

# Towards a New Collection of Hexaplaric Material for the Book of Genesis

R. B. ter Haar Romeny<sup>1</sup> and P. J. Gentry

**Abstract:** The Hexapla Working Group formed at the 1994 Rich Seminar on the Hexapla in Oxford aims to produce a new collection of Hexapla fragments. The authors report on a preliminary database of fragments for Genesis, a pilot project of the new collection. The aim of the project, its sources, the method and scope of the work as well as an indication of new material are presented along with a discussion of the format of the new publication.

## 1. Introduction

At the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla held at Oxford in 1994, all agreed that a new collection of Hexapla fragments was a desideratum. Gerard Norton reported at the last IOSCS Congress on this Seminar and the plans made there,<sup>2</sup> and a volume containing the papers presented at the Seminar has been published by Alison Salvesen: *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*.<sup>3</sup> This paper is an update of the progress made on the new collection of hexaplaric fragments. The steering committee of the Hexapla Working Group

---

<sup>1</sup>During part of the 1997–1998 academic year, Ter Haar Romeny worked on this project at Wolfson College, Oxford. His research there was made possible through a NATO Science Fellowship accorded him by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).

<sup>2</sup>G. J. Norton, "Collecting Data for a New Edition of the Fragments of the Hexapla," in: B. A. Taylor, ed., *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995*, SCS 45 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 251–262.

<sup>3</sup>A. Salvesen, ed., *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments. Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25<sup>th</sup> July–3<sup>rd</sup> August 1994*, Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

assigned the Book of Genesis to us. Our work on Genesis, a preliminary database, functions as a pilot study for the project as a whole. A general presentation is given here of the tasks at hand, the choices we have made, and the problems we encountered. As this is a report on work in progress—and a larger project in its early stages—it is also explicitly meant as an invitation to cooperate by providing constructive criticism and comments.<sup>4</sup>

Several issues must be considered. First, the question of the aim of our collection of hexaplaric material, which cannot be, as contradictory as it may seem, the reconstruction of the Hexapla. Second, the problem of the selection of a basis or foundation for the new collection: which of the earlier collections of hexaplaric material should serve as such? Third, changes in scope and method with regard to earlier collections. Fourth, the listing of new material added by us. And finally, a few words about the choice of format.

### The Aim of the New Collection

What should be the aim of a new collection? In his contribution to the last Congress, Norton made clear that the Hexapla was not an original text, but an arrangement of known texts.<sup>5</sup> Apart from a very limited number of fragments, this arrangement in columns has not been handed down to us. The precise number of the columns is not certain for all biblical books and there is still discussion about the existence of a Hebrew column in Hebrew characters,<sup>6</sup> but even if we found convincing answers to these

---

<sup>4</sup>Messages can be sent to the Hexapla list, <hexapla@bham.ac.uk>, or directly to the authors, <romeny@rullet.leidenuniv.nl> and <pgentry@sbt.s.edu>.

<sup>5</sup>Norton, "Collecting Data," 255–259. Cf. also his "Cautionary Reflections on a Re-edition of Fragments of Hexaplaric Material," in: G. J. Norton and S. Pisano, eds., *Tradition of the Text. Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, OBO 109 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag-Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1991), 139–140, 146.

<sup>6</sup>On this question, see now the articles by R. G. Jenkins, G. J. Norton, and P. W. Flint in: Salvesen, *Origen's Hexapla*, 73–132.

questions, it would still remain uncertain how Origen or his collaborators aligned the different versions in each individual line of the Hexapla.<sup>7</sup> If we were to try to construct a six-column Bible, we would be repeating their work rather than reconstructing it.

What we can do is collect those materials which can be classified as hexaplaric in at least one of three senses. First of all, we have the asterisks and obeli, and explicit indications in scholia of pluses and minuses relative to the Hebrew text of that time. This is material that can be labelled hexaplaric in the strict sense of the word. Second, we have the Hebrew text in Greek characters and the readings of the three revisions of the Septuagint: Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. This material is hexaplaric in the sense that it was used in the Hexapla, but at least the revisions existed already before Origen and fragments of them have come down to us not only via the Hexapla, but also directly.<sup>8</sup> Third, there is some material that we would call hexaplaric by association: the readings of ὁ Σύρος, the readings in the Greek language attributed to τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν or ὁ Ἑβραῖος, and the readings of τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν. We now know that the Σύρος readings and many of the Ἑβραῖος readings go back to Antiochene exegetes who gave them as *ad hoc* renderings of the Syriac and Hebrew whenever they needed them for their comments. These two indications do not refer to full Greek translations. Neither they nor the Greek Samaritan were used in the Hexapla, but they were often quoted together with the readings of the three in commentaries and margins of manuscripts, and in some cases became mixed up with these. They have always been included in collections of hexaplaric material.<sup>9</sup>

In fact, the wide interpretation of the word "hexaplaric" may have its origin in the use of the term "Hexapla" in Montfaucon's

---

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Norton, "Cautionary Reflections," 147–150.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Norton, "Cautionary Reflections," 139–146.

<sup>9</sup>We give all readings (possibly originating) in Greek sources. This criterion does not necessarily exclude all transliterations and translations of the Hebrew text in Jerome's *Quaestiones Hebraicae*, yet as a rule we included no more of this material than Field or Wevers did.

collection of 1714. He presented his work clearly as a reconstruction of the Hexapla. His title, *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt*, is, with a small difference in word order, also the first title of Field's collection of 1875. Field indicated the problem, however, by giving a second title: *Veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*. It is no coincidence that this is the title of Drusius' collection, posthumously published in 1622.

### The Basis of the New Collection

This brings us to the second issue, that of the base collection to be used. Whoever studies the history of hexaplaric editions will find that the different editions relate to each other as the dolls in a babushka. I have already mentioned the two titles of Field's work, which refer to those of his predecessors. The subtitle is even more clear: here he explicitly mentions the work of Nobilius, Drusius, and Montfaucon.<sup>10</sup> In this, Field followed the example of Montfaucon, who mentioned his two predecessors: Nobilius and Drusius.<sup>11</sup> We can say that just as Montfaucon stood on the shoulders of these two, Field stood on his.

Does this mean that we, in our turn, should stand on the shoulders of Field? The answer is both yes and no. No, because for many books—including Genesis<sup>12</sup>—the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint, of which all newer volumes provide a hexaplaric apparatus, is available. In their hexaplaric apparatus, the Göttingen

<sup>10</sup>The full title is: *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta; post Flaminium Nobilium, Drusium et Montefalconium, adhibita etiam versione Syro-hexaplari, concinnavit, emendavit, et multis partibus auxit Fridericus Field, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1875).*

<sup>11</sup>*Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt, multis partibus auctiora, quam a Flaminio Nobilio et Joanne Drusio edita fuerint. Ex manuscriptis et ex libris editis eruit et notis illustravit Bernardus de Montfaucon, monachus Benedictinus à Congregatione S. Mauri, 2 vols. (Paris: Simart, 1714).*

<sup>12</sup>J. W. Wevers, ed., *Genesis, Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis edita 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1974).*



editions provide in many respects more complete information than Field. It is only natural to take one's departure from this collection which is based on new and accurate collations of the Greek biblical manuscripts and independent study of other sources. Yet the answer is at the same time also "yes," because in some points of scope and method, our collection follows Field rather than an apparatus such as the one made by Wevers for Genesis. Therefore, we take Wevers' apparatus as our basis, but check Field in all instances. It should be stressed that this not a point of criticism of Wevers. The differences between Field and Wevers spring from their different aims. In the Göttingen editions, the second apparatus has the function of listing readings that may have influenced the tradition of the Septuagint.<sup>13</sup> Their aim is not the reconstruction of the constituent elements of the Hexapla and related material, as in Field and in our project, but the reconstruction of the Old Greek.

### Changes in scope and method

Let us now turn to the actual points of scope and method in which we follow Field's policy rather than that of the Göttingen edition.

#### 1. *Choices between readings*

In Wevers' apparatus some choices between variant readings have been indicated by the fact that variants have been put between brackets. In other cases where witnesses are in conflict, this has not been done. The use of brackets seems to have a practical purpose in the first place: the divergent reading of a minority of witnesses can be presented easily in this way. Our policy, however, is to state our preference, based on a text-critical consideration of the different readings, in all cases. In some cases—even if we are dealing with

---

<sup>13</sup>See Wevers, ed., *Genesis*, 60, and cf. U. and D. Hagedorn, "Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 1. Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1991/10) 378.

the same witnesses—our decisions may be different from those of Field, if only because ideas about the work and time of the Three and about indications such as ο Σύρος and ὁ Ἐβραῖος have changed. In general, studies such as Salvesen's work on Symmachus<sup>14</sup> and the Reider-Turner *Index to Aquila*<sup>15</sup> have broadened the scope for a substantiated choice.

2. *References to secondary literature and other remarks*

In connection with this, we sometimes feel the need to clarify our position. Some editorial discussion is necessary. Moreover, we collect useful references with regard to both the text of the reading in question and its content.<sup>16</sup> Thus we have to add a field for remarks in our database. This can be compared to the information given by Field in his apparatus, and the elucidations in the Hagedorns' "Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob."

3. *Latin and oriental sources*

Our policy for non-Greek sources is both more audacious and more cautious. On the one hand, we accept these sources as support for Greek readings and, unlike Wevers, we also try to give a retroversion to Greek in cases where no equivalent Greek witness is available.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, we always

---

<sup>14</sup>A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*, JSS Monogr. 15 (Manchester: Victoria University of Manchester, 1991). See also Idem, "Symmachus Readings in the Pentateuch," in: Salvesen, ed., *Origen's Hexapla*, 177–198.

<sup>15</sup>J. Reider and N. Turner, *An Index to Aquila. Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew-Greek, Latin-Hebrew, with the Syriac and Armenian Evidence*, VTS 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1966). For the use of this work, note the strictures by J. Barr in *JSS* 12 (1967), 296–304.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. Norton, "Collecting Data," 253 second point.

<sup>17</sup>On the necessity and difficulties of retroversions from Armenian, see C. E. Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia*, SCS 42 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 20–21; and cf. his "Travelling with Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion in Armenia," in: Salvesen, ed., *Origen's Hexapla*, 309–311. On retroversions from Syriac, see M. P. Weitzman, "The Reliability of Retroversions of the Three from the Syrohexapla: A Pilot Study in Hosea," in: Salvesen, ed., *Origen's Hexapla*, 317–359.

give the full original reading in order to allow instant checking.<sup>18</sup> Wherever a non-Greek reading differs from an available Greek text without giving reason to assume a different *Vorlage*, and in places where we do not feel confident to give a retroversion, we supply a Latin translation.

4. *Additional patristic evidence*

Wevers' apparatus gives the most complete collection of the evidence that can be culled from the margins of manuscripts. The commentaries in catena manuscripts, however, have not been collated systematically, as his introduction makes clear.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, the collection of patristic commentaries handed down to us in direct tradition that is collated by Wevers is not extensive. We deal with the catena manuscripts in the section on new material below. For the direct tradition, most references can be found through Field, who included a larger number of these sources. Of course, the patristic evidence is now checked in, and quoted according to, modern editions.<sup>20</sup>

5. *Variant readings from editions*

In order to give a complete view of the available data, we also give variant readings from editions of patristic sources.<sup>21</sup> If an author quotes a text a second time, this is now also recorded.

6. *Readings from earlier collections that can no longer be checked*

Wevers used the indication "Field" for some readings. We replace these by Field's source, in order to facilitate an assessment. In some cases this is a patristic author, in other cases one cannot go further than giving "Montef," "Combef,"

---

<sup>18</sup>Cf. Norton, "Collecting Data," 253 third point.

<sup>19</sup>Wevers, ed., *Genesis*, p. 61 sub e.

<sup>20</sup>The *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* proved to be a very helpful instrument in locating some of the more cryptic references in Field.

<sup>21</sup>We add these between brackets, with the marker "ap" or, in the case of Philoponus, "cod" (Corderius' conjectures and errors are not quoted from the apparatus, only the manuscript readings). Unlike Wevers, we usually give variants with diacriticals.

or "Nobil." Montef is used for those readings which were given by Montfaucon in his edition of the Hexapla without further indication, Combef refers to the readings found by Montfaucon in *schedis Combefisianis*, in notes made by Combefis.<sup>22</sup> Field notes in some instances that he has the idea that Montfaucon conjectured certain readings on the basis of parallels or his ideas about the usage of the translator-revisor in question. In instances where a reading appears particularly unreliable, we indicate this; in the database the field "preferred reading" is not filled.

#### 7. *Other hexaplaric material*

Apart from actual readings, many other indications that refer to the Hexapla can be found in Bible manuscripts and patristic sources. We are thinking in particular of asterisk and obelus, and other indications of pluses and minuses (the material we called "hexaplaric in strict sense" above). Part of this material is found in Wevers' first apparatus. In the definitive form of the new collection, this material should be integrated.<sup>23</sup> In our preliminary database we only take a first step towards this goal, in the sense that we enter remarks from commentaries and margins of manuscripts that were recorded in neither of Wevers' apparatuses.

#### 8. *Hebrew text*

The Hebrew consonantal text should be included as a second lemma (the Septuagint being the first). Where there is reason to believe that Origen's Hebrew text or the *Vorlage* of one or more of the *recentiores* differed from our present masoretic text, this should be indicated.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Indications such as Montef, Combef, and Field are not retained if other sources for the reading are found.

<sup>23</sup>See Norton, "Collecting Data," 254 last point.

<sup>24</sup>See Norton, "Collecting Data," 254 second point, and P. W. Flint, "Columns I and II of the Hexapla: The Evidence of the Milan Palimpsest (Rahlfs 1098)," in: Salvesen, ed., *Origen's Hexapla*, 132.



There is one point in which we have expressly chosen to follow the Göttingen edition, namely in the use of sigla for the witnesses. This is not so much a point where our ways and those of Field part; it is rather a difference with regard to a principle formulated earlier in Norton's contribution to the last Congress. It was said then that the distinctions between the various kinds of witness should be drawn clearly.<sup>25</sup> However, as there is no general rule that, for example, a marginal note in a manuscript gives a more reliable reading than a patristic author, we feel at this moment that the advantage of keeping a close connection with the Göttingen edition is more important.

Our point is that the type of the information carrier is not relevant to the text-critical decision. However, the provenance of a reading can play a role in some instances—and the Göttingen system gives ample scope for indicating this. We shall give one example of this. For Gen 4:4, Procopius gives four alternative readings for ἐπέιδεν, "God *regarded* Abel and his offering." He attributes the reading ἐνεπύρσειεν, "he set fire to," to Theodotion, and εὐδόκησε, "he consented," to ὁ Σύρος. Now John Chrysostom attributes ἐνεπύρσειεν to the Syrian rather than to Theodotion. Who is right? Even if nothing more than this was known, the knowledge of the provenance of the information would have given us a possibility to make a choice: John Chrysostom is known for his free citation of Scripture. In this particular case we can reach a more reliable decision, as there are more witnesses, and especially because the source of both Chrysostom and Procopius has been detected: both go back to the fourth-century Antiochene exegete Eusebius of Emesa, who gave the word εὐδόκησε as his rendering of the Peshitta. Procopius gave a literal quotation, Chrysostom only cited the reading ἐνεπύρσειεν and must have remembered only that his predecessor quoted the Syrian.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Norton, "Collecting Data," 254.

<sup>26</sup>Full texts and discussion in R. B. ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian in Greek Dress. The Use of Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of*

By mentioning Eusebius of Emesa we anticipate our next point: the new material that has become available since the publication of Wevers' edition.

### New material

1. The edition of the *Catena in Genesim* and *Collectio Coisliniana*. We have already mentioned the fact that for Wevers' edition, the commentaries in catena manuscripts have not been systematically checked. As Françoise Petit has now studied and edited all this material, we are in a completely new situation. She has been able to construct a stemma of this tradition. It is now clear that apart from the *Catena in Genesim*—the *Catena* proper, which is a single composition—there was also a collection of comments centred on the *Quaestiones* of Theodoret instead of the biblical text, which is always the axis of a catena in strict sense. This collection, now published by Petit under the title of *Collectio Coisliniana*, has been handed down to us separately, but also in combination with a shortened and corrupted form of the *Catena* proper. It is this form which has come down to us in the majority of manuscripts; in the edition, this is the *C*-group. It is clear that these manuscripts are good witnesses to the material originally quoted in the *Collectio Coisliniana*. However, for the material from the *Catena* proper, the manuscripts 17-135-628-708 should be quoted.

Petit's editions of all these texts<sup>27</sup> give us additional materials from manuscripts that were not systematically checked for Wevers' second apparatus; they make additional witnesses available: MS Rahlfs 628 (L in Petit), which was not used in the edition of Genesis,<sup>28</sup> and the three manuscripts that give the

---

*Emesa's Commentary on Genesis*, *Traditio Exegetica Graeca* 6 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 220–226.

<sup>27</sup>F. Petit, ed., *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition intégrale* 1–4, *Traditio Exegetica Graeca* 1–4 (Leuven: Peeters, 1991–1996), and *Idem*, ed., *Catena Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum* 2. *Collectio Coisliniana in Genesim*, *Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca* 15 (Turnhout: Brepols–Leuven: University Press, 1986).

<sup>28</sup>As the biblical text of this manuscript can not easily be distinguished from the catena fragments (see Petit's description in *La Chaîne* 1, xxvi–xxvii),

*Collectio Coisliniana* only; and for the first time they enable a reliable assessment of this material, because we now know so much more about the relation between the catena manuscripts and because Petit has dealt with all the attributions of the fragments to their authors.<sup>29</sup>

## 2. Procopius of Gaza.

Procopius of Gaza's Ἐπιτομή Ἐκλογῶν is closely related to the *Catena in Genesim*. It is very possible that Procopius used the *Catena*; if so, his main activity was to expand some of the fragments from their original sources, and to add some new ones from the same sources.<sup>30</sup> Unlike the catenist, Procopius often reworked his sources, and he did not give the names of the original authors. However, on the basis of Petit's work, several passages in Procopius can now be provided with an attribution.<sup>31</sup>

For Genesis, Wevers used the edition of Procopius found in the *Patrologia Graeca*, volume 87.1. This edition (a reprint of that of Mai<sup>32</sup>) does not extend beyond Gen 18:2. From this verse onwards, the *PG* prints only Clauser's free Latin translation and parallels from the *Catena Lipsiensis*. It is now clear that

---

the Göttingen team may have overlooked this manuscript. It was used for the edition of Exodus, but there the situation is different, as it does not give catena fragments for this and following books.

<sup>29</sup>Attributions found in the manuscripts themselves are cited, as usual, as <sup>commOr</sup>; we give attributions that can be ascertained on other grounds as <sup>(commOr)</sup>. (For wrong attributions we might resort to something like <sup>commEus(proOr)</sup>.)

<sup>30</sup>See F. Petit, "La Chaîne grecque sur la Genèse, miroir de l'exégèse ancienne," in: G. Schöllgen and C. Scholten, eds., *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann*, Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband 23 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1996), 244–245.

<sup>31</sup>Such attributions are placed between brackets which, in this case, also warn the reader that Procopius has often reworked the texts he used.

<sup>32</sup>A. M[ai], ed., *Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum tomus VI. Procopii Gazaei Commentarius in Genesim usque ad cap. XVIII. Eiusdem fragmentum in Canticum Salomonis. Anonymi Scholia in Matthaeum et Marcum. Glossarium Vetus Latinitatis* (Rome: Collegium Urbanum, 1834), 1–347.

the Manuscript Munich, *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*, gr. 358 (quoted as Mnc), represents the archetype of the tradition. Whereas the three later manuscripts used by Mai are truncated, this manuscript gives the complete Greek text of Procopius' work. We therefore check this manuscript in all instances, as was done by Wevers himself in his Exodus edition.<sup>33</sup>

### 3. Eusebius of Emesa's *Commentary on Genesis*

The identification and publication of an ancient Armenian translation of Eusebius of Emesa's *Commentary on Genesis* has almost doubled the number of known Ἑβραῖος and Σύρος readings for this book. Hovhannessian's edition of this work<sup>34</sup> and the new edition of the *Catena* also provide a much more reliable basis for the establishment of the original text of these readings. Moreover, we now know that Eusebius supplied all but one of the Σύρος readings in Genesis, and the majority of Ἑβραῖος readings.<sup>35</sup>

### 4. Other new editions

Since Field, and even since Wevers, many other new editions and studies of patristic and Byzantine authors have been published. All sources not collated for the Göttingen edition<sup>36</sup> are given according to new editions as far as these are available. This adds considerably to the reliability of the material. An interesting example of an author who has been used for the Göttingen edition, but who is now available in a critical edition,

---

<sup>33</sup>Up to Gen 18:2, references are given in the form "Procop 37 Mnc 5r," where 37 stands for the column number in *PG*, to which the reference is maintained as a matter of convenience, and 5r for the page number of the MS. After Gen 18:2, the reference to *PG* is dropped (and the Latin text replaced by the Greek).

<sup>34</sup>V. Hovhannessian, ed., *Eusèbe d'Émèse 1. Commentaire de l'Octateuque* (Venice: S. Lazare, 1980).

<sup>35</sup>All Genesis readings are dealt with in Ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian in Greek Dress*.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. point 4 under *Changes in Scope and Method* above.



is Theodoret of Cyrrihus' *Quaestiones in Genesim*.<sup>37</sup> This edition also added to the number of readings. Where Wevers could give five references, we now have nine.

Hexaplaric materials preserved in the Armenian Version have now been collected by Claude Cox.<sup>38</sup>

### The New Format and Present Progress

We now come to the progress made so far, and the format used for entering the data. Most of the material has now been collected. Our basis, Wevers' second apparatus, has been entered into the computer in Microsoft-Word format, as well as about 25% of the additions and corrections. These have been clearly marked as such, in order to make instant comparison possible. At this moment, not all technical details of the database software have been sorted out, but it seems probable that we shall have to use a format with some more (SGML/XML-style) markup, in order to enhance the readability and make conversion to database software easier. The Aquila reading of Gen 1:1 has been added to this paper as a sample of such a format. Via the Hexapla list, we will give a regular update on our progress.<sup>39</sup> The aim of the Hexapla Working Group is to make the

---

<sup>37</sup>N. Fernández Marcos, and A. Sáenz-Badillos, eds., *Theodoretii Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» (Madrid: CSIC, 1979). Another important source that is available in a new edition is John Philoponus: C. Scholten, ed. and trans., *Johannes Philoponos. De Opificio Mundi. Über die Erschaffung der Welt* 1–3, *Fontes Christiani* 23.1–3 (Freiburg: Herder, 1997). The small number of corrections of Reichardt's 1897 edition comes from A. Boffi, "Osservazioni sull'edizione di G. Reichardt del commento all'Hexaemeron di Giovanni Filopono," *Athenaeum* 68 (1990) 547–548. The main additions in our collection stem from the principle explained under point 5 of *Changes in Scope and Method* above. Idem, an important example of a study on the hexaplaric readings in an author is A. Salvesen, "Hexaplaric Readings in Išo'dad of Merv's Commentary on Genesis," in: J. Frishman and L. Van Rompay, eds., *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation. A Collection of Essays*, *Traditio Exegetica Graeca* 5 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 229–252.

<sup>38</sup>C. E. Cox, *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version*, SCS 21 (Atlanta Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986).

<sup>39</sup>See n. 4 above.



## Appendix: Possible Format for the Preliminary Database

<recno>1</recno>

<place>Gen 1:1</place>

<tr>α' (> 14-550-615; ἕτεροι Bas; alii Ambr)</tr>

<hebr>:בראשית ברא אלהים את השמים ואת הארץ</hebr>

<lxx>'Εν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν.</lxx>

<witnesses>  
underlined = already quoted in Wevers' second apparatus

full lemma] 912<sup>2</sup> Diod *Ps* 18 Philop 92

ἐν ἀρχῇ] 135 14<sup>(commEusEm)</sup> -78-413-550<sup>(commEusEm)</sup> -615<sup>(commEusEm)</sup> 343-

344 Ambr *Exam* I 16 Bas *Hex* 12 Ish 12 EusEm<sup>Arm</sup> 4 GregNys *Ap*

in *Hex* 69 Hi *Quaest* 3

τὸν—γῆν] Hi *Ep* LVII 11.3

</witnesses>

<prf>

ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν θεὸς σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν

<prf>

<variants>

ἐν] + τῷ 78-413

κεφαλαίῳ] κεφαλεω 912

ἔκτισεν] ἐποίησεν Diod; + ὁ Diod Philop

σὺν 1°] > Diod<sup>ap</sup>

τὸν οὐρανὸν] τῷ οὐρανῷ Diod<sup>ap</sup>

καὶ] > Philop

σὺν 2°] > 912 Diod<sup>ap</sup>

</variants>

<nongrk>

Ish: אֵלֹהִים

EusEm<sup>Arm</sup>: ի գլխոյ

Hi *Quaest: in capitulo*

</nongrk>

<rem>

For the α' reading in 135, see also Petit, *Cat.* 1. For the α' reading in 14-550-615, see Petit, *Cat.* 10; on the relation of this text to EusEm, cf. Ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian in Greek Dress*, 161-162. Ish based his α' reading also on EusEm; cf. Salvesen, "Hexaplaric Readings," 236, 249n, and Ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian in Greek Dress*, 160-162. On the α' reading itself, cf. *ibidem*, 169. Ambrose quoted the reading in Greek, but added a Latin translation (*in capite*); his source was Basil.

On α' s use of θεός for אֱלֹהִים (both without the article), cf. Reider-Turner, *Index*, 109-110. Philop and some other sources tend to add the article here and in the following verses.

</rem>