CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY TO THE SECOND EDITION OF THE
HATCH-REDPATH *CONCORDANCE TO THE SEPTUAGINT*[*]

IN CONJUNCTION WITH R. A. KRAFT

A century ago, in 1897, the two volumes of the main body of the "Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint," as it was then known, were published as a set five years after the individual fascicles began to appear. The original editor, Edwin Hatch, had died in 1889; in 1906 his successor, Henry A. Redpath, completed the project by issuing a third volume that included a list of additions and errata to the main body as well as four appendices: (1) a concordance of proper names, (2) a concordance of the recently discovered Hebrew text of Ben Sira, (3) a concordance of the newly published Hexaplaric materials, and (4) a comprehensive (if awkward to use) reverse Hebrew-to-Greek index. Unmodified reprints were issued by the Akademische Druck und Verlaganstalt (Graz, Austria) in 1954 and five times by Baker Book House between 1983 and 1991.

History of Earlier Concordances of Greek Jewish Scriptures

This Oxford Concordance, or "Hatch-Redpath" (HR) as it has come to be known, was hardly a new concept or endeavor. Concordances of various sorts had been available for a long time as a backbone of study and research, primarily to assist in locating words or subjects in the main text of a standard edition, with the "dictionary" forms of the words usually arranged in alphabetic or some other accessible order (see Rouse and Rouse 1974 on early concordances to the Latin Bible; Gregory 1909 in general). It is unknown when the first concordance of the Greek Jewish Scriptures was created—a Basilian monk named Euthalius of Rhodes is credited with a handwritten concordance to the entire Greek Bible

---

[*] The bibliography for this chapter is located at the end of the chapter.

around the year 1300.[1] In the era of the printing press, however, several notable productions have fulfilled this function and sometimes more. They have also generated a significant amount of debate about how best to construct a concordance.

The first printed concordance that attempted systematically to incorporate information from the LXX/OG and associated materials was published in 1607, after seven years of preparatory work, by Conrad Kircher, a much traveled Lutheran pastor born in Augsburg.[2] Some critics (especially Trommius) called the title of Kircher's work deceptive, since the material was not arranged primarily as a "concordance to the Greek OT" with the Greek words governing the format, but alphabetically in accord with the supposed Hebrew roots. Thus, in some sense it was basically a Hebrew-Greek concordance listing under each Hebrew headword each apparent Greek equivalent along with the passages attesting it, including, occasionally, information from the Hexapla. Latin translations were included with both the Hebrew and the Greek headwords.

Critics struggled to find any consistent rationale for the exact order of the Hebrew entries (e.g., אָבִיב ,אָבַד, and several other Hebrew words stand between אָב = "root" and אָב = "father" in the opening columns) and the order in which the Greek equivalents were presented. An alphabetically arranged index was provided to make it possible for users to locate the Greek words, but the value of this index was severely compromised by its indicating only the column numbers, to which the user then had to turn to determine what Hebrew was being represented and where. Greek words found in the Apocrypha, which had no preserved Hebrew basis and thus were not covered by the body of the concordance, were included in the index (but without Latin translation) along with the specific passages in which they occurred. As a pioneering effort, Kircher's work boldly aimed at comprehensiveness, as indicated by its lengthy title, which listed its various features and functions: organization according to Hebrew headwords; lexicons for Hebrew-Latin, Hebrew-Greek, and Greek-Hebrew equivalents; materials from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion as well as LXX/OG; Greek and Hebrew homonyms and synonyms; Greek explanation of Hebrew variations, and Hebrew of Greek; usefulness for New Testament studies as well as Old

---

[1] So Sixtus Senensis, *Bibliotheca Sancta* (Cologne: Maternum Cholinum, 1566) 4.286; according to Gregory, "Concordances," this manuscript was reported to have been at Rome, "but is unknown" to him.

[2] It is probably significant that the first published New Testament concordance was also by an Augsburg native, Xystus Betuleius (Sixtus Birken) in 1546 (so Bindseil, "Über die Concordanzen," 689, 693).

Testament. As Trommius and others would later point out, however, problems both with the organization and the details compromised the reliability of Kircher's contribution.

Several attempts to improve on Kircher's concordance are reported from the following decades of the seventeenth century. One is attributed to Henry Savile, although that identification is questioned by Redpath (1896, 72) on the grounds that it is dated to "a time when Savile had been long dead"—but at least two literary figures by that name flourished in the seventeenth century, the first and most famous of whom died around 1622, but the other not until 1687. In any event, Redpath calls the "Savile" compilation "a mere work of scissors and paste for the greater part. Two copies of Kircher were cut up and distributed in alphabetical order according to the Greek words, and the Hebrew equivalents were inserted either in MS or from the headings of Kircher's articles." Redpath notes that this work was preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford (pressmark, Auct. E.I.2,3), and that "a specimen" was edited by Jean Gagnier and printed and published in 1714 by Oxford University Press.

A similar concordance was completed in 1647 by Ambrose Aungier, chancellor of St. Patrick's Cathedral in Dublin. This was in the possession of Trinity College, Dublin, when Redpath wrote his article. Redpath did not actually see the manuscript, but on the basis of information he had received describes it (1896, 72) as "in many parts an abridged transcript of Kirchner," but following the Greek order of words, like Savile.

Le Long (1723, 1.456) also notes some other by-products from Kircher's efforts (none of which we have seen):

1. *Epitome Concordantiarum Graecarum Kircheri* produced by Arnold Bootius.

2. A two-volume work with the title *Concordantiae Graecae Veteris Testamenti Hebraicis vocibus respondentes, sive Conradi Kircheri Concordantiae inversae*. The editor is not identified (Bindseil 1870 suspects that this may be a muddled reference to Trommius). According to Le Long, this work is found in codices 3046–47 in the Bodleian Library.

3. *Concordantiae librorum Veteris Testamenti Apocryphorum Graeco-Danicae, Kircherianis perfectiores*, edited by Francisco Michaele Vogelius prior to 1699.

Perhaps the most impressive and comprehensive effort at publishing a concordance of the Greek Jewish scriptures came from the hand of Abraham van der Trommen, or Trom(m), or Trommius as he calls himself in the volume under examination. Trommius was a protestant pastor from Groningen in the Netherlands who had studied Hebrew with the younger Johann Buxtorf in Basel and had also traveled to France

and England during his career. In 1692 he produced a concordance to the Bible in Flemish. In 1718, at age 84 and following sixteen years of effort, he issued his Greek concordance. He died the following year.

Trommius is understandably critical of aspects of Kircher's work and even includes in his lengthy title (typical for those times) the description "with words following the order of the Greek verbal elements, contrary to the approach taken in Kircher's work"! In his preface, Trommius takes issue with Kircher on three main points (as well as several lesser matters): (1) the failure to organize the materials alphabetically with the Greek as the basis, (2) the numerous erroneous quotations, probably caused by the manner in which Kircher worked (he first recorded where a Greek word occurred and only later filled in the actual contexts, and (3) the confused and confusing attempt to organize by Hebrew roots. That Trommius was not opposed in principle to some sort of lexical grouping is shown by his own juxtaposition of related Greek words (e.g., the same structural block contains ἀγαπάω, ἠγαπημένος, ἀγάπη, ἀγαπητός, etc.). But the presentation of the Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents to the Greek headwords and of the invaluable Hebrew-Greek reverse index (130 pages of detailed listings, not just page/column references) is strictly alphabetic.

In addition, Trommius discusses briefly the following procedural points:

1. For his main Greek text, he uses the 1597 Frankfurt edition of Andrew Wechel, including its occasional appended scholia and its chapter and verse divisions (as did Kircher).

2. Other editions have been consulted, such as London 1653 (with its scholia), Cambridge 1665, Amsterdam 1683, and the recent 1709 edition by Franciscus Halma and Lambert Bos (with its numerous scholia); a 33-page appendix prepared by Lambert Bos lists differences in chapter and verse locators between the Wechel text and the London edition of the Vatican text (Codex B).

3. Other ancient Greek versions and variations are also included, such as Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion (so also Kircher), while Montfaucon's Greek lexicon to the Hexapla constitutes a second appendix (70 pages).

4. A special notation is used to mark passages in which information from Greek scholia and similar older sources has been inserted because the actual LXX/OG text lacks any equivalent for the Hebrew (Greek "omissions"; Kircher also includes such material).

5. Hebrew words not represented in the Greek are not included (except as noted in § 4); for Greek words that have no Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent, an appropriate notation is also provided.

6. Transliterated Hebrew words and place names are treated variously.

7. Partial or paraphrastic renderings in the Greek present special problems for which there is no single solution.

8. Passages in which the Greek does not fully render what is in the Hebrew also present special problems.

9. Proper names are not included (so also Kircher), unless they are actually translated (not simply transliterated) by the Greek.

10. Indeclinables, prepositions and conjunctions are not included (so also Kircher).

11. Words found in the Apocrypha are included and appropriately designated (see also Kircher's Greek-Hebrew index).

12. Latin meanings for Hebrew and Greek words are included (as in Kircher; Trommius occasionally included Flemish definitions!), but basically the dictionary order of Hebrew and Greek words is followed (unlike Kircher).

Redpath's summary comparing the works of Trommius and Kircher is worth excerpting (1896, 73–74):

> Trommius gives many more quotations from the Hexapla than Kircher did. He does not quote the transliterated words, and omits passages which are paraphrastic or do not give the meaning of the Hebrew. Proper names are, as a rule, omitted, and both Concordances omit indeclinable words and pronouns. The apocryphal quotations are by no means complete. A certain number of passages are given by both compilers, derived from scholia and other sources, but not actually to be found in the present text of the LXX. These are marked with a § by Trommius [and similarly identified by Kircher].

Redpath continues (p. 74), with marked understatement:

> Though the book is by no means perfect, it is in some respects an advance upon Kircher. Trommius generally notices the Hebrew conjugations and also inserts conjectures as to what the Hebrew reading of the LXX was. But the work is disfigured by a considerable number of misprints and misplacements of passages in succession. This was probably due to a slip of the MS being misplaced, as we gather from these mistakes that each slip contained about six or seven lines of MS. . . . So far as a rough calculation can settle the point, there would seem to be four quotations in Trommius for every three in Kircher.

An interesting historical sidelight is that Jean Gagnier, who had migrated from Paris to England and received an Oxford appointment in 1717, defended the approach of Kircher over against Trommius. Already

in 1718, the year that Trommius's concordance appeared, Gagnier published an essay to vindicate Kircher and criticize the work of Trommius. Doubtless this had something to do with Gagnier's plan to publish more of the "Savile" material, of which a "specimen" appeared in 1714. Redpath concludes on the basis of correspondence from that period that "many thought . . . that Gagnier had transgressed all the bounds of moderation in his *Vindiciae*, and the dispute about the rival merits of the two Concordances died away" (1896, 76).

In addition to Gagnier-Savile and Trommius, Le Long (1723, 1.456, with reference to Alexander Helledius, *Praesens status Ecclesiae Graecae* [1714], p. 7) mentions reports from the same general period (around 1700) that for thirty years a person named Sugdor (i.e., George Sugdures, who studied at Rome and later taught in Constantinople according to Gregory) had been working on a Greek concordance for the entire Christian Bible (Old and New Testaments), although it does not seem to have ever been published. Nor after all these years is there yet such a concordance from Western scholarship!

The existence of these basically bilingual concordances helped spur progress in lexicography and vice versa. The rather unmethodological efforts of John Williams to introduce the main Hebrew equivalents as found in Trommius into a concordance of the Greek New Testament (1767) may be noted in passing, if only because Bindseil (1870; see also Tov, *TCU*, 90–99) listed it as an addendum to his discussion of LXX/OG concordances.[3] Despite its ambiguous title, Williams's work is not a concordance of the Greek Jewish scriptures. It does, however, show how lexicographical interests were served by the tools that generated Greek-Hebrew equivalents.

More promising for our purposes was the line of development laid out in Johann Christian Biel's posthumous *Novus thesaurus philologicus* that appeared in 1779–1780. This work should be discussed together with its successor, Johann Friedrich Schleusner's *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus* (1820–1821), since the two works are, in general, virtually identical in title, structure, and general content. Indeed, following his own introductory comments, Schleusner reprints the preface that E. H. Mutzenbecher contributed to Biel.

To be sure, the works of Biel and Schleusner are not concordances in the usual sense, nor do they attempt to list all biblical occurrences of each Greek headword, but they do organize the material in Greek alphabetical order, and each entry includes the Hebrew or Aramaic equivalents and

---

[3] Bindseil knew Williams's work only third-hand and clearly was not acquainted with its actual contents.

sample references. Basic to these efforts is the concordance produced by Trommius. Where Biel and Schleusner make marked progress is in annotating and analyzing the presumed equivalents, including those drawn from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. They also give much more attention to identifying where the Greek translator may have had a different Hebrew text or may have read the text in what seems to us an unusual manner. Although Biel and the first edition of Schleusner do not include a Hebrew index, one was supplied (Hebrew words in alphabetic order, together with the page numbers where they occur) in Schleusner's second edition, published in Glasgow (1822) and London (1829). Even today, the materials in these antiquated volumes provide valuable information to be used alongside of our improved reprints and new tools—both print and electronic.[4] Indeed, current electronic capabilities can combine the features of lexicon and concordance features (as well as grammatical matters) into a single multipurpose tool.

What motivated Schleusner to produce his work so soon (at least from our vantage point) after the appearance of Biel's work? Doubtless there were a variety of factors, but an important event in LXX/OG study had occurred in the interim—the appearance, in stages, of Holmes and Parsons's major collation of Greek variants from the numerous available manuscripts of the LXX/OG (Oxford, 1795–1827). It was a period of renewed interest in and access to these materials, and Schleusner represents a high point of such activities. A similar proliferation of textual activity provided the context for the appearance of the Hatch-Redpath concordance, surrounded as it was by a flow of new discoveries and attendant text-critical work that remains unfinished (the "larger Cambridge Septuagint") or in progress (the Göttingen Septuagint).

One last item remains to be noticed before we reach the Oxford Concordance. The Bagster product by "G.M." (i.e., George Morrish) attempted to incorporate a wider range of text-critical information into its utilitarian format (1887). Redpath gives a handy thumbnail sketch of this relatively thin volume, which gives biblical chapter and verse locations but not the actual Greek (or even English) context (1896, 76):

> Pronouns and prepositions are omitted. It contains no proper names. No Hebrew equivalents are given except under θεός and κύριος, and then they are given in English characters. No references to the Apocrypha are inserted. In some of the longer and commoner words only references are given to passages where there is a various reading. The various readings are given at the foot of each article. The Appendix also contains words from the twelve Uncials of Holmes and Parsons,

---

[4] For some suggested refinements, see Kraft, "Towards a Lexicon of Jewish Translation Greek" (in Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography,* 157–78).

but "no attempt has been made to give *all* the references where a word occurs." It is impossible in any satisfactory way to compare the number of entries with that in previous Concordances. It is an extremely useful and handy book as far as it goes, but something more is still felt to be desired in the way of a complete setting forth of the Hebrew equivalents and of Hexaplaric references, and also of the Greek of the Apocrypha.

This comment brings us to the appearance of the Hatch-Redpath Oxford Concordance of a century ago.

The Hatch-Redpath Concordance

Surprisingly, the brief preface to HR (dated 1897) makes no reference at all to the history of concordance work as we have tried to lay it out here, and as Redpath himself presented it elsewhere (1896). While HR is in many ways a vast improvement over its predecessors, there are aspects that might have been even more useful if the older discussions and quibbles had been weighed more carefully, especially those between Trommius and Kircher. The most obvious failure of HR to profit from this history is in its Hebrew-Greek reverse index, which basically mimics Kircher's Greek-Hebrew index in format (criticized by Trommius and others for providing only column locations) and ignores the considerable improvement introduced by Trommius (with also a side glance to Schleusner's reverse index). The attempts to rectify this problem by various scholars in various formats are laudable: Dos Santos (1973, handwritten expansions of HR's page/column numbers) and Muraoka (handwritten manuscript privately circulated in the early 1970s, mentioned already in Dos Santos, and published in the present volume <that is, HR>) come most readily to mind, along with the "Greek Lexicon of Hebrew Words," a project still in progress (Athens, 1968–). In hindsight a reprint of the reverse index by Trommius (which includes Latin glosses and indications of the number of occurrences for each equivalence) would have served scholarship well in the intervening century!

As we have noted, HR appeared at a time of great ferment in biblical studies, with a wealth of new textual and lexicographical materials becoming available, and old perspectives and theories giving way to newer insights (see Jellicoe, *SMS* for details). Swete's "manual edition" of the LXX/OG in three volumes—the "smaller Cambridge Septuagint" (1887–1894)—was under way, and with its focus on the "great uncials" B, A, and S provided a convenient companion to HR. Frederick Field's Oxford edition of the Hexaplaric materials had appeared in 1875, and a

burst of new energy relating to these materials was inspired by the Cairo Geniza discoveries a few years later. Meanwhile, Paul de Lagarde was preparing in Göttingen his influential, if partly misdirected, reconstruction of the text of the "Lucianic" recension/revision (1883) and the larger project of which it was a part (carried forward by his pupil and successor Alfred Rahlfs).

In such a rich and productive scholarly context, HR was greatly appreciated and praised—and with good reason—although in some areas the need for even better tools was already apparent. Rudolph Smend, for example, was able to improve on the treatment of the materials from Sirach almost immediately (1907), illustrating how much of a moving target our editors faced a century ago. The new collections and collations of text-critical materials—by projects in Göttingen, Cambridge, and elsewhere—too quickly exposed the limitations of HR in terms of its value for coping with the textual richness of the LXX/OG and related traditions. Indeed, even apart from what was about to happen with the appearance of the "larger Cambridge Septuagint" and its wealth of variant readings (edited by Alan E. Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. J. Thackeray; 1906–1940), HR did not do justice to the text-critical data that had already been long available in the Holmes and Parsons edition (1795–1827) and even earlier.

For example, even Trommius included some Greek entries that were subsequently absent from HR, such as the Aldine edition's προσεκχέω in Exod 29:16 and συναλάλαγμα in Job 39:25; Codex 87's πλησιοχῶραι in Dan-Th 11:24; and the Göttingen Septuagint's ἐξανάστασις in Gen 7:4 (for which HR 82b lists only ἀνάστημα, the reading of manuscripts A and M and some other sources [manuscripts B and S are not preserved in this section]). Particularly regrettable is the absence of readings from important minuscules such as the "Lucianic" group (bo(r)c$_2$e$_2$) in the historical books and in Esther. Furthermore, HR does not include emendations; for example, on the basis of Jer 34:4 [= 34:5 Rahlfs = 27:5 MT] and 31:25 [Göttingen/Rahlfs = 48:25 MT], the Göttingen Septuagint—but not HR 538c—adopts ἐπίχειρα in Jer 29:11 [= 30:4 Rahlfs = 49:10 MT] instead of διὰ χεῖρα (found in all manuscripts; in all three places ἐπίχειρα represents וְרִעַ). It is unfair, of course, to hold HR responsible for any such particulars that were not known a century ago, but its principle of neglecting variants and emendations is justifiably criticized.

The careful work by scholars like Max Margolis (1905, 1906) on the special problems presented by translation literature reminded researchers of the need for a more sophisticated approach to word

groupings in Greek and Hebrew, methods pioneered already by Kircher (for Hebrew roots) and Trommius (for interrelated Greek words) and expanded by Biel and Schleusner. The failure of HR to provide information on such word groups is well illustrated by the equivalence הוֹאַלְנוּ = κατεμείναμεν in Josh 7:7 (HR 739a), which should be examined within the larger context of comparing the word group μένω, περιμένω, ὑπομένω, and προσμένω with the word group חוּל/חִיל, הוֹחִיל, and יָחַל elsewhere in the LXX/OG. The approach advocated and to some extent pioneered by Margolis has been facilitated by the 1972 list compiled by Xavier Jacques—a valuable supplement to the mechanically alphabetic approach of HR. Jacques gathers together all the words in a single word-group that occur in the LXX/OG; for example, under the entry κλῆρος we find:

ἀκληρεῖν	κληρονόμος
ἀποκληροῦν	κλῆρος
ἔγκληρος	κληροῦν
ἐπικληροῦν	κληρουργία
εὔκληρος	κληρουχεῖν
κατακληροδοτεῖν	κληρουχία
κατακληρονομεῖν	κληρωτί
κατακληροῦσθαι	ὁλοκληρία
κληροδοσία	ὁλόκληρος
κληροδοτεῖν	συγκατακληρονομεῖν
κληρονομεῖν	συγκληρονομεῖν
κληρονομία	

Jacques also indicates in which part(s) of the LXX/OG the entry-word occurs: Torah, historical books, poetic and sapiential books, prophetic books.

Especially frustrating is the approach taken in HR to the identification of Hebrew-Greek translational equivalents. In the academically conservative British environment from which HR derives, there is a focus on what Tov[5] calls "formal" equivalents—the word or words that occupy the same locations in the parallel texts—rather than on the "presumed" (conjectured) equivalents, although Trommius already had included references to presumed equivalents, added in parentheses after the formal equivalents (see, e.g., δοῦλος, κάλλος, καταδολεσχέω, καταδουλόω). But even in its low-risk setting, HR is frustratingly inconsistent—as the preface states:

> There are . . . many passages in which opinions may properly differ as to the identification of the Greek and the Hebrew: it must be understood in regard to

---

[5] Tov, *TCU*, 60–70.

such cases that the aim of the present work, from which philological discussions are necessarily excluded [see, e.g., Biel-Schleusner], is rather to give a tenable view than to pronounce a final judgment.

The preface goes on to say that the editors have resisted including conjectured Hebrew equivalents even when the "variant [Hebrew] reading followed by the Septuagint version was obvious." When it comes to coding the entries linking the Hebrew list to the individual Greek occurrences, "the absence of a reference number after a quotation implies that the passage does not exist in Hebrew [thus –] . . . The presence of an obelus (†) instead of a number implies that the identification of the Greek and Hebrew is doubtful" and merits closer examination.

Thus, in practice, many equivalents that could easily be described unambiguously on a formal level are nevertheless denoted "†" (or sometimes "?") because the editors suspected, with good reason, that the presumed equivalent differed from the formal equivalent. For example, συνετέλεσεν in Deut 31:1 is denoted † (HR 1319c), even though its formal equivalent is fairly obviously הָלַךְ. Although δοῦλοι in 1 Kgdms 13:3 clearly reflects עֲבָדִים instead of its formal equivalent עִבְרִים in MT, it is misleadingly denoted † (HR 246b). Likewise, καταδουλόω in Gen 47:21 reflects הֶעֱבִיד as elsewhere in the LXX/OG, but it is indicated as † (HR 731a) because the formal MT equivalent reads הֶעֱבִיר. Αἰνεῖν in Jer 38:5 [Göttingen/Rahlfs = 31:5 MT] represents הָלַל as elsewhere in the LXX/OG, but is indicated as † (HR 33c) because MT reads חָלַל. On the other hand, no such † indication is found when ἀσθενέω in Mal 3:11 is listed (HR 172a) as an equivalent of שׁכל *pi'el* (MT תְשַׁכֵּל, though its presumed equivalent would be כשׁל *pi'el* (thus passim in the LXX/OG). Similarly, HR 1257c indicates that σαλεύω in 4 Kgdms 17:20 reflects the formal equivalent ענה *pi'el* of MT, though its presumed equivalent would be נוע *hiph'il* (thus passim in the LXX/OG). Instances could be multiplied. Such inconsistent employment of the † sign is not only misleading but also reduces the usefulness of the concordance.

An obvious example of side effects of this situation is that by eliminating reference to any formal Hebrew equivalents that may exist for Greek entries, the frequent use of the † sign in the body of the concordance makes the reverse index even less useful because it cannot include any Hebrew entries for Greek words thus marked. For example, in the reverse index the formal equivalence of צוּר and κτίστης (2 Kgdms 22:32) is not mentioned because HR 796a flags this with †. Similarly, there can be no entries in the reverse index for frequently occurring Greek words (conjunctions, prepositions, numerals, pronouns) for which

Hebrew equivalents are not included in HR. Nor does the reverse index mention Hebrew words when they happen to occur in combinations that are listed elsewhere in the concordance. Accordingly, the reverse index often provides incomplete information (see, e.g., אַחֲרֵי, אִם, כִּי, לִפְנֵי).

In addition, but for different reasons, the HR concordance does not list any Hebrew equivalents for words occurring in Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and other Hexaplaric sources (here also Trommius retains its usefulness; see also Biel-Schleusner). Thus HR is less useful for studying those sections of the LXX/OG traditions that represent a translation approach similar to or identical with what we identify as Aquila or Theodotion[6] or for research on individual equivalents in cases where the Hexaplaric materials may provide important clues to recovering the presumed Hebrew. For example, in 1 Kgdms 9:25 the proposed presumed equivalence of διέστρωσαν // רבד *qal* (where MT has דבר *pi'el*) finds support in Prov 7:16, where Aquila and Theodotion are credited with rendering רבד with περιστρώννυμι (see HR 1127a).[7] This sort of information is difficult to discover from the data in HR.

Interestingly, the notation of equivalents is different in HR's appendix 1, which lists the proper names of the LXX/OG, probably because the editors (mainly Redpath at this point) thought that the presumed equivalents of proper names could be determined more easily than those of common nouns. In some instances, equivalents in proper names are described as "aliter [otherwise] in Heb.," while in others the formal equivalents are given and yet others indicate the presumed equivalents. For example, Ἑβραῖοι in 1 Kgdms 17:8 is listed by HR *53a* as an equivalent of MT's עֲבָדִים and not of the presumed עִבְרִים. But Σύρος is often represented by אֲרָם even where MT reads אָדָם or אֱדוֹם (HR *148b*).

As with the sign †, many question marks in HR's notation are superfluous, for the formal equivalent can be indicated easily. Several examples will suffice:

> 3 Kgdms 6:7   MT   אֶבֶן שְׁלֵמָה מַסָּע נִבְנָה
>
> OG   λίθοις ἀκροτόμοις ἀργοῖς ᾠκοδομήθη

In this phrase, the first, second, and fourth Greek words are presented in HR with their Hebrew equivalents. The third word, however, is marked "?" (HR 153a).

> Isa 23:17 [16]   MT   וְשָׁבָה לְאֶתְנַנָּה
>
> OG   ἀποκαταστ(αθ)ήσεται εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον

---

[6] For recent relevant discussions of this situation and of literal and free translation techniques, see Tov, *TCU,* 17–29; note also Reider and Turner 1966.

[7] For other examples, see Margolis 1910, 306.

The first Greek word is given with its Hebrew equivalent, but the last receives the "?" code (HR 163a).

1 Kgdms 20:30 MT בָּחֵר אַתָּה לְבֶן-יִשַׁי

OG μέτοχος εἶ σὺ τῷ υἱῷ Ιεσσαι

Μέτοχος ("sharing in, partner"), the formal equivalent of MT's בחר ("to choose"), here reflects חבר ("to unite, join"), as in five other places in the LXX/OG. HR 918a therefore decided to add a question mark to the formal equivalence.

Likewise, in dealing with words that are transposed in the Greek translation, HR often deviates from its system of listing equivalents. In accordance with the overall layout, HR often records the inverted words in the arbitrary order of formal equivalence. For example, the inverted translation of Deut 33:8 תֻּמֶּיךָ וְאוּרֶיךָ // δήλους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλήθειαν αὐτοῦ is recorded according to its formal equivalents (HR 53a, 295b).[8] The inverted Greek text of Deut 11:1 is treated similarly. Usually, however, HR inverts the notation with reference to the Greek words and thus records them as if they reflected a Hebrew text different from MT. Thus for Gen 30:43 שְׁפָחוֹת וַעֲבָדִים // παῖδες καὶ παιδίσκαι, the formal equivalents are abandoned in favor of the presumed (HR 1048b, 1049b).[9]

As is to be expected in a work of the scope of HR, many equations are erroneous or doubtful. A few examples may be mentioned:

1. In Gen 4:21, HR 730b incorrectly lists the equivalent of καταδεικνύναι as only תפש rather than אֲבִי כָּל-תֹּפֵשׂ (where the Greek translation condensed the three words into one).
2. In Gen 49:24, HR 751b records κατισχύειν as the equivalent of אֶבֶן even though from a formal point of view the Greek verb reflects both רֹעֶה and אֶבֶן.
3. Ἀθῳοῦν ("to hold guiltless") in Jer 15:15 is recorded as reflecting נקה ni. (as elsewhere in the LXX/OG), although MT reads נקם ni. ("to take vengeance").

A few remaining minor problems deserve brief notice:

*   HR fails to group the evidence in the most useful manner (e.g., by juxtaposing translation units that show similar approaches or by providing references to related word groups, synonyms, or antonyms; see Jacques 1972 and Margolis 1910) and even to provide significant statistics about translational equivalents (how often does Greek *x* represent Hebrew *y* and vice versa, and in which writings? See Dos Santos 1973 and Muraoka's index [appendix 4 in HR]).
*   HR provides minimal grammatical and syntactical information.

---

[8] For a discussion of these renderings, see A. Toeg, "A Textual Note on 1 Samuel xiv 41," *VT* 19 (1969) 496.

[9] See further Tov, *TCU*, 133–4.

- Most transliterated common nouns are listed in the main concordance, some in appendix 1, and others in both!

Some of the problems with the reverse index noted above and elsewhere are solved in HR by Muraoka's expanded treatment.

Moving into the Future

With the advent of the computer, a new age of possibility has dawned for such tools as the textual concordance. If one has a standard computer with software for accessing reliable electronic texts, the sort of simple searches that are made possible by a traditional concordance could be performed on the fly, at least in theory. Nearly a quarter century ago, the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) project at the University of California in Irvine encoded the entire Rahlfs edition of the LXX/OG for computer access. A few years later, *BHS* was similarly encoded, and the Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint/ Scriptural Study (CATSS) project created parallel Hebrew/Greek files to permit bidirectional bilingual searching of a sort that conventional concordance users could perform only with difficulty. Gradually, morphological analysis for both the Hebrew and the Greek materials has been added, which not only makes it possible to find all forms of particular dictionary entries in either language, but also facilitates searching for specific grammatical and syntactical features that have never been systematically noted in traditional concordances (see GRAMCORD and similar computer projects). A project to encode the textual variants in the Greek witnesses is well under way by CATSS, with the hope that a similar project on the Hebrew side will soon follow. The ability to link such data with itself and with other resources is becoming increasingly possible both on and off the Internet (see, e.g., Marquis 1991; chapter 17* above).

When Swete first issued his classic *Introduction* in 1900, he had little to say about concordances beyond mentioning that the Oxford Concordance had recently appeared and was a great asset (p. 290). Jellicoe's attempted update is only slightly more informative (*SMS*, 335–6): "Despite its being too narrowly based and other shortcomings of which the surviving editor was fully conscious [see Redpath's note prefacing the list of addenda et corrigenda] it has remained, with the supplements of 1900 and 1906. . . , the standard work." Jellicoe concludes (pp. 336–7) that "it would still be premature to contemplate a complete revision of the Concordance. As it stands it remains, in the hands of the discerning, a most serviceable instrument. A further supplement would be the only practicable measure, and even this should await the

publication of the remainder of the relevant materials from Qumran." Probably, given the developing state of affairs and its promises for future research, no "complete revision" in Jellicoe's sense will ever be needed. But during the often-frustrating transition period, we can be comforted and assisted by having this revived HR at our sides.

Pertinent Literature (arranged alphabetically)

John R. Abercrombie, William Adler, Robert A. Kraft, and Emanuel Tov, *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS)*, vol. 1: *Ruth* (SBLSCS 20; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

Johann Christian Biel, *Novus Thesaurus Philologicus, sive Lexicon in LXX et alios Interpretes et Scriptores Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (Posthumously edited by E. H. Mutzenbecher; 3 vols.; The Hague: J. A. Bouvink, 1779–1780).

Henricus Ernestus Bindseil, "Über die Concordanzen," *TSK* 43 (1870) 670–720. [An abbreviated presentation of Bindseil's more detailed treatment (not seen) in the prologue to the anthology entitled *Concordantiarum Homericarum specimen cum Prolegomenis in quibus praesertim Concordantiae biblicae recensentur earumque origo et progressus declarantur . . . .* (Halle: Hendelius, 1867); one of Bindseil's main sources is Le Long].

CATSS: Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint/Scriptural Studies Project, a joint project of the Hebrew University and the University of Pennsylvania, with assistance from various other institutions, under the direction of Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov. For individual volumes, see items by Abercrombie et al., Jarick, Polak and Marquis, and Tov; for further information, access the web site at URL http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/.

Elmar Camilo Dos Santos, *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* (Jerusalem: Dugith, [1973]).

Jean Gagnier, *Vindiciae Kircherianae, sive adimadversiones in novas Abrahami Trommii concordantias graecas versionis vulgo dictae LXX interpretum. . . .* (Oxford: Theatro Sheldoniano, 1718) [not seen].

J. Göttsburger, "Berichtigung zur LXX Konkordanz von Hatch- Redpath." *BZ* 3 (1905) 39 [A brief note on correspondences between Isa 9:6, Job 20:15 אֵל = ἄγγελος, and Job 42:3 פלא ni. = μέγας, and a correction for H-P 528 col 3, Ps 139(140):8 (not 7)]; and "Zu Εἰρήνη bei Hatch-Redpath," *BZ* 4 (1906) 246 [Focusing on Isaiah].

GRAMCORD: Computerized Grammatical Concordance project from the GramCord Institute, Vancouver, Wash., under the direction of Paul Miller; initially developed for the New Testament but more recently expanded to include Jewish Scriptures in Hebrew and in Greek.

Caspar R. Gregory, "Concordances," in the New Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1908–1912). [For a similar treatment in French, see E. Mangenot, "Concordances de la Bible," in *DB* 2.C (ed. F. Vigouroux; Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1912 [1899]) 901–2; both Gregory and Mangenot are heavily indebted to Bindseil].

Robert Hanhart, "Jüdische Tradition und christliche Interpretation—zur Geschichte der Septuagintaforschung in Göttingen," in *Kerygma und Logos, Festschrift Carl Andresen* (ed. A. M. Ritter; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 280–97. [Analysis of Schleusner's lexicon].

Xavier Jacques, *List of Septuagint Words Sharing Common Elements*, published simultaneously in a French edition, *Index des mots apparentés dans la Septante: Complément des Concordances et Dictionnaires* (SubBi 1; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972).

John Jarick, *A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance of the Hebrew and Greek Texts of the Book of Ecclesiastes, CATSS—Basic Tools Volume 3* (SBLSCS 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).

Conrad (Konrad) Kircher, *Concordantiae Veteris Testamenti Graecae, Ebraeis Vocibus Respondentes πολύχρηστοι. simul enim et Lexicon Ebraicolatinum, Ebraicograecum, Graecoebraicum: genuinam vocabulorum significationem, ex Septuaginta duorum, ut vulgo volunt, interpretum (vel istis, pro tempore, deficientibus, ex Aquilae nonnunquam, vel Symmachi, vel Theodotionis) translatione petitam: homonymiam ac synonymiam Graecam & Ebraeam: quin & Ebraismorum variorum explanationem Graecam: Graecismorum elocutionem Ebraeam: & sic διασάφησιν Veteris & Novi Testamenti, collatione linguarum utrobique facta, suavissima συμφωνία, lectoribus exhibent.* 2 vols. (Frankfurt am Main: Claudium Marnium & heredes Iohannis Aubrii, 1607).

Robert A. Kraft (ed.), *Septuagintal Lexicography* (SBLSCS 1; Missoula, Mont.: SBL, 1972).

Jacob Le Long, *Bibliotheca Sacra in Binos Syllabos Distincta, quorum prior qui jam tertio auctior prodit, omnes sive Textus sacri sive Versionum ejusdem quavis Lingua expressarum Editiones; nec non praestantiores MSS. Codices, cum Notis historicis & criticis exhibet. Posterior vero continet omnia eorum opera quovis idiomate conscripta, qui huc usque in sacram Scripturam quidpiam ediderunt simul collecta tum ordine Auctorum alphabetico disposita; tum serie sacrorum Librorum. Huic coronidis loco subjiciuntur grammaticae et lexica linguarum, Praesertim Orientalium, quae ad illustrandas sacras paginas aliquid adjumenti conferre possunt*, 2 vols. (ed. P. N. Desmolets, with the preface by C. F. Boerner reprinted from the 1709 Leipzig edition; Paris: Montalant, 1723 [1709]).

J. Lust, "J. F. Schleusner and the Lexicon of the Septuagint," *ZAW* 102 (1990) 256–62.

Max L. Margolis, "Entwurf zu einer revidierten Ausgabe der hebräisch-aramäischen Äquivalente in der Oxforder Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament," *ZAW* 25 (1905) 311–19 [English translation: "Specimen Article for a Revised Edition of the Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents in the Oxford Concordance...," in Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography*, 52–64]; see also the following related articles: "καίειν (einschliesslich der Komposita und Derivata) und seine hebräisch-aramäischen Äquivalente im Gräzismus des A. T.," *ZAW* 26 (1906) 85–90 [Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography*, 65–9]; "Λαμβάνειν (Including Compounds and Derivatives) and its Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents in Old Testament Greek," *AJSL* 22 (1906) 110–19 [Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography*, 70–79]; "Complete Induction for the Identification of the Vocabulary in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament with its Semitic Equivalents: Its Necessity and the Means of Obtaining it," *JAOS* 30 (1910) 301–12 [Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography*, 80–91].

Galen Marquis, "The CATSS-Base: Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Study for All -- Transcript of a Demonstration," in Cox, *VII Congress,* 165–203 [CATSS-Base computer software for linking and searching the CATSS materials].

Raymond A. Martin et al., *The Computer Bible series* (Wooster, Ohio: Biblical Research Associates) -- e.g. Raymond A. Martin, *Syntactical and Critical Concordance to the Greek Text of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah*, (The Computer Bible 12 [1977]); Martin and S. Scorza, *Syntactical Concordance to the Correlated Greek and Hebrew Texts of Ruth*: *The Septuagint Series* (The Computer Bible 30 [1988–1989]).

George Morrish, *A [Handy] Concordance of the Septuagint, Giving Various Readings from Codices Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, and Ephraemi with an Appendix of Words from Origen's Hexapla, etc., not Found in the Above Manuscripts* (London: Bagster, 1887; repr. 1970, 1974, 1976 [Grand Rapids: Zondervan], 1987 [Regency Reference Library]) [Title originally included "handy," but not on some later reprints].

Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Index to I Esdras* (SBLSCS 16; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1984); *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)* (Louvain: Peeters, 1993); idem, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Louvain/Paris/ Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2002).

Frank H. Polak and Galen Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint, Part I: Introduction; Part II: The Pentateuch* (CATSS Basic Tools 4, 5; Stellenbosch: Print24.com, 2002).

H. A. Redpath, "Concordances to the Old Testament in Greek," *The Expositor* 5.3 (1896) 69–77 [reviews the works of Kircher, Savile-Gagnier, Aungier, Trommius, and "G.M." = Morrish].

Joseph Reider and Nigel Turner, *An Index to Aquila* (VTSup 12; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966).

Rosenerch, "Vocabulary of the LXX" [Published as a lexicon in 1624; cited by Redpath, 1896, 77; not seen].

Ernst Friedrich Karl [Carl] Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1797) 449–55 [4-volume series, to 1800; not seen].

R. H. Rouse and M. A. Rouse, "The Verbal Concordance to the Scriptures," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 44 (1974) 5–30 [deals almost exclusively with early concordances to the Latin Bible; note p. 5 n. 1: "The history of the Greek and the Hebrew concordances ... needs more careful investigation"].

Johann Friedrich Schleusner, *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus, sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1820–1821; 2d ed. Glasgow: Duncan, 1822 and London: Duncan, 1829 [reprinted Turnhout: Brepols, 1994]).

N. Simotas, Αἱ ἀμετάφραστοι λέξεις ἐν τῷ κειμένῳ τῶν Ο' (Saloniki, 1969) [lists and analyzes the transliterated proper names and common nouns found in LXX/OG, based on HR (thus incomplete)].

Rudolf Smend, *Griechisch-syrisch-hebräischer Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Berlin: Reimer, 1907) III–XIII ("Vorrede").

Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1902; supplemented ed. by Richard Rusden Ottley, 1914; reprinted by Ktav: New York, 1968; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass., 1989).

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, computerized text project at the University of California in Irvine, under the direction of Theodore Brunner.

Emanuel Tov, "The Use of Concordances in the Reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX," *TCU,* 90–99.

—, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies: The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible* (CATSS 2; *JNSL*, Supplementary Series 1; Stellenbosch, 1986).

Abraham Trommius, *Concordantiae Graecae Versionis Vulgo Dictae LXX Interpretum, Cujus voces secundum ordinem elementorum sermonis Graeci digestae recensentur, contra atque in Opere Kircheriano factum fuerat. Leguntur hic praeterea Voces Graecae pro Hebraicis redditae; Ab antiquis omnibus Veteris Testamenti Interpretibus, quorum nonnisis fragmenta extant, Aquila, Symmacho, Theodotione & aliis, quorum maximam partem nuper in lucem edidit Domnus Bernardus de Montfaucon*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam/Utrecht: Sumptibus Societatis, 1718).