In a critical edition of any ancient text, only variants can be recorded in the apparatus which give direct evidence to the actual transmission of that text, in manuscripts and occasionally in early prints. A discussion and an evaluation of the material assembled lies beyond the framework of an 'editio' in the strict sense of the word, to the exception of the barest minimum of explanatory notes which the editor considers to be indispensable. It follows that, as in the case of the edition prepared by the Hebrew University Bible Project, a great deal of information and insights gathered in the process cannot be included in the final publication. These by-products in many instances have an interpretative value. They can be conducive to a better understanding of the transmission history of the text under scrutiny, and also can illuminate exegetical considerations of the traditions which ultimately crystallized in the form of variant readings. At times, the analysis of such variants may lead to a new perception of the intrinsic meaning of a passage. Thus, the 'purely textual' endeavor attains a heuristic dimension.

These considerations apply with special force to the text of the Bible. Its variegated and multifaceted history, and the theological-ideonic significance which attaches to the 'holy scriptures', cause that transmission variants, in the
Hebrew original and in the ancient translations, foremost the LXX, prove to be of importance for the exegete and the commentator, and should be brought to their attention.

The following notes constitute a sample of a comprehensive commentary on the LXX of Jer. which evolved in the work on the HUBP edition of the Book of Jeremiah, and which is to be published in toto in conjunction with that edition.

1 תַּחַל תִּירָב - וַתֶּהֶמֶת תֵּבָעַה שָׁאוּ בָּלֶגְנֶהוֹ אֶלֶּה יִשְׁרֵאֹל

Commentary on the Text of Jeremiah

A retroversion of the Greek opening formula will produce a Vorlage which differs from the MT: "דברי שאמרו על יום". However, the following considerations militate against the assumption that this reading in fact had been before the translator. It is possible that in rendering the present MT reading, the translator either was influenced by identical formulae in other prophetic books (thus Thiel, p. 49, who also mentions earlier bibliography), or that he was motivated by theological considerations. These possibilities indeed were taken into account by scholars who discussed the Greek translation of the verse. It is unlikely that both factors influenced the translator as Volz and Rudolph presume, since the first would have been operative on the Hebrew level, the second on the Greek.

Before presenting our own view, we shall discuss the assumption that the deviating rendition originated with the Greek translator.

1. The Hebrew formula reflected in the retroversion from the LXX occurs in the MT also at the beginnings of the following books: Joel, Hosea, Micha and Zephaniah. However, there the reading is יְהִי and not יְהִי, as reconstructed from the LXX for Jer. 1:1 (cf. also infra v.7). One may discount a possible influence of the Greek rendition of the above verses on Jer-LXX for the following reasons:

In all of the quoted instances (a) יְהִי is rendered λόγος κυρίου, whereas Jer-LXX has τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ; (b) πρὸς is used to render יְהִי, whereas Jer-LXX has εἰς (for יְהִי).

2. While an impact of the aforementioned Greek openings must be ruled out, the translator may have been influenced by the Hebrew formula. But this assumption will stand up only if it can be corroborated by additional examples which also show an external influence on the translation of formulaic or other expressions in Jer-LXX.

3. By altering the MT to achieve the present Greek phrasing, the translator may have wished to underline the divine origin of Jeremiah's prophecies. This aspect was stressed by Jerome in his commentary ad loc. (V 837). For a probably similar phenomenon in the LXX, cf. Is. 2:1 ὁ κυρίου λόγος υἱὸς ἁγίων with LXX ὁ λόγος ὁ γενόμενος παρὰ κυρίου πρὸς Ἰσαὰκ (corrected by Origen and Lucian towards the MT). Again, if one assumes that a theological tendency underlies the reading in Jer LXX 1:1, one admittedly would have to support this assumption by other instances which evidence the same tendency.

4. According to Köhler (p. 30), τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ = יְהִי לֶבֶר, The supposition that the translator understood the poss. pronoun 1st pers. sing. as an abbreviated [4]
tetragrammata in itself is admissible (cf. Talmon, 1954, 95-96 and Driver, 119-121). But in the present case it is weakened by the fact that it does not account for the origin of the added δ ἐγένετο ἔξω.

In view of these considerations, we tend to presume that Jer-LXX indeed reflects the above retroverted different opening formula which is corroborated by the incipits of Joel, Hos., Micha and Zeph. The assumed existence of such a deviating opening formula in the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX is further strengthened by additional similar differences between the MT and LXX in Jeremiah, e.g.: 14:1 ἀνέρ ηῆθνος ἄν ἐξ Ἰραμίθων - πάντα ἐγένετο λόγος ἱπποταμοῦ πρὸς Ἰεριμώνα (Τοβ); 46:1 ἀνέρ ηῆθνος ἄν ἐξ Ἰραμίθων ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἰδωρίας as against 25:13 ἀνέρ ηῆθνος ἄν ἐξ Ἰραμίθων ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἰδωρίας, which is reflected in the LXX rendition -- δ ἐπορευθεὶς Ἰεριμώνα ἐπὶ τὰ Ἀλαμ (the last two words, to be emended to τῇ Ἀλαμ, reflect the corrupted heading of the prophecy against Elam in 49:34-39, 25:15-19 in the LXX). More importantly, several opening formulae of the MT are lacking in the LXX, either in toto or in part, as e.g. in 2:1-2; 7:1-2; 16:1; 25:1; 27(34):1-2; 28(35):1; 29(36):1; 47(29):1; 50(27):1. Accordingly, Tov, 1972 has offered the suggestion that these instances reflect two different editions of the Book of Jeremiah and, that like other differences, they resulted from editorial processes.

The retroverted opening formula underlying the LXX, thus should be considered as a parallel to the one found in MT (for the latter, cf. Am. 1:1 and Eccl. 1:1).
While in Jer-LXX, as generally in the LXX, θεὸς reflects בַּהֵן, in the present instance, it was suggested to retrovert it as 'ה, for the following reasons:

(1) בַּהֵן is not found in Jer., it occurs rarely in the O.T., and never is used in the incipit of the book.

(2) The retroversion of θεὸς = 'ה is based on the fact that also in other instances in Jer-LXX, θεὸς renders 'ה in MT, e.g., in 1:2, 9:20(19), 3:21, 4:4, 14:10, (50)(27):15 (θεὸς is further found secondarily in S in 37(44):17, 46(26):23, 51(28):7). However, in all but the first two cases, it may be argued that the Greek actually presupposes בַּהֵן.

For the assumed unusual translation equivalent, see Redpath, 608 and Baudissin, 191, n.l.

Ο ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ δέ ἐγενέτο

ἐπί is not included in the section obelized by Origen, probably because the ensuing accusative Ἰερεύμων would be incongruous with the preceding nominative τὸ ἡμᾶ. It should be pointed out, though, that in similar instances incongruencies of this kind did not disturb Origen (cf. Soisalon-Soininen, 1959, 32 ff.). It is also possible that the metobelos was incorrectly placed in the transmission of the text.

Since Origen presumably obelized the words τοῦ θεοῦ δέ ἐγενέτο, and did not adjust τὸ ἡμᾶ, one might wonder whether he did not read דֶּבֶר לִימָיו instead of MT - דֶּבֶר לִימָיו. However, this is rather unlikely; Origen paid more attention to quantitative than to qualitative differences between MT and LXX (see Soisalon-Soininen, ib., 33ff.). The absence of a remark on
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τὸ ἑγέμον in the LXX, thus cannot be construed to enlighten us on Origen's Vorlage.

The prevalent translation of ἀναστέθη denoting descent, in Jer-LXX as elsewhere in the LXX is οὖς (for this Hebraistic translation see Thackeray, 41-42). It is noteworthy that the idiomatic phrase ὁ τοῦ ... is found only here in Jer-LXX, although it occurs frequently elsewhere in the LXX (cf. Johannesseohn, 22; see especially the above-mentioned openings of the books Hos., Joel, Micha, Zeph.).

The MT is ambiguous. The Vulgate may formally refer to either Jeremiah, Hilkiah or the priests. Therefore, the translator probably felt the need to add a clarifying verb. Similarly, the Targum made it explicit that Jeremiah lodged -- in Anathoth, while the priests resided in Jerusalem -- דוד והרשים. The Vulgate, against this, made the clause dependent on the clause: ... qui fuerunt in Anathoth. However, because of the syntactical remoteness of ὃς from Ἱερευμων and its incongruity with ἱερέων, not all problems are solved by the added Greek verb. For similar additions of Greek verbs in Hebrew verbless clauses see Jer-LXX 7:31 (contra 32(39):35), 20:2 - both εἶναι; 4:15 - ἤκεῖν; 6:1 γηγενεθῶσαν.

This is the usual LXX transcription of ἁμαρτον (2 Ki. 21:18-25; 1 Chr. 3:14, 2 Chr. 33:20-25; Zeph. 1:1; Jer. 25:3; cf. also

[7]
Matthew 1:10). Therefore, the minority reading Ἄρως (V-544 0 l=198 Arm) should be rejected with Ziegler as a Hexaplaric correction.

In view of the large number of Ἄρως readings, an inner-Greek interchange ἈΜΩΝ / ἈΜΩΣ seems improbable. Rather does it seem likely that the transcription is based on the graphic interchange on the Hebrew level of י/ו (יִּיְשָׂרֵא / יִיְשָׂרֵא), as suggested by Ziegler, Beiträge, p. 63, for which other instances can be adduced (see Delitzsch, 113 and Kennedy, 72; cf. also Deut. 23:14 MT vs. LXX). However, in view of the recurring transcription of יִיְשָׂרֵא as Ἄρως one should probably also postulate an underlying exegetical tradition. In the LXX, Ἄρως stands for both the names of the prophet יִיְשָׂרֵא and of Isaiah's father יִיְשָׂרֵא. Thus, יִיְשָׂרֵא could have been connected with either one. In fact, the two persons are often confused in the LXX as a result of the identical spelling of their names (see especially Ginzberg, VI, 356-357).

In Jer-LXX the word sequence differs from that of MT, probably on the basis of a deviating Vorlage. The MT sequence -- number-noun -- occurs also elsewhere, though infrequently (Gen. 14:5, Deut. 1:3, 2 Ki. 25:27, Is. 36:1, 2 Chr. 34:3, cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, §134), while the reverse sequence -- noun-number -- is more common. But this fact cannot be construed to imply that Jer-LXX rendered the phrase in accordance with the more frequent practice in Hebrew (see especially the next verse, 1:3), since both sequences are found
in the LXX. Moreover, in some instances the MT sequence noun-number was rendered in Greek by the rarer number-noun sequence (cf. 2 Chr. 16:13, 17:7, 34:8, Esth. 1:3, Dan. 9:2 Th).

For the temporal genitive in Jer-LXX, see Johannesson, 15.

With the exception of Esth. 1:3, the inflected infinitive is always rendered in the LXX by the noun βασιλεία (for other renditions of Hebrew infinitives by Greek nouns, see Soisalon-Soininen, 1965, Index p. 209). Cf. the Vulgate's regni eius ad loc. and elsewhere. A reading indeed also would have been rendered βασιλεία. But it is nevertheless unwarranted to assume here a different Hebrew Vorlage, especially since נחלות occurs in Biblical regnal formulas only in late books (Dan., Chr.). It is also unlikely that the use of the dative - ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, as against the prevalent genitival rendition of לְמַלְכֹּת - בּוֹ, reflects a different Hebrew Vorlage - לְמַלְכֹּת, for the following reasons: (1) to the exception of 1 Ki. 22:42 (16:28a), לְמַלְכֹּת is always rendered in the LXX by an infinitive; (2) מָלֶק means "when he began to reign" (see BDB, s.v.), which meaning does not apply to the case under review.

It is hard to ascertain why Jer-LXX chose the unusual dative rendition (for which see also above), which seemingly is not conditioned by the preceding ἐπούς τρισκαιδεκάτου; in the LXX the element after the temporal gen. ἐπούς / ἐν ταύτῃ (translating ... προς) is either a noun in the genitive, a gen. abs. or a dependent clause.
3 θήμα

The word is not represented in the majority tradition of the LXX which was adopted by Ziegler in his edition. ζυγελεύας was secondarily added in 2 Η 130' Aeth Arm Or. III 2.

The assumption of Rudolph and Thiel, p. 53 that the translator judged the word θήμα to be contradictory to the second part of the verse and therefore omitted it, is somewhat simplistic. (Note that the reference to the "end" of the year disagrees also with 52:5 ff. = 2 Ki. 25:2 ff.). The variant should be discussed, in fact, in the light of the presumed one-time existence of a shorter LXX text of the Book of Jer. (see especially Janzen). In this context, θήμα possibly could be viewed as an editorial expansion in the MT which, like others, conflicts with the short text underlying the LXX. For further examples of this phenomenon, cf. Tov. 1979, 90-91.

πηλά - αἰχμαλωσίας

Instead of the Hebrew verbal form, Jer-LXX possibly read a noun πηλά which is also reflected in Aquila: μετοικεσίας. - A reverse case may be found in Is. 50:2. There, the LXX translation (τοῦ) δύσοσθαι probably renders the infinitive πηλά(ν), against the MT noun πῆλα(ν). However, in several instances, infinitive forms of the verb after τῦ (e.g. 1 Ki. 18:28; 1 Chr. 4:31) and other conjunctions were translated in the LXX by nouns (see Soisalon-Soininen, 1965, 113-114; oral communication by S. Ory).

In this context it is noteworthy that the rendition of several words in the first verses of Jer-LXX differs from their translation later on the book, e.g.: v. 1 'θήμα - δέσδω (see above);
v. 1 רָבָר - ῥῆμα is outweighed in Jer-LXX by λόγος to the ratio of 170:12 (see Repa, 188); v. 2 נַעַל - ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ (see above); v. 3 נוֹבָא - αἰχμαλωσῶς, while the usual equivalent of נוֹבָא in Jer-LXX is ἀποκαλύπτα. One could conceivably explain this situation by the assumption that in the opening verses the translator had not yet stabilized his translation equivalents.

4 לָלֵי - πρὸς αὐτὸν

The retroverted reading of the LXX - ῥῆμα לָלֵי - never occurs in MT in an opening phrase. Streane nevertheless claims that it should be preferred over לָלֵי which the MT adopted for the sake of smoothness. However, the same reasoning may be applied to the LXX reading which echoes v.2: אַשְּרָה היה דִּבְרֵי הָאַלְוָי (i.e. to Jeremiah) and reflects the LXX variant in v. 1: דִּבְרֵי הָאַלְוָי (see above). It is therefore difficult to decide which is the "original" reading, if such a decision should be attempted at all in view of the complicated relationship between the MT and LXX. לָלֵי probably has a better claim to originality in view of the parallels in the MT of Jer., e.g. 1:11; 2:1; 13:3,8. לָלֵי may have developed secondarily in the LXX because of the aforementioned contextual reasons, and/or of the graphic similarity with לָלֵי.

לָלֵי

The Jer-LXX often lacks the word (e.g., 27:9 (34:7), 39(46):16, 40(47):15, 45:1(51:31)). It probably was not in its Vorlage. Also this case should be viewed in the light of the overall problem of the shorter LXX text.
Against the main LXX tradition, ms A reads πρὸ τοῦ πλάσαν με ἐκ κολλάς, possibly under the influence of the similar phrase in Is. 44:2 - καὶ ὁ πλάσας σε ἐκ κολλας (cf. also Is. 44:24 and 49:5). Also in other cases, ms A exhibits an influence of parallel passages in Jer. and in other books (cf. Ziegler, 1957, pp. 53-55). This tendency makes it improbable that A reflects here a Hebrew variant שִׁבַּל. One should altogether beware of the assumption that variants in individual mss of the LXX independently witness a Hebrew Vorlage which differed from the MT. We have no proof that individual LXX mss display a knowledge of independent Hebrew sources, in distinction from Hexaplaric, Lucianic and other revisions which were based on a deviating Hebrew text. Notwithstanding the view of Sperber, based on P. Kahle’s theory, all mss of the LXX, at least all uncials, may be considered as belonging to one textual family.

The interesting minority reading (cf. 18:7, 9) rightly was rejected by all editors of the LXX. The plural of MT - שִׁבַּל and LXX - εἰς ἔσην caused exegetical difficulties. They were described and partly settled by ancient and modern commentators. The impact shows in the textual tradition underlying the minority reading. The most important representative of this tradition is the Catena group which exhibits also other secondary exegetical variants (see Ziegler, 1957, 94 ff.). In any event, the minority reading cannot be viewed as an independent Greek rendition of an original Hebrew - שִׁבַּל (see also above on ἐν κολλάς). Greek - εἰς ἔσην was wrongly connected with the
emended יִצְהַר, accepted by some commentators ever since Stade's remarks.

ץְהֵר normally renders in the LXX שָׂם and נָשָׂא; but sometimes it reflects יֵהָא in the connotation 'to place', 'to appoint'. Thus, δέσμων and τεξάννα in the LXX should be considered synonyms (cf. vv. 9, 15, 18; 9:10(11)), parallel to the Hebrew pair of synonymous verbs בָּשָׂם // יֵהָא (e.g. Gen. 27:37; Jos. 7:19). This and similar examples of synonymous, and therefore interchangeable readings (e.g., Ex. 40:22; Lev. 8:9) are discussed by Talmon, 1975, 340-343.

6 יִנְאָה - יִנְאָה

Rahlfs' edition has יִנְאָה in 1:6 (ο ὁ 106C; ὁ νῦν rel.), 4:10 (ὁ νῦν 26; ω rel.), 14:13 (ω 106C; ὁ νῦν rel.) and 39(32):17, even though only in 4:10 יִנְאָה has strong manuscript support. Similarly Spohn and Streane explain ὁ νῦν as a secondary development from an original ὁ through an intermediary stage νῦν. However, it is unlikely that in three different instances in Jer-LXX, the same textual development occurred independently. Moreover, it did not occur in Jer. 6:6, 22:13,18, 23:1 nor in 2 Ki. 3:10; 6:5,15. In all these passages νῦν reflects יִנְאָה (6:6 MT יִנְאָה).

The following considerations also militate against an assumed development ω > νῦν: In rendering (יו) יִנְאָה יִנְאָה by ὁ νῦν, Jer-LXX differs from all other translations of this phrase in the LXX: δέσμων (Jos. 7:7), ἡ θέση (Jud. 6:22), πεποιημένος (Ex. 4:14, 20:49(21:5)), ὁ ἱματία (Ex. 9:8, 11:13), ὁ (2 Ki. 3:10, 6:5, 15). Therefore it seems plausible that ὁ νῦν in Jer-LXX
resulted from a specific conception of the Hebrew. Ziegler, 1958, 40 already observed that the translator presumably connected הָנָן with הָנָן of Ex. 3:14 and rendered it in accord with the LXX of that verse ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ θεόν ("der Übers. las aus ἕνας das Verbum ἔσει' heraus und hat in Abhängigkeit von Ex. 3:14 LXX (ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ "θεόν) an allen vier Stellen ὁ "ἵν wiedergegeben"). See further Tov, 1976, 24, and the bibliography mentioned there.

BHS mentioned a few Hebrew mss which read כ (ץראָנָהָנ), probably under the influence of the two adjacent occurrences of כ. δὲν indeed could reflect כ (thus BH and BHS). But it is more probable that, as in classical Greek, it functions here as a colon, added by the translator after a verbum dicendi, for which cf. 2:27, 8:8 and 37(44):19. At least in 2:27 and 37(44):19, δὲν cannot be viewed as a representation of כ because of contextual considerations.

ע - πρὸς]
πρὸς generally renders כ, but it stands also for ע.
Therefore it cannot be determined whether in any specific case, as in the one under review, πρὸς reflects Hebrew כ or ע, since the individual translators were not consistent in such matters. See further Johannesson, 263 ff.

כ - πάντας]
Note that the translator, by necessity had to render the Hebrew either as πάντας or πάντα (neutral).
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The Greek reflects a variant which should be considered synonymous with MT; cf. Deut. 32:46 and Ps. 110:1. Further interchanges of א על כל on the Hebrew and the Greek level are discussed in Talmon, 1975, 348-349.