:1-7). *Old Testament Essays*, 23(2), 235–260.
- Dunham, K. C. (2024). Old Age, Death, or Something Else? Another Look At Qohelet’S Climactic Poem. *Semănătorul (The Sower)*, 4(2 supp), 7–44.
<https://doi.org/10.58892/ts.swr4210supp>
- Fassberg, S. E. (2013). *Shifts in Word Order in the Hebrew of the Second Temple Period* (pp.

- 57–71). Brill. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004254794_006
- Fox, Michael V. (1988). Aging and Death in Qohelet 12. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 13(42), 55–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030908928801304204>
- Hahn, S. (2023). William Carlos Williams and the Subject of Aging. *William Carlos Williams Review*, 40(2), 206–242. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.5325/willcarlwillrevi.40.2.0206>
- Harvey, E. J. (2023). Not Seeing, Unseeing, and Blind: Disentangling Disability from Adjacent Topoi in the Hebrew Bible. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 142(3), 363–383. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1423.2023.1>
- Keefer, A. (2022). Suffering and Meaning in Egyptian Literature. In A. Keefer (Ed.), *Ecclesiastes and the Meaning of Life in the Ancient World* (pp. 26–56). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/9781009110082.003>
- Kiperwasser, R. (2007). Structure and Form in Kohelet Rabbah as Evidence of Its Redaction. *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 58(1), 283–302. <https://doi.org/10.18647/2736/JJS-2007>
- Knight, D. A. (2014). Perspectives on Aging and the Elderly in the Hebrew Bible. *Interpretation*, 68(2), 136–149. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0020964313518179>
- Landy, F. (2004). Chapter 14 The End of the World : Archive Lamentations Rabbah. *Derrida, Archive Fever*, 1(1), 231–246. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-09037-9>
- Lavoie, J. . (2019). Où en sont les études sur le livre de Qohélet (2012–2018) ? *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses*, 48(1), 40–76. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0008429819828376>
- Pitcher, S. L. (2023). The Medieval Prosodic Orthography of the Tiberian Masoretic Reading Tradition. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 68(2), 501–553. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jss/fgad009>
- Robinson, J. T. (2022). Secrets of Qohelet: Toward an Exegetical History of a Biblical Text during the Middle Ages. *The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy*, 30(1), 90–113. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/1477285X-12341328>
- Russ Fishbane, E. (2022). Facing Mortality Towards a Hebrew Poetics of Ageing. In E. Russ Fishbane (Ed.), *Ageing in Medieval Jewish Culture*. Liverpool University Press. <https://doi.org/10.3828/liverpool/9781800348516.003.0008>
- Sinykin, D. A. N., & Winant, J. (2025). Close Reading for the Twenty-First Century. In D. A. N. SINYKIN & J. WINANT (Eds.), *Close Reading for the Twenty-First Century*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.28274133>
- Sovran, T. (2013). House and home: A semantic stroll through metaphors and symbols.

Journal of Israeli History, 32(1), 141–156.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13531042.2013.768044>

Spieckermann, H. (2020). Jugend—Alter—Tod: Kohelets abschließende Reflexion: Koh 11:7-12:8. *Vetus Testamentum*, 70(1), 193–208.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/15685330-12341435>

Stefano, A. (2022). Torah Overtones in the Epilogues of Qoheleth. *Verbum Vitae*, 40(2), 515–534. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31743/vv.13466>

Tantlevskij, I. (2019). Allegories of life, death and immortality in the book of ecclesiastes 1 2: 5 b - 7. *Schole*, 13(1), 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.25205/1995-4328-2019-13-1-48-57>

van Wieringen, A. L. H. M. (2020). Methodological Developments in Biblical Exegesis: Author – Text – Reader. *Analecta of the UCU. Theology*, 7(1), 27–46.

<https://doi.org/10.47632/2075-4817-2020-7-27-46>