1

P. Vindob. G 39777 (Symmachus) and the Use of the Divine Names in Greek Scripture Texts

Emanuel Tov

The Psalms fragments of P. Vindob. G 39777, probably from the Fayum in Egypt, kept at the Austrian National Library, were published as a fragment of Aquila's translation in an *editio princeps* by Wessely and subsequently also by Capelle.[1] At a later stage Mercati suggested that the fragment may have been part of the translation by Symmachus (approximately 200 CE),[2] and this view became the *communis opinio* in scholarship. Indeed, anyone who is familiar with Aquila's style recognizes immediately that the free translation style of this fragment does not suit that translator, while it would be typical of Symmachus.

Roberts described the two fragments (Ps 69 [LXX 68]:13–14, 31–32 and 81 [80]:11–14) as deriving from a parchment roll of Psalms dating to the third or fourth century CE.[3] These fragments have been mentioned in many sources,[4] and their full publication history and physical description are provided by A. Rahlfs and D. Fraenkel.[5]

P. Vindob. G 39777 includes the fragmentary remains of respectively three and five lines of two columns of Psalm 69 (LXX: 68) and five lines of one column of Psalm 81 (LXX: 80) in the version of Symmachus. The readings of Symmachus show his free translation style which has been analyzed by Busto Saiz for Symmachus in Psalms in general,[6] with no special focus on this fragment. The most remarkable feature of the Vienna fragments is the writing of the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters in the following verses: Ps 69 (LXX: 68):14, 31, 32.

1 Charles Wessely, "Un nouveau fragment de la version grecque du Vieux Testament par Aquila," *Mélanges offerts à M. Émile Chatelain* (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1910), 224–229; idem, *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde*, Vol. XI (Leipzig, Haessel: 1911), 171 [containing only a transcription]; P. Capelle, "Fragments du Psautier d'Aquila?", *Revue Bénédictine* 28 (1911): 64–68. The contents of the fragment are also provided by Jose Ramon Busto Saiz, but this is not a publication in the usual sense of the word: J.R. Busto Saiz, *La traducción de Símaco en el libro de los Salmos* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 22; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1978), 422– 423.

2 G. Mercati, "Frammenti di Aquila o di Simmaco?," *RB* NS 8 (1911): 266–272.

3 C.H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (The Schweich Lectures 1977; London: Oxford University Press, 1979), 32.

4 Among them: Larry H. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006), 19, n. 16; 103, n. 27; J. Van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976), 167.

5 A. Rahlfs & D. Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments, I, 1, Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum, Supplementum; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 428.

6 Busto Saiz, *La traducción de Símaco.* For a good summary of his translation technique and lexical approach see A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (JSS Monograph 15; Manchester, 1991), 283–297 and F. Albrecht, "Die alexandrinische Bibelübersetzung," in *Alexandria* (eds. T. Georges, F. Albrecht, and R. Feldmeier; COMES 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 209–243 (233–234).

The fragment also includes the uncontracted form of the divine name θεοῦ (69 [68]:31). We do not know whether Symmachus himself represented the Tetragrammaton with paleo-Hebrew characters or whether this type of writing was initiated by the scribe of the fragment of the third-fourth century. However, in light of parallel evidence it is likely that Symmachus employed this technique in 200 CE since it had been used as early as the end of the first century BCE in the Minor Prophets scroll from Nahal Hever.[7]

Remarkably, in another source representing the translation of Symmachus in the fourth column of the Hexapla, the Tetragrammaton is likewise transmitted in Hebrew characters, but this time in the square Aramaic script. This is no independent witness, however, since the other columns of the Hexapla[8] likewise present the Tetragrammaton in the square script.[9]

There is no consensus with regard to the original form of the presentation of the Tetragrammaton in the Greek translations, in the paleo-Hebrew or square Aramaic script or any other way. The present paper presents renewed thinking on this question. Chronological considerations of the dates of the fragments are irrelevant. The paleo-Hebrew script preceded the Aramaic script, but possibly the writing in the paleo-Hebrew script reflected the revival of that script in the Hasmonean period.

In any event, neither script was understandable to Greek readers at a later stage, and special scribes were needed to write words in these Hebrew scripts in some Greek manuscripts. Therefore empty spaces were left for the writing of the divine name in P.Ryl. Greek 458 of 2 BCE (Rahlfs: 957) that were subsequently filled in everywhere, while one was left empty in Deut 26:18. Likewise, in P.Oxy. 4.656 of Genesis spaces were left open and filled in (see below). In P.Fouad 266b (Ra 848, middle of 1st cent. BCE), with portions of Deuteronomy 17–33, the first scribe left spaces for the Tetragrammaton that were subsequently filled in by the square script Tetragrammata written by the second scribe (see below).[10]

The representation of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew and Greek sources has drawn much interest, but many aspects remain enigmatic. While a full analysis starts with the Hebrew texts, the present analysis is limited to Greek texts. Two issues are at stake:

1. What was the shape of the representation of the name of God in the Old Greek translation, the two major options being either a transliteration of a personal name יהוה as ΙΑΩ or the like or a

---

7   See E. Tov with the collaboration of R.A. Kraft: *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyal Collection I)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

8   See the Hexapla in the Psalms fragments published by G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae* (Vatican: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1958).

9   For example, Ps 31(30):22, 24, 25; 32 (31): 10, 11. Some of these instances are transmitted in the later transmission of Symmachus with Greek characters as ΠΙΠΙ, for example in Ps 32(31):10 in the Auctarium of F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* (Oxford: Clarendon: 1875), II.*17. These Greek characters graphically resemble the square letters יהוה. See below.

10 See W.G. Waddell, "The Tetragrammaton in the LXX," *JTS* 45 (1944): 156 – 161; E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004), 220. Many additional examples of this kind were provided by Frank Shaw, *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of Iαω* (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 265–267.

translation κύριος (Lord) based on a pronunciation of יהוה as *adonay* (my Lord). Much has been written on this question, before the evidence on the transcription ΙΑΩ in 4QpapLXXLev[b] became known as well as afterwards.

2. What is the background of a transcription, that is the writing in Hebrew characters, of the name of God in the middle of the Greek text as in the fragment of Symmachus. It is actually quite an unusual situation to present a word in a script different from that of the surrounding document. We are not talking here about transliterations of which there are many in the Hebrew Bible, such as the Egyptian name of Joseph, צפנת פענח (Zaphenath-paneah [*NRSV*]) presented in Hebrew characters in Gen 41:45, but about writing a complete text in a totally different script. Nor are we talking about glosses, such as the Greek word Σαβαωθ next to its demotic equivalent in demotic magical papyri. Nor are we talking about the Rosetta Stone containing three separate inscriptions in three scripts. The Hebrew Tetragrammaton in the Greek text resembles the writing of Greek words in the middle of demotic ostraca, both languages written in a different direction.[11] In all these cases it is taken for granted that the readers were able to understand both scripts. At the same time, since only one word was represented in the Hebrew script, the reader could easily get accustomed to its shape in either its paleo-Hebrew or Aramaic script and surmise that it represented "the Lord." The special care taken in writing the divine name was understandable.

Returning to the Vienna Symmachus fragments, and noting that Symmachus contains a so-called revision of the LXX, we turn to the question why this and other texts represented the Tetragrammaton with Hebrew characters and not with a translation such as κύριος or a transliteration such as ΙΑΩ in 4QpapLXXLev[b]. There is no answer to this question, but we can try to reply by reviewing the complete data for all the texts that use this system of representation. The earliest evidence for the use of the Tetragrammaton in any Greek translation is the Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever usually dated to the end of the first century BCE (see n. 7). Both scribes of this scroll used the paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton. The revisional nature of this scroll is evident, as it shares a common base with the OG and corrects that text towards a Hebrew text close to the proto-Masoretic text. As part of the revision, named *kaige*-Th in modern research, the two scribes of this scroll represented the Tetragrammaton with paleo-Hebrew letters, each with a different handwriting. The custom itself probably represents the practice of the original *kaige*-Th translator, and not the scribes of the scroll. The reason why this translator used a transliteration cannot be pinpointed. Possibly he thought that the Tetragrammaton should not be translated into Greek;

---

11 See the texts published by E. Bresciani, S. Pernigotti, and M.C. Betrò, *Ostraka demotici da Narmuti*, Pisa: Giardini, 1983); Angiolo Menchetti (ed.) *Ostraka demotici e bilingui da Narmuthis (ODN 100-188)* (Pisa: ETS, 2005). See further the analysis by Penelope Fewster, „Bilingualism in Roman Egypt," in J.N. Adams, M. Janse & S. Swain, *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Text*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 220–245. Thanks are due to Tonio Sebastian Richter for providing these references.

possibly he thought that the writing in Hebrew characters was the most dignified representation of the sacred Hebrew name; or possibly he thought that the name of God must be presented as a proper name and cannot be translated. The use of the paleo-Hebrew script gave the name of God an especially dignified appearance.

The best parallel for the presentation of the tetragrammaton in Greek translations with Hebrew characters is the custom of writing the Tetragrammaton with paleo-Hebrew characters in Hebrew Qumran texts written in the square script. That writing in Hebrew texts reflects the perception of these names as sacred implying that they cannot be erased, while the prefixes of these names may be erased (thus *y. Meg.* 1:9 [71d]), as was recognized early on in the discussion of the Qumran texts by J. Siegel.[12]

While it is unknown whether the Greek translations first used paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammata and secondarily Tetragrammata in the Aramaic script or vice versa, it is clear that the use of a paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton was not carried over from the *Vorlage* of the OG, because that did not use paleo-Hebrew characters. It was shown in detail by Eidsvåg,[13] at least for the Minor Prophets, that the OG of the Minor Prophets was rendered from a text written in the square script. This had been claimed all along for all the books of the LXX on the basis of less evidence.[14]

The following two tables list the evidence for the presentation of the Tetragrammaton in early Greek sources without any attempt to arrange that evidence in a historical sequence. The major question surrounding the texts that use Tetragrammata with Hebrew characters is whether they have common characteristics. I had thought for some time that what these texts have in common is that they attempt to represent the Hebrew Bible in the most precise way possible, and that within that framework they use the Hebrew script for the Tetragrammaton. This feature comes to the fore in the clearest way possible in the Minor Prophets scroll from Nahal Hever.

However, I now have some doubts with regard to that assumption because not all texts using the Tetragrammaton are in the nature of early revisions, although it is still true for most of them. Table 1 records the sources transcribing the Tetragrammaton with Hebrew characters. The first four texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script contain revisions, but the last two (P.Oxy. 50.3522 and 7.1007) do not. These two fragments could reflect the OG. On the other hand, all the evidence referring to the square script pertains to revisional texts. Table 2 records sources translating the Tetragrammation with κύριος.

Table 1. *Representation of the Tetragrammaton with Hebrew characters*

---

12 J. Siegel, "The Employment of Palaeo-Hebrew Characters for the Divine Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaitic Sources," *HUCA* 42 (1971): 159–172.

13 G.M. Eidsvåg, "The Paleo-Hebrew Tetragram in 8HevXIIgr," *JSCS* 46 (2013): 86–100 (91–96).

14 See my analysis in *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Third Edition, Completely Revised and Enlarged; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 163–164.

This Table records the writing of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters in two different scripts in early sources of the Greek Bible, arranged chronologically.

a. *Paleo-Hebrew script* (on leather and papyrus). All the sources use different letter shapes because each scribe has a different handwriting.[15] Some scribes distinguish between a medial and final letter *he*:[16]

• Scribes A and B of 8HevXIIgr (Rahlfs 903; end of 1 BCE); the Tetragrammaton includes a *final* letter *he*.

• P.Oxy 77.5101 of Psalms 27, 45, 48-50, 64–65 (Rahlfs 2227; 1-2 CE), "probably the earliest extant copy of the Septuagint Psalms."[17]

• P.Vindob. Gr 39777 of Psalms 68, 80 in the version of Symmachus (3–4 CE).

• The Aquila fragments of Kings and Psalms from the Cairo Genizah published by Burkitt (6 CE)[18] and Taylor (5–6 CE).[19] In the Burkitt fragments the *yod* and *waw* are identical.

• P.Oxy. 50.3522 of Job 42 (Rahlfs 857; 1 CE); the Tetragrammaton includes a *final* letter *he*. The text of P.Oxy. 50.3522 presents a text similar to the main tradition of the LXX and not to the style of the revisions of the OG.[20] The language is that of the central LXX vocabulary and the free translation addition of καὶ ἐθαύμασαν shows that it could not have been a revision of the OG.

• P.Oxy. 7.1007 (leather) of Genesis 2–3 (Rahlfs 907; 3 CE) = PLit.Lond. 199; the Tetragrammaton consists of a double *yod* written with a horizontal stroke through both letters, also known from Jewish coins of the second century CE (at the same time, this text also has the abbreviated θ(εό)ς, which could point to a Christian scribe). The text of P.Oxy. 7.1007 presents a text similar to the main tradition of the LXX and not to either Aquila or Theodotion.[21] There is no

15 An ancient testimony to this custom is preserved in Jerome's *Prologus Galeatus* (*Praef. in Libr. Sam. et Malach.*; Migne, PL XXVIII, cols. 594–5): 'Nomen Domini tetragrammaton in quibusdam Graecis voluminibus usque hodie antiquis expressum litteris invenimus.'

16 For analyses, see H. Stegemann, *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ Ο ΘΕΟΣ und ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ: Aufkommen und Ausbreitung des religiösen Gebrauchs von ΚΥΡΙΟΣ und seine Verwendung im Neuen Testament* (Habilitationsschrift, Bonn 1969), 110–133, 194–228; P. W. Skehan, "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980): 16–44; G. Mercati, "Sulla scrittura del tetragramma nelle antiche versioni greche del Vecchio Testamento," *Biblica* 22 (1941): 339–366; Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*, 26–48; L.W. Hurtado, "The Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*: A Proposal," *JBL* 117 (1998): 655–673. It is not impossible that the custom of writing paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammata in Greek translations derived from the Hebrew *Vorlagen* of the Greek translations such as found at Qumran in which the Tetragrammata were written in the paleo-Hebrew script in scrolls written in the square Hebrew script such as 11QPs[a] (suggestion of Oren Ableman).

17 Thus the editors, D. Colomo & W.B. Henry, "5101. LXX …," in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 77 (Graeco-Roman Memoirs; London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2011), 1–11 (2). See also Jannes Smith, "The Text-Critical Significance of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 5101 (Ra 2227) for the Old Greek Psalter," *JSCS* 45 (2012): 5 – 22.

18 F.C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings According to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge: University Press, 1897). The fragments from the Cairo Genizah are inventorized as Cambridge UL, T-S 12.184 & UL, T-S 20.50.

19 Charles Taylor, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection Including a Fragment of the Twenty-Second Psalm According to Origen's Hexapla* (Cambridge: University Press: 1900). These fragments are inventorized as Cambridge UL, T-S 12.186 & UL, T-S 12.187 & UL, T-S 12.188.

20 Thus already P.J. Parsons in the publication of this text: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* vol. L (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983), 1.

21 In one detail P.Oxy. 7.1007 differs from Aquila (in 2:19, this papyrus reads κ[ατ αυτον dot under kappa, while

reason to believe that this fragment was close to Symmachus.

b. *Square Aramaic script.* The Tetragrammaton is also represented by the square Hebrew script. The letters themselves were not understood any more in later times when they were taken as the similarly shaped Greek letters πιπι, subsequently transliterated into Syriac.

• P.Fouad 266b (Ra 848, middle of 1 BCE), with portions of Deuteronomy 17-33, the first scribe left spaces for the Tetragrammaton that were subsequently filled in by the square script Tetragrams written by the second scribe.

•יהוה: The second (transliterated) column as well as the third, fourth, fifth and sixth columns of the Hexapla by Aquila, Symmachus, the "LXX" and the "Quinta" in the Mercati fragments, e.g. Ps 18 (17):31, 32, 42 of the Hexapla of Psalms published by Mercati.[22]

•יהוה in the Aquila fragments from the Cairo Genizah (7 CE) published by Taylor.[23]

•ΠΙΠΙ in several Hexaplaric manuscripts (Q^{margin}, 86 [Barberinus], 88 [Chisianus], 234^{margin}, 264). See Rahlfs-Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 348.

•ΠΙΠΙ in the Catena manuscripts Rahlfs 1122 and 1173 containing Hexaplaric fragments as published by Schenker.[24]

• ΠΙΠΙ in the Hexapla fragments published by Taylor (columns of Aquila, Symmachus, and LXX).[25]

•פיפי in the Syriac script in the margins of Syro-Hexapla manuscripts.

The texts that are recorded in Table 1 transcribe the Tetragrammaton in two different scripts of Hebrew characters and we have no means of determining which presents the earlier custom. There is early evidence in favor of the square Aramaic script (P.Fouad 266b [Ra 848, middle of 1 BCE]) as well as the paleo-Hebrew script (scribes A and B of 8HevXIIgr [Rahlfs 903; end of 1 BCE]).

Table 2. *Representation of the Tetragrammaton with either a transliteration or κύριος*

• 4QpapLXXLev^{b} (Rahlfs 802) of Leviticus 2–5 (1 BCE) transliterated the Tetragrammaton as ΙΑΩ (preceded and followed by a space) in Lev 3:12; 4:27.[26] This transcription is unique among the

---

Aquila reads ὡς κατέναντι αὐτοῦ [according to M 235]). In other details it deviates from MT in a fashion that is uncharacteristic of Aquila. In v. 24 the fragment does not represent the pronominal suffixes of אביו and אמו and it has a plus of οι δυο against MT (cf. v. 25), and the last word in 3:6 has a plural form as opposed to MT.

22 I. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae* (Vatican: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1958).

23 F.C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings According to the Translation of Aquila: from a Ms. Formerly in the Geniza at Cairo, Now in the Possession of C. Taylor ... and S. Schechter* (Cambridge: University Press, 1898). The fragments are inventorized as Cambridge UL, T-S 12.182.

24 A. Schenker, *Hexaplarische Psalmenbruchstücke* (OBO 8; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975), 248 and passim.

25 Taylor, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests.*

26 See the analysis by Frank Shaw, *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use,* with much bibliography.

witnesses of Greek Scripture.[27] See below.

• The first scribe of P.Oxy. 4.656 of Genesis 14–27 (Rahlfs 292; 2 or 3 CE) left spaces for the divine name (Tetragrammaton?), as in P.Fouad 266b (848; middle of 1 BCE), filled in by a second hand with the unabbreviated form of κύριος in 15:8; 24:31, 42. According to Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 17, these occurrences of κύριος were written with a different pen.

• All the uncial manuscripts of the LXX as well as P.Chester Beatty VI (Numbers-Deuteronomy) of 2 or 3 CE presented the divine name with κύριος, usually without the article.[28] This use probably represents a later stage in the development of the translation.

There is no consensus among scholars which system was used by the first translators and where the Vienna fragment would fit in. Most, but not all, the texts transcribing the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters reflect early revisions, in which the employment of Hebrew characters was considered a sign of authenticity and antiquity in which the reviser attempted to get close to the Hebrew text. A parallel phenomenon took place in several Hebrew Qumran manuscripts written in the square Aramaic script, mainly nonbiblical texts, in which the Tetragrammaton was written in paleo-Hebrew characters.[29] This practice, reflected in both Hebrew and Greek sources, thus indicates reverence for the ineffable name of God.[30]

In the reconstruction of the history of the Greek versions, the writing of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters mainly in Greek revisional texts is a relatively late phenomenon. On the basis of the available evidence, the analysis of the original representation of the Tetragrammaton in Greek Scriptures therefore focuses on the question of whether the first translators wrote either κύριος or ΙΑΩ as in the Qumran papyrus.[31] According to Pietersma, Rösel, Perkins and Smith, the first translators wrote κύριος, mainly without the article, considered a personal name in the Greek Torah, as "the written surrogate for the tetragram" (Pietersma).[32] Rösel provides his own arguments in favor of the originality of κύριος in the OG as a representation of the later Masoretic *Qere*

27 The concordance of Hatch–Redpath misleadingly quotes in the list of the personal names a marginal reading ΙΑΩ from codex Marchalianus (Q) in Ezek 1:2 and 11:1. These readings, not mentioned in Ziegler's Göttingen edition, refer to Ιωακειμ in 1:2 and to בניהו in 11:1 represented in this note as οικος ιαω.

28 See W.W. von Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum* (Giessen: Topelmann, 1926–1929) and Stegemann, *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ*, 200–202.

29 See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 238–246.

30 Origen recognized this feature when stating that the "most accurate exemplars" of Greek Scripture wrote the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters (Migne, PG 12 1104 [B]). See also D.W. Parry, "Notes on Divine Name Avoidance in Scriptural Units of the Legal Texts in Qumran," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (eds. M.J. Bernstein et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 437– 449.

31 See Kristin De Troyer, "The Pronunciation of the Names of God, with Some Notes Regarding *Nomina Sacra*," in Gott Nennen (eds. Ingolf U. Dalferth and Philipp Stoellger; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 143–172.

32 A. Pietersma, "Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX," in *De Septuaginta, Studies in Honour of J. W. Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. A. Pietersma & C. Cox; Mississauga, Ont: BenBen Publications, 1984), 85–101 (98); M. Rösel, "The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch," *JSOT* 31 (2007): 411–428. Similarly in a more limited investigation, L. Perkins, "ΚΥΡΙΟΣ, Articulation and Non-Articulation in Greek Exodus," *BIOSCS* 41 (2008): 17–33; Smith, "The Text-Critical Significance."

(*Adonay*)[33] and he further supports the originality of that rendering within the framework of the theology of the early translators.[34] However, the internal LXX evidence offered in support of this assumption is not convincing, as all the irregularities pertaining to the anarthrous use of κύριος can also be explained as having been created by a mechanical replacement of ΙΑΩ with κύριος by later scribes. Further, there is no evidence for the use of κύριος in the pre-Christian centuries.[35] It should not be forgotten that the earliest evidence for the use of κύριος is P.Oxy. 4.656 of 2 or 3 CE. Therefore, according to Stegemann and Skehan, ΙΑΩ reflects the earliest attested stage in the history of the LXX translation, when the name of God was represented by its transliteration, just like any other personal name in the LXX.[36] Skehan[37] provided important early parallels for the use of ΙΑΩ and similar forms representing the Tetragrammaton: Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibliotheca historica* I,29,2 (1 BCE) records that Moses referred his laws to τὸν Ιαω ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν; likewise, in his commentary on Ps 2:2, Origen speaks about Ιαη (PG 12:1104) and Ιαω (GCS, Origenes 4:53); and two onomastica used ΙΑΩ as an explanation of Hebrew theophoric names.[38] The later magical papyri likewise invoke ΙΑΩ. In a similar vein, Stegemann gives a long list of arguments in favor of the assumption of the priority of the transliteration.[39] This transliteration reflects an unusual pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton such as known from the Elephantine papyri (יהו).[40]

However, there is no convincing evidence in favor of any one explanation, but it seems to me that the view of Skehan and Stegemann seems more plausible in light of the parallels provided. This argument serves as support for the view that ΙΑΩ in 4QpapLXXLev[b] reflects the OG form for יהוה. This view is also maintained, in great detail, in recent studies by Shaw, who also mentions other scholars preferring ΙΑΩ, and by Vasileiadis.[41]

---

33 P. 413.

34 Pp. 419–423.

35 This point is made by Robert J. Wilkinson, T*etragrammaton: Western Christians and the Hebrew Name of God: From the Beginnings to the Seventeenth Century* (Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 179; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 62. Furthermore, the earliest evidence for the use of κύριος is P.Oxy. 4.656 of the early 3rd century CE.

36 Stegemann, *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ*, 197; P.W. Skehan, "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980): 14–44. Likewise: G. Howard, "The Tetragram and the New Testament," *JBL* 96 (1977): 63–68 (65).

37 Skehan, "The Divine Name," 29.

38 For full details, see Skehan, "The Divine Name." For additional references in early Christian literature, see Wilkinson, *Tetragrammaton*, 65.

39 Among other things Stegemann claims that a transliteration rather than a translation or transcription in Hebrew characters is the natural representation of this proper noun. He also claims that ΙΑΩ cannot be considered a change of an original form out of reverence to the divine name, since the use of the equivalent of יהוה in Greek does not prevent the pronunciation of God's name. The fact that this system is not encountered in later manuscripts of the Greek Bible, as opposed to the other systems, is a sign of originality rather than of secondary nature.

40 Cf. also הו in 4QD[a] (4Q266) 11 9 and *m. Sukk*. 4.5 together with J. Baumgarten, "A New Qumran Substitute for the Divine Name and Mishna Sukkah 4.5," *JQR* 83 (1992): 1–5.

41 P.D. Vasileiadis, "Aspects of Rendering the Sacred Tetragrammaton in Greek," *Open Theology* 1 (2014): 56–88; idem, "The God Iao and His Connection with the Biblical God, with Special Emphasis on the Manuscript 4QpapLXXLev[b]" (forthcoming).

There is one important appendix to this analysis. In the last two items in Table 1 I present two important fragments that contain transcriptions of the Tetragrammaton but are not revisional and may well reflect the OG: P.Oxy. 50.3522 of Job 42 (Rahlfs 857; 1 CE) and P.Oxy. 7.1007 (leather) of Genesis 2–3 (Rahlfs 907; 3 CE). These two fragments could overturn the theory just analyzed. We could claim that the OG contained neither ΙΑΩ nor κύριος, but a Hebrew transliteration of the divine name. However, in my view, the evidence is too scanty for this, and I rather think that two independently thinking scribes used the Hebrew forms in the first centuries of the common era. I thus retain my view that the OG contained the Greek transliterated divine name ΙΑΩ as in the Qumran fragment 4QpapLXXLev[b]. The study of the Vienna fragment of Symmachus thus led to a reinvestigation of the divine names in Greek Scripture manuscripts.