SOME CORRECTIONS TO REIDER-TURNER'S INDEX TO AQUILA

EMANUEL TOV

While reading through the Aquila Index of J. Reider and N. Turner\(^1\), one notes several incorrect or inconsistent notations and many misprints. In the process of checking some data in the Index, I found many more errors. It is inevitable that an Index of this scope will include some mistakes; however, the present Index contains more than would be expected from an auxiliary tool whose information is used and quoted. The reader is therefore well advised to verify the information in the Index before relying upon it. Moreover, the reader cannot be certain that the Index provides him with all the available evidence. Nevertheless, the Index is helpful in the study of Aquila’s vocabulary and translation technique, if only because for the first time the interested reader has the opportunity to see at a glance Aquila’s Hebrew and Greek equivalents. Hopefully, similar Indexes for Symmachus and Theodotion will follow soon.

First, attention should be drawn to several methodological and other inconsistencies and defects of the Index.\(^2\) The below-mentioned numbers refer to the pages of the Index.

1. A serious defect of the Index is that it does not state when Aq is identical with the LXX *ad loc.*\(^3\) Unquestionably, the student of Aq’s vocabulary needs to know that σκόπελον in Regn. IV xxiii 17 (p. 217) is also found in the

---


2 After writing down a list of the Index’s defects, I came across J. Barr’s penetrating review in *JSSS* 12 (1967) 296–304. Since I agree with Barr’s exposition of the defects, none of his statements are repeated here. It is certainly no compliment to the Index that Barr’s long list of the Index’s methodological deficiencies can be extended by the present one. Moreover, since mistakes have been found in every third or fourth item under investigation, the list of corrections can be expanded many times.

3 However, from time to time one finds notes like ἐσδόκεσθαι πιστής Gen. xxxiii 10 α’θ’ο’. Such notes are quoted from the Hexaplaric apparatuses of the Göttingen and Cambridge editions of the Septuagint. These editions record marginal notes in Manuscripts referring to the fifth column of the Hexapla, which may be identical with the Old Greek (as in Gen. xxxiii 10).
“LXX” (*kaige* in this case). The same applies to *χανόν* in Ier. vii 18 li(xliv) 19 (p. 254) and to numerous additional examples. This omission of information leads to imprecise conclusions about Aq’s vocabulary.

2. Many *α’ε* readings⁴, quoted from the Mercati fragments of the Psalms, occur also in the o’ column, and, accordingly, should have been listed as *α’οε* (e.g., *sub ἐκλεκτός*, στρεβλός, διαστρέφειν). While the reader might be tempted to assume that the renditions listed as *αε’* point to a special relationship between Aq and the Quinta, it can actually be shown that both depended upon the Old Greek (identical with the Hexaplaric o’) which both left unrevised from time to time.

3. The Index underlines Aq readings which are reconstructed from Latin, Syriac and Armenian. In some instances these retroverted readings are recorded together with the Greek evidence, while in others they are listed as a separate entry. Apparently, there is no principle behind the two systems of notation (cf. also p. IX).

4. It is unfortunate that the Index does not provide the reader with a separate list of transliterated Hebrew words (similar to the one in Field, xxiii, n. 33). It is even more regrettable that some of these transliterations are included in the list of proper names (pp. 319–323). By this procedure two completely different groups of transliterations are mixed.⁵ The following transliterations should not belong to the list of proper names, nor are they to be capitalized: Ἀφαδανώ, Γάζερα (but p. 45: γαζερά), Ῥασσούρ (but p. p. 107: θασσούρ), Ῥαθάρ (but p. 107: θαθάρ), Καστό (but p. 127: κάστο), Μαμίζήρ (but p. 151: μαμίζηρ), Σαρήκ.

In the Index, some transliterated Hebrew words are accented like Greek words, e.g., θασσούρ, θαθάρ, κάστο, μαμίζήρ, while others are not: αγουρ, αδαμα, αδοναι, αλάμ (p. 7; but p. 206: αλάμ), αλαλαί, αρσεί.

5. The Heb.–Gk. Index of proper names, which is arranged according to the Hebrew alphabet, should have referred also to proper names whose components were translated by Aq, e.g. Gen. xxxii 30(31) Ἀγάμπρσωπον ἰσχυροῦ (p. 206).⁶ Hence, the Index contains incomplete notations such as Ἰσμαήλ Ἰσάμπαν (p. 321), to which εἰσακον θεοῦ should have been added.

⁴ The editor should have explained in the introduction that he quotes the fifth column of the Mercati fragments of the Psalms (Mercati’s column “f”, in other books generally representing Th) as ε’.

⁵ Proper names are transliterated since, as a rule, they cannot, and actually should not, be translated. In addition, Aq transliterated some rare words which apparently were unknown to him, i.e. he left them untranslated. Cf. also 53–67 in the present volume.

⁶ Examples of such translations are mentioned in Reider’s *Prolegomena*, 20, n. 46.
6. References to ἐβρ’ (e.g., s.v. ἀγγέλος, ἀκαταστρατεῖν, ἐπιστυσθαι, Ἐμμανουήλ, καθαρίζειν, καλλωπισμός (read: καλλωπισμός), κόπος, or to o συρ’ (e.g., s.v. πόγων) have no place in an Index to Aquila.

7. The Index designates several references as “LXX” or “LXX?”, e.g. s.v. ἔλπις (78), ἔτος (99), ζῆν (104), μάχαιρα (153), τέμενος (236), τέσσαρες (236), τοιούτος (238), φείδεσθαι (249). In all these instances the quoted renditions7 are indeed found in the LXX only, and hence they have no place in an Aq Index.

8. The same passive verbs are sometimes referred to in their active and at other times in their passive forms, e.g.

46. γεννάσθαι pass. 282. γεννάν pass.
56. διασκορπίζεσθαι pass. 292. διασκορπίζειν (sic) pass.
60. διώκεσθαι pass. 128. (κατα)διώκειν
74. ἐκκαίεσθαι pass. 128. ἐκκαίειν/ κατακαίειν pass.

9. The introduction lacks a clarifying statement on the inclusion and exclusion of anonymous marginal notes.

10. Some of the interesting notes of the Index are written in English while others are in Latin (see, e.g., the below-mentioned example from p. 135 and p. 159).

Now some more detailed corrections:


7. αἰλάμυ λύλυ] divide the entry into two parts:
   a. Αἰλάμυ λύλυ Ier. xxv 15 (xlix 35) α’ σ’ syr. 17 (xlix 37) α’ σ’ syr. Add λύλυ Αἰλάμυ to the Index of proper names on p. 322.
   b. αἰλάμυ λύλα Ez. viii 16 LXX α’ (2 ed.) lat. (aelam) → προστάς and θ’ (not mentioned in the Index). Add this reference on p. 262 (where λύλα should be corrected to λύλα). The reference on p. 206, l. 5 (“vide αἰλάμυ”; better: “→ αἰλάμυ”, referring to Ez. viii 16 rather than to Ez. xi 48) probably refers to this reconstructed entry.

In the present confusion the proper name Αἰλάμυ and the transliterated noun αἰλάμυ are treated alike. Furthermore, λύλα is omitted. Moreover, the notes “syr” (1’) and “→ προστάς” have been left out as well.

7 It is remarkable that all but one of the references refer to the LXX of Ez.
12. ἀλωτός (?) βραχ ἀν Ἰουδ. xvi 17] read: βραχ ἀν Ἰουδ (correctly so on p. 279); correct further: Iou. xvi 7.

12. ἀλλ᾽ ἡ 1 conversive: Deut. 1 26 ou λ᾽] Deut. has only 34 chapters. Did the editor mean i:26? But Brooke-McLean (hereinafter: BM) has there σ' άλλ᾽ ἡ.

16. ἀνάβλεψις ἐκκ-ἐκκ Is. lxi 1 (vide διάβλεψις)] this entry has to be cancelled. ἀνάβλεψις is the reading of the LXX, while Aq has διάβλεψις. Emend accordingly on p. 53 and p. 303.

16. ἀνάγαυν ἐκκ hiph. Ier. ii 6 [α'] (leg. σ') add: syr.

17. ἀνασαίνειν ἁφρ hiph.] read: ἁφρ pilp. (or: ἁφρ κινο as on p. 280).


19. ἀνθελκώνυμι ἰεράκ Is. vi 23 ἀγριὸς syr.] read: ... vi 23 (sec. 86; ἄγριος syr.).


19. ἀνήρ ἄνω add: Barthélémy, p. 48 ff.

21. ἀνθρώπος ἑα Os. i 4 α' σ' LXX et θ' lat. (homo)] and ἀνθρώποι ἑα Os.xi 4 α' σ' θ lat. (homines)]

A very interesting "doublet". The first line (where read xi 4 for i 4) should be omitted.

21. ἀνόητος ἄκμα Ps. xlviii (xlix) ll] add: α' σ'.

23. ἀνόητος ἱππ颌 Ier. ii 6 [α'] (leg. σ') syr.] underline ἀνόητος and read Ἀθὴνα instead of ἡπὶ ἱππ颌 (cf. infra on ἀρὰβα p. 30). Change accordingly in the reverse Index.

25. ἀπλούς ἁπ Ps. xv (xvi) 1 (σάθις ἐκκ = σάθις ἂπ)] read: σάθις ἂπ (correctly so on p. 234).

25. ἀπὸ ἹερΣκ Is. xxxiv 16 α' θ' Ier. xi 15 syr.] read: Is... α' et θ'; Ier.... gr. et syr.

25. ἀπὸ ἐπὶ ἹερΣκ Regn. IV xxiii 27 [ο']<α'>omit [ο']<α'>: the quoted reading occurs in an Aq fragment (Z., edited by F. C. Burkitt; see also BM).

27. ἀπόκομμα ἱππ颌 Ez. xx 7 8] and


30. ] add: ἀρὰβα ἱππ颌 Ier. ii 6 [α'] (leg.σ') syr.

37. ἀφι ἀπ Ps. lxxviii (lxxix) 33] add: α'σ'.

41. and 289. βασιλεουσα κατσ] add: leg. κατσ.

46. γεννάσθαι pass. ἄρα hoph. Is. ix 6(5)] read: ἄρα pass. qal or pu'al (α'ρα)

50. Δαμασκός κατσ] read: κατσ.
ib. קְסִיַּר read: קְסִיָּר. Both forms are listed on p. 320 as if they were variants: (ג) קְסִיַּר.
50–1 δֶּא] the entry should be divided into δֶּא and -דֶּא. In addition, on p. 70, l. 11 for δֶּא read -דֶּא.
53. הִיָּוּ כֹּלְכָּל read: דִּקֵּט The same word is written on p. 318 as דִּקֵּט (r.: דִּקֵּט).
56. דִּיוּסְפְּרָאָה pass. הַדּוֹנְיַר niph. Ier. l(xliii) 5 × α’0’ add: (sec. Q; 86 דִּיוּסְפְּרָאָה pass.). The same information should be provided s.v. דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה.
56. דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה hiph. Ier. viii 3 α’0’ syr.] read α’0’.
56. דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה read: דִּקֵּט.
56. דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה hiph. Ps. xc(xci) 14 Is. v 29 α’0’] read: pi. Ps. xc(xci) 14; hiph. Is. v 29 α’0’ (correctly so on p. 302).
59. דִּיקְטִוּנ פֶּרֶּשֶׁנ Ps. xxx (xxxi) 5 add: α’0’.
59. דִּיקְטִוּנ פֶּרֶּשֶׁנ read: פֶּרֶּשֶׁנ הַשּׁוֹרָא.
60. דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה... Thr. i 4 α’ syr.] underline דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה and omit α’.
60. דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה read: דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה.
61. דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה Number of occurrences...] the editor should have listed the precise references.
60. דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה neut. פֶּרֶּשֶׁנ Lev. iii 1 ot λ’ 6 ot λ’ 9 ot λ’ Regn. III ix 25 ×] instead of Lev. iii 9 ot λ’ read α’ (and anon.). Note that the text of Regn. III ix 25 × reads דִּיוָסְפְּרָאָה against the neuter form in the other passages. Add further: Lev. iii 3 anon. 6 anon. iv 10 anon. 31 anon. vi 12(5) anon. viii3 (13) anon. 4(14) anon. 5(15) anon. 10(20) anon. 27(37) anon. ix 18 anon. x 14 anon. xvii 5 anon. xix 5 anon. xxii 21 anon. Num. vii 29 ot λ’ syr.
70. εἰς οὖν... syr.] underline εἰς οὖν.
70. εἰς οὖν read: Regn. III xxi (xx) 13.
72. ἐκάστη γενεά δέ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ Ps. xliv (xlvi) 18 [α’] σ’0’] the editor correctly surmises that this reading probably should not be attributed to Aq; however, he should have listed γενεά in the same way and not as “γενεά πρῶτος έτος...Ps. xliv (xlvi) 18 α’σ’θ’” (p. 46).
73. ἐκατά δὴ ἦν Ier. xxix (xlvii) 7 α’0’ syr.] read ἐκάτω only (underlined) and add δὴ to p. 52: δὴ om. M.
73. ἐκείθεν μή Regn. IV xxiii 12] read: ἀπὸ ἐκείθεν.
74. ἐκκαίσεσθαι... Ier. ii 15] add: syr.
75. ἐκλεκτὸς ἃ Ps. xvii (xviii) 27 α᾿ε [miph. or ἃ (a notation which probably was intended by the editor, cf. p. 269 ἐκλεκτὸς ἃ ἃ) Ps. xvii... ἃ Ps. lxiv...

76. ] add: ἐκτότε ἃ Is. xvi 13 or ἃ. ἐκτότε (read: ἐκτότε) is mentioned on p. 263 of the Heb.-Gk. Index as rendering ἃ. However, the current Gk.-Heb. Index does not provide this information.

78. ἐλεμ[ read Ἐλέμ (sic p. 320).
85. ἔξαιρνης... ἢ ler. xviii 7 syr.] add: (s. ἔξαιρνα).
101. εὐκλεφθος [add: Barthélemy, p. 82.
101. εὐρύχωρος [add: Barthélemy, p. 82.
101. εὐρύχωρος [add: Barthélemy, p. 82.
110. and 323. θαδαύρι μὴ] read: θαδαύρη.
113. θρόνος [add: θρόνη.
117. and 320. [add: Barthélemy, p. 82.
118. and 303. ἵππος [read: ἵππος Hence, on. p. 303 ἵππος and ὅπλη ἵππος should be listed as one entry.
119. ἵσχυσκός [add: Barthélemy, p. 83.
120. ἵσχυς [read (pro ζήτα) Os. xii 3(4) or ἃ] ζήτα?
125. κάμπτεαν [add: κάμπτει.
128. κατακαίειν [add: Barthélemy, p. 84.
129. καταλύειν [μὴ] read: Μὴ.
130. καταπτάρασθαί [add: cf. καταπτάρασθαί.
134. κερατίνη [add: Barthélemy, p. 63.
135. κίδαρης ἔπνεε Exod. xxvii 37 α᾿ο Lev. viii 9 or ἃ; ἃ Is. lxii 3 α᾿ο (Aq. renders by μίτρα iii 23, thus breaking his rule) and
159. μίτρα ἔπνεε Exod. xxvii 39; ἔπνεε Exod. xxvii 41(40); ἃ Is. iii 23 (sed Aqu. habet κίδαρης in lxii 3, contra usum eius; fortasse error est in ascriptione aut hic aut in lxii 3; vide Ziegler, Notizen, p. 78)].

This method of notation raises doubts as to what the editor means by a “rule”. Since ἔπνεε is rendered twice with κίδαρης (α᾿ο and ἃ) and once with μίτρα while ἃ is rendered once with κίδαρης (α᾿ο) and once with μίτρα, what is the “rule”? Does the editor mean that Aq rendered ἔπνεε with μίτρα (once; the two instances of ἔπνεε – κίδαρης [α᾿ο and ἃ] are not to be ascribed to him) and ἃ with κίδαρης (once)? In fact, the evidence provides no solid basis for assuming such a “rule”, a “rule” which Aq pre-
sumably broke when he rendered μήμα with μήμα. Even if the reader accepts this possibility, on p. 159 he can find, most surprisingly, a diametrically opposed statement in which the translation of μήμα with μήμα is now called the rule (this time in Latin: “usus”).

Note further: 1. For “sed Aqu. habet...” (p. 159) read: Aqu. et Sym. 2. The Heb.-Gk. Index lacks an entry κιδαրις, μήμα μήμα. 3. The correct references in Ex. are: Ex. xxviii 33(37) 35(39) 36(40).

136. and 305. κλίτος (μήμα) read: μήμα (the error must have occurred at an early stage in the preparation of the Index, since μήμα and μήμα are listed separately on p. 305, each according to its place in the alphabet).

143. and 322. Κυριοθίμι. . . syr.] underlien Κυριοθίμι.

143. κύριος [it would have been adequate to refer to fragments of Aq in which the Tetragrammaton is written in palaeo-Hebrew characters. In Z₃, for example, the Tetragrammaton is written, as a rule, in palaeo-Hebrew characters; only once (Regn. IV xxiii 24) is it written as κυ.

143. and 321. Κύριος (μήμα) read: μήμα.

144. κολεθόν] read Κολεθόν and add to the list of proper names on p. 322.

145. λαλεῖν κατ' ἀυτὸ...Regn. IV xxiii 16] cancel the reference (MT has καταλαβεῖν) and add to κατάλαβεῖν.

147. λέγειν μακαρ... Regn. IV xxiii 21] omit the reference and add to the next entry (τῷ λέγειν καταλαβεῖν).


151. μακρύνειν καθ' hiph. Ps. xxi (xxii) 20 xxxiv (xxxv) 22 α' cii (ciii) 12...] read: καθ' Ps. xxi... καθ' hiph. Ps. cii...

157. and 318. μετέωρος Ἐζ. iii 15? (οτ γ': θέλα)] omit with Ziegler (μετέωρος = LXX).

159. μισώρ] read Μισώρ as on p. 321.

159. Μολόχ (μήμα) add: leg. μήμα.

160. μύρωμα plur. Μυρώμα Regn. IV xxiii 24 syr.] read: gr. (Z₃) et syr. and do not underline.

162. Ναβανίας ... syr.] underlien Ναβανίας.

163. νεβειν μήμ Exod. xvi 10] add: α' θ'.


174. ὁτακός (μήμα) ...ier. (<x. 18>) this way of notation is too ambiguous. In fact, for ὁτακός εὑρεθή of the LXX, Aq has <ὁτακός> ἐλέγχθεσαν (Syh.). Does <ὁτακός> deserve to be mentioned at all?

175. ὑμῖν ὃντες read: ὑμῖν (correctly so on p. 262).
175. ὑμῖν ὃντες but 279: ὑμῖν εἶναι ἦμεν.
179. οὗτε ἀκή Ier. xv 10 bis ὧν is Ἱωσηππος (J. Ziegler, *Ieremias etc.*
(Gött. 1957) 106), and accordingly this information does not belong to an
Index to Aquila. For the second οὗτε of ὧν’, [α’]οś’ have οὗτε. This information
should have been given s.v. οὗτε (p. 178).
182. I. 7 ὃντε read: ὃντε.
182. and 281. παλαιοῦν ...syr.] underline παλαιοῦν.
187. τῆν ἐμν Ps. xvii (xviii) 28] add: α’ε’.
192. and 290. πικραμμός] add: Μὴτρίκα Thr. iii 15 Zi. (Ἀμμον Q anon.;
198. πολυορκία ἱερίδια] read: ἱερίδια.
200. πόρνη ἦς] add: Ier. ii 20 α’θ’ syr. (Zi.: [α’]θ’).
203. προστστονον ἐμν ... syr.] underline προστστονον.
204. προσεγιταὶν ἐμν πι.] read: ὕποι niph. (sic p. 291).
206. προστιχίσμα ἐγενέ] read: ἐγενέ.
208. πολὴ ἐγενέ Ier. ii 12 syr.] add: α’ς’; add further: leg. ἐγενέ προ ἐγενέ.
209. πορωτής ἦν ἦν Ier. vi 29 α’ς’ Field recte (ZIEGLER σ’) however,
Ziegler prints [α’]ς’ (correctly so in the Index s.v. πορωτόν).
209. and 276. ρακίον όντε read: ράκιον ὃντε.
212. and 322. Ἀσιφανή ἐμν ἐμν] read: ἐμν ἐμν. The Greek name is
written as Ἀσιφανή on p. 33, Ἀσιφανή on p. 212 and Ἀσιφανή (vide
Ἀσιφανή) on p. 213, while BM records only the latter one.
214. and 282.] add: σημειοσκόπος ἐμν] Regn. I xxviii 9 (jz); cf. also the
anon. σημ. in jz in v. 3.
218. σκυθοὶ ὃντε read Σκύθουι and add to the list of
proper names on p. 319; omit σκυθοὶ on p. 264 (where ὃντε is misprinted
as ὃντε).
224. στρόμμα] add: δέκτα Ier. ii 20 α’θ’ syr. (Zi.: [α’] θ’).
234. ταπεινόφρονον ἔν Ps. xv (xvi) 1 α’ς’ (τοῦ ταπεινόφρονος καὶ ἀπλοῦ) the
full quotation refers only to Aq. Sym has (τοῦ) ταπεινόφρονος καὶ τοῦ
ἀμώμου.
235. ταπεινόφρονον ἔν Ez. xviii 17 α’θ’] read: ἔν. However, Ziegler records
no such reading for α’θ’. ταπεινόφρονον is the translation of the LXX ad loc. and,
therefore, this reference should be omitted from pp. 235 and 289. Moreover,
Aq renders ἔν always by (ἀπο)θνήσκειν.
236. τήμενος ἔν Ez. vi 4 (LXX ?) cancel the reference: Aq reads ἕλακον
(correctly so on p. 165; but cp. Field) while τήμενος is the reading of the LXX.
236. τέρψις ἀραβικήν add: (s. ἱλατόρης).
250. φθορά ... ταύτης (sic. ταύτης) Regn. IV xxiii 13] add: syr.
251. χοφόν read Φωτιόν and add to p. 322.
252. and 309. φωνεύτης ηλικίαν] read φωνεύτης and add to φωνεύτης ηλικία
(p. 251).
255. χείρ] read: יָאָר.
262. μήλῳ] read: μήλῳ; refer to or connect with 264 סְפָרָא.
265. פְּשַׁנְתָה] read: פְּשַׁנְתָה.
268. παλαιός οὐκ ἔβλεψ] underline παλαιός.
268. διά τὸ μὴ εἶναι ὁμολογώμενον I. The equivalents are imprecise: for Ier. viii 18 ὁμολογώμενον the Greek has διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι διβριν ἐπιστῆμε. 2. The Gk.-Heb. Index reads μὴ εἶναι ἱππόλοπ (p. 68). 3. Read [α']θ' for [α']σ' on p. 68. 4. Actually, the reading has no place in the Index: Ziegler is undoubtedly correct when describing the reading as "θ' (a' mend. sec. 86) 86 Syh" since a different and more Aquila-like reading is recorded as α' in the Syh. If the readings are nevertheless included in the Index, they have to be accompanied by a precise description of the documentation. These remarks also refer to δβρις (p. 241) and δδυνήρός (p. 168).
276. שׁוּנ] read: שׁוּנ.
280. [וֹק] read: וֹק (cf. Ziegler ad Ier. xlix (xlii)
281. בַּשׂל] read: בַּשׂל.
281. καταδιόκευνον read: (κατά)διόκευνον pass. ἤν.
288. δία κρίνει add: δίστε.
288. ἀναλήθησιν read: ἀναλήθησιν.
289. ] add: παραπλήθος καὶ ἀπλοῦς.
289. [αὰ] read: αὰ.
289. ἀνεπλήθησιν read: ἀνεπλήθησιν.
304. [κυρ] read: κυρ.
308. θερίστῳ] read: θερίστῳ τῷ.
309. [θέρ] belongs to p. 311.
310. [θέρ] read: θέρ.
310. αἰνείςις] read: αἰνείςις.
311. τρέχων καὶ [γραφ] the reverse Index mentions only γρ.
311. ] add: προσδοκάντι βρέχαι (βρέχαι); add further on p. 313: προσδοκάν
βρέχαι leg. βρέχαι.
311. דְִּשֵּׁי read: דָּשֶׁי.
312. שִּׁנְיָתֵךְ read: שִׁנְיָתֵךְ.
313. יֶשֶׁל read: יֶשֶׁל.
318. וְִזֵּּי דְִמַּיָּאִים read: דְִמַּיָּאִים (sic p. 172).
324. aegre ferre (ἀγανακτών) διέτατα] read: διάτα (as on p. 2) or διάτα (as on p. 278).
326. deserere εγκαταλείπειν] read: εγκαταλείπειν.

My friend Mrs. S. Ori adds the following corrections:

29. ἀπόστασες ἱππ. Is. i 5] read ἱππ. and add to the appropriate entry.
35. and 319. ἰδιερωμένοι] read: ἰδιερωμένοι.
42. βιβλιοθήκη ρώμ.] read Ῥώμ. and add the references to the already mentioned Ͽήμ. Omit ἰτήμ. on p. 267.
112. θοίμων ἰτήμ. read: θοίμ. (MT: ἵλεσί).
113. ὅλακος βύζ. read: βυζ.
136. κλητός Is. i 13... (leg. ἀριθμ. προ ἀριθμ.)]. The note “leg. ἀριθμ. προ ἀριθμ.” cannot be accounted for: κλητήν of ὁ' and of οἱ may reflect either MT ἀριθμ. (cp. LXX ἅριμ ἀριθμ. – κλητήν ἄγια Ex. xii 16, Lev. xxiii passim) or ἀριθμ. (MT has ἀριθμ. ἀριθμ.). In the light of Symmachus' rendition κλητήν ἐπίκλησιν of MT ἀριθμ. ἀριθμ., the latter possibility might be preferred.
150. λοιμός ἰτήμ.] read: ἰτήμ.
233. ταλαπωρία ἰτήμ.] read: ἰτήμ.
245. ὑπερπηδάεν] add: t.
265. ἁμεῖν] read: ἁμεῖν.
272. ἴτημ.] read: ἴτημ.
276. ἰτήμ.] read: ἰτήμ.
315. ἰτήμ.] read: ἰτήμ.
322. ἰτήμ.] read: ἰτήμ.

Finally, some additions to the Index collected from a Syh. text recently published by W. Baars, New Syro-Hexaplaric Texts (Leiden 1968) 83–100, 132–145:
10. ἀκρότομος + φθινόπωρον Deut. xxxii 13 syr.
61. δοῦλος + Deut. xxxii 43 or λ' syr.
84. ἐνοτετεθαι + Deut. xxxii 1 α' syr.
85. ἐξεγείρειν hiph. + Deut. xxxii 11 syr.
105. ξωοῦν πι. + Deut. xxxii 39 syr.
115. ἱδοθαι + Deut. xxxii 39 syr.
116. ἱδοίμαι + Deut. xxxii 39 or λ' syr.
152. μάταιος neut. ἄποψις + Deut. xxxii 21 or λ' syr.
164. νῦν πρᾶξαι + Deut. xxxii 39 syr.
170. ὑπανόσει + Deut. xxxii 1 α' syr.
182. παίειν γυμνός + Deut. xxxii 39 syr.
221. στερεῶς + Deut. xxxii 13 syr.
277. ἀκρότομος φθινόπωρον.