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**PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY**

This Study arose from the following post addressed to me on 12 October 2010 by a Watchtower apologist:

However what Doug Mason fell to bring out is that in 1995, George Howard released a book entitled: “Hebrew Gospel of Matthew” If I’m right this book refer to Shem-Tob Hebrew writing of the book of Matthew.


What was Howard refering to was in his footnote 112, page 231. In it consists the refferance to his writings about God’s name in the NT in 1977 & 1978.

So in another words, Howard’s was saying that his writings in 1977 and 1978 were NOT “theory” or “hypothesis”. It was a FACT!!!  

The Jehovah’s Witness thus claimed that the actions by Shem-Tob support the actions taken by the Watchtower Society when it renders the name “Jehovah” in its translation of the New Testament (NT). The Watchtower apologist also claimed that Howard’s earlier writing was not theory or hypothesis, but was a fact.

Since I was not aware of the book by George Howard, I offered to read it and respond with my findings. This Study is the outcome of my enquiry.

On 1 November 2010, I wrote the following letter to Professor Howard:

Professor Howard,

A Jehovah’s Witness friend referred me to your book, “Hebrew Gospel of Matthew”. I managed to purchase a copy of your book, which I shall be reading with interest.

My friend informs me that the information in your book provides evidence that the tetragram was removed from the New Testament, which means his Watchtower organization is thus fully justified in reinserting the Name “Jehovah” throughout its translation of the New Testament.

I would like to know if you agree with my Jehovah’s Witness friend and with the Watchtower’s actions.

If it is convenient for you, please feel free to respond using my email address.

Kind regards,
Doug Mason

In response, on 17 November 2010, Professor Howard replied to me by email

Doug, I am not at all in agreement with the use (misuse) of my writings by the JWs. They have pestered me for years by using my material which meant nothing in regard to the Tetragram being used in the NT as they use it. On page 232 of my second edition I added a

---

1 [http://www.topix.com/forum/religion/jehovahs-witness/TP5T220KFK8SJLMU8](http://www.topix.com/forum/religion/jehovahs-witness/TP5T220KFK8SJLMU8)
sentence or two, without naming the Jehovah Witnesses, as a caveat to their blundering usage of the divine name: “The author of this text {meaning the Hebrew Matthew I found in the Medieval Hebrew treatise published by Shem Tob} was not a radical Christian, arbitrarily supplying his gospel with the Tetragrammaton. His attitude was one of awe and respect. In fact, his use of the Divine Name corresponds to the conservative practice found in the Septuagint and in the Dead Sea Scrolls.”

I have tried to correct the JWs for years and finally gave up. For one thing they won’t answer a letter written to their headquarters. I’ve had enough of them.

George

Clearly, Professor Howard added that sentence to his book because he sees Jehovah’s Witnesses as “radical Christians” who “arbitrarily supply the Tetragrammaton”. He objects to their “blundering usage of the name”, and he sees that they fail to display an attitude of “awe and respect” towards the Divine Name.
**HEBREW GOSPEL OF MATTHEW (GEORGE HOWARD, 1995)**

These are the words in Howard’s book that the Watchtower apologist referred to:


Howard is thus:

- Referring to the use of the Divine Name in the Hebrew version of Matthew by Shem-Tob.
- Saying that he finds Shem-Tob’s version supports his earlier conclusions in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (JBL), *Biblical Archaeology Review* (BAR), and his article in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*.

“READING A” of this Study provides the context of the sentence in Howard’s book that is cited by the Watchtower apologist. Relevant parts of these other contributions by Professor Howard are also provided in this Study.

The following excerpts from George Howard’s book, *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew* dispels any idea that Shem-Tob’s *Matthew* or anything written by Professor Howard provides justification for the actions taken by the Watchtower:

Shem-Tob’s Matthew is a Christian text in Hebrew, appearing in a Jewish polemical treatise designed specifically to point out its errors and the general fallacies of Christianity. Yet the linguistic nature of the gospel text is basically biblical Hebrew (BH) with a healthy mixture of Mishnaic Hebrew (MH) and later rabbinic vocabulary and idiom. ...

Assuming that the basic text of Shem-Tob’s Hebrew Matthew is old, we have what one might expect, a writing composed primarily in BH with a mixture of MH elements, but which has undergone scribal modification designed to bring it more into harmony with later linguistic forms. In addition, the text reflects considerable revision designed to make it conform more closely to the standard Greek and Latin texts of the Gospel during the Middle Ages.

Shem-Tob’s Matthew ... does not preserve the original in a pure form. It reflects contamination by Jewish scribes during the Middle Ages. Considerable parts of the original, however, appear to remain, including its unpolished style, ungrammatical constructions, and Aramaized forms. ...”

Shem-Tob’s Hebrew Matthew is the most unusual text of the First Gospel extant. It contains a plethora of readings which are not to be found in any of the Christian codices of the Greek Gospel. Its unusual nature may be explained by the fact that it underwent a different process of transmission than the Greek, since it was preserved by Jews, independent from the Christian community.

A textual profile of Shem-Tob’s Matthew reveals that it sporadically agrees with early witnesses, both Christian and non-Christian.

---

2 *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*, page 178, George Howard
Sometimes it agrees with readings and documents that vanished in antiquity only to reappear in recent times. The profile thus suggests that a Shem-Tob type text of Matthew was known in the early Christian centuries.

Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew contains theological motifs not found in the Greek or Latin. None of these motifs enhances the polemic against Christianity. Some portray Christianity more, not less, attractive to the Jewish mind, reflecting a lesser disparity between Judaism and Christianity than the Greek or Latin examples include the text's views concerning the Law and the Gentiles.

Some of the motifs are heretical when judged by the standard of traditional Christianity. These include the text's views regarding the Gentiles (saved only in the messianic era), the Christ/Messiah (never equated with Jesus), and John the Baptist (portrayed in an exalted position).

With the possible exception of [Matthew] 16:16, the author of Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew never identifies Jesus with the Christ. This is to be contrasted with the Greek text, where the Christ identification is clearly made.

This series of readings [in Shem-Tob’s Matthew] asserts that none is greater than John, the prophets and the law spoke concerning John, John (Elijah) is to save all the world, and Jesus’ own disciples are disgraced for not having believed John. In traditional Christianity such a description is usually applied to Jesus. Its application to John the Baptist in Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew, elevates the Baptist to a salvific role.

An interesting scenario emerges when the Gospel of John and the Pseudo-Clementine writings are compared with Shem-Tob’s Matthew. The polemic against John the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel and the Pseudo-Clementines appears to be directed against the image of the Baptist portrayed in Shem-Tob’s text.

At page 229 of his book, Professor Howard says that Shem-Tob’s version of Matthew uses the Divine Name 19 times. In all but one place, Shem-Tob renders the Name with the Hebrew letter “h” ( ה ), because that is the first letter of “hashem”, which means “The Name”. In the 19th incidence, Matthew 28:9, the word “hashem” is spelled out in full ( הויה ).

Shem-Tob therefore uses a surrogate, and does not use the tetragram ( יהוה ). The Watchtower does not use the tetragram either, also preferring to use a substitute word, “Jehovah”. All existing early Greek NT writings of Matthew do not use the tetragram either, but prefer to use “Lord” (Greek: κυριος).

The NWT Matthew uses this substitute “Jehovah” word 18 times. At several occasions, the Divine Name at Shem-Tob and the “Jehovah” in the NWT do not appear at the same verse. The Table on the following page compares the Divine Name ( h ) in Shem-Tob with the appearance of “Jehovah” in the Watchtower’s New World Translation (1984 edition). The Table includes references to Moulton & Geden: A Concordance to the Greek Testament which is given as Reference “J20” by the WTS in its NWT. Facsimiles of the relevant pages are provided as an Appendix to this Study.

---

3 Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, pages 190-191, George Howard
4 Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, page 212, George Howard
5 Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, page 216, George Howard
6 Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, page 219, George Howard
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Shem-Tob</th>
<th>KIT</th>
<th>J20</th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>NWT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>An angel appeared unto him</td>
<td>Jehovah's angel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>According to the Lord</td>
<td>spoken by Jehovah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:24</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>The angel of the Lord</td>
<td>the angel of Jehovah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:13</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>The angel of the Lord</td>
<td>Jehovah's angel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>Spoken by the prophet</td>
<td>spoken by Jehovah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:19</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>The angel of the Lord</td>
<td>Jehovah's angel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>J20 Prepare the way of the Lord</td>
<td>Prepare the way of Jehovah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>θεου</td>
<td>J20 It is written</td>
<td>Jehovah's mouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:7</td>
<td>ג קִרְיָו</td>
<td>J20</td>
<td>You shall not tempt the Lord your God</td>
<td>It is written, ‘You must not put Jehovah your God to the test.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>J20 I will pray to the Lord</td>
<td>It is written, ‘It is Jehovah your God you must worship’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:33</td>
<td>ב&quot; יְוָלָט</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>Return to the Lord your oath</td>
<td>It was said ... ‘... pay your vows to Jehovah’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:9</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>J20 Who comes in the name of the Lord.</td>
<td>Blessed is he that comes in Jehovah’s name!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:12</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>Jesus entered the house of the Lord</td>
<td>Jesus entered into the temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:42</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>This was from the Lord.</td>
<td>In the Scriptures, ‘... From Jehovah this has come to be’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:31</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>θεου</td>
<td>The Lord spoke to you.</td>
<td>Spoken to you by God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:32</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>ο θεος</td>
<td>I the Lord am the God of Abraham</td>
<td>I am the God of Abraham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:37</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>Love the Lord your God.</td>
<td>You must love Jehovah your God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:44</td>
<td>ב&quot; קִרְיָו</td>
<td>J20</td>
<td>The Lord said to my Lord</td>
<td>Jehovah said to my Lord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:39</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>Blessed is our savior.</td>
<td>‘Blessed is he that comes in Jehovah’s name!’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:9</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>Then the Lord said to me: ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:10</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>As the Lord commanded.</td>
<td>According to what Jehovah had commanded me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:2</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>The angel of the Lord</td>
<td>Jehovah’s angel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:9</td>
<td>ב&quot;</td>
<td>קִרְיָו</td>
<td>“May the Name deliver you.”</td>
<td>“Good day!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In his book *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*, Howard pointed to the “conclusions” he had arrived at in his previous works, saying he still held them. To find out what his views are, it is therefore necessary to read his earlier articles.

In his 1977 article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (JBL), Howard offers this “Concluding Observation”:

> CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS. The above examples are, of course only EXPLORATORY in nature and are set forth here programmatically. Nevertheless, the evidence is sufficiently strong to SUGGEST that the thesis of this paper is QUITE POSSIBLE. We have REFRAINED FROM DRAWING TOO MANY CONCLUSIONS due to the revolutionary nature of the thesis. RATHER THAN STATE CONCLUSIONS now in a positive manner it seems BETTER ONLY TO RAISE SOME QUESTIONS that suggest a need for further explanation.  

The wording of his 1977 article shows that he is putting forth a theory, and that there is no NT evidence that provides evidential support to the theory.

The following pages provide sentences from Professor Howard’s article in JBL that are relevant to the purpose of this Study.

---

7 JBL, page 82 (emphases supplied)
On the Christian side, conservative Jewish Christians probably continued to write the Tetragram in their copies of the LXX. (page 76)

Toward the end of the first century Gentile Christians, lacking a motive for retaining the Hebrew name for God, substituted the words κύριος and θεός (κύριος being used more often than θεός) for the Tetragram. (pages 76-77)

When we come to the NT, there is good reason to believe that a similar pattern evolved. Since the Tetragram was still written in the copies of the Greek Bible which made up the Scriptures of the early church, it is reasonable to believe that the NT writers, when quoting from Scripture, preserved the Tetragram within the biblical text. On the analogy of pre-Christian Jewish practice we can imagine that the NT text incorporated the Tetragram into its OT quotations and that the words κύριος and θεός were used when secondary references to God were made in the comments that were based upon the quotations. (page 77)

Thus somewhere around the beginning of the second century the use of surrogates must have crowded out the Tetragram in both Testaments. (page 77)

If our theory is correct, the first century church saw: εἶπεν θαῦμα τῷ κυρίῳ μου (Matt 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42), while that of the second century saw: εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου. (page 78)

The theory we suggest to explain the origin of many of these variants (though, of course, not all) is that the removal of the Tetragram from the OT quotations in the NT created a confusion in the minds of scribes as to which person was referred to in the discussion surrounding the quotation. (page 78)

If we assume that the original lemma employed the Tetragram, the quotation would have appeared to the first-century church as: ἡμών τίς ἐπίστησεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν. It can be argued from this that θεός in the following comment is the original reading, not Χριστοῦ, (page 79)

Excerpts from Professor George Howard’s article in Journal of Biblical Literature (1977)
The omission of both θεοῦ and Χριστοῦ in some Western witnesses, on the other hand, may go back to a time before the Tetragram was removed. Some Gentile scribe, totally bewildered by the Hebrew word, failed to recognize it as the antecedent to the word θεοῦ. By eliminating the word “God” in the comment (and perhaps even the Tetragram itself in the lemma, though we have no evidence for it) the problem of antecedence was solved.

D. \textit{1 Pet. 3:14-15}  
\begin{align*}  
14 & \text{τὸν δὲ φῶς οὐ αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε} \\
15 & \text{kύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν / θεόν ἀγιάσατε} \\
\end{align*}

| Χριστόν   | \textit{P72 ABCY} min versions Clement |
| θεὸν      | KLP min Fathers                      |
| OMIT      | de Promissionibus                    |

The passage contains an allusion to the LXX of Isa 8:12-13 in spite of its lack of a more formal introduction than δὲ.\textsuperscript{77} The best NT witnesses read Χριστόν, the Textus Receptus with the later uncial KLP and many minuscules read θεὸν. The reading Χριστόν, though better attested, is probably secondary, if we suppose that the Tetragram stood in the original citation. In that case the original text would have read: \textit{νῦν δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἀγιάσατε}.

These examples support the theory that the removal of the Tetragram from the NT quotations of the Greek OT created confusion in the minds of early scribes which resulted in scribal alterations designed to clarify the text.

If we permit ourselves to extend such examples to passages that are merely paraphrastic of the OT narrative, we will find the same scribal confusion. Such an extension is not beyond the realm of probability.
(2) *Concluding Observations.* The above examples are, of course, only exploratory in nature and are set forth here programatically. Nevertheless, the evidence is sufficiently strong to suggest that the thesis of this paper is quite possible. We have refrained from drawing too many conclusions due to the revolutionary nature of the thesis. Rather than state conclusions now in a positive manner it seems better only to raise some questions that suggest a need for further explanation. *(page 82)*

(a) If the Tetragram was used in the NT, how extensively was it used? Was it confined to OT quotations and OT paraphrastic allusions, or was it used in traditional phrases, such as “the word of God / Lord”? *(page 82)*

(b) Was the third person singular pronoun ever used in the NT as a surrogate for “God”? *(page 82)*

(c) How great was the impact of the removal of the Tetragram from the NT? Were only those passages affected in which God and Christ were confused by the ambiguity of the immediate context; or were other passages,

(d) What part did heresy play in the formation of the NT text? Did the removal of the Tetragram play a role in the split between the Ebionites and the Gentile church; and if so, did the Ebionite movement cause the Gentile church to restructure even more its NT toward a higher christology? *(page 83)*

(e) What are the implications of the use of the divine name in the NT for current christological studies? Are these studies based on the NT text as it appeared in the first century, *(page 83)*
Was the Gospel of Matthew Originally Written in Hebrew?  
(Bible Review, Howard, 1986)

In 1986, following the publication of material that questioned his assumptions, Howard wrote an article for Bible Review. It covered the same territory, and in the following selection taken from that article, Howard addressed the subject of the Divine Name in the NT:

**Divine Name of God**

Another characteristic of Shem-Tob’s Matthew indicates it is not a translation, but an original Hebrew composition. This is its use of the divine name. In Hebrew the ineffable, unpronounceable name of the Israelite God is written with four Hebrew consonants, YHWH, known as the tetragrammaton. Modern scholars pronounce and write it Yahweh. In ancient times it was pronounced only once a year—on the Day of Atonement—by the high priest in the Holy of Holies in the Temple.

In prayer, ancient Jews—and modern ones as well—read (or pronounced) these four consonants *adonai*; that is, even though the text contains the letters YHWH, the reader reads *adonai*. *Adonai* is a more generic word for lord.

In Shem-Tob’s Hebrew Matthew a common abbreviation for the divine name of the Israelite God YHWH appears some 15 times. The abbreviation is H (ח) which stands for *ha-shem*, “the name,” a circumlocution for the tetragrammaton.

If this were a Hebrew translation of a Greek Christian document, we would surely expect to find *adonai* in the text, not an abbreviation for the ineffable divine name YHWH. For Shem-Tob the Gospel of Matthew was an object of attack, a heretical writing that needed to be exposed for its fallacies. For him to have added the ineffable name would be inexplicable. The repeated appearance of an abbreviation for the divine name strongly suggests that Shem-Tob received his Matthew with the divine name already in the text; he probably preserved it rather than run the risk of being guilty of removing it.

I do not mean to suggest that the Hebrew in Shem-Tob’s text is pure first-century AD Hebrew, for it clearly is not. The first-century text

---


9 Cf. the famous rabbinic passage, Tosefta Shabbath, 13.5: “The margins and books of the minim do not save.” The debate that follows about what is to be done with heretical books concerns the issue of the divine names in the m. Rabbi Jose suggests the divine name should be cut out and the rest of the document burned. Rabbi Tarphon and Rabbi Ishmael say the books in their entirety including the divine name should be destroyed. See R. Travers Herford, Christianity in *Talmud and Midrash* (Clifton, NJ: Reference Book Publishers, 1966), pp. 155-157. By incorporating the Hebrew Matthew into his *Even Bohan*, Shem-Tob apparently felt compelled to preserve the divine name along with the rest of the text.

must be linguistically excavated, so to speak. Shem-Tob’s Matthew is written in biblical Hebrew with a healthy mixture of mishnaic Hebrew and later rabbinic vocabulary and idiom. It also reflects changes by medieval Jewish scribes who, among other things, attempted to make it read more like the Greek.

Moreover, the most primitive layer of Shem-Tob’s Matthew is written in an unpolished style and is filled with ungrammatical constructions and Aramaicized forms and idioms. In these characteristics it resembles many of the Dead Sea Scroll fragments and gives the appearance of belonging to the same time frame. Reading Shem-Tob’s Matthew is often like reading one of the Dead Sea Scrolls.
TETRAGRAMMATON IN THE NEW TESTAMENT
(ANCHOR BIBLE DICTIONARY, HOWARD 1992)

In a footnote at page 229 of his book Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, Professor Howard references his contribution to ABD (Anchor Bible Dictionary). This is his contribution:

Tetragrammaton In The New Testament

There is some evidence that the Tetragrammaton, the Divine Name, Yahweh, appeared in some or all of the OT quotations in the NT when the NT documents were first penned. ... The evidence for this is twofold.

A. Jewish Scribal Evidence

The extant pre-Christian copies of the Greek OT that include passages which in Hebrew incorporate the Divine Name also preserve the Hebrew Divine Name in the Greek text. These copies are (1) P. Faud 266 (=Rahifs 848), 50 B.C.E., containing the Tetragrammaton in Aramaic letters; (2) a fragmentary scroll of the Twelve Prophets in Greek from Wadi Khabra (= W.Khabra XII Kaige), 50 B.C.E.-50 C.E containing the Tetragrammaton in Paleo-Hebrew letters; and (3) 4QLXX Levb (=Rahifs 802), 1st century B.C.E., containing the Tetragrammaton written in Greek letters in the form of IAO. The well-known Jewish-Greek versions of the OT that emerged in the 2d century C.E., i.e., those of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, continued the Jewish practice of writing the Hebrew Tetragrammaton into the Greek text. The evidence, therefore, suggests that the practice of writing the Hebrew Divine Name into the text of the Greek OT continued throughout the NT period. From this it may be concluded (1) that the NT writers had access to copies of the Greek OT that contained the Hebrew Divine Name, and (2) that the NT writers who quoted from the Greek OT had reason to preserve the Tetragrammaton in their quotations.

B. Christian Scribal Evidence

By the time of the earliest extant Christian copies of the LXX (2d or early 3d century C.E.), a clear break with the Jewish practice outlined above is to be observed. The Christian copies of the Greek OT employ the words Kyrios ("Lord") and Theos ("God") as substitutes or surrogates for the Hebrew Tetragrammaton. The evidence suggests that this had become the practice of Christian scribes perhaps as early as the beginning of the 2d century. Curiously, the surrogates for the Tetragrammaton have been abbreviated by the writing of their first and last letters only and are marked as abbreviations by a horizontal stroke above the word. Thus, for example, the word for "Lord" is written ΚΣ and for God ΤΗΣ. These two so-called nomina sacra, later to be joined by thirteen other sacred words, appear also in the earliest copies of the NT, including its quotations from the Greek OT. The practice, therefore, in very early times was consistently followed throughout the Greek Bible.

A conjecture is that the forms ΚΣ and ΤΗΣ were first created by non-Jewish Christian scribes who in their copying the LXX text found no traditional reason to preserve the Tetragrammaton. In all probability it was problematic for gentile scribes to write the tetragrammaton
since they did not know Hebrew. *If this is correct*, the contracted surrogates KS and THS were *perhaps* considered analogous to the vowelless Hebrew Divine Name, and were certainly much easier to write.

Once the practice of writing the Tetragrammaton into copies of the Greek OT was abandoned and replaced by the practice of writing KS and THS, a similar development no doubt took place in regard to the quotations of the Greek OT found in the NT. There too the Tetragrammaton was replaced by the surrogates KS and THS. In the passing of time, the original significance of the surrogates was lost to the gentile Church. Other contracted words which had no connection with the Tetragrammaton were added to the list of *nomina sacra*, and eventually even KS and THS came to be used in passages where the tetragrammaton had never stood. *It is possible* that some confusion ensued from the abandonment of the Tetragrammaton in the NT, although the significance of this confusion *can only be conjectured*. In all probability it became difficult to know whether KS referred to the Lord God or the Lord Jesus Christ. That this issue played a role in the later Trinitarian debates, however, is unknown. (George Howard)10

---

10 *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Volume 6, pages 392-393
**Watchtower Society’s reference to Howard’s article in BAR**

In its booklet, *The Divine Name That Will Endure Forever*, the Watchtower Society quoted from part of Howard’s article in *Biblical Archaeology Review*:

> Thus, Professor George Howard, of the University of Georgia, U.S.A., made this comment: “When the Septuagint which the New Testament church used and quoted contained the Hebrew form of the divine name, the New Testament writers no doubt included the Tetragrammaton in their quotations” (*Biblical Archaeology Review*, March 1978, page 14). …

> The same thing occurred in the “New Testament,” or Christian Greek Scriptures. Professor George Howard goes on to say: “When the Hebrew form for the divine name was eliminated in favor of Greek substitutes in the Septuagint, it was eliminated also from the New Testament quotations of the Septuagint. … Before long the divine name was lost to the Gentile church except insofar as it was reflected in the contracted surrogates or remembered by scholars.”

The following provides the immediate context of these sentences from Howard. The sentences cited by the Watchtower are highlighted in yellow. The section between the passages highlighted in yellow therefore shows material omitted by the “Divine Name” booklet.

Key words omitted from the “Divine Name” booklet are highlighted below in green. These show that Howard is putting forward a possibility rather than demonstrating anything was proven beyond doubt. Howard also says that if the suggested action did take place, it occurred before 100 CE, while the Christian Church was in its infancy.

> It seems to me … hardly likely … In all likelihood … no doubt … perhaps … may have …

> Assuming this to be generally correct, I offer the following scenario … As to the Old Testament: … In all probability Jewish Christians wrote the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew as well. Toward the end of the first Christian century … the words *kyrios* and *theos* were substituted for [the tetragrammaton] in Christian copies of *Old Testament Septuagints* …

> A similar pattern probably evolved with respect to the New Testament. When the Septuagint which the New Testament church used and quoted contained the Hebrew form of the divine name, the New Testament writers *no doubt* included the Tetragrammaton in their quotations. But when the Hebrew form for the divine name was eliminated in favor of Greek substitutes in the Septuagint, it was eliminated also from the New Testament quotations of the Septuagint. Thus toward the end of the first Christian century, the use of surrogates (*kyrios* and *theos*) and their contractions must have crowded out the Hebrew Tetragrammaton in both Testaments. Before long the divine name was lost to the Gentile church except insofar as it was reflected in the contracted surrogates or remembered by scholars.

---


12 *Biblical Archaeology Review*, page 14, George Howard
**KYRIOS OR TETRAGRAM?: A RENEWED SEARCH FOR THE ORIGINAL LXX**

(ALBERT PIETERSMA, 1994)

Professor George Howard refers to the appearance of the Tetragram in some copies of the Septuagint (LXX). These are Greek translations of the Hebrew Scriptures (OT). When interpreting that evidence, Howard assumed the Tetragram had appeared in Greek documents but it was subsequently removed. This, he suggests, happened before 100 CE.

There is a difference between evidence and information. When Albert Pietersma conducted an intense research into the same documents, he concluded that the LXX originally contained the Greek word for “Lord” (Κυρίος) and that some time later, unknown persons later had replaced it with the Tetragram written very early characters. Thus, rather than indicating that the Tetragram had been removed, Pietersma concluded that these LXX documents showed the Jews were adding the Hebrew word, and in the process sought to retreat deep into their past.

The following is from pages 98 to 100 of that study by Pietersma.

When the Pentateuch was translated, _kyrios_ was incorporated in the Greek text as the written surrogate for the tetragram, a surrogate which would also serve to safeguard the ineffable nature of the divine name, if indeed ineffability was a concern at so early a date. The translators felt no more bound to retain the tetragram in written form than they felt compelled to render distinctively Hebrew _el, elohim_ or _shaddai_. Nor were they more unfaithful to the original than the Masada scribe of Ben Sirâ who everywhere wrote _adonai_.\(^{13}\) Their procedure was certainly far less radical than that of their Hebrew predecessors who on no fewer than 30 occasions in Genesis alone eliminated the tetragram from the Vorlage of the LXX and replaced it with (one assumes) _elohim_ (Greek _theos_).

Since then, as we have tried to show, our early texts do not give us convincing proof of an original tetragram in the LXX, and since, more importantly, a number of passages in the Greek Pentateuch, in direct contradication to these early witnesses, demonstrate the written originality of _kyrios_ we might well ask what kind of historical perspective on the Hebrew tetragram and its Greek surrogate emerges. Skehan’s article, to which reference has already been made, provides us with the key.

In delineating the development of the divine names (principally the tetragram) in the Hebrew MSS from Qumran, Skehan distinguishes three stages: 1) names in normal (i.e. square) script, 2) substitution of paleohebrew, 3) spread of the substitution process. And at each stage the author gives appropriate evidence. What the headings indicate and what Skehan makes clear in comment on the evidence is that at Qumran we encounter what may be called an archaising process in the writing of the divine name, and not, in so far as our present knowledge indicates, a gradual replacement of an older paleohebrew tetragram by a younger one in the square script. Similarly in his survey of Greek evidence Skehan discerns several stages: 1) _iao_, 2) tetragram in square script, 3) tetragram in paleohebrew script, 4) _kyrios_. Naturally we would not agree with _iao_ in first place and _kyrios_ in last, but apart from that there is evidence of archaising similar to that in the Hebrew MSS. The paleohebrew tetragram in Greek witnesses is not the oldest but apparently the youngest. Both in the

\(^{13}\) Cf. Skehan, “Divine Name,” 18-20.
Hebrew MSS from Qumran and in our earliest Greek MSS there is clear evidence that the divine name was the object of revisionary activity.

It is this archaising tendency or process to which Skehan has called attention that was responsible for introducing the various forms of the tetragram into the Greek traditions. Its original home was not Egypt but Palestine, whence it was exported to the Diaspora. As Hanhart noted quite correctly in connection with P. Fouad 266, the tetragram in Greek MSS is evidence of a secondary stage. When this secondary stage began to be introduced is not certain. It may be that some sporadic, unconscious, hebraizing is as old as the LXX itself, though we have very little evidence to support such a view, but what in any case distinguishes the introduction of some form of the tetragram from other (non-recensional) instances of Hebrew influence is its systematic, “recension-like,” nature. We would venture to suggest that the hebraizing corrective process began in earnest during the second century BC when Egypt became once again a place of refuge from troubled Palestine. It is likely to have been the influx of Palestinian Jews into Egypt that created the occasion for Aristeas’ defense of the venerated LXX against its detractors. …

The kind of systematic replacing of the familiar and hallowed κύριος with the parochial Hebrew tetragram which reduced the LXX to an inferior status vis-a-vis the Hebrew.

Our evidence for the substitution of kyrios by the tetragram does not, at present, take us beyond the first century BC. … But unlike previously proposed theories, the present suggestion rests on concrete textual evidence which is traceable to well within a century of Aristeas’ day.

Since the full article by Pietersma is freely available on the www, it is reproduced in this Study as “READING C”, with the parts that are relevant to this Study being highlighted. (Note that his footnotes have been removed).

---

15 http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/Kyrios%20or%20Tetragram.pdf
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This Study had its genesis in a Post addressed to me by an apologist for the Watchtower Society. In that Post, I was advised that in his 1995 book Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, Professor Howard wrote that his enquiry into the use of the Divine Name in the Shem-Tob Hebrew gospel of Matthew confirmed his previous conclusions. Based on that statement by Professor Howard, the Watchtower apologist wrote:

What was Howard referring to was in his footnote 112, page 231. In it consists the reference to his writings about God’s name in the NT in 1977 & 1978.

So in another words, Howard’s was saying that his writings in 1977 and 1978 were NOT “theory” or “hypothesis”. It was a FACT!!!


Investigation of the content and conclusions of those particular articles show that Professor Howard concluded that he was proposing a theory that needed to be tested. Nowhere in those articles, nor in any other he wrote, does Professor Howard say that he was proposing facts; rather, it is supposition, a theory. Other scholars cited in this Study also recognise that Professor Howard was proposing a theory.

When I contacted Professor Howard, he expressed his anger at the unwarranted use that the Watchtower makes of his works, as well as his frustration that the leadership never gave him the courtesy of replying to his letter of complaint.

Evidence is not information. Evidence is seen, but information is derived through its interpretation. When they looked at examples of LXX documents that contain the tetragram – albeit written in ancient characters, Professor Howard and the Watchtower interpreted this evidence as showing that the tetragram had been included in the LXX but at some point it had been removed.

When he analysed those same LXX documents, Albert Pietersma discerned that the Greek word for “Lord” (κυρίος) was the original word but that later scribes replaced it with inserted the tetragram, using ancient characters. They did this to revert backwards into their past.

There is no existing early New Testament document that contains the tetragram. The Shem-Tob Hebrew Gospel, which does not have any relationship to the Greek text, does not use the tetragram. Instead, it uses the Hebrew letter for “h” (ה) because it is the first letter of “hashem”, which means “The Name”.

The Shem-Tob Matthew does not share a common origin with the Greek text. Also, for Christians it is doctrinally heretical; for example it does not identify Jesus with “Messiah”, and it focuses on John the Baptist as its hero.

The Apologist’s assertions are nothing more than assertions without evidence or proof. This is not surprising. The Apologist was unable to provide any citations from Howard to back up the claim that Howard was saying he was providing facts. Instead, Professor Howard made it very clear that he was proposing a theory.

The Watchtower does not deserve to have apologists acting on their behalf. The Watchtower rudely ignored Professor Howard’s letter to them, and in doing so they kept their Watchtower followers completely in the dark. And when the Watchtower cited from Professor Howard’s published material, they omitted parts that did not suit their predetermined conclusion. Apologists for the Watchtower are genuine and sincere, but they are being played with by the Leadership. Apologists are genuinely deceived.
The Divine Name

Shem-Tob’s Hebrew Matthew employs the Divine Name, symbolized by ה (apparently an abbreviation for השם, “the Name”). The Name occurs 19 times in the text. (Fully written השם occurs at 28:9 and is included in the nineteen.)

Usually, the Divine Name appears where the Greek reads ΚΟΡΙΤΩ, but twice (21:12 mss, 22:31) the Greek reads ΘΕΟ, and three times the Divine Name has no correspondent in the Greek (22:32; 27:9; 28:9).

The Divine Name occurs in the following situations:

1. In quotations from the Hebrew Bible where the MT contains the Tetragrammaton.

2. In introductions to quotations. For example: 1:22, “All this was to complete what was written by the prophet according to the LORD”; 22:31, “Have you not read concerning the resurrection of the dead that the LORD spoke to you saying?”

3. In such phrases as “angel of the LORD” or “house of the LORD”: 2:13, “As they were going, behold, the angel of the LORD appeared unto Joseph saying”; 2:19, “It came to pass when King Herod died the angel of the LORD appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt”; 21:12, “Then Jesus entered the house of the LORD”; 28:2, “Then the earth was shaken because the angel of the LORD descended from heaven to the tomb, overturned the stone, and stood still.”

The appearance of the Divine Name in a Christian document quoted by a Jewish polemist is interesting, to say the least. If this text were a translation of the First Gospel by Shem-Tob himself, we would expect to find adonai in the text where the Greek or Latin reads “the Lord.” We would never expect to see the ineffable Divine Name used as a translation equivalent of ΚΟΡΙΤΩ or Dominus. I have no hesitancy in saying that the occurrence of the Divine Name in places where the canonical text lacks any reference to the Lord at all, eliminates Shem-Tob as the author of this text. No pious Jew of the Middle Ages would have dignified a Christian text by inserting the Divine Name.

The ineffable Divine Name is the most sacred word in the Jewish language. In medieval times, a debate arose about what to do with a heretical book that contained the Divine Name. T. sabb. 13.5 reads: “The margins and books of the minim do not save.” R. José suggested that the Divine Name should be cut out and the rest of the document burned. R. Tarphon and R. Ishmael said that the books in their entirety, including the Divine Name, should be destroyed.16

Shem-Tob makes it clear that the Gospel of Matthew is a heretical writing. In the preface to his Matthean text, he writes as follows:

The author, Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut, says: I have chosen to complete this my treatise which I have called Even Bohan by transcribing the books of the gospel in spite of the fact that the books are forbidden for us to read, lest the disciples should come without having sufficient practice and should drink from those waters. Nevertheless, I have chosen to transcribe them for two reasons: The first is to answer the Christians from them and especially proselytes who speak in regard to their faith but do not know the meaning of faith and explain the Scriptures of our holy law in regard to that which is contrary to the truth and contrary to their faith. In this way glory will come to the Jew who debates with them whenever he captures them in their own pit.

16 See Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, 155-57
The second is to show to the faithful the degree of defect in these books and the errors that occur in them. By this they will know and understand the superiority and virtue of our faith to the other religions. Since the greatness of the virtue of the word is not known except by an examination of that which is contrary to it, I depend on God, blessed be He, that there come from this nothing but good since I have aimed at that which is good.

Shem-Tob recorded the Hebrew Matthew, which he considered heretical, only because he wished to teach his people how to answer questions regarding the Jewish religion in face of opposition from the Christian public. Using the Divine Name in this heretical text could only have caused confusion and doubt in the minds of his people. They could only have wondered what they should do with it: preserve it, destroy it? That Shem-Tob created such a problem for his people is beyond belief.

The conclusion that seems inescapable is that Shem-Tob found the Divine Name already in his gospel text, having received it from an earlier generation of Jewish tradents. He permitted the Divine Name to remain in the text perhaps because he was unsure himself about what to do with it.

The occurrence of the Divine Name in Shem-Tob’s Matthew supports the conclusions I reached in an earlier study of the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament, basing my observations on the use of the Divine Name in the Sep-tuagint and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Some pre-Christian copies of the Septuagint, for example, contain the Divine Name written into the Greek text. These include: (1) P. Fouad 266 (=Rahlfs 848), 50 BCE; the Tetragrammaton occurs in Aramaic letters; (2) a fragmentary scroll of the Twelve Prophets in Greek from Nahal Hever (= 8 Hev XIrg), 50 BCE-50 CE; the Tetragrammaton occurs in paelo-He-brew letters; (3) 4QLXXLev (=Rahlfs 802), first century BCE; the Tetragrammaton occurs in the form of IAO. In my previous study, I concluded that the New Testament writers, who had access to such copies of the Septuagint, may have preserved the Tetragrammaton in their biblical quotations from the Septuagint.

Now Shem-Tob’s Matthew testifies to the use of the Divine Name in the New Testament. As argued above, it is very unlikely that Shem-Tob inserted the Divine Name into his text. No Jewish polemist would have done that. Whatever the date of this text, it must have included the Divine Name from its inception. One final note regarding the Divine Name: Shem-Tob’s Matthew shows a very conservative attitude toward its usage. The author of this text was not a radical Christian, arbitrarily supplying his gospel with the Tetragrammaton. His attitude was one of awe and respect. In fact, his use of the Divine Name corresponds to the conservative practice found in the Septuagint and in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

22 Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, George Howard, pages 229-232
Summary and Conclusion

A Remarkable Hebrew text of the Gospel of Matthew appears in the fourteenth-century Jewish polemical treatise, Even Bohan, authored by Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut. Traditionally, this text was thought to be a translation of the Latin Vulgate. It was also equated with the Hebrew versions of Matthew published in the sixteenth century by Münster and du Tillet. In neither case is this true. A comparison of Shem-Tob’s Matthew with the Latin Vulgate reveals its independence from the Vulgate. A similar comparison with Münster and du Tillet shows that they are not the same.

From earliest times, the Christian community believed that Matthew was written in Hebrew/Aramaic and translated into Greek. Papias (ca. 60-130 CE) was the first to make reference to a Hebrew Matthew, and later writers, such as Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome allude to it or quote it. A comparison of these allusions and quotations shows that little or no relationship exists between the Hebrew/Aramaic Matthew preserved by the Christian Church and Shem-Tob’s Hebrew Matthew.

Jewish writings of the Middle Ages allude to or quote a Hebrew Matthew of the Shem-Tob type. These writings include the Talmud, the Book of Nestor, the ToPdoth Yeshu, the Milhamot HaShem by Jacob ben Reuben, Sepher Joseph Hamekane by Rabbi Joseph ben Nathan Official, and the Nizzahon Vetus.

A conclusion that can be drawn from these comparisons is that Shem-Tob’s Hebrew Matthew predates the fourteenth century, being preserved primarily by the Jewish community.

Further evidence that Shem-Tob did not create his Matthew is as follows:

1. His text as a whole is unlike the Byzantine Greek text current in his day (or any Greek text known) and unlike the Latin Vulgate. If Shem-Tob had made a fresh translation, he would most certainly have rendered one of these text forms.

2. Shem-Tob’s polemical comments, scattered throughout his text, suggest that he did not create it. He criticizes the text’s selection of vocabulary and the mistakes it has accrued during transmission. He also bases some of his arguments on the text’s unique readings.

3. His Hebrew Matthew has a sporadic relationship with some texts that were lost in antiquity, then rediscovered since the fourteenth century. These include Q, Codex Sinaiticus, the Old Syriac version, and the Coptic Gospel of Thomas. Shem-Tob hardly had access to these sources.

Stylistically, Shem-Tob’s text of Matthew is written in Biblical Hebrew with a healthy mixture of Mishnaic Hebrew and later rabbinic vocabulary and idiom. It is unpolished in style and contains a number of later scribal revisions. It is characterized by puns, word connections, and alliteration. These devices are numerous—the text is saturated with them—and belong to the structure of the Hebrew.

In regard to theology, Shem-Tob’s Hebrew Matthew is heretical according to the standard of traditional Christianity. It never identifies Jesus with the Messiah. John the Baptist is given an exalted role (even takes on messianic traits), similar to the one polemized against in the Gospel of John and the Pseudo-Clementine Writings. Shem-Tob’s text envisions the salvation of the Gentiles only in the Messianic era. It reflects a lesser disparity between Judaism and Christianity than the Greek or Latin canonical texts. Finally, Shem-Tob’s text employs the Hebrew Divine Name, symbolized by ה (apparently an abbreviation for הוהי, “the Name”) where the canonical version simply uses the word “Lord.”

---

23 *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*, George Howard, pages 233-234
The Name of God in the New Testament

By George Howard

Did the earliest Gospels use Hebrew letters for the Tetragrammaton?

George Howard is Associate Professor of Religion and Hebrew at the University of Georgia. His book, Paul, Crisis in Galatia: a Study in Early Christian Theology (Cambridge University Press) will be published this year.

MANY EARLY COPIES of the New Testament abbreviate sacred words (nomina sacra). The earliest of these abbreviations stand for “God,” “Lord,” “Christ,” and “Jesus.” Abbreviations of these words were formed by writing their first and last letters and placing a line over them. Thus, using English to illustrate, “God” would appear as God and “Lord” as Lord.

The attempt to differentiate and dignify the sacred name of God goes back to pre-Christian times; it was done first by Jews.

From the Dead Sea Scrolls we know that Jewish scribes often distinguished the divine name Yahweh. (Yahweh is known as the Tetragrammaton because it consists of four consonant Hebrew letters, yod, he, vav, he, often written in English YHWH.) Frequently, the scribes who wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls would write the Tetragrammaton in old paleo-Hebrew script, although the scroll was otherwise written in square Aramaic script. An example is the Habakkuk commentary found in cave 1. In the portion reproduced in the color photograph (see outside back cover), the Tetragrammaton appears twice in paleo-Hebrew script: on line 7 word 3 (reading from right to left) and on line 14 word 7. The rest of the text is in square Aramaic script—the same script used as a basis for writing Hebrew today. The Tetragrammaton is used in the Habakkuk commentary only in Biblical quotations. Whenever reference is made to God in the commentary portion, the generic word el (God) is used. This is true not only in the Habakkuk commentary, but in other Qumran (Dead Sea Scroll) documents as well.

The Qumran covenanters had other devices for circumventing the use of God’s name. Sometimes they would write four, or five dots in place of the Tetragrammaton. In the Community Rule, for example, the writer quotes Isaiah 40:3 as follows: “Prepare in the wilderness the way of ....”. We know from the Masoretic Text that the four dots stand for the Tetragrammaton YHWH. This same passage is quoted again in a document discovered in Qumran Cave 4 (4QTanhumim) with four dots representing the divine name. At times, dots were placed above the Tetragrammaton when it had been written by mistake, apparently as a means of canceling the word without actually erasing it.

Jews early adopted the practice of not pronouncing the divine name when Scripture was read aloud, even in prayer. The word adonai (Lord) was (and is to this day) read by Jews instead of the Tetragrammaton YHWH which appears on the page.

Such practices as writing the divine name in archaic script, of substituting dots for it, or of avoiding it altogether suggests that to Jews the sacred name for God was a special word which required special treatment both in writing and oral reading.

Christian Scriptures frequently quote passages from the Old Testament in which the divine name YHWH appears in the original Hebrew. In these quotations, however, the divine name is translated into the Greek word kyrios (Lord), or occasionally theos (God). Both of these words are generic words for God, not limited to the Hebrew God whose name is Yahweh and who is represented in the Hebrew Bible by the Tetragrammaton. Most of these Old Testament quotations in the New come from the Septuagint, a Greek translation of the Old Testament made by Jews in pre-Christian times. The

24 Biblical Archaeology Review, Pages 12-14, 56 (Vol IV, No1, March 1978)
Septuagint (or at least the extant, later Christian copies of it) usually renders the Tetragrammaton by *kyrios*; the New Testament simply follows this practice.

In 1944, W. G. Waddell discovered the remains of an Egyptian papyrus scroll (Papyrus Fuad 266) dating to the first or second century B.C. which included part of the Septuagint. In no instance, however, was YHWH translated *kyrios*. Instead the Tetragrammaton itself—in *square Aramaic letters*—was written into the Greek text. This parallels the Qumran Covenanters’ use of the palaeo-Hebrew script for the Divine Name in a document which was otherwise written in square Aramaic script.

An even closer parallel to the practice Waddell found in Papyrus Fuad 266 comes from second century A.D. Jewish translations of the Old Testament into Greek by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. In 1897, F. C. Burkitt published some fragments of Aquila’s Greek Old Testament which had been found in the debris of a geniza (a storeroom for worn out manuscripts) of the old synagogue in Cairo. These fragments which are the underwriting of palimpsest25 scraps clearly show the Hebrew Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew script written into the otherwise Greek text. A number of other similar examples have also come to light.

At the end of the last century, Giovanni Cardinal Mercati discovered a palimpsest in the Ambrosian Library of Milan containing parts of the Psalter to Origen’s *Hexapla*,26 (lacking the Hebrew column). All the columns show the Tetragrammaton written in square Aramaic script, although the texts are otherwise written in Greek.

Fragments of Psalm 22 from Origen’s *Hexapla*, found in the Cairo geniza, were published in 1900 by C. Taylor. These fragments show the Tetragrammaton written into the Greek columns of Aquila, Symmachus, and the Septuagint in the strange form of *PIPI*. This is a clumsy attempt to represent with Greek letters what the Tetragrammaton looked like in Hebrew. The Greek letter *pi* somewhat resembles the Hebrew letter *he*.

The Fuad papyrus scroll is the earliest example we have examined, dating to the first or second century B.C. Here for the first time we have clear evidence that in pre-Christian times the Septuagint, at least sometimes, did not translate the divine name with the Greek word *kyrios* as had been thought; rather it preserved the Hebrew word YHWH itself. Could it be that Jews had always written the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew into the text of their Greek Bibles and that this practice represented a continuous tradition from the earliest Septuagint through the second century translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion? Or is the Fuad manuscript a maverick, the only one in its day to do such a thing?

In 1952, fragments of a scroll of the Twelve Prophets in Greek were found in a cave at Nahal Hever in the Judean Desert. Père D. Barthélemy announced the discovery of the scroll in 1953 and ten years later published a transcription of it. In all probability the document dates to the beginning of the first Christian century. Like the Fuad papyrus it too writes the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew—in old style script—in an otherwise Greek text.

At Qumran cave 4, a fragment of the Greek translation of Leviticus confirms that the divine name was preserved in the pre-Christian Septuagint. In this scroll, dated by P. W. Skehan to the first century B.C., the Tetragrammaton is transliterated with the Greek letters *IAO*.

Thus, we have three separate pre-Christian copies of the Greek Septuagint Bible and in not a single instance is the Tetragrammaton translated *kyrios* or for that matter translated at all. We can now say with near certainty that it was a Jewish practice before, during, and after the New Testament period to write the divine name in *paleo-Hebrew or square Aramaic script* Septuagint and the quotations of it in the New Testament which translate the Tetragrammaton as *kyrios* or *theos*.

---

25 Palimpsests are parchments written over erased earlier writing

26 The *Hexapla*, written by Origen, a third century Church father, is a multi-columned work containing among other things the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.
Why do Christian copies of the Septuagint reflect a practice so radically different from that of the Jews in designating the Divine Name? Or do they? We have already mentioned that while Christians translated the Tetragrammaton as either kyrios or theos, they abbreviated these surrogates by writing only their first and last letters and by placing a line over them to attract attention. What was the purpose of these Christian abbreviations?

In 1907, Ludwig Traube suggested that the nomina sacra were of Hellenistic Jewish origin. The first of these, he suggested, was theos, which was abbreviated without vowels so as to follow the Hebrew custom of writing consonants only. Soon theos was followed by kyrios which became an alternate surrogate and the first and last letters became an alternate contraction. According to Traube, these contractions gave rise to the belief that the important thing was to write sacred words in abbreviated form. This resulted in a number of words being written in a similar way (for example, spirit, father and heaven).

In 1959, A.H.R.E. Paap took up the issue again and argued that the system of contracted nomina sacra was of Jewish-Christian origin emanating from Alexandria about 100 A.D. It seems to me, however, that a much better case can be made that the system of contractions is of Gentile Christian origin. The divine name YHWH was and is the most sacred word in the Hebrew language. So it is hardly likely that Jews of any sort would have removed it from their Bibles. Furthermore, we know now from discoveries in Egypt and the Judean desert that Jews wrote the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew even in their Greek texts. In all likelihood Jewish Christians felt the same way about the divine name and continued to preserve it in Hebrew in their Bibles. A famous rabbinic passage (Talmud Shabbat 13.5) discusses the problem of destroying heretical texts (very probably including books of Jewish-Christians). The problem arises for the rabbinic writer because the heretical texts contain the divine name, and their wholesale destruction would include the destruction of the divine name. This further suggests that Jewish Christians did not translate the divine name into Greek.

But Gentile Christians, unlike Jewish Christians, had no traditional attachment to the Hebrew Tetragrammaton and no doubt often failed even to recognize it. Gentile scribes who had never before seen Hebrew writing (especially in its archaic form) could hardly be expected to preserve the divine name. Perhaps this contributed to the use of surrogates like kyrios and theos for the Tetragrammaton. The contracted form of the surrogates marked the sacred nature of the name standing behind them in a way which was convenient for Gentile scribes to write. At the same time the abbreviated surrogates may have appeared to Jewish Christians who continued to feel the necessity of differentiating the divine name from the rest of the text. After the system of contractions was in use for some time, its purpose was forgotten and many other contracted words which had no connection with the Tetragrammaton were introduced.

Assuming this to be generally correct, I offer the following scenario of the history of the Tetragrammaton in the Greek Bible as a whole, including both testaments. First, as to the Old Testament: Jewish scribes always preserved the Tetragrammaton in their copies of the Septuagint both before and after the New Testament period. In all probability Jewish Christians wrote the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew as well. Toward the end of the first Christian century, when the church had become predominantly Gentile, the motive for retaining the Hebrew name for God was lost and the words kyrios and theos were substituted for it in Christian copies of Old Testament Septuagints. The contracted form of the surrogates marked the sacred nature of the name standing behind them in a way which was convenient for Gentile scribes to write. At the same time the abbreviated surrogates may have appeared to Jewish Christians who continued to feel the necessity of differentiating the divine name from the rest of the text. After the system of contractions was in use for some time, its purpose was forgotten and many other contracted words which had no connection with the Tetragrammaton were introduced.

A similar pattern probably evolved with respect to the New Testament. When the Septuagint which the New Testament church used and quoted contained the Hebrew form of the divine name, the New Testament writers no doubt included the Tetragrammaton in their quotations. But when the Hebrew form for the divine name was eliminated in favor of Greek substitutes in the Septuagint, it was eliminated also from the New Testament quotations of the Septuagint.

Thus toward the end of the first Christian century, the use of surrogates (kyrios and theos) and their contractions must have crowded out the Hebrew Tetragrammaton in both Testaments. Before long the
divine name was lost to the Gentile church except insofar as it was reflected in the contracted surrogates or remembered by scholars. Soon, even the contracted substitutes lost their original significance and were joined by a host of other abbreviated nomina sacra which had no connection with the divine name at all.

Is there any way for us, at this late date, to calculate the effect which this change in the Bible had on the second century church? It is of course impossible to know with certainty, but the effect must have been significant. First, a number of passages must have taken on an ambiguity which the original lacked. For example, the second century church read, “The Lord said to my Lord” (Matthew 22:44, Mark 12:36, Luke 20:42), a reading which is as ambiguous as it is imprecise. The first century church probably read, “YHWH said to my Lord.”

To the second century church, “Prepare the way of the Lord” (Mark 1:3) must have meant one thing, since it immediately followed the words: “The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ.” But to the First Century Church it must have meant something else since they read, “Prepare the way of YHWH.”

The second century church read 1 Corinthians 1:31, “The one who boasts, let him boast in the Lord,” which was probably considered a reference to Christ mentioned in verse 30. But to the first century church, at probably referred to God mentioned in verse 29 since they read, “The one who boasts let him boast in YHWH.”

These examples are sufficient to suggest that the removal of the Tetragrammaton from the New Testament and its replacement with the surrogates kyrios and theos blurred the original distinction between the Lord God and the Lord Christ, and in many passages made it impossible to tell which one was meant. This is supported by the fact that in a number of places where Old Testament quotations are cited, there is a confusion in the manuscript tradition whether to read God or Christ in the discussion surrounding the quotation. Once the Tetragrammaton was removed and replaced by the surrogate “Lord”, scribes were unsure whether “Lord” meant God or Christ. As time went on, these two figures were brought into even closer unity until it was often impossible to distinguish between them. Thus it may be that the removal of the Tetragrammaton contributed significantly to the later Christological and Trinitarian debates which plagued the church of the early Christian centuries.

Whatever the case, the removal of the Tetragrammaton probably created a different theological climate from that which existed during the New Testament period of the first century. The Jewish God who had always been carefully distinguished from all others by the use of his Hebrew name lost some of his distinctiveness with the passing of the Tetragrammaton. How much He lost may be known only by the discovery of a first century New Testament in which the Hebrew name YHWH still appears. (For further details, see George Howard, “The Tetragram and the New Testament”, Journal of Biblical Literature 96 (1977) 63-83.)
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KYRIOS OR TETRAGRAM: A RENEWED QUEST FOR THE ORIGINAL LXX

ALBERT PIETERSMA

When more than fifty years ago Wolf Wilhelm Graf Baudissin wrote his massive work entitled *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte* he arrived at the conclusion, on the basis of his extensive, detailed and at times belaboured investigation, that the ancient LXX read *kyrios* as a surrogate for *Yhwh*, and not a form of the Hebrew tetragram, as had been maintained as far back as Origen. Since his time, however, the claim for an original tetragram, either in Semitic guise or in Greek transliteration, is being reassessed by an increasingly growing number of scholars. The reasons for the revival of a theory already espoused by antiquity’s great hebraizer are well known. Important early Greek texts have recently come to light on both Egyptian and Palestinian soil, which give us proof positive that the tetragram was indeed employed in pre-Christian biblical manuscripts. Hence Baudissin must be wrong and Origen must be right!²

What we propose to do in this essay is 1) to survey briefly the important new evidence and the use that has been made of it in scholarly writings, 2) to determine whether the Septuagint itself perhaps gives us a clear-cut answer to the question, *Kyrios* or tetragram? and 3) to suggest a *terminus a quo* for the substitution process. Our aim, however, is far more modest than Baudissin’s. Rather than attempting to deal with the whole Greek Bible, the so-called LXX, we will focus on the (original) LXX, namely the Pentateuch. For an essay of modest scope such delimitation hardly needs defense. Furthermore, to begin at the beginning would seem eminently reasonable, especially now that a critical edition of the Greek Pentateuch is nearing completion thanks to the prodigious efforts and amazing perseverance of Professor J. W. Wevers. Critical texts for all but Exodus are complete, though not all of these are as yet generally accessible.³

Not only have the newly discovered texts, to which we already alluded and to which we will presently turn, been thought to prove that the Hebrew tetragram was employed by some circles in some Greek MSS in pre-Christian times, but that the Alexandrian translators incorporated it in their translation of the Hebrew scriptures. What form the tetragram is surmised to have had at that early date naturally has to depend on what evidence one selects as oldest and/or most trustworthy.

When in 1944 W. G. Waddell⁴ published a fragment of the now famous P. Fouad 266 (Rahlfs 848) he declared Baudissin wholly mistaken in having concluded,

Dart über hinaus ergibt sich aus der Art des Artikelgebrauchs bei *κυρίος*, dass in der ursprünglichen Septuaginta das Tetragramm nicht in hebräischen Buchstaben beibehalten, ebensowenig mit *ὅδε* oder *ομοι* umschrieben war, und dass dafür nicht erst später *κύριος* substituiert worden ist.⁵
When attacking, one understandably attacks at the enemy’s weakest point and that is what Waddell clearly does. “Der Artikelgebrauch bei κυρίος” is not Baudissin’s most conclusive proof (at least not in the Pentateuch). But he does furnish some better evidence, in fact in the immediately preceding paragraph. Waddell, however, issues his verdict.

This statement [says he in comment on Baudissin] is now flatly disproved by a new papyrus of the LXX, the remains of a roll containing the second half of the Book of Deuteronomy, which in the extant fragments shows no example of κυρίος but everywhere the Tetragrammaton in Aramaic characters.⁵

Much more recently George Howard has written a well documented and extensive article, “The Tetragram and the New Testament,”⁶ in which he seeks to launch an exploration into the implications and consequences of early Christian confusion resulting from the substitution of the tetragram by κύριος. He discusses the evidence from P. Ryl. Gk. 458 (Rahlfs 957), P. Fouad 266 (Rahlfs 848), 8 Hev. XII. Irr (Rahlfs 943), and 4QLXXLev b (Rahlfs 802) and then writes,

From these findings we can now say with almost absolute certainty that the divine name, הַיְיָ, was not rendered by κύριος in the pre-Christian Bible, as so often has been thought. Usually the Tetragram was written out in Aramaic or in paleo-Hebrew letters or was transliterated into Greek letters.⁷

Since the LXX had the tetragram, according to Howard, the New Testament authors when quoting the Greek Bible naturally incorporated the tetragram in their own writing, thus keeping distinct “the Lord God” and “the Lord Christ”; but this line of demarcation disappeared with the substitution of κύριος for the tetragram. If correct, Howard’s theory could produce interesting results for students of early Christianity, but as will be argued below, the foundation on which it has been built, namely the ancient LXX, will not sustain it, though it might possibly still be debated whether perhaps the Palestinian copies with which the NT authors were familiar read some form of the tetragram.

Interestingly enough, as we indicated earlier, the originality of the tetragram in the LXX is not a modern theory. No less a textual authority than Origen put forth the same claim. Wrote he,

In the more accurate exemplars [of the LXX] the (divine) name is written in Hebrew characters; not, however, in the current script, but in the most ancient.⁸

Similar statements are found in Jerome.⁹ Clearly in Origen’s estimation, Greek MSS with the tetragram written in paleo-hebrew were the best representatives of the LXX. There is, furthermore, evidence to suggest that Origen wrote the tetragram in his Hexapla.
The Mercati palimpsest of Psalms\textsuperscript{11} has it in all its columns, including the LXX one, and the Cairo Geniza fragment of Ps 22 from the Hexapla has πιῖπι.\textsuperscript{12} But it may well be asked what Origen's statement about the "more accurate exemplars" or the possible evidence from his Hexapla proves about the originality of the tetragram. In our opinion, neither proves anything! Origen obviously knew what we now also know first-hand, namely, that among the Jews there were Greek texts which sported the tetragram in Hebrew characters—and he seized on this as original LXX. But in light of his all surpassing regard for the \textit{hebratica veritas} and his colossal undertaking to attain it, it is not this precisely what one would have expected, and is it any wonder 1) that Origen fondly and wishfully judged the tetragram to be "more accurate" and hence presumably original, and 2) that he therefore incorporated it in his Hexapla? One should rely on Origen for an original tetragram no more than one should rely on his fifth column as a whole for original LXX.

That we have very ancient literary as well as documentary evidence for the use of the tetragram is clear. What is perhaps not quite so clear, rather, what has thus far not been clearly stated by the proponents of the original-tetragram theory, is the nature of the textual witnesses on which their case rests. There would appear to be room for closer examination and also for drawing into the discussion what others have said in other connections. The underlying assumption of the original-tetragram theory is a rather simple one: older is better, or to word it more adequately: since we have early, even pre-Christian, MS evidence for the tetragram and no such MS evidence to the contrary, the tetragram must be original LXX. But before we conclude what we all like to believe, namely, that older is better, we should at least ask two questions: 1) With what fidelity do these early texts testify to the LXX? and 2) What internal evidence on \textit{kyrios} versus tetragram does the LXX itself supply?

In answering our first question we begin by calling attention to a text which is being cited to instruct us on what the LXX had or did not have, even though it is not itself an exemplar of the LXX at all. The Scroll of the Minor Prophets (8 HevXIIgr),\textsuperscript{13} written sometime between 50 BC and AD 50,\textsuperscript{14} writes the tetragram in paleohebrew characters. To be sure this scroll has given us a wealth of information on the fascinating and complicated history of the LXX,\textsuperscript{15} but it would be a patent mistake to treat it as a \textit{bona fide} exemplar of the LXX. A hebraizing recension of the LXX it is, but a representative of the LXX itself it is not. And in a text so filled with hebraizing corrections of LXX readings what could persuade one to count its paleohebrew (?) tetragram as original LXX? Furthermore, since, where the Hebrew text is evidently neutral, the scroll follows the LXX in articulating the tetragram, the latter would seem to be decidedly secondary (cf. Hab 3:20).
Our second important text is P. Fouad 266, or more particularly, Rahlf's 848, the only one of three MSS registered under that number which has preserved the tetragram. It has been dated by Ludwig Koene to the middle of the first century BC. Like the Minor Prophets scroll it contains the tetragram, but in Aramaic rather than paleohebrew script. Also, in distinction from the MP scroll, 848 is an exemplar of the LXX. Whether it is a typical exemplar is open to question. Textually it is first of all an excellent witness to the Old Greek of Deuteronomy, but even by a conservative evaluation it also contains at least half a dozen instances of correction to the Hebrew text. Some revising of this text has obviously been done in order to bring it in better accord with the Hebrew. Furthermore, it consistently reads μακσε in place of LXX μακσα and as Wevers comments,

The spelling of 848 is certainly nearer M(T), and may be due to the bilingual scribe's undoubted knowledge of the Hebrew name.

Whether or not the scribe was bilingual (he evidently could not manage to write the tetragram in Aramaic script!), some kind of influence of the Hebrew text seems to have been at work here, and with consistent result, it should be emphasized.

Then there is the tetragram itself. Is it to be taken seriously as original LXX or is it a secondary and foreign intrusion into LXX tradition like the other hebraizing corrections it contains? Robert Hanhart in a review of Dunand's edition of P. Fouad 266 leaves no doubt about his answer to that question. He writes,

Ein Indiz dafür, dass dieser Text der ältesten Septuagintaübersetzung gegenüber bereits eine sekundäre Stufe darstellt, die einen bewussten Eingriff in die vorgegebene Überlieferung voraussetzt, bleibt mir der für diese Handschrift wie für alle bis heute gefundenen jüdischen Septuagintexte geltende Befund, dass der Jahvename konsequent nicht mit κοπιος sondern mit dem Tetragramm wiedergegeben wird.

What the grounds are for his belief that the tetragram is not original LXX, Hanhart feels unable to document in the context of his review. Had he done so, the present essay would undoubtedly not have been written.

Interestingly, if Ludwig Koene is correct, MS 848 seems to furnish some purely physical evidence that kyrios rather than the tetragram was rooted in the textual tradition on which its scribe drew. Koene has argued in his notes to the new edition of P. Fouad 266 that the scribe of 848 was unable to write the Hebrew tetragram and hence left space for a second scribe to insert it:

Where it [the tetragram] was to occur the original scribe left a blank equal to 5-6 letters (i.e. about the size of κοπιος written in full) and marked it by a high dot at its beginning. A second scribe filled in the Hebrew letters. They cover only the middle of the blank, usually the space of 2 1/2 - 3 letters.

The 6 letter kyrios, therefore, served apparently as a spacer for the tetragram which required only half the allotted room. Naturally, this piece of physical evidence ought not be pressed unduly. Yet, for the light it seems to throw on our problem, it is too interesting to pass by without notice.
On textual grounds there is, however, complementary evidence for the secondary nature of the tetragram. In Deut 31:27 the LXX text, supported by all MSS, including 847 (by Koenen’s placement of the relevant fragment), reads πρὸς τὸν θεόν for the Hebrew הוהי, but mistakenly in this instance the scribe(s) of 848, rather than substituting the tetragram for θεόν, inserted it after πρὸς, thus creating a unique doublet. That the introduction of the tetragram into the Greek text was more important than bringing the LXX quantitatively into line with the Hebrew is perhaps further suggested by 28:64 where ὁ θεός has no counterpart in MT. In any case, the tetragram in 31:27 is clearly secondary, and if secondary here it would be difficult to count it as original LXX elsewhere in 848.

When one thus considers the various items of information which 848 supplies, its status, in general, as a typical exemplar of the LXX is not beyond doubt, and its tetragram, in particular, as a remnant of the Old Greek is hardly to be taken seriously.23

Of the pre-Christian texts which give positive proof of the tetragram there remains 4QLXXLev b (Rahlfs 802). It was written in a hand very similar to 848, and P. W. Skehan has dated this text to the first century BC. 4QLXXLev b has not yet been published; hence a detailed discussion of its textual character must wait. This much can be said, however: there is no doubt that the very fragmentary 42 verses of 802 give us a genuine LXX text with at most two corrections to the Hebrew, while evidencing as many as 21 extant and videtur agreements with the LXX against MT.24 Yet, in spite of its apparent excellence as a representative of the LXX, it contains the Hebrew tetragram in the form of the Greek tetragram κυρίος, leading Skehan to comment,

This new evidence strongly suggests that the usage in question [i.e. of some form of the tetragram] goes back for some books at least to the beginnings of the Septuagint rendering, and antedates such devices as that in the Faia papyrus or the special scripts in the more recent Hebrew manuscripts of Qumran and in later Greek witnesses.25

Certainly, to the extent that its fragmentary condition enables us to determine, the genuinely Septuagintal credentials of 4QLXXLev b are well-nigh impeccable.

The last text we need to mention is P. Ryl. Gk. 458 (Rahlfs 957), not because it is relevant to our discussion but because it has been forcibly introduced into the discussion, in part, one surmises, because it is the oldest extant LXX MS. As is well known, Paul Kahle26 managed to persuade the editor of P. Ryl. Gk. 458, C. H. Roberts,27 that at Deut 26:18, in a lacuna too large for the ubiquitous contraction κύριος, this MS did not read the full form κύριος as Roberts had suggested, but the Hebrew tetragram—as (some) other early witnesses do. That P. Ryl. Gk. 458 did not read κύριος is, of course, to be expected since the contractions of the nomina sacra are of Christian origin,28 but the full κύριος would seem to be perfectly acceptable from every perspective. Kahle wished to insert the tetragram because he thought he knew what the original LXX must have read. One hopes that this text will henceforth be banned from further discussion regarding the tetragram, since it has nothing to say about it.
What we have tried to do thus far in our survey is to emphasize that of the four early texts that have been cited in support of an original tetragram, one gives no evidence at all, a second is non-Septuagintal, and a third contains hebraizing revisions (including at least one instance of the tetragram). Only one text, 4QLXXLev, would seem to have good credentials as a typical exemplar of the LXX.

When we put aside the biblical MSS and look for literary sources which may enlighten us on whether kyrios was a surrogate for the tetragram, we might possibly appeal to such books as Wisdom of Solomon, 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees, et al., all of which use kyrios as a divine epithet (or name?) extensively. But since there is no sure proof that kyrios in these works is a substitute for the tetragram, we had better not draw on them. Similarly, we might appeal to Aristaeas 155 which contains a near quotation of Deut 7:18, and Aristobulus who seems to make reference to Exod 9:3, but since these authors were transmitted by Christians, kyrios could be secondary. Philo of Alexandria, however, has to be faced. Of course, he too was transmitted by Christians, as Howard emphasizes, and Peter Katz has made us all a little cautious in making use of biblical quotations in Philo. Yet, extreme caution sometimes makes one ignore valuable evidence. To deal with kyrios throughout the Philonic corpus would be superfluous and might in any case prove little more than that Philo employed kyrios in reference to God. Attention may be called simply to two passages in which Philo gives an exposition on the meaning of the divine appellations θεός and κύριος, namely De Abrahamo 121 and De Plantatione 85-90. Especially the latter is instructive because it includes comments on Gen 21:33 (τὸ ὄνομα κύριου θεοῦ ἀνάμνησις) and 28:21 (καὶ ἔσται κύριος ἐμοὶ εἰς θεόν). In light of his exposition there can be no doubt as to how Philo read his biblical text and what he read. Consequently, Dahl and Segal have stated quite correctly,

While preserved Jewish fragments of the Greek version have some form of transliteration for the tetragrammaton, Philo must have read kyrios in his texts (emphasis added).

There is only one way to negate the force of Philo’s evidence on the equation of kyrios and the tetragram, and that is by making a distinction between what Philo saw in his Bible and what he understood and read, but that issue we will turn to at a later point.

Against this background we now finally turn to the LXX itself, or rather the Greek Pentateuch. That throughout the first five books of the Greek Bible kyrios is employed as a proper noun was shown long ago by Huber, Debrunner, and Baudissin and has been reiterated since. As a proper noun, a divine name, and in complete conformity with other personal names in these books, it is more often unarticulated than articulated. This basic fact holds true for all five books. Articulation, however, is well attested in all but Deuteronomy, especially in some of the oblique cases, a fact which demonstrates that, if per chance the original text read the tetragram, this was construed in every respect as a Greek personal name and was not treated as a foreign element. Furthermore, a basic rule in the Pentateuch is that kyrios is unarticulated in the nominative case, the genitive, as object of a preposition and as subject of an infinitive. Kyrios is articulated most often in the dative when rendering Hebrew le- prefixed to the tetragram. It is in this construction that differences among the five books are most noticeable. Thus, τῷ κυρίῳ
appears twice in Genesis as against five unarticulated instances, in Exodus twelve times against twenty-three without articulation, in Leviticus seventy-two versus twenty-one, in Numbers four as against fifty-four, and not at all in Deuteronomy.

Since most often kyrios is unarticulated, the articulated instances naturally attract special attention. Why, for instance, the translator of Leviticus chose to render הַלְוָי approximately three times out of four by τῷ κυρίῳ, while the Numbers translator did so in a mere four occurrences out of fifty-four, is an interesting question. Debrunner believed that the Leviticus translator sought to represent each detail of his Vorlage, but this cannot be the full explanation since Hebrew le- is by no means consistently represented in his Greek text. Baudissin, though recognizing some influence exercised by the Hebrew text, places more emphasis on the distinction between kyrios as name and kyrios as appellative, but this too can hardly be the complete story since the appellative use of kyrios would hardly be so one-sidedly linked to the dative. Yet, as Baudissin discusses at length, in view of the primary meaning of kyrios, its use as an appellative in the LXX deserves attention. He speaks with qualified approval of the procedure employed in the Cambridge Septuagint in which unarticulated and articulated kyrios are distinguished by means of an upper and lower case kappa. But rather than attempting to draw an absolute distinction between kyrios as divine name and kyrios as appellative, Baudissin prefers to speak of "appellativartige Färbung." Also the Pentateuch contains many instances where kyrios may well have this appellative colouring. A particularly instructive example for our investigation as a whole is Exod 8:22 (MT 8:18):

...ιδοὺ εἶδεν ὅτι έγὼ εἰμὶ κύριος ὁ κύριος πάσης τῆς
λήμνου, ᾅ γὰς γάρ ἐφ κόσμῳ, δεδομένῳ ἐν εἰλήμνῳ,
γάρ γάρ ἐφ κόσμῳ λήμνου μεταβληθήναι μὴ μὴν
πᾶσς τῆς λήμνου μεταβληθήναι, καὶ τε ἐγὼ εἰμὶ κύριος πάσης τῆς
λήμνου.

Presumably for exegetical reasons the translator deviates from his Vorlage and his appellative ὁ κύριος as an interpretation of the preceding word is especially apt on the assumption that he wrote (or at the very least read!) kyrios instead of the tetragram.

In the final analysis, however, it must be admitted that, with the exception of Exod 8:22, no list of passages in which kyrios seems to have appellative force can prove beyond reasonable doubt that the original LXX read kyrios. At best we obtain a glimpse.

Certainly more than a glimpse of what the LXX must have read can be obtained by examining translational consistency. The almost universal Greek equivalent of הַלְוָי in the Pentateuch is kyrios in the dative case, often articulated but also frequently without articulation. The translator of Exodus in approximately 23 instances chose not to articulate, and in 14 of these MS evidence shows that the genitive case is a viable alternative. The same is true in Numbers where the incidence of non-articulation is much higher (over 90%) than in Exodus, and where in approximately 25% of the cases the genitive is read by some witnesses, though the original text is nowhere seriously in doubt. Now if we posit that the original LXX did not have kyrios but the indeclinable tetagram instead, we would have to believe that the kyrios surrogate, without any help whatsoever from his Greek text, hit upon such a remarkably high degree of correspondence between הַלְוָי and κυρίῳ. Impossible it is perhaps not, but certainly improbable.
Proof that, of the translators of the Pentateuch, at least the translator of Exodus understood both adon and the tetragram as being equivalent to kyrios can be ascertained from two passages in which they occur together in the Hebrew. Both solutions which the translator forged are well known in the LXX outside of the Pentateuch, as we will see presently. The first passage is Exod 23:17:

What we see immediately is that the translator rather than repeating kyrios, has opted for the so-called Palestinian gere, which was apparently known in Egypt as early as the third century BC. The second passage which posed the same problem, however, called for a different solution. Exod 34:23 reads in our two texts:

In this case, due to the concluding phrase “the God of Israel,” the writing of the gere, though not an impossibility had the translator focused myopically on a one-to-one correspondence, was scarcely a live option. Hence he resorts here to a second solution, also well attested elsewhere in the Greek Bible, namely the omission of one kyrios.

That in the two passages above, the LXX rests on a Vorlage which differed from MT has, to the best of my knowledge, not been proposed, and would seem in any case most unlikely.

The translator of Genesis was twice faced with the same problem as the Exodus translator but his solution was strikingly different. In fact his solution, or rather solutions since they are not wholly identical, are rare in the Greek Bible. They show beyond a shadow of a doubt not only that adonai and the tetragram were taken to be equivalent to kyrios but also that this equivalency was expressed in written form. The first reference is Gen 15:2:

Though there is some textual evidence supporting a plaus of Kyrie. Wevers appears to be correct in choosing despota as the original text, though in the second passage both are evidently the work of the translator. Gen 15:8:

εἶπεν δὲ: Δέσποτα, κυρίε, κατὰ τί γνώσομαι ὦτι κληρονομήσω αυτήν;
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Like the Exodus translator, the translator of Genesis wants to avoid repeating kyrios, even though it be in the form of direct address, the vocative, the only case in which a double kyrios was to become usual in the LXX, but it seems as though no generally accepted manner of dealing with adonai Yhwh had as yet evolved when the translator of Genesis presumably began a process that was to last for several centuries. He himself, as the inconsistency in our two passages suggests, was just feeling his way. What is of paramount importance for our discussion is that nowhere else does this translator translate either the tetragram or adon, whether the referent be human or divine, by despotes, a word unique in Genesis to the two passages under discussion. Both are consistently rendered by kyrios. The reason for his unique rendering is obvious: he wished to avoid writing kyrie kyrie. However, by the time we reach the translation of Deuteronomy, the usual Septuagintal solution to adonai Yhwh in the vocative has been arrived at. Deut 3:24:

And again in Deut 9:26:

The latter passage includes an interpretive gloss on kyrios of which Philo, with his understanding of this name as indicating God’s royal or ruling power, would have been proud.

For confirmation of what we have found in the Pentateuch we might briefly appeal to an important article written recently by the late Patrick Skehan. Skehan surveys the evidence for the tetragram at Qumran, Masada, and in early Greek MSS. There is no need here to repeat in detail what he has written. In his final section, “Greek Texts of the Prophets,” the author calls the reader’s attention to the fact that in LXX Ezekiel adonai Yhwh is represented by a single kyrios, a rendering also encountered in other prophetic books, notably Isaiah and the Minor Prophets. In 15 instances, however, Pap. 967 reads kyrios ho theos, which is equivalent to the greek adonai elohim. This same translation is found in 9 out of 23 occurrences of adonai Yhwh in the Minor Prophets. Whether kyrios ho theos in 967 is original or secondary as Ziegler judged it to be is not crucial for its Septuagintal nature. Be it sufficient to note that for Hebrew adonai Yhwh single kyrios and kyrios ho theos as well as the vocative kyrie kyrie, are amply attested in the prophetic corpus as original LXX—precisely what we already know from the Pentateuch. But Skehan, while emphasizing that both major equivalents must hail from a Jewish setting, seemingly cannot bring himself to call them genuine LXX. He concludes.
A large part of the LXX prophetic corpus... comes to hand with its earliest attainable stage showing leanings toward Κύριος or Θεός as an equivalent for מָלֵא צֶדֶק in accordance with the Palestinian qere. Also, as far back as it is possible to go, the Kyrios term is employed in these books for both מְלֵא צֶדֶק and מַעֲשֵׂה, on the basis of the spoken Adonai that stood for either separately; and there is a wide acceptance of one single Kyrios to stand in the place of the combined names. This cannot have come about as exclusively the work of Christian scribes. Whatever earlier incidence of ΙΑΝ or מְלֵא צֶדֶק there may have been in these prophetic books... the option of translating only the qere...would seem to have been selected by sources familiar with Hebrew and not connected with the work of Origen.50

In the Pentateuch Kyrios as a surrogate for the tetragram is original LXX, and one more than suspects that its originality is not confined to the first five books; yet, might it not be objected that the translators wrote one thing but pronounced another? No less a scholar than Elias Bickerman wrote more than thirty years ago, “Although the ineffable Name was transliterated in the Greek Bible it was pronounced as Kyrios, the Lord.”51 That both Adonai and the tetragram were equated with kyrios already in pre-Christian times is beyond doubt, but could this possibly have applied only to the qere? Internal evidence of the LXX itself, in our view, disproves this. Surely, the singly written kyrios not only in the Prophetic Books but also in the Pentateuch argues otherwise. If the LXX translators are thought to have written the tetragram is there any reason to suppose that they would not have written kyrios YHWH where the Hebrew had Adonai YHWH? And this kyrios YHWH could then have been read as kyrios ho theos,—which is in fact the way in which it was at times written, both within and without the Pentateuch. Likewise, does not kyrios ho theos again attested in written form within and without the Pentateuch, indicate equally strongly that the translators wanted to avoid a nonsensical repetition of kyrios and hence wrote the qere?52 Is it possible to explain despota and despota kyrie in Gen. on the ketib/qere hypothesis? Surely, the translator could have written kyrie YHWH. That he resorts instead to a word which he otherwise never uses for Adonai not only proves it would seem, that both Adonai and YHWH meant kyrios to him, but that he wished to avoid writing kyrie kyrie. Moreover, had he written a combination of kyrie plus the tetragram, would not this have been changed at some later stage to a double kyrie (which is in fact usual in the LXX) by the supposed kyrios surrogators?53

The same argument might be applied to the two instances of despota kyrie for Adonai YHWH in Jer (1:6; 4:10), and the three occurrences of ho despotes kyrios sabaath for ho-Adon YHWH sabaath in Isa (1:24; 3:1; 10:33), since neither translator otherwise ever translates Adon by despotes, and also neither ever writes a double kyrios in any form, including the vocative.

When the Pentateuch was translated, kyrios was incorporated in the Greek text as the written surrogate for the tetragram, a surrogate which would also serve to safeguard the ineffable nature of the divine name, if indeed ineffability was a concern at so early a date. The translators felt no more bound to retain the tetragram in written form
than they felt compelled to render distinctively Hebrew el, elohim or shaddai. Nor were they more unfaithful to the original than the Masada scribe of Ben Sira who everywhere wrote adonai. Their procedure was certainly far less radical than that of their Hebrew predecessors who on no fewer than 30 occasions in Genesis alone eliminated the tetragram from the Vorlage of the LXX and replaced it with (one assumes) elohim (Greek theos).

Since, then, as we have tried to show, our early texts do not give us convincing proof of an original tetragram in the LXX, and since, more importantly, a number of passages in the Greek Pentateuch, in direct contradiction to these early witnesses, demonstrate the written originality of kyrios we might well ask what kind of historical perspective on the Hebrew tetragram and its Greek surrogate emerges. Skehan’s article, to which reference has already been made, provides us with the key.

In delineating the development of the divine names (principally the tetragram) in the Hebrew MSS from Qumran, Skehan distinguishes three stages: 1) names in normal (i.e. square) script, 2) substitution of paleohebrew, 3) spread of the substitution process. And at each stage the author gives appropriate evidence. What the headings indicate and what Skehan makes clear in comment on the evidence is that at Qumran we encounter what may be called an archaizing process in the writing of the divine name and not in so far as our present knowledge indicates, a gradual replacement of an older paleohebrew tetragram by a younger one in the square script. Similarly in his survey of Greek evidence Skehan discerns several stages: 1) tao, 2) tetragram in square script, 3) tetragram in paleohebrew script, 4) kyrios. Naturally we would not agree with tao in first place and kyrios in last, but apart from that there is evidence of archaizing similar to that in the Hebrew MSS. The paleohebrew tetragram in Greek witnesses is not the oldest but apparently the youngest. Both in the Hebrew MSS from Qumran and in our earliest Greek MSS there is clear evidence that the divine name was the object of revisionary activity.

It is this archaizing tendency or process to which Skehan has called attention that was responsible for introducing the various forms of the tetragram into the Greek traditions. Its original home was not Egypt but Palestine, whence it was exported to the Diaspora. As Hanhart noted quite correctly in connection with P. Fouad 266, the tetragram in Greek MSS is evidence of a secondary stage. When this secondary stage began to be introduced is not certain. It may be that some sporadic, unconscious, hebraizing is as old as the LXX itself, though we have very little evidence to support such a view. But what in any case distinguishes the introduction of some form of the tetragram from other (non-recensional) instances of Hebrew influence is its systematic “recension-like” nature. We would venture to suggest that the hebraizing corrective process began in earnest during the second century BC when Egypt became once again a place of refuge from troubled Palestine. It is likely to have been the influx of Palestinian Jews into Egypt that created the occasion for Aristeas’ defense of the venerated LXX against its detractors.
That the book of Aristeas is, in part at least, an attack on Palestinian Jews has been recognized by Tcherikover and Howard and with greater focus on the text of the LXX by Klijn, Jellicoe and Brock, the last named of whom calls specific attention to the poignant manner in which the author of the book cuts the legs from under his Palestinian opponents: 1) the translation into Greek had been sponsored by the high priest in Jerusalem and was carried out by Palestinian translators; 2) the translation which was produced had achieved such a high level of accuracy that all subsequent revision was not only uncalled for but in fact proscribed; 3) the LXX had been based directly on the Jerusalem text. Hence, any attack on or belittling of the LXX would be not only ridiculous but aimed directly at the high priest himself and the Jerusalem text. Aristeas meant to take the wind out of his opponents’ sails and at the same time give them a powerful disincentive against denigrating the Bible of Egyptian Jewry and tampering with its text.

That Aristeas’ defense of the LXX presupposes a rival Greek text as has been argued by Klijn and carried a step further by Jellicoe, is, in our view, unwarranted. Not a scrap of such a text has survived. Aristeas’ point is clear: the accuracy of the LXX makes all revision both unnecessary and illegal. Nothing is either said or implied about the scope of such revision. The kind of systematic replacing of the familiar and hallowed κυ̣ριος with the parochial Hebrew tetragram which reduced the LXX to an inferior status vis-à-vis the Hebrew, thereby creating what seems to have been a new notion in Egyptian Jewry, viz. that of the hebraica veritas, would seem to be perfectly capable of having provided an occasion for Aristeas to launch his counter attack.

That criticism of the LXX by immigrants from Palestine is more than a text-critical inference, is evident from the Prologue of Ben Sira’s grandson, whose negative reflection on the Greek Bible has often been pointed out by modern scholars.

Our evidence for the substitution of κυ̣ριος by the tetragram does not, at present, take us beyond the first century BC. We must therefore frankly admit that there is no sure way to link the beginnings of this process with Aristeas’ floris. But unlike previously proposed theories, the present suggestion rests on concrete textual evidence which is traceable to well within a century of Aristeas’ day.
Who Changed Jehovah to Lord?27
Rev. Wesley P. Walters

The Watchtower leaders have blundered again. They recently published a 32-page pamphlet titled The Divine Name That Will Endure Forever. In it they accused an “apostate” Christian church of removing the Divine Name “Jehovah” from both the Old and New Testament Scriptures and substituting the mere title of “Lord.” They wrote, “while the Jews refused to pronounce God’s name, the apostate Christian church managed to remove it completely from Greek language manuscripts of both parts of the Bible” (pg. 25).

They based this erroneous idea on some guesswork published by Professor George Howard in an article in the March 1978 Biblical Archaeological Review, (pp. 12ff) Howard’s article dealt in part with the use of the divine name in the Greek translation of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint.

A number of manuscript copies of the Septuagint (LXX) dating after the time of Christ have been preserved, but only a few fragmentary pre-Christian copies have survived and only recently have they been discovered. The post-Christian copies all have either the word “Lord” or “God” (Greek: Kyrios or Theos) where the Hebrew Bible has the Divine Name “Yahweh” (Hebrew: YHWH, which the Watchtower prefers to pronounce “Jehovah”). Thus unquestionably the Greek-speaking Christians of the early church used a Greek Bible that had substituted either “Lord” or “God” where the original Hebrew Bible had contained the name “Jehovah”.

The key question here is: Was this substitution made by an “apostate Christian church” or had the original Jewish translators of the LXX introduced the substitution themselves when they made their translation about 200 B.C.?

Within the past half-century, badly deteriorated fragments of three pre-Christian Greek manuscripts of the Old Testament have been found. These at first appear to support the Watchtower’s assertions. In the few places where the text is still readable, these three copies do not have “Lord” (Kyrios) where the Hebrew Bible has “Jehovah.” Instead, in two of the copies the divine name itself is written out in Hebrew letters YHWH; in the third, an attempt is made to spell out in Greek letters the way the Name YHWH sounded to the Greek copyist. Accordingly, it appears as “IAO”.

On the basis of this very slim evidence, Howard, in a more detailed article published in 1977 in The Journal of Biblical Literature, proposed “a theory” (p. 63). He suggested that the original LXX translators had written the divine name into their translation in Hebrew letters wherever they encountered it in the Hebrew text. He further suggested that, if this guess were correct, then the New Testament writers, being Christian Jews, probably would have done the same thing when quoting

---

passages from the LXX. Although there is no New Testament manuscript that contains the divine name written out in Hebrew – all use “Lord” and “God” in Greek instead – Howard thought it was possible that they originally had used the Hebrew. Howard conjectured that, gradually, as the Old and New Testaments were recopied by Gentile Christians to whom the name “Jehovah” would have little meaning, “Jehovah” was dropped in favor of Kyrios.

Thus, on the basis of Howard’s largely theoretical reconstruction of the change from “Jehovah” to “Lord”, the Watchtower leaders have issued a dogmatic assertion that a corrupt church had introduced such a change.

The question that the Watchtower leaders never considered is whether Howard’s guesses are supported by the evidence. This question was addressed recently by Dr. Albert Pietersma of the University of Toronto. Writing in De Septuaginta, a collection of scholarly articles in honor of John William Wevers, Pietersma carefully reviews Howard’s use of the three Old Testament manuscript fragments. He finds that a careful examination does not support Howard’s theory.

The first fragmentary manuscript contains portions of the 12 minor prophets and was found in a cave in Nahal Hever in the Judean Desert. One column of this manuscript containing Zech. 8:19–9:4 and dating between 50 B.C. and A.D. 50 was photographically reproduced in his 1978 article. It clearly shows that the divine name was written out in a very ancient form of Hebrew called paleo-Hebrew at the places where later LXX copies read Kyrios. This is the fragment the Jehovah’s Witnesses reproduced in their article. At first glance, this appears impressive and looks like conclusive proof that the original LXX translators did write out the divine name, and later post-Christian scribes substituted the title “Lord” in all those places.

However, Pietersma points out that this particular manuscript “is not itself an exemplar (example) of the LXX at all” (pg. 88). Rather it is a worked-over version made by some Jewish scribe who was trying to bring the LXX text into line with his copy of the Hebrew Bible, and who made changes in many other places as well to try to accomplish this. In this reworking process, he probably inserted the Hebrew name for God where the LXX text he was copying had read Kyrios. This is the type of thing the translators of the 1901 American Standard Version did when they restored the name “Jehovah” in all those places where the King James Version had translated the divine name by the word “LORD.”

That a process of restoring the divine name in the LXX translations is going on is further evidenced by the second pre-Christian fragment. This is a small, still unpublished fragment of Leviticus, covering parts of chapters 2 to 5. It was found in Cave IV at Quamran near the Dead Sea. This is the manuscript that writes the divine name out in Greek letters to mimic the name’s pronounced sound “IAO.” Professor Patrick Skehan, who was preparing the fragment for publication at the time of his death in 1980, regarded it as dating to the first century B.C. He considered it older than the fragments containing the divine name written out in Hebrew letters, and therefore concluded that it “antedates such devices” as the use of the Hebrew script itself. (See his quote both in Pietersma, p. 91 and in Howard, p. 65). If Skehan’s dating is correct, then this again argues that some Jewish copyists were busy putting the divine name back into the LXX translation from which it had been removed by the original Jewish translators of the LXX when they used Kyrios to translate “Jehovah”.

That the process was one of inserting the Divine Name where the original LXX translators had simply used Kyrios or Theos is seen most clearly in Howard’s third piece of manuscript evidence. This is a fragment of Deuteronomy found in Egypt and known as Papyrus Fuad (or Fuad) No. 266. Dating also to the first century B.C., this fragmentary text has the divine name written out in the contemporary Hebrew letters rather than in the paleo-Hebrew script found in the minor prophets manuscript. This suggests that various ways of writing the divine name back into the Greek Bible were being used in the first century B.C. That this is the case seems clearly established by Deut. 31:27 of Fuad No. 266. That verse speaks of the Israelites having rebelled “against Jehovah”. (Hebrew: ‘im YHWH). All post-Christian copies of the LXX translate this into Greek as “pros ton Theon” (“against the God”). The scribe who copied Fuad No. 266 inserted the divine name after “pros”, but forgot to remove the “ton Theon” he was substituting it for, “thus creating a unique doublet” (as Dr. Pietersma points out, p. 90). This presence of “Jehovah , followed immediately by its LXX translation, “ton
Theon”, makes it evident that the scribe in the process of inserting the Hebrew name and removing the original Greek translation, forgot to remove the original translation at this point.

That the LXX had employed in its original translation both *Kyrios* and *Theos* where the Hebrew had the divine name Jehovah is confirmed with finality in the writings of the pre-Christian Jewish scholar Philo. This Egyptian Greek-speaking Jew died about A.D. 40 when the Christian Church was just beginning to take shape. Throughout his voluminous writings he quotes continuously from the LXX, using *Kyrios* and *Theos* and never the divine name itself. That this is the way his pre-Christian LXX reads is established beyond doubt by his attempts to explain why his Bible sometimes read *Kyrios* and sometimes read *Theos*. Philo concluded that his Bible used *Theos* when God’s graciousness or mercy was being stressed and it used *Kyrios* when his “kingly” nature, or justice, was emphasized. Thus he wrote, “Now the name denoting the kind and gracious power is ‘God’ (*Theos*) and that denoting the kingly, ruling power is ‘Lord’ (*Kyrios*). (“On Dreams”, Loeb edition V, p. 383, Sec. 163; cf also “On the Changing of Names” V. 155, Sec. 23ff).

There is no way Philo could have set forth this explanation in these terms if his copy of the LXX had not already employed substitutes for the divine name. In his *JBL* article Howard writes that Philo may be “our earliest witness to this particular Greek substitute for the divine name in an expositional reference” (p 71).

Thus the Watchtower’s charge that an “apostate Christian church” substituted a mere title “Lord” for the divine name “Jehovah” is refuted. Long before the Christian Church came into existence, the substitution had been made by the Jewish writers, as Howard’s article shows. The Watchtower once again has erred in its statements. If Watchtower statements are the result of direct guidance of the leaders by Jehovah, as Society leaders appear to claim, then their “Jehovah” has shown himself once more in error. The Watchtower “Jehovah” is therefore not the Jehovah of the Bible, since the biblical Jehovah is perfect in wisdom from eternity to eternity, and does not fall into such outstanding blunders.
When one picks up a modern LXX text, of course, one does not find these variants. ΚΥΡΙΟΣ (with or without the article) is the preferred rendering of the tetragrammaton. Since the textual evidence for this comes in MSS copied by Christians, however, it has been argued that this is a later development and may even post-date the New Testament itself.

The view that ΚΥΡΙΟΣ did not appear in the LXX until after the advent of the Christian era is implausible. Albert Pietersma has undertaken a very detailed analysis of the translation technique of the Greek Pentateuch and has concluded that the evidence strongly suggests that ΚΥΡΙΟΣ was the original reading of the text. Even more persuasive is the testimony of Philo and the NT itself. Philo consistently uses ΚΥΡΙΟΣ as a designation for God. But might this not be, as Howard suggests, simply another instance of Christian scribes inserting ΚΥΡΙΟΣ in place of the tetragrammaton? Such an objection is countered when one considers that Philo does not merely employ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ as a title for God in his texts – he frequently interprets the word itself and even derives significance from its etymology. In Leg. All. 95, for example, he comments on the use of the compound form ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ο ΘΕΟΣ in Genesis: “This is in order that, should he obey the exhortations, he may be deemed worthy by God (ο ΘΕΟΣ) of His benefactions; but that, should he rebel, he may be driven from the presence of the Lord (ΚΥΡΙΟΥ) who has a master’s authority over him.” In Quis Her. 22ff., Philo discusses the distinctions between God as ΚΥΡΙΟΣ and God as δέσποτα. ΚΥΡΙΟΣ, he says, comes from ΚΥΡΙΟΣ meaning “power,” and it indicates that which is secure (while δέσποτα derives from δέος, “fear,” and indicates a “terrible lord” – Gk. φόβος ΚΥΡΙΟΥ).

As for the NT, we must first note the fact that there is no known evidence of the tetragrammaton in any surviving MS of the NT. If it were ever there, it has vanished without a trace. Secondly, as in the case of Philo, the presence of ΚΥΡΙΟΣ in the LXX is crucial to the interpretation of certain NT passages. Foremost among these is Ro. 10:9ff, where Paul states that salvation rests upon believing in the resurrection of Christ and confessing Jesus as Lord. He then cites some OT texts which he believes support his assertion: Is.28:16, “No one who believes in him will be ashamed” (Ro.10:11); and Joel 3:5, “All who call upon the name of the Lord will be saved” (Ro.10:13). The latter is a direct quotation from the LXX: παίς... οζ ἐπικαλέσηται το όνομα ΚΥΡΙΟΥ σωθήσεται. Even if one wishes to make God the Father and not Christ the antecedent of these verses (and this is by no means certain), the passage only makes sense based on LXX texts containing ΚΥΡΙΟΣ. How else does one account for the phrase “for the same is Lord of all” (ο γαρ αυτος ΚΥΡΙΟΣ παντων) in v. 12, just before the Joel quotation? The tetragrammaton would not make grammatical sense here. It is far more likely that Paul is making a Christological statement through a deliberate juxtaposition of ΚΥΡΙΟΣ and LXX references concerning the saving power of God, o ΚΥΡΙΟΣ.

It is safe to say that, even if ΚΥΡΙΟΣ were not the original LXX reading, there were certainly Greek MSS containing this rendering of the divine name during the NT era. This should not obscure the fact, of course, that some Greek manuscripts did contain variations of the tetragrammaton rather than ΚΥΡΙΟΣ.

---

**READING E: YHWH AT PATMOS, SEAN McDONOUGH, 1999**

The following is from pages 60 – 61
The name YHWH, as is well known, does not occur explicitly in the New Testament. In quotations from the OT, for instance, where the MT reads הוהי, the NT generally speaking has Κυρίος.28 There is also evidence for the corresponding Aramaic title נַהֲרָא in 1 Cor. 16:22 (Gk. μαρανθάκα, “Our Lord, come!”), although this likely has particular reference to Jesus Christ. As we have indicated, the substitution of Adonai/Κυρίος/ארמ for YHWH is a matter of great intrinsic interest, particularly for New Testament Christology. For this very reason, we have chosen to avoid the topic and concentrate on the usage and meaning of YHWH itself. We will only note here that Κυρίος appears not only in Paul’s letters to Jewish and Gentile Christians, but also in letters which appear to be addressed to strictly Jewish audiences, such as the book of James. Thus, while Jewish Christians could possibly have used the name YHWH when (and if) they spoke Hebrew, when they wrote (and presumably spoke) in Greek, they used Κυρίος. This at least is what the concrete evidence of the New Testament suggests. Furthermore, the admittedly slight evidence of 1 Cor. 16:22, when combined with the use of נַהֲרָא for God in 4QEnb, suggests that they may have used נַהֲרָא in place of the name YHWH in their Aramaic discourse.

28 As we have argued above, Howard’s theory (and in fairness to him, it is only presented as a theory) that the tetragrammaton may have appeared in the original NT texts has no MSS support, and furthermore rests on dubious assertions about the (non-) use of Κυρίος.
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