Leseprobe

Die Theologie der Septuaginta / The Theology of the Septuagint

HANDBUCH ZUR SEPTUAGINTA
HANDBOOK OF THE SEPTUAGINT

LXX.H BAND VOLUME 5

Hans Ausloos / Bénédicte Lemmelijn (Hg./eds.)

Die Theologie der Septuaginta

Theology of the Septuagint

G

Seiten: 605

Erscheinungstermin: 27. April 2020

Mehr Informationen zum Buch gibt es auf

www.penguinrandomhouse.de

HANDBUCH ZUR SEPTUAGINTA
HANDBOOK OF THE SEPTUAGINT

LXX.H

Herausgegeben von
Martin Karrer,
Wolfgang Kraus und
Siegfried Kreuzer

HANDBUCH ZUR SEPTUAGINTA
HANDBOOK OF THE SEPTUAGINT

LXX.H ^{BAND}_{VOLUME} 5

LXX.H BAND VOLUME 5

Hans Ausloos / Bénédicte Lemmelijn (Hg./eds.)

Die Theologie der Septuaginta

The Theology of the Septuagint

Gütersloher Verlagshaus

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorwort zum *Handbuch zur Septuaginta/ Handbook of the Septuagint*

Das Handbuch zur Septuaginta will eine umfassende Darstellung der derzeitigen Forschungen um die Septuaginta geben. Es ist damit Hinführung zu den vielfältigen Fragen und Ergebnissen der Septuagintaforschung, Bilanz des aktuellen Standes und Grundlage für die weitere Forschung. Folgende Bände sind vorgesehen: Einleitung in die Septuaginta, Textgeschichte der Septuaginta, Sprache der Septuaginta, der historische Kontext der Septuaginta, Theologie der Septuaginta, Wirkungsgeschichte.

Die Planungen für das Handbuch entstanden auf dem Hintergrund von »Septuaginta Deutsch«. Schon die Übersetzung »Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung« (hg. von Wolfgang Kraus und Martin Karrer, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2009; ²2010) und die damit verbundenen Bände »Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare« (2 Bde. hg. von Martin Karrer und Wolfgang Kraus, 2011) waren international orientiert. In den Bänden des Handbuches spiegelt sich dieses Anliegen in der internationalen und interdisziplinären Zusammensetzung des Herausgeberkreises und der Autorenschaft.

Die Septuagintaforschung erlebt in jüngster Zeit eine eindrucksvolle Blüte. Ein Ausdruck dafür sind die zahlreichen Übersetzungsprojekte. Während zuvor nur zwei schon ältere englische Übersetzungen existierten, gibt es nun bzw. sind in Bearbeitung eine neue Übersetzung ins Englische, eine französische Übersetzung, die deutsche Übersetzung, aber auch eine Übersetzung ins Rumänische, ins Spanische, ins Italienische, ins Neuhebräische und Neugriechische sowie Übersetzungen in das Japanische und Koreanische.

Die Übersetzungen erleichtern den Zugang zur Septuaginta und fördern ihre Wahrnehmung nicht nur im Bereich der Theologie, sondern auch in anderen Fachgebieten wie etwa der Geschichte, der Judaistik, der Sprachwissenschaft oder der Übersetzungs- und der Editionswissenschaft. Zugleich ergeben sich immer wieder neue Fragestellungen. Die verschiedenen Teilbände des Handbuchs zur Septuaginta wollen hier die bisherigen Forschungen bündeln, neue Fragestellungen aufnehmen und sowohl Basis als auch Impuls für die weitere Forschung geben.

Nachdem im Jahr 2016 mit LXX.H 1, »Einleitung in die Septuaginta«, und LXX.H 3, »Die Sprache der Septuaginta / The Language of the Septuagint«, erschienen sind, wird hiermit LXX.H 5, »Die Theologie der Septuaginta / The Theology of the Septuagint«, vorgelegt.

Die Hauptherausgeber danken den Herausgebern der Bände, in diesem Fall Hans Ausloos, Louvain-la-Neuve, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, Leuven, und den zahlreichen Autorinnen und Autoren für ihre engagierte Arbeit und dem Gütersloher Verlagshaus für den Mut, dieses große Projekt auf den Weg zu bringen und zu realisieren.

Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus und Siegfried Kreuzer

Preface

The present volume within the series *Handbuch zur Septuaginta* (LXX.H) does not aim at providing 'the' ultimate systematic and consistent theology of 'the' Septuagint. That would be a very uncritical endeavor, as will become clear already in the very first contribution to this volume. Nevertheless, the search for theological elements and accents within the Septuagint is a scholarly topic that gains more and more attention, and rightly so. In that respect, it is, of course, favorable to include it in the present Handbook series.

Taking the above described caution seriously, the present volume will be organized in the following way. For the case of workability, as well as in an attempt to cover the main theological issues in the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible (in their pluriformity and divergence), this book has centered its chapters around eight theological perspectives that will be studied against the background of the central question pertaining to the particular accents and elements in the Septuagint in that respect. At stake are: 1. The one and only God and the human understanding of this ultimate reality, 2. The divine Law, 3. The cult and the encounter with God, 4. Prophecy and its speaking about God, 5. Humans in the presence of God, 6. Wisdom reflecting life in the presence of God, 7. People and covenant, and finally 8. Reaching out for the promise of a future before God. These themes function as a point of departure.

However, these eight thematic entries will not be generally presented for the whole Septuagint as such. Rather, and in an attempt to meet the challenges formulated in the introductory contribution, the individual authors have discussed the items respectively on the basis of the different parts of the Septuagint. That means that all reflection will be presented on the basis of each theme in the Pentateuch, the Prophets, Wisdom literature, the Historical books and the Psalms. Within this context, the contributors also pay specific attention to particular books and pericopes.

Moreover, the attentive reader will notice that some of these chapters have been written by one and the same author, while others have been divided into five minor parts being written by five different authors. In this respect too, this book resembles the composition history of the Bible. It has taken quite some years to arrive at the book as it is presented at this moment. Scholars agreed to contribute, but canceled later on when the deadline was approaching. This, of course, implied that a new deadline had to be fixed because, foremost, new authors had to be addressed. This process repeated itself a number of times, to such an extent that the editors grew desperate if it were not that they could always appeal to the help and support of the series editors … In the end, it was decided that the failing chapters would be divided in shorter subchapters by different authors. However, also in this new procedure, the pattern described above of new deadlines and new authors, repeated itself. Finally, nevertheless, the volume reached its complete form. And at the same time, initial contributions that had been sent in from the very first deadline on, have matured or were re-edited slightly by their authors.

Anyway, we sincerely hope that its current form presents a little bit of the rich biblical theology, that, precisely in its diversity, reflects the deep existential experience

of life itself. Anyway, like the biblical books, this collection of contributions has grown over time; it has been reworked and redacted and let's hope that it likewise enjoyed some inspiration that might become yours in turn …

Hans Ausloos
Bénédicte Lemmelijn

I. Theology or not? That's the question. Is there such a thing as 'the theology of the Septuagint'?

Hans Ausloos & Bénédicte Lemmelijn

1. Prolegomena: the Septuagint in a changing panorama

Basing ourselves on 'actual facts' – evident in the number of publications, conferences and congresses –, there can hardly be any doubt that the ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, the so-called Septuagint, has gained a lot of scholarly attention in our time.[1] The study of its origin, its importance, its reception history, its translation techniques, as well as its own literary characteristics are at the front of research today. This Greek translation, originally created by Jewish scholars within a Hellenistic context,[2] has surpassed the borders of its historical situation to a large extent. Indeed, the Septuagint later became the primary textual source for the New Testament authors, thereby turning into one of the founding texts of Christianity too.[3]

---

1. The present introductory contribution to this volume has been inspired by former articles by the authors, and, in particular by, H. Ausloos, "Sept défis posés à une theologie de la Septante" in: L. C. Jonker / G. R. Kotzé / C. M. Maier (eds.), *Congress Volume IOSOT Stellenbosch 2016* (SVT 177), Leiden / Boston, MA 2017, 228-250. With respect to the broader context, reference can be made also to B. Lemmelijn, "Textual Criticism" in: A. Salvesen / M. Law (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, Oxford (in press); B. Lemmelijn, "Influence of a So-Called P-redaction in the 'Major Expansions' of Exod 7-11? Finding Oneself at the Crossroads of Textual and Literary Criticism" in: A. Piquer Otero / P. Torijano Morales (eds.), *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense* (JSJS 157), Leiden / Boston, MA 2012, 203-222 as well as to B. Lemmelijn, "Text-Critically Studying the Biblical Manuscript Evidence: An 'Empirical' Entry to the Literary Composition of the Text" in: R. F. Person / R. Rezetko, *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism* (SBL AIL), Atlanta, GA 2016, 129-164.
2. With regard to the context in which the Septuagint has developed, and the reasons why at all such an enterprise would have been initiated, see J. M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (UBW), London 2004, 47-62. S. Kreuzer; "Origin and Development of the Septuagint in the Context of Alexandrian and Early Jewish Culture and Learning" in: idem, *The Bible in Greek*, SBL SCS 63, Atlanta 2015, 3-31.
3. Moreover, in the Orthodox Churches, the Greek translation as such is considered to be 'Sacred Scripture'. See, in this context, the argument to use the Septuagint as the 'Christian Bible', by M. Müller, "The Septuagint as the Bible of the New Testament Church. Some Reflections" *SJOT* 7 (1993), 194-207 and idem., *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint* (JSOT SS 206), Sheffield 1996. For the use of the Septuagint in the Orthodox church service see the list of Scripture readings "Lesungen in den Orthodoxen Gottesdiensten" in: W. Kraus / M. Karrer (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch*, Stuttgart ²2010, 1495-1501.

And even from a mere scientific point of view, the Septuagint is actually a highly important extant textual witness. Being the most ancient translation of the Hebrew Bible, it provides us with a lot of information on the development of the biblical text in a period in which the so-called *textus receptus* of the biblical books did not even exist yet. Moreover, from a material point of view,[4] the Septuagint is still the oldest complete text of the Old Testament. Contrary to the most complete manuscript of the Hebrew text dating from the 11th century, there are Greek complete codices from the 4th (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) and 5th (Alexandrinus) century. Until the discoveries of the Judaean Desert, the Greek manuscripts, even if they were sometimes fragmentary, were far more ancient witnesses of the Old Testament text than any of the Hebrew extant textual witnesses.

Nevertheless, and notwithstanding its major importance on different levels, it was mostly not until the beginning of the 20th century that the Septuagint has been valorized. The scholarly interest in the study of the Septuagint has become very clear in recent decennia, and especially when one considers the several translation projects that have been launched in which the ancient Greek text has been rendered into different modern languages, each project having its own accents and approach. In this respect, reference can be made to the ongoing French project of "La Bible d'Alexandrie", the finalized "New English Translation of the Septuagint" (2004), "Septuaginta Deutsch" (2004), "La Biblia Griega Septuaginta" (2008-2013), as well as "La Bibbia dei Settanta" (2012-2016), all publications of recent years.[5]

Precisely within the context of these translation projects, the question on the so-called 'theology of the Septuagint' has also gained growing attention. Even more, the answer to this question has become largely relevant, not only in terms of the proper situation of the Septuagint in its original context but equally with respect to later interpretations that have developed in the course of the reception history of this Greek text, and also within the development of systematic theology and ecclesial doctrines. Within recent Septuagint scholarship, one can clearly discern interest in what are called 'exegetical elements' in the Septuagint,[6] or 'theological and/or ideological tendencies' in the translation.[7]

---

4. See in this respect, also B. Lemmelijn, "Text-Critically Studying the Biblical Manuscript Evidence," 129-164.

5. See on the particular and distinctive approaches of these translations, especially: H. Ausloos / J. Cook / F. García Martínez / B. Lemmelijn / M. Vervenne (eds.), *Translating a Translation: The LXX and its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (BETL 213), Leuven / Paris / Dudley, MA 2008.

6. See, for example, E. Tov, "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint" in: idem., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (SVT 72), Leiden 1999, 257-269.

7. Recently, Johann Cook who used the term 'ideology' quite frequently. See, for example, J. Cook, "'Theological/Ideological' Tendenz in the Septuagint – LXX Proverbs: A Case Study" in: F. García Martínez / M. Vervenne (eds.), *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (BETL 192), Leuven / Paris / Dudley, MA 2005, 65-79, esp. 65. See equally J. Cook, "Ideology and Translation Technique – Two Sides of the Same Coin?" in: R. Sollamo / S. Sipilä (eds.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (SESJ 82), Göttingen / Helsinki 2001, 195-210. For a succinct discussion on the

Nevertheless, the interest in a particular theology within the Septuagint is not entirely new. It has its origins already at the beginning of the 19th century.[8] However, a real start of the more systematic and theoretical way of reflection on the possibility of discerning and defining a/the theology of the Septuagint has been made since the 1960's.[9] Already in 1962, Joseph Ziegler mentioned the urgent need to gain insight in the theology of the Septuagint.[10] Only a few years later, in 1968, the Leuven scholar Jozef Coppens regretted to have not yet disposed of any systematic theology of the Septuagint, which would allow scholars to evaluate the development of ideas and hopes in the Jewish milieu in which it had come into existence.[11]

Longing for this kind of systematic theology is one thing. Reaching it, however, is another. Soon enough, scholars grew conscious of the fact that the composition of such a systematic theology of the Septuagint was not without serious methodological challenges. In this respect, the methodological reflection on this matter also grew quickly. As it is clear in Coppens' desire, mentioned above, one seemed to take for granted that 'the' Septuagint could inform us on the evolution of the ideas of 'the' Hebrew text. This supposition was, of course, linked to the idea that the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible had only begun after the latter had been literarily finalized. This presupposition, however, has turned out to be far too simplistic, in view of the scriptural findings of the Judean Desert and the implications thereof on our understanding of the textual development of the biblical texts. Instead of one single finalized Hebrew text at the origin of the textual transmission (including translation), it has

---

terminology, see idem., "Interpreting the Septuagint – Exegesis, Theology and/or *Religionsgeschichte*" in: W. Kraus / M. Karrer / M. Meiser (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse* (WUNT 252), Tübingen 2010, 590-606, esp. 593-595. See also most recently, J. Cook, "Interpreting the Septuagint" in: L. C. Jonker / G. R. Kotzé / C. M. Maier (eds.), *Congress volume IOSOT Stellenbosch 2016* (SVT 177), Leiden / Boston, MA 2017, 1-22, esp. 12-15 and J. Cook, "A Theology of the Septuagint" *OTE* 30 (2017), 265-282.

8. See, for example, Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, Leipzig 1841 and idem., *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, Leipzig 1851. Frankel used the expression 'religious exegesis'. For a historical survey, see also M. Rösel, "Eine Theologie der Septuaginta? Präzisierungen und Pointierungen" in: F. Ueberschaer / T. Wagner / J. M. Robker (eds.), *Theologie und Textgeschichte. Septuaginta und Masoretischer Text als Äußerungen theologischer Reflexion* (WUNT 407), Tübingen, 2018, 25-43. See equally E. G. Dafni, "Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta" *TZ* 58 (2002), 315-328, esp. 316-318 and idem., "Σάρξ μου ἐκ αὐτῶν (LXX-Hosea ix 12). Zur Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta" *VT* 51 (2001), 336-353.

9. Notwithstanding the earlier and clearly critical contribution to this question by I. L. Seeligmann, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research" in: idem., *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (FAT 40), Tübingen 2004, 21-80, esp. 72-76 (which is an English translation of a Dutch contribution: idem., "Problemen en perspectieven in het moderne Septuaginta Onderzoek" *EOL* 7 [1940], 359-90, 763-766).

10. J. Ziegler, *Die Septuaginta. Erbe und Auftrag. Festvortrag, gehalten beim 380. Stiftungsfest, der Julius-Maximilians-Universität zu Würzburg am 11. Mai 1962* (WUR 33), Würzburg 1962, 28: "[…] damit endlich auch einmal eine längst ersehnte Theologie der Septuaginta geschrieben werden kann".

11. J. Coppens, *Le Messianisme royal: Ses origines, son développement, son accomplissement* (LD 54), Paris 1968, 119.

become clear that one should rather accept a textual plurality and pluriformity, resulting in a completely different synergic view on the formerly distinguished phases of production and transmission of the texts.[12] And this in turn has led into a completely different view on the relationship between the formerly separated respective domains of literary and redaction criticism (regarding the literary production) on the one hand and textual criticism (regarding the textual transmission) on the other.[13] Entirely parallel, moreover, it changed the understanding of the activities of redactors/authors on the one hand and copyists/scribes on the other.[14] Within this radically altered textual landscape, the Septuagint has played an important role and the aim of its study has equally changed.[15] Indeed, against the said background, it has become clear that the Septuagint could allow us to discover textual forms of a biblical text much older than and sometimes independently different from the one transmitted in the so-called standard text of the Masoretic text.[16]

Following this, the importance of a more adequate understanding of the theology of the Septuagint became undeniable. However, the question how to reach that aim and the awareness of the factors complicating that enterprise became more and more pertinent. In this respect, one could, with Johann Cook, even speak of 'maximalists' and 'minimalists'.[17] Both groups of scholars seem to agree that the composition of a

12. See (among others) J. Trebolle Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible*, Leiden / Cologne / New York, NY 1998, 370; 390 as well as idem., "A Combined Textual and Literary Criticism Analysis: Editorial Traces in Joshua and Judges" in: H. Ausloos / B. Lemmelijn / M. Vervenne (eds.), *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (BETL 224), Leuven / Paris / Dudley, MA 2008, 437-463.

13. See also B. Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called 'Plagues Narrative' in Exodus 7,14-11,10* (OTS 56), Leiden / Boston, MA 2009, passim, esp. 3-7; 197-207. However, see also already in 1998: B. Lemmelijn, "The So-Called 'Major Expansions' in SamP, 4QpaleoExodᵐ and 4QExodʲ Exod 7:14-11:10. On the Edge between Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism" in: B. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies – Oslo 1998* (SBL SCS 51), Atlanta, GA 2001, 429-439.

14. See especially, and for a comprehensive presentation of this matter, Lemmelijn, "Influence of a So-Called P-redaction in the 'Major Expansions' of Exod 7-11?" 203-222 as well as Lemmelijn, "Text-Critically Studying the Biblical Manuscript Evidence," 129-164.

15. See in this respect especially B. Lemmelijn, "Textual Criticism" in: A. Salvesen / M. Law (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, Oxford (in press) or B. Lemmelijn, "Η σημασία τῆς Μεταφράσεως τῶν Ο᾽ ἐν ὄψει τοῦ μεταβαλλομένου πανοράματος τῆς Κριτικῆς τοῦ Κειμένου [*The Significance of the Septuagint in a Changing Text-Critical Panorama*]" *VTeH* 3 (2016), 1-21. See also, based thereon: B. Lemmelijn, "Op zoek naar de oorspronkelijke tekst" *Schrift* 275 47.1 (2015), 10-15; B. Lemmelijn, "Tekstkritiek en de 'Hebreeuwse tekst' van het Oude Testament" *MAW* 35 (2016), 15-24 and B. Lemmelijn, "A la recherche du texte de la Bible Hébraïque" *Homme Nouveau Hors Série* 34 (2019), 21-28.

16. On the contribution of the study of the Septuagint to the discussion on a so-called 'Urtext' or 'original text', see, by way of introduction, E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research: Completely Revised and Expanded Third Edition,* Winona Lake, IN 2015, 201-223.

17. J. Cook, "Towards the Formulation of a Theology of the Septuagint" in: A. Lemaire (ed.), *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (SVT 133), Leiden 2009, 621-640. Cook situates Martin Rösel and Joachim Shaper among the 'maximalists', while he perceives Albert Pietersma and Raija

Septuagint theology is possible, but they do not agree on the methodology needed to attain this aim. Other scholars more fundamentally doubt the possibility at all of the systematic presentation of the theology of the Septuagint.[18]

Against this background, this introductory contribution to a volume dedicated to 'the theology of the Septuagint' – and in the context of what has been said above, this might seem a tricky enterprise – focuses on a number of methodological concerns, indeed, which have to be taken into account when talking about a theology of the Septuagint, let alone 'the' theology of 'the' Septuagint …

2. Towards a theology of the Septuagint?

If one would simply imagine the process of the translation of the Septuagint, being the Greek version of Sacred Scripture for Hellenistic Jews, it is quite clear that this process itself implies a considerable degree of interpretation. It is simply impossible to produce a purely mechanical one-to-one rendering of a Hebrew text into a Greek one, even if one tries or would aim at such a text. Each language, and thus each translation, implies a cultural background, a 'world of ideas', a certain perception of reality within a particular socio-historical background. Thus, even if the translators of the Septuagint would have aimed at this kind of a 'neutral' rendering of the Bible into Greek *(quod non)*, the said culture, perceptive world and ideas of Hellenism, as well as the grammatical and idiomatic implications of the Greek language, would have demanded at least some degree of interpretation. And since we talk about theological texts, this implies theological interpretation: in other words, some theology or exegesis. Indeed, if a given Septuagint translator has aimed at producing a Greek Bible text, it would have been important to not only translate the biblical wording, but also to make its theology understandable. And doing so implies the actualization, adaptation and maybe even explanation of aspects from the source text into the context of the new audience.[19] Just to refer to one example, one could think of Lev 24,16, in which the Hebrew text requires the death penalty for anyone blaspheming God's name, whereas the Septuagint mentions the same with respect to even pronouncing it. This most probably reflects the later – contemporary to the translators – Jewish practice not to pronounce the divine name.

Sollamo as 'minimalists', although he does not explicitly indicate what he means exactly by the said terms.

18. See, in this respect, for example, M. CIMOSA, "È possibile scrivere une 'teologia' della Bibbia Greca (LXX)?" in: R. FABRIS (ed.), *Initium sapientiae: Scritti in onore di Franco Festorazzi nel suo 70° compleanno* (SRivB 36), Bologna 2000, 51-64. See also the caveats expressed by A. DOUGLAS, "Limitations to Writing a Theology of the Septuagint" JSCS 45 (2012), 104-117.

19. See in this respect, for example, also W. KRAUS, "Contemporary Translations of the Septuagint: Problems and Perspectives" in: W. KRAUS / G. WOODEN (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBL SCS 53), Atlanta, GA 2006, 63-83, esp. 78: "The LXX is in the first instance a translation, but it is more. The translators wanted to mediate between the tradition and the contemporary situation. This includes modifications and updates."

Just as redactors have actualized and altered versions of the biblical books – cf. e. g. to the development of the Hebrew book of Isaiah with its clearly distinct layers revealing different historical backgrounds and distinctive theological concerns –, so did copyists and scribes, and so did translators.[20] As indicated above, the fact that texts had been transmitted before they had literarily been finalized (if they have ever been intentionally),[21] implies that this process also integrates changing theological reflection. Very similarly, traces of these activities can also be found in the work of translators.[22] They handle the text in a similar way: they reproduce and transmit the text, be it into another language.

Thus, the question to be answered primarily should not be: Can we compose a modern systematically formulated theology *of* the Septuagint, but rather, how and where do we detect and explore the theological accents *in* the Septuagint? The Septuagint is *ipso facto* part of the development of Jewish (and Christian) reflection and theology, of biblical thinking within a new and altered context, but intrinsically integrated in the textual and theological development of the biblical books. Perhaps it would be better to speak of the 'implicit theology' of the Septuagint. One cannot find it in methodological and modern-like consistent exposés, but rather implicitly in and through Greek concepts, Greek cultural ideas and Greek words and expressions already supplied by the language itself. Scholars should develop a sensitivity to this reality in order to properly understand the theology in the Septuagint. Only then, with an open and explorative mind, one could perhaps even discover more explicit theological accents thereof.

Nevertheless, the main obstacle to reach this aim situates itself on the methodological level. In what follows, some of the main complicating factors will be described and illustrated.

3. Some complicating factors

If scholars aim at discussing the theology in the Septuagint, some fundamental issues should seriously be taken into account.

3.1. The name 'Septuagint'

Today, the name 'Septuagint' is used in many different ways. However, at its origin, it indicated only the Greek translation of the first five books of the Hebrew Bible, quite generally accepted as being realized in Alexandria in the 3rd Century BCE.[23] Neverthe-

---

20. See Lemmelijn, "Influence of a So-Called P-redaction in the 'Major Expansions' of Exod 7-11?" 203-222 and B. Lemmelijn, "Textual Criticism," (in press) or B. Lemmelijn, "Η σημασία τῆς Μεταφράσεως τῶν Ο᾽ [*The Significance of the Septuagint in a Changing Text-Critical Panorama*]," 1-21.

21. See in this respect, for example, E. Blum, "Gibt es die Endgestalt des Pentateuch?" in: J. A. Emerton *et al.* (eds.), *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* (SVT 43), Leiden 1991, 46-57.

22. See in this respect, for example, H. Debel, "Greek 'Variant Literary Editions' to the Hebrew Bible?" *JSJ* 41 (2010), 161-190.

23. With regard to the *communis opinio* on when, by whom and how the five books of the Torah

less, the name 'Septuagint' includes the complete Greek Old Testament in our days. This means thus not only the Greek Pentateuch, but also the Greek translation of the other books of the Hebrew Bible, as well as several additions to the books of Esther, Job, Psalms, Daniel and Jeremiah. Moreover, the term is also used for the books that have not been translated at all from Hebrew, but which have been composed immediately in Greek (the so-called deuterocanonical books, such as the Book of Wisdom). Finally, the name 'Septuagint' also encompasses the books that have been originally written in Hebrew and have been translated in Greek, but which have not been integrated in the Jewish canon, such as the Wisdom of Jesus Sirach.

Consequently, if one talks about the theology of the Septuagint, it is important to know which sense of the term one is discussing. And this is all the more true if one tries answering specific questions concerning, e. g. the view of the Septuagint on messianism, on life after death, on retribution … The respective answers to these kinds of questions undoubtedly depend on the selection of books that one considers as constitutive of "the Septuagint". Thus, it is not possible to discuss 'the theology of the Septuagint', if one does not define what specifically is meant by that term.

3.2. The author(s) and translator(s)?

In the same vein, the following is perhaps even more important. There is a striking analogy to the fact that we don't know the exact authors/redactors of the different books of the Hebrew Bible. If one aims to discuss the theology of the Septuagint, it is important to know that the *communis opinio* regarding the Septuagint is that every single book has been translated by a different translator,[24] even if some indications could suggest that a few books would be the exception to the rule. This could have been the case with the books of Proverbs and Job, on which there is dispute as to whether they have been translated by a single translator or not.[25] Thus, methodologically speaking, it is highly important and even necessary to distinguish between the different books of the Septuagint when speaking about its 'theology'. And this is, more-

---

have been translated, see, among others, G. Dorival, "Les origines de la Septante: la traduction en grec des cinq livres de la Torah" in: M. Harl / G. Dorival / O. Munnich (eds.), *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (ICA), Paris 1988, 55-66. Equally, see A. van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of the Pentateuch" in: idem. / J. Cook (eds.), *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom: On the Provenance of Translators and their Books in the Septuagint Version* (CBET 68), Leuven, 2012, 15-62.

24. See, for example, J. Cook, "Towards the Formulation of a Theology of the Septuagint," 636: "The individual book should act as a guideline as to how 'lxx theologies' should be formulated. As a sine qua non I suggest that the diversity of each lxx book should be honoured". See equally T. Römer / J.-D. Macchi, *Guide de la Bible hébraïque: La critique textuelle dans la Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Labor et Fides 194), Genève 1994, 55: "Chaque livre a son histoire, sa propre qualité de traduction, ses tendances, présuppositions et problèmes qui doivent être évalués soigneusement de cas en cas".

25. See in this respect B. Lemmelijn, "The Greek Rendering of Hebrew Hapax Legomena in lxx Proverbs and Job: a Clue to the Question of a Single Translator?" in: K. De Troyer / T. M. Law / M. Liljeström (eds.), *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (CBET 72), Leuven 2014, 133-150 in which a discussion of the current views on this topic has also been presented.

over, completely analogous to any attempt of constructing 'the' theology of the (Hebrew) Old Testament. Already G. von Rad indicated that the Old Testament books are so different from each other, both in background and in structure and argumentation, that they too reveal no one single 'theology', but different and diverging 'theologies'.[26]

Moreover, a further nuance should be made. Even if one generally accepts that every Septuagint book has been translated by a respective translator, it has been observed that books which seem to have been translated first (such as the Pentateuch) may have influenced later translators (which is, however, not the same as what Rösel indicates as a "gemeinsame(s) Entstehungsmilieu").[27] To offer some examples, one could refer to the Greek version of Exod 15:3 – in which Hebrew יהוה איש מלחמה (YHWH is a man of war) has been rendered by κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους (The Lord is a crusher of wars) – that could be the origin of this very formula in Isa 42: 13. Whereas the expression is identical in Hebrew (YHWH is compared to "a man of war" – כאיש מלחמות), the Septuagint translates, similarly to Exod 15:3, stating that God "crushes the wars" (συντρίψει πόλεμον).[28] A similar case can be found in the book of Judith, written in Greek, in which God is presented as a God who is the "crusher of wars" (9:7: κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους; 16:2: θεὸς συντρίβων πολέμους κύριος). Thus, even though one should take into account that each book has its own translator, one cannot neglect the fact that former translations could have influenced later ones.[29] Notwithstanding this fact, one should, however, not exaggerate this phenomenon.

3.3. Which text of the Septuagint?

As already pointed out above, the Hebrew textual landscape offers a horizon of multiple and pluriform textual witnesses. There is no such thing as 'the' biblical text (anymore). In a very similar vein, it is also a misunderstanding to talk about 'the' Septuagint. 'The' Septuagint does not exist. What we actually have at hand are the manuscripts (plural) of a Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. That is why it is important to ask if any reconstruction of an eclectic text that would claim to present 'the original Septuagint'[30] – something that one would call the 'Old Greek' today –, is at any rate accessible or desirable?

Indeed, this would presuppose that, at its origin, there was a single Greek original

---

26. See G. von Rad, "Offene Fragen im Umkreis einer Theologie des Alten Testaments" in idem., *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, vol. 2 (TBü 48), München 1973, 289-312, esp. 291: "Problematisch wird uns unter diesem Aspekt die Vorstellung von der Einheit des Alten Testaments insofern, weil das Alte Testament nicht nur eine, sondern ein Anzahl von Theologien enthält, die sowohl in ihrer Struktur wie in der Art ihrer Argumentation weit voneinander divergieren."

27. M. Rösel, "Eine Theologie der Septuaginta. Präzisierungen und Pointierungen", 29.

28. See B. Schmitz, "Κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους – 'The Lord who crushes wars' (Exod 15:3LXX): The Formative Importance of the Song of the Sea (Exod 15:1-18LXX) for the Book of Judith" *JSCS* 47 (2014), 5-16.

29. See E. Tov, "The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books" in: idem., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (SVT 72), Leiden 1999, 183-194.

30. See parallelly in this respect also B. Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the*

translation, something parallel to the idea of the Hebrew 'Urtext', which most scholars have given up after the exploration of the Dead Sea scrolls.[31] Very much in analogy to the discussion between the positions of Paul de Lagarde and Paul Kahle in the early 20th Century[32] – postulating a single 'Urtext' or rather a multiplicity of 'Vulgärtexte' at the beginnings of the development of the Hebrew Bible –, one could ask the same question regarding the Septuagint.[33] Did there exist a single Septuagint version at some point or rather, already from the beginning, a multiplicity of manuscripts and texts? And consequently, should we reconstruct an 'Old Greek' like we have aimed at reconstructing the Hebrew "Urtext" (and some still do), or do we accept a multiplicity and pluriformity of texts on the Greek level equally as we now do for the Hebrew? The answer to this question undoubtedly changes the problems for the search of a 'theology of the Septuagint'.[34]

Moreover, if one would accept some kind of an Urtext for the Septuagint, being the 'Old Greek', one should seriously take into account the fact that we only have a historically and accidentally preserved number of manuscripts of the Greek translation of the Bible. It is, therefore, only on the basis of that fortuitous collection of preserved manuscripts that we can formulate any theology of the Septuagint. This implies that lost manuscripts might have contained other elements, which also could alter our idea on 'the' Septuagint's theology.

We only refer to one example. The Babylonian Talmud teaches scholars that, despite the corpus of numerous extant manuscripts, our knowledge of the textual witnesses is ultimately quite limited. Indeed, the Talmud refers to several texts in which an apparent difference between the Greek and the Hebrew version is present.[35] This is, e. g., the case in Gen 1:26. Following the Hebrew text, God says: נעשה אדם ("let us make the human"). According to the Talmud, the Greek version of this verse reads: ποιήσω

So-Called 'Plagues Narrative' in Exodus 7,14-11,10 (OTS 56), Leiden / Boston, MA 2009, 18-19; 96-98; 215-216.

31. See, however, R. HENDEL, *Steps to a New Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (TCS 10), Atlanta, GA 2016. For a critical note to Hendel's 'reconstruction' of the Hebrew Urtext of Gen 4,8, see H. AUSLOOS, "Caïn a-t-il dit quelque chose? Une analyse de Genèse 4,8" in: idem / D. LUCIANI (eds.), *Temporalité et intrigue. Hommage à André Wénin* (BETL 296), Leuven 2018, 9-21.

32. With regard to a more detailed discussion of the positions of Kahle and De Lagarde, see E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: Third Edition, Revised and Expanded*, Minneapolis, MN 2012, 169-174.

33. See B. LEMMELIJN, "Textual Criticism," (in press) and based on the latter contribution also B. LEMMELIJN, "Ἡ σημασία τῆς Μεταφράσεως τῶν Ο' [*The Significance of the Septuagint in a Changing Text-Critical Panorama*]," 1-21.

34. See also J. COOK, "Towards the Formulation of a Theology of the Septuagint," 636: "Such a theology can only be formulated in conjunction with the Old Greek text". And moreover, even if one would accept the idea of an original 'Old Greek', it is not known to us. See, in this respect, equally J. JOOSTEN, "Exegesis in the Septuagint of Hosea" in: idem, *Collected Studies on the Septuagint: From Language to Interpretation and Beyond* (FAT 83), Tübingen 2012, 123-145, esp. 124-125. And moreover, the Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the LXX translators is not factually known to us either.

35. In this respect, see E. Tov, "The Rabbinic Tradition Concerning the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX" in: idem, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (SVT 72), Leiden 1999, 1-20.

ἄνθρωπον ("I will make the human"). Instead of a first person plural, the translation would thus present a first person singular. A similar case can be observed in the story of the tower of Babel in which, according to the Talmud, the Greek version would have rendered a plural form נרדה ונבלה ("let us go down") in Gen 11:7 by a singular verb form (in Tov's reconstruction: δεῦτε καὶ καταβάς συγχέω, "let me go down").[36] Now, although the Talmud clearly demonstrates that these variants were present in the Septuagint tradition, we do not have one single Greek manuscript attesting these particular variants (the text known to us reads: καταβάντες συγχέωμεν). Nevertheless, this does not at all imply that the contributor to the Talmud would not have known Greek manuscripts of that kind.

Anyway, it is clear that these variants between the Hebrew and the Greek texts confront us with theologically significant differences. In the Hebrew version, it is perfectly possible to conceive God as representing multiple 'persons', while this interpretation is not possible in the Greek translation. However, it always stays very difficult to discern whether it would have been the translator of these particular manuscripts or rather the Hebrew *Vorlage* thereof in which the variants developed.[37] To use the aforementioned example of Gen 1:26, we cannot be certain if the reading of a singular verb was introduced by a Greek translator, by a scribe thereafter within the Greek tradition, or by the scribe of the Hebrew *Vorlage* which the translator was using.

3.4. The sequence of books in 'the Septuagint'

And if all that seemed already difficult, there is even more to ponder when talking about a theology of 'the Septuagint'. Even from the 'canonical' point of view – be that of course a much later stage in the transmission of the text – the sequence of the books can certainly have an impact on the way we perceive the 'theology' of the Septuagint. In this respect, the following observation by J. Lust is helpful.[38]

Whereas the Hebrew Bible consists of three parts – the Law *(Torah)*, the Prophets *(Neviim)* and the Writings *(Ketuvim)* –, the sequence of the books in them is different. In the Hebrew canon, it seems that the idea of divine revelation is at the front: the word of God is given through the Law. After Moses, the prophets have taken up the role to proclaim that divine word, especially in their role as mediators between the Law and the people. The third part, the Writings, could then be considered as the human answer to the divine word. The Greek canon, however, focuses rather on a 'historical' perspective, even if the textual evidence presents several 'canons', in which the order of the biblical books varies.[39] The first part seems to focus on the 'history' of Israel, from

---

36. Tov, "The Rabbinic Tradition," 11.

37. See also J. Joosten, "Une théologie de la Septante? Réflexions méthodologiques sur la version grecque" *RTP* 132 (2000), 31-46, esp. 34: "L'analyse de la théologie de la Septante s'en tiendra-t-elle aux dires du texte, ou tentera-t-elle de retracer, au-delà du texte, les idées et les convictions du traducteurs? La distinction n'est pas saugrenue".

38. See J. Lust, "De Septuaginta: de Bijbel van de Christenen?" *Collationes* 21 (1991), 231-249, esp. 235-236. We summarize his view in the following paragraph.

39. See, in this respect, also H.-J. Fabry, "The Biblical Canon and Beyond: Theological and Historical Context of the Codices of Alexandria" in: J. Cook / H.-J. Stipp (eds.), *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint* (SVT 157), Leiden 2012, 21-34, esp. 23: "We know noth-

the creation until the era of the Maccabees. The second part encompasses the Psalms and Wisdom literature, in which the actual life of Israel in the present is at stake. And finally, the prophetic literature – which has been interpreted as foretelling prediction, especially within Christian thinking – would then be more oriented towards the future.

Notwithstanding the complexity of obtaining an adequate understanding of the concept of the 'Septuagint', as evoked in what preceded, one could, of course, try to research a particular theology of the Septuagint. However, this quest is certainly complicated and can only be launched when taking into account the aspects discussed above. Only against that background could one take the next step: how and in what way can we discover and explore the theology of the Septuagint, or rather, as stated above, the 'implicit' theology or still differently, the 'theological accents' in the Septuagint?

4. Which trail to follow: How do we discover the theology of the Septuagint?

Before launching into the quest of discovering and describing an eventual (implicit) theology of the Septuagint, even on the slightest level of particular theological accents, it is important to become conscious of the point of departure that one takes. This question pertains to the way we read the Septuagint.

Of course, one could read the Septuagint in its own right. And this has actually been done, both in ecclesial as well as in academic spheres. The Greek orthodox churches use the Septuagint simply as their Bible, and they read it as such without any need whatsoever to trace back its Hebrew *Vorlage*. Also, in the academic world, the Septuagint is sometimes studied as a self-reliant document from the Jewish communities of Alexandria in Hellenistic times. Within classical philological and historical studies, the Septuagint is studied in both linguistic and cultural terms. And this stance can also be observed within scholarly projects, e. g., within the premises of the French translation project, already mentioned above, 'La Bible d'Alexandrie'. The latter project focuses on the Greek text as it stands and analyses, moreover, the way in which this Greek text has been perceived and interpreted in tradition, more particularly within the writings of the Church fathers who often refer to the wording of the Septuagint. In addition, one can recently even see the so-called synchronic literary methods of biblical exegesis, such as narrative criticism or even hermeneutical approaches, being applied directly to the text of the Septuagint, without any reference to a preceding Hebrew text.[40]

---

ing about any discussions or decisions about the arrangement of the biblical books". See also Douglas, "Limitations to Writing a Theology of the Septuagint,", esp. 106-111.

40. Discussing this matter, see, for example, the critical stance of T. A. W. van der Louw, "A Narratological Approach to the Septuagint?" *ZAW* 125 (2013), 551-565, esp. 565: "In my view, a narratological approach to the lxx is not impossible, as long as we realize its limited potential."

Nevertheless, even if this way of reading and interpreting the Septuagint or using it to develop knowledge of Hellenistic Greek and its culture could be valuable as such, and even if the Septuagint as such has indeed been an important source for Christianity,[41] in which indeed the Church fathers have used and interpreted it within the context of developing a Christian theology, it would be a serious methodological mistake to neglect the fact that after all, or better, before all, the Septuagint is factually a translation, at least for those books that have been translated from Hebrew.[42]

Therefore, as we have already stated above, searching for particular theological elements in the Septuagint requires first recognizing its translation character, discerning what was present in its Hebrew *Vorlage*, and how that *Vorlage* was rendered into Greek. In other words, being conscious of the fact that we are dealing with a translation, implies already that we should make sure to be well aware of the fact that translation is in any case always interpretation. And particularly if we are talking about a theological text, like the Septuagint, it seems inevitably that there will be theology for us to find.

The question is rather which theology comes from the translator and which was already present in the Hebrew source text? It is only this question that leads us to the eventual recovery of particular theological accents in the Septuagint.[43] To answer this question, however, one needs to understand, with as much accuracy as possible, the way in which the Septuagint translators have handled their *Vorlage*. In other words, one must first understand their translation techniques and/or their translational attitude and intentions. It is this issue that we will discuss in the following paragraphs.

4.1. The background: The theology of the Septuagint as a translational reality

As we already pointed out above (section 2), every translation implies interpretation. A translation of a theological text thus equally implies theological interpretation. Therefore, if one aims at reaching out for the 'theology' of the Septuagint, the first element to take into account is the way in which the translator has interpreted his source text. In the words of Jan Joosten: "For the exegesis of the Septuagint is not first and foremost to be viewed as a function of its being a religious document of Hellenistic

---

41. On this see M. Karrer, "Der Septuaginta-Text im frühen Christentum, in: S. Kreuzer (ed.), *Einleitung in die Septuaginta* (LXX.H1), Gütersloh 2015, 663-677, and W. Kraus, "Die Bedeutung der Septuagintazitate im Neuen Testament auf dem Hintergrund der alttestamentlichen Textgeschichte" in: Kreuzer (ed.), *Einleitung*, 678-695 (English translations in S. Kreuzer (ed.), *Introduction to the Septuagint*, Waco, 2019 [in press]).

42. See E. Tov, "Die Septuaginta in ihrem theologischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Verhältnis zur hebräischen Bibel" in: M. Klopfenstein et al. (eds.), *Mitte der Schrift? Ein jüdisch-christliches Gespräch* (JeC 11), Bern 1987, 237-265, esp. 238: "Bei unserer Diskussion über die LXX dürfen wir nie vergessen, dass die LXX eine Übersetzung ist. Diese Tatsache sollte uns bei der Untersuchung jeder Einzelheit bewusst sein."

43. For some reflections and examples on this subject see also S. Kreuzer, "Textgeschichte und Theologie" in: F. Ueberschaer / T. Wagner / J. M. Robker (eds.), *Theologie und Textgeschichte* (WUNT 407), Stuttgart, 2018, 1-24, esp. 3-10.

Judaism, but of its being a translation".[44] Or in the words of Johann Cook, one could confirm: "What is clear to me is that 'theology' or 'ideology' for that matter, is to be located in the way any given translator in fact renders his parent text".[45] Indeed, and evidently, as has been said above, the source text that has been translated by the Greek translators was a theological/ideological text. So, that implies naturally that the Greek translation thereof is equally theological/ideological.

Nevertheless, one should not exaggerate. Even if the interpretative aspect of translation can never be disregarded in the process of translation – which is already clear in the Greek terminology in which ἑρμηνεύω has a double meaning, that of 'to translate from one language into another' as well as 'to interpret' – one should simultaneously nuance this principle. Generally speaking, the primary intention of a translator is to render his source text as faithfully as possible. He will do his utmost best to transfer the ideas of his source text – in this case, the Hebrew Bible and its theologies – into another language. That is ultimately the reason why any translation is made: to provide valuable thoughts into another language to make them accessible for a wider audience. The idea is to render faithfully – even if that requires some adaptation, both linguistically as well as sometimes conceptually and culturally –, not to present the translator's own writings …

Offering a concrete example, one could refer to the obviously theological text of Exod 20:2. In the Masoretic text, God addresses the Israelites in the following words: אנכי יהוה אלהיך אשר הוצאתיך מארץ מצרים מבית עבדים ("I am yhwh your God who has made you leave the land of Egypt, the house of slavery"). In Greek, one reads: Ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεός σου, ὅστις ἐξήγαγόν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας ("I am the Lord, your God, who has made you leave Egypt, the house of slavery"). If one compares the Masoretic text to the Septuagint, one observes that the Greek translation is virtually identical to the Hebrew text, which most probably can be considered as its *Vorlage*. The theology in both versions is identical, even if there are, of course, some differences on the grammatical level. Nevertheless, these differences are simply the inherent result of the process of translation of a Hebrew text into a Greek one.[46] In Greek, the verb εἰμι is needed to express the nominal sentence of the Hebrew. Furthermore, the Hebrew system of pronominal suffixes does not exist in Greek: there is often no other possibility than rendering one Hebrew word in its different segments (אלהיך; הוצאתיך) by different Greek words (ὁ θεός σου – notice, moreover, the quantitative 'plus' of the definite article in Greek –; ἐξήγαγόν σε). Furthermore, and as is always the case in the Septuagint, the name of God (the tetragrammaton) has been 'translated' by the substantive κύριος. The *hifil* הוצאתיך has been rendered by an aorist and the unchangeable relative pronoun (אשר) has been translated by the Greek pronoun ὅστις. Nevertheless, and notwithstanding these differences, the Masoretic text

---

44. Joosten, "Exegesis in the Septuagint of Hosea," 123.
45. J. Cook, "Towards the Formulation of a Theology of the Septuagint," 622.
46. See A. Aejmelaeus, "Übersetzungstechnik und theologische Interpretation. Zur Methodik der Septuaginta-Forschung" in: E. Zenger (ed.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter. Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (HBS 32), Freiburg 2001, 3-18, esp. 11: "Von theologischer Interpretation kann keine Rede Sein, wenn der Übersetzer Wort für Wort übersetzt und dabei Standardäquivalente verwendet."

and the Septuagint's rendering are identical on the theological level. Thus, even if this Greek text is clearly theological, it does not show us any interesting clues with regard to a theology of the Septuagint.

The question at stake pertains thus to the way in which, apart from the evident theological character of the Septuagint being a translation of a theological source text, particular elements of theological thinking and interpretation can be traced.

4.2. The main principle:
marking identity and particularity, emphasizing differences?

If we think, in general, about the way that individual people, as well as cultures and societies, express their identity and particularity, they often do so by emphasizing that which makes them different from others. Would it not be almost natural then to look at the aspects in which the Septuagint differs from the Hebrew text when searching for its particular theological accents? In other words, can we find the particular theology of the Septuagint mainly in passages in which it significantly differs from the Hebrew text?

And indeed, one can observe that scholars explicitly point to that methodological trail. "Ce qui intéresse, c'est ce qui change dans la traduction par rapport à la source: les ajouts de sens, et les soustractions, les infléchissements et les transformations […]", as Joosten states. And a little further, he emphasizes: "Là où la traduction diverge de façon sensible du texte original, dans un passage aux implications théologiques, on peut espérer toucher du doigt la théologie propre du traducteur".[47] Also Cook insists on this criterion, when he posits: "It is exactly in the differences between the source text and the target text that interpretation takes place. This interpretation could be understood as exegesis or theology".[48] In a similar vein, Evangelia Dafni writes: "Theologie der Septuaginta ist m.E. die aus den Unterschieden zwischen dem Masoretischen Text und der Septuaginta wirklich herausgenommene Theologie und nicht die in den gemeinsamen Punkten beider Textformen feststellbare Theologie, die gleichsam das theologische Erbe des ganzen Alten Testaments ausmacht. Die Punkte, wo beide Textformen voneinander abweichen, sind zuweilen charakteristisch für ein anderes oder auch ein neues Verständnis".[49] And to echo a final voice, Anneli Aejmelaeus has also insisted on this perspective: "Die Erforschung der Theologie der Septuaginta konzentriert sich also auf Textstellen, an denen die Formulierung des Übersetzers auf eine theologisch interessante Weise von der genauen lexikalischen oder formalen Wiedergabe seiner *Vorlage* abweicht".[50]

As such, this runs parallel to the idea within the study of the Septuagint's translation technique, that it is not the 'literal' word-to-word translating that teaches us something about the particularities of a certain Septuagint translator, but rather those

---

47. Joosten, "Une théologie de la Septante?" 33.
48. Cook, "Towards the Formulation of a Theology of the Septuagint," 622.
49. Dafni, "Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta," 327.
50. A. Aejmelaeus, "Von Sprache zur Theologie. Methodologische Überlegungen zur Theologie der Septuaginta" in: M. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195), Leuven 2006, 21-48, esp. 30.

aspects that deviate from that 'easy technique',[51] in showing something special, be it the way he strives for a more idiomatic Greek text or the manner in which he tries to make his text more understandable for his audience when dealing with difficult semantic and/or theological situations. That is also why, in the development of translation technical studies on the Septuagint, the focus has gradually changed from studying its 'literalness', be it in its specific aspects, to rather studying its 'freedom' in different ways, and relating that to so-called 'faithfulness' but, reaching beyond that, also to his linguistic and literary 'creativity'.[52] This creativity can be clear indeed on the level of the language, but equally in terms of theological originality (through aspects of re-actualisation, new conceptualization etc.), in which the activity of a translator resembles that of an author/redactor.[53] In this respect, the recent 'content- and context-related criteriology in the qualitative characterization of the Septuagint translation', developed at the Louvain CSSTC's,[54] demonstrates itself capable of indeed tracing back the 'creativity' of particular translators,[55] thereby finding out in what way they handle their *Vorlage* with regard to specific content-related aspects and where and in which way they take their own stance.

Turning back to the scholars' desire, mentioned above, to find meaningful differences in theologically relevant passages, one observes that 'theological' differences are sometimes very clear. By way of illustration, one could refer to Isa 6:10 and 9:5. In the first passage, according to the Masoretic text, God commands Isaiah, in the context of

---

51. With respect to the expression 'easy technique', see J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (MSU 15), Göttingen 1979, 300. Concerning the statement itself, see especially the discussion of the approach by the so-called Finnish school in Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts*, 112-113: "While the fact that every Septuagint translation can be characterised in general terms as more or less literal cannot be denied, the Finnish scholars argue that it is precisely the deviations from this literal manner of working in favour of a more free, idiomatic Greek usage that expose the difference between individual translators and at the same time illuminate the particular characteristics of each individual translator."

52. See B. Lemmelijn, "Two Methodological Trails in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint" in: R. Sollamo / S. Sipilä (eds.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (SESJ 62), Helsinki 2001, 43-63; Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts*, 108-129; Lemmelijn, "Text-Critically Studying the Biblical Manuscript Evidence," 144-147; H. Ausloos / B. Lemmelijn, "Faithful Creativity Torn Between Freedom and Literalness in the Septuagint's Translations" *JNSL* 40 (2014), 53-69.

53. See Lemmelijn, "Influence of a So-Called P-redaction in the 'Major Expansions' of Exod 7-11?" 203-222, esp. 221.

54. B. Lemmelijn / H. Ausloos, "Septuagint Studies in Louvain" in: K. Spronk (ed.), *The Present State of Old Testament Studies in the Low Countries: A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap* (OTS 69), Leiden 2016, 144-158; H. Ausloos / B. Lemmelijn, "Content Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique" in: W. Kraus / M. Karrer / M. Meiser (ed.), *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse* (WUNT 252), Tübingen 2010, 357-376; H. Ausloos / B. Lemmelijn / V. Kabergs, "The Study of Aetiological Wordplay as a Content-Related Criterion in het Characterisation of LXX Translation Technique" in: S. Kreuzer / M. Meiser / M. Sigismund (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte* (WUNT 286), Tübingen 2012, 273-294; Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts*, 124-125; Lemmelijn, "Text-Critically Studying the Biblical Manuscript Evidence," 144-147.

55. Ausloos / Lemmelijn, "Faithful Creativity," 53-69.

his vocational vision: "Make fat the heart of this people (השמן – *hifil*), make their ears heavy (הכבד – *hifil*), glue their eyes (השע – *hifil*), so that it will not see with its eyes, nor hear with its ears, so that its heart will not understand and it will not be able to convert and be healed". This text is quite hard, giving the impression that it is God himself who prevents the Israelites from converting. The version of the Septuagint is obviously different: "The heart of this people is hardened (ἐπαχύνθη – passive aorist), they hear in a deaf way (βαρέως ἤκουσαν – active aorist), and they have closed their eyes (ἐκάμμυσαν – active aorist), for fear that their eyes would see, that their ears would hear, that their heart would understand and that they would convert to me and that I would heal them." In the Septuagint translation, the Israelites themselves are responsible for their own obstinacy, the prophet only observes it.[56] Another difference can be observed in Isa 9:5, a verse regarding the coming of a new king: "For a child has been born for us, a son given to us; authority rests upon his shoulders and he is named: Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace". In the Septuagint, one reads: "A child has been born to us, a son given to us; the principality rests on his shoulder, and he is called by this name: angel of wise advice. For I will bring peace to the princes/rulers (ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξω εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας)". Whereas the first part of the verse seems to have been translated quite literally, the Septuagint differs rather strongly from the Masoretic text in the second half of the verse. Without entering into details, it seems that the royal child is considered to bring peace in the Masoretic text, whereas in the Septuagint, it is God himself who provides peace.[57]

Anyway, one thing that is obvious is that the analysis of differences between the Masoretic text and the Septuagint should be exclusively done on the level of the text itself. The literary text, indeed, is the only available entrance to an analysis of the theology of the Septuagint. Aejmelaeus expresses it adequately when she states: "Wenn es sich aber um Theologie der Septuaginta-Übersetzung handelt, sind ihre sprachlichen Äusserungen alles, was wir haben. Es geschieht ausschliesslich durch die Sprache, durch die Formulierung des griechischen Übersetzungstextes, dass wir überhaupt etwas von den theologischen oder religiösen Überzeugungen der Übersetzer erfahren oder spüren können".[58]

Nevertheless, even if one would agree that the 'theology' of the Septuagint can only be discovered when focusing on the differences regarding the Hebrew text, it is of utmost importance to stay cautious. Observing a difference is one thing, interpreting takes another step further. Therefore, in interpreting differences, one should be prudent not to jump to rash conclusions without solid grounds.

---

56. See, with respect to the interpretation of this verse, C. A. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6,9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation* (JSOT SS 64), Sheffield 1989, 61-68.

57. A. van der Kooij, "Wie heisst der Messias? Zu Jes 9,5 in den alten griechischen Versionen" in: C. Bultmann / W. Dietrich / C. Levin (eds.), *Vergegenwärtigung des Altes Testaments. Beiträge zur Biblischen Hermeneutik. Festschrift für Rudolph Smend zum 70. Geburtstag*, Göttingen 2002, 156-169. This verse demonstrates, moreover, that it seems impossible to consider the Septuagint as such as more 'messianic' than the Masoretic text. On messianism in the Septuagint, see especially J. Lust (edited by K. Hauspie), *Messianism and the Septuagint: Collected Essays*, Leuven 2004. For an example of a probable anti-messianic development in the Masoretic text (Amos 4:13) see Kreuzer, "Origin and Development," 27-28.

58. Aejmelaeus, "Von Sprache zur Theologie," 21.

4.3. One step further:
Interpreting differences, searching for their origin

Quite similar to the methodological steps of a text-critical study, in which the first step is to observe and collect, thereafter to describe and select and only ultimately to evaluate the text-relevant variants in the extant texts,[59] the search for a theology in the Septuagint works in much the same way. Even if we agree that theological elements or accents can be found on the basis of differences between the Septuagint and the Masoretic text (or *in extensu* all other Hebrew textual witnesses), then, of course, we factually did only collect, observe and describe. The conclusion as to whether the variant includes particular exegesis by the Septuagint translator can only be reached on the basis of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, one should be able to say whether the (theological) variant under study finds its origin in the work of the translator effectively. Indeed, even if a variant is theological, this does not necessarily imply that it stems from the translational activity. It is equally possible that the origin of this difference is to be situated on the level of the *Vorlage* of the Greek text. Discerning the distinction between the *Vorlage* and the translator is a very difficult question, but highly important and even indispensable to reach well-founded conclusions on the particular theology of the Septuagint.[60]

Again, one could refer to an example showing a variant between the Masoretic text and the Septuagint in Gen 2:2. In the Masoretic text, God completed his creational work on the seventh day (ביום השביעי). In the Septuagint, he does so on the sixth day (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ). One can observe a clear difference between the two textual witnesses, and moreover, it is a difference that undoubtedly entails some theological relevance. In Judaism, to stop working is equally still working, which is not allowed on the "seventh day". Thus, it seems hardly possible that God himself would not respect his own commandments. The question, however, is to find out at what level the text has been 'changed'. From the perspective of the Hebrew text, the reading of the seventh day seems to be the original. However, the fact that the Samaritan Pentateuch equally reads the "sixth day" (ביום הששי), provides the scholar with a Hebrew reading which conforms to the Septuagint's, and demonstrates thereby that it is likely that this reading had been known in Hebrew in the Jewish tradition,[61] thereby implying that the

---

59. See Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts*, 22-27; Lemmelijn, "Text-Critically Studying the Biblical Manuscript Evidence," 132-151 and B. Lemmelijn, "What Are We Looking for in Doing Text-Critical Research?" *JNSL* 23 (1997) 69-80.

60. See, for example, Dafni, "Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta," 323 who speaks of "scheinbaren Miss- bzw. Fehldeutungen der Vorlage" and "Annahme einer anderen Vorlage als den Masoretischen Text"; Douglas, "Limitations to Writing a Theology of the Septuagint," 112. See equally Aejmelaeus, "Von Sprache zur Theologie," 26-27: "Es geht nicht darum, dass die Septuaginta zum Werkzeug der Textkritik degradiert werden soll, auch nicht darum, dass alle abweichenden Aussagen auf eine abweichende Vorlage zurückgeführt werden sollen, sondern einfach darum, dass die Fälle erkannt werden, wo die Vorlage in Wirklichkeit anders als der MT gelautet hat, damit nicht dem Übersetzer zugeschrieben wird, wofür er nicht verantwortlich ist, und auch damit kein falsches Bild von der Arbeitsweise des Übersetzers geschaffen wird."

61. See equally the Talmudic tradition in this respect: E. Tov, "The Rabbinic Tradition Concerning

Greek variant is not particular nor original in the Septuagint.[62] In this case, the existence of a Hebrew variant confirming the Greek one suggests a different *Vorlage*.

However, one does not always have concurring Hebrew variants at one's disposal when tracing the origin of Greek variants. Even if the preceding example was quite clear in the suggestion of a different *Vorlage*, it is indeed not always as simple to evaluate whether the difference is situated on the level of the *Vorlage* or, on the contrary, whether it has been the translator who has changed the text. This evaluative judgment is a very difficult matter, in which several parameters should be taken into account. Let us illustrate this problem again with an example, namely Deut 11:13.

In this verse, being part of Moses' speech, he addresses the Israelites, according to the Masoretic text, with the following words: "If you obey my commandments that I prescribe to you today …". From the perspective of the content of the text, this verse presents a problem, certainly if one reads it in the context of the rest of the book of Deuteronomy: the commandments that Moses gives to the Israelites are not his, but God's. In the book of Deuteronomy, the word מצוה always refers to the divine commandments. And the usage of the suffixes confirms this: when Moses speaks, he speaks about "his commandments"; when God speaks, he mentions "my commandments"; when the Israelites talk to God, they speak of "your commandments". That is why it is very strange that in Deut 11:13, the Hebrew text gives the impression that Moses does not speak of the divine commandments, but of his own. In the Septuagint, this theological problem has disappeared: Moses speaks according to the theology of Deuteronomy of the divine commandments ("his commandments" – τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ). Does this variant testify to a theological alteration produced by the Septuagint? Even if this would theoretically be possible, one should also take into account that the consonants י and ו are often interchanged by error: the Masoretic text reads מצותי, while a retroversion of the Greek text would result in מצותו (as in Deut 7:9; 8:2; 27:10).

In this respect, Rösel has argued that the fact that a difference should be attributed to the *Vorlage* does not imply that this difference is irrelevant from a theological point of view.[63] However, if Rösel is correct, this would mean that one would no longer be talking about a theology particular to the Septuagint, but rather of a theological accent that the Septuagint shares with other extant Hebrew textual witnesses.

Finally, except for having concurring Hebrew textual variants in non-Masoretic texts at hand that provide evidence of a different *Vorlage*, the distinction between variants from a different *Vorlage* and those introduced by the translator can be deduced in one other way: through careful study of the translation techniques.[64] That is, the way in

the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX" *JSJ* 15 (1984), 65-89.

62. See Tov, "Die Septuaginta in ihrem theologischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Verhältnis," 260-261. Unfortunately, there is no extant fragment from the Dead Sea scrolls that could confirm the existence of this variant in the pre- or proto-Masoretic texts.

63. Rösel, "Eine Theologie der Septuaginta. Präzisierungen und Pointierungen, 34.

64. With respect to the importance of the analysis of the translation technique with a view to the discussion of the theology of the Septuagint, see R. Sollamo, "Translation Technique as a Method" in: H. Ausloos et al. (eds.), *Translating a Translation* (BETL 213), Leiden 2008, 35-41, esp. 41: "As for a methodology, the study of translation technique is the *conditio sine qua non* for a theology of the Septuagint translators. Emphasis of the translation technique does

which the particular translators handled their *Vorlage* and their observable and demonstrable attitudes toward their source texts can provide the scholar with some factors of probability in deciding on the origin of a variant.[65] In this respect, the development of the study of translation technique in the last decades, and as described above, has nuanced the formerly rather intuitive labels that scholars gave to the different books of the Septuagint, in terms of either literal and slavish or free and random. Literalness has been studied in its different aspects, and freedom has also been studied from different qualitative perspectives, whether that be on the basis of language and grammar or on the basis of more content- and context-related criteria.[66] In this way, far more nuanced characterizations have been suggested, and labels have been nuanced in terms of faithfulness and creativity, tracing the originality of particular translators in specific aspects.[67] As said above, only a painstaking characterization of the translation technique in the specific books of the Septuagint can provide the scholar with some 'probability' when evaluating the Greek variants. Simply put, if a specific translation is generally very close to its *Vorlage*, and if, in that context, it suddenly shows a larger plus, then, it is hardly imaginable that the translator was the one to insert it. Rather, he has indeed probably relied on a different *Vorlage*.

Moreover, besides the question of the origin of the Greek 'theological' variant differing from the Masoretic text (as a hypothetical placeholder for the supposed *Vorlage*), there is another factor to take into consideration. The fact that the Septuagint would testify of another theology does not imply automatically that this theological reading would *ipso facto* be younger, reflecting a later stage in the development of the text. Even if the Hebrew text has been considered as a 'holy text', this 'confessional' character has no relevance at all in the context of a scientific analysis of the text. One should therefore be careful not to provide a privileged position to one or another text. Even if one demonstrates that a difference between the Hebrew and the Greek text does not result from an error, thus being intentional in Greek, this does not mean automatically that it is the translator who was responsible for the differing theology. It is always possible that the Septuagint confronts us to a textual variant which is more original than the one we know in Hebrew, and that it might have been a copyist/scribe

---

not imply denying the existence or the possibility of the existence of a theology of the Septuagint or an individual translator, but it makes the study of it more complicated and compels it to rely on solid argumentation." See equally F. Austermann, "ἀνομία im Septuaginta-Psalter. Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von Übersetzungsweise und Theologie" in: R. Sollamo / S. Sipilä (eds.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (SESJ 62), Helsinki 2001, 99-138.

65. See Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts*, 18-20; 96-107; Lemmelijn, "Text-Critically Studying the Biblical Manuscript Evidence," 144-148.

66. See Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts*, 124-125; Ausloos / Lemmelijn, "Content Related Criteria," 357-376; Ausloos / Lemmelijn / Kabergs, "The Study of Aetiological Wordplay as a Content-Related Criterion," 273-294; Lemmelijn, "Text-Critically Studying the Biblical Manuscript Evidence," 144-147.

67. See Lemmelijn, "Two Methodological Trails," 43-63, Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts*, 108-129; Lemmelijn, "Text-Critically Studying the Biblical Manuscript Evidence," 144-147; Ausloos / Lemmelijn, "Faithful Creativity," 53-69.

within the Hebrew textual transmission that has altered (whether or not intentionally) his original text. Or maybe, but this is still another issue, it would be better to speak of a 'redactor' in such cases.[68]

In this respect, the case of the book of Jeremiah is well known. Even if, during several decades, scholars have thought that the Greek translator had shortened the Hebrew text of Jeremiah, nowadays, and thanks to the study of the textual material of the Dead Sea scrolls (again providing parallel material in Hebrew), it is quite generally accepted that the Septuagint of Jeremiah has transmitted a more original text of this book. Or, to give another example, one could refer to Judg 9:46. In the Masoretic text, one reads that the inhabitants of Sichem "went into the fortified part of the house of the god Berith" (אל צריח בית אל ברית). In the Greek text of Judges A (the eclectic text that Rahlfs has composed on the basis of Codex Alexandrinus; the B-text presents the text of Codex Vaticanus), one reads: εἰς τὸ ὀχύρωμα οἴκου τοῦ Βααλ διαθήκης. Was it the Greek translator that changed the formula אל ברית (ʾel bᵉrît) to Βααλ διαθήκης (בעל ברית, baʿal bᵉrît)? Did the translator (or his *Vorlage*) aim at harmonizing with Judg 8:33 and 9:4, as Paul Harlé suggests?[69] Or is the Greek A-text (βάαλ) rather a textual witness of a more original variant that has been changed into אל (cf. the B-text, presenting the Codex Vaticanus reading βαιθηλβεριθ) on the basis of theological motives, as Natalio Fernández Marcos proposes?[70] Whatever may be the case, this example demonstrates in a clear way that one needs to be cautious not to link Greek variants too easily to a different theology of the translator.

5. Hidden theology?
Nuancing the main principle

Even if the main rule, described above, according to which a particular theology of the Septuagint would be discovered through the exploration of important variants, is quite generally confirmed, one needs to nuance this guideline. In a challenging article, Emanuel Tov asked the following pertinent question: Did the Septuagint translators always understand their Hebrew Text?[71] The contribution opens by stating that the (correct)

---

68. On the overlap between textual criticism and literary criticism, and as a result also the change of view on the activities of copyists/scribes on the one hand and authors/redactors on the other, see Lemmelijn, "Influence of a So-Called P-redaction in the 'Major Expansions' of Exod 7-11?" 203-222. See equally H. Ausloos, "Literary Criticism and Textual Criticism in Judg 6:1-14 in Light of 4QJudgᵃ" *OTE* 27 (2014), 358-376.

69. P. Harlé / T. Roqueplo, *Les Juges* (BdA 7), Paris 1999, 174: "AL remplacent *El* par *Baal* sous l'influence de 8, 33 et 9, 14 *(sic)*".

70. N. Fernández Marcos, *Judges* (BHQ 7), Stuttgart 2011, 80: "The form βάαλ is probably an ancient reading preserved in G and La (*Bahel;* see v. 4 and 8:33), before it was corrected to אֵל in M for theological motives, as can be appreciated, given the many other biblical attempts to polemize against Baal. Since this is a clear case of theological correction in M, the reading of G is preferable."

71. E. Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" in: idem, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (SVT 72), Leiden 1999, 203-218.

interpretation of a biblical text is an abstract concept. Indeed, a modern translator is often confronted by words and expressions which he simply does not understand. Sometimes, there is no other choice except conjecture. The situation of the translators of the Septuagint was similar. In their *Vorlage*, they have undoubtedly been challenged by words which they did not know or which looked strange to them. Consequently, it is unsurprising that one sometimes finds conjectures in the Septuagint. Tov distinguishes several types thereof: the Septuagint translator can leave the unknown word untranslated; he can try to find out the meaning on the basis of the context; he could try to manipulate the text; or he could attempt to trace back the etymology of the Hebrew word and invent a meaning based thereon.

5.1. A different theology without differing texts

As such, this is a normal aspect of linguistic reality. However, and against this very background, there is yet another complication to consider when addressing the issue of the theology of the Septuagint. The interpretation that the Septuagint (correctly or incorrectly) has given to a difficult Hebrew text has sometimes become the general norm for the interpretation of the (still difficult) Hebrew text. However, in this case, one does not even question whether this translation of the Hebrew, which is based on the trial-and-error-interpretation that the Septuagint has given of a difficult Hebrew text, is also the most adequate one.[72] Two examples may suffice to illustrate the implications of this procedure: 1 Kings 19:12 and Gen 1:2.

The text of 1 Kings 19:12 narrates the stay of the prophet Elijah at Horeb.[73] When Elijah stays in a cavern that night, a word of God comes to him: the prophet has to leave the cavern in order to see in which way God will reveal himself. Next, the pericope reports a theophany. First, there is a strong wind, eroding mountains and breaking rocks. However, God is not in the wind. After the wind, there is an earthquake, but God is neither therein. Thereafter, there is a fire, but God is not in the fire either. Finally, after the wind, the earthquake and the fire, God manifests himself in a קוֹל דְּמָמָה דַקָּה. Generally speaking, this Hebrew expression is interpreted as silence,[74] and one often uses it in pastoral terms to explain that the biblical God is a God of tenderness and calm, contrary to Baal who is a god of thunderstorms.

If one compares the Hebrew text to the Septuagint translation, it seems at first sight that the translator has well understood the Hebrew text, since he translates it by φωνὴ αὔρας λεπτῆς (the whispering of a light breath). At least, that would be the

---

72. With regard to this problematic issue, see H. Ausloos, "Hapax Legomena, the Septuagint, and Hebrew Lexicography" in: M. K. H. Peters (ed.), xiv *Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies – Helsinki 2010* (SBL SCS 59), Atlanta, GA 2013, 291-300.

73. See H. Ausloos, "Beyond Maximalism and Minimalism: The Theophany in 1 Kings 19:11-12 and the Theology of the Septuagint" in: E. G. Dafni (ed.), *Gottesschau – Gotteserkenntnis. Studien zur Theologie der Septuaginta*, vol. 1 (WUNT 387), Tübingen 2017, 29-39.

74. See, for example, the English translations of 'a still small voice' (KJV), 'a still small voice' (RSV) and 'a sound of sheer silence' (NRSV).

opinion of Charles Burney[75] and Jobst Bösenecker.[76] Anyway, from a quantitative perspective, the translation technique looks perfect, since every Hebrew word has been rendered by a corresponding Greek equivalent: קול/φωνὴ; דממה/αὔρας; דקה/λεπτῆς.[77] However, to evaluate the translation qualitatively, one also should carefully observe the choice of the equivalent words. And precisely at this point, 1 Kings 19:12 reveals a problem. Even if, generally speaking, exegetes and modern Bible translators agree that the Hebrew formula should be understood as referring to a notion of silence, this interpretation is debatable.

It was Johan Lust who demonstrated that the said interpretation is indeed doubtable from the point of view of both the content and the context of the verse.[78] His main arguments are the following. First, the concept of "voice of thin silence" is a strange anticlimax after the cosmic elements of wind, earthquake and fire. Second, the presentation of God as a "soft" God is really in contradiction to his presentation in the previous chapter (1 Kings 18), in which he sends a heavenly fire to consume the offerings of the prophet, as well as the wood, the stones, the dust and even the water (1 Kings 18:38). Third, a spiritual and metaphysical presentation of God linked to silence would imply more western than eastern thinking. Fourth, to the author of the Hebrew text, Horeb or Sinai are symbols of a religion in which Moses is considered to be the model in having witnessed real divine revelation. Speaking of a קול דממה דקה, the author seems to aim at juxtaposing the theophanies of Elijah and Moses. Fifth, Lust confirms that, from a linguistic point of view, the interpretation of the word דממה is debatable. The word only occurs four times and, both in the Hebrew Bible as well as in the Dead Sea scrolls, it should be interpreted as "thunder". In short, and according to Lust, all of these arguments seem to suggest that the Hebrew expression קול דממה דקה should not be understood as referring to a silent divine presence. Rather, the debated formula should be translated as the opposite: "a roaring and thunderous voice".[79]

If Lust's interpretation is correct, there is a need to re-evaluate the translation which we read in the Septuagint. If the author of the Hebrew text would really have aimed at presenting an anticlimax, then the interpretation of the Septuagint is correct and adequate. However, if Lust is right, and thus if the Hebrew text was not meant to

75. C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix,* Oxford 1903, 231: "lxx […] and so Vulg. […] have excellently grasped the sense both of substantive and adjective."

76. J. Bösenecker, "Basileion iii. Das dritte Buch der Königtümer / Das erste Buch der Könige" in: M. Karrer / W. Kraus (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten* Testament, vol. 1: *Genesis bis Makkabäer,* Stuttgart 2011, 898-945, esp. 938: "Treffende Übs für die entsprechende hebr. Formulierung".

77. With respect to a further elaboration of the link between 'translation technique' and 'theology' in the Septuagint, see W. E. Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos* (SVT 126), Leiden 2009. See equally Aejmelaeus, "Übersetzungstechnik und theologische Interpretation," 11-13.

78. J. Lust, "Elijah and the Theophany on Mount Horeb" in: J. Coppens (ed.), *La notion biblique de Dieu: Le Dieu de la Bible et le Dieu des philosophes* (BETL 41), Gembloux / Leuven 1976, 91-100 and idem, "A Gentle Breeze or a Roaring Thunderous Sound? Elijah at Horeb: 1 Kings xix 12" *VT* 2 (1975), 110-115.

79. Lust, "Elijah and the Theophany," 99.

present an anticlimax but rather a climax – after the lightning (the fire), there came the thunder –, then the translation of the Septuagint presents a significantly different interpretation. In this case, there are two possibilities to discern. First, it is possible that the translator has simply not understood the Hebrew text, which is Lust's conviction. In this case, and on the basis of an etymological interpretation,[80] erroneously linking the substantive דממה and the verb דום (to be silent), the translator would have translated קול דממה דקה by φωνὴ αὔρας λεπτῆς. Second, in the other case, the translator would have intentionally changed the meaning of the text, thereby providing also a different theology according to which God would be present in the silence.

The second example illustrating the complexity that the concept of a theology of the Septuagint is linked to the difficulty of correctly understanding the Hebrew text, is a text that plays an equally important role in the theology of the Church fathers and the orthodox tradition. In Gen 1:2, the Hebrew author/redactor evokes the initial chaos which God will transform into order and harmony. In the King James Version, one reads the following translation: "And the earth was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters". The Revised Standard Version reads almost identically: "And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters". It adds, however, a footnote to "the Spirit of God", indicating: "or wind". The New Revised Standard Version reads: "The earth was a formless void and darkness covered the face of the deep, while a wind from God swept over the face of the waters", equally adding a footnote stating: "or while the spirit of God or while a mighty wind". Already in comparing a few English translations, one notices a translational complication in the third part of this evocation of the primeval chaos. The portion of the verse under dispute reads in Hebrew as follows: ורוח אלהים מרחפת על פני המים.[81] At first sight, in this Hebrew version, the first two words are not problematic: literally speaking, the Hebrew has the words "wind" – and only because of other Old Testament texts, we have learned that רוח (rûᵃḥ) can equally mean something as "spirit" – and "God". The Septuagint quantitatively and qualitatively renders those two words in an adequate way. It seems to have interpreted them correctly, taking up, however, the second, figurative meaning of the Hebrew רוח: καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος. Reading the verse in this way, the πνεῦμα θεοῦ (formula often used for the "Spirit of God") would already have been present at the beginning of creation.

Nevertheless, one could question whether the Hebrew author/redactor has really aimed at this theology, referring to the "Spirit of God". Indeed, in Hebrew, the word אלהים (ʾᵆlohîm) can also be used as an indication for the superlative.[82] Thus, it is well

---

80. See H. Ausloos / B. Lemmelijn, "Etymological Translations in the Septuagint" in: E. Bons / J. Joosten (eds.), *Die Sprache der Septuaginta / The Language of the Septuagint* (LXX.H 3), Gütersloh 2016, 193-201.

81. See also C. Westermann, *Genesis. 1. Teilband: Genesis 1-11* (BKAT I 1), Neukirchen 1974, 147: "Der dritte Satz des zweiten Verses bietet besondere Schwierigkeiten und ist besonders kontrovers."

82. See D. Winton Thomas, "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew" VT 3 (1953), 209-224. See equally B. K. Waltke / M. O'Connor, *An introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax,* Winona Lake, IN 1990, 154, fn. 33.

possible that the expression רוח אלהים should be interpreted as a "mighty wind" indeed (cf. the note of NRSV), giving expression to a vivid evocation of the initial chaos. Understood in this way, there would not have been only the תהו ובהו (tohû wabohû) and the darkness, but also a mighty stormy wind representing the primeval chaos. Thus, there would not have been any "Spirit of God" in the Hebrew text. Rather, it was the Septuagint that has introduced this idea by translating רוח אלהים literally by πνεῦμα θεοῦ. In this perspective, the Septuagint thus presents a different theology from the Hebrew one, but the texts do not actually differ. However, parallel to the situation in 1 Kings 19:12, it does not seem possible to determine whether that translation was intentional. Indeed, from the point of view of its translation technique, there is no problem at all. On the contrary, the rendering of the Septuagint can even be characterized as both literal and faithful, since it translates רוח by πνεῦμα and אלהים by θεοῦ.

The example of Gen 1:2 has demonstrated that it is not easy to recover the proper intention of the translator and his attitude towards his *Vorlage*. In light of this observation, a final but highly relevant remark must be made about developing a theology of the Septuagint.

5.2. Distinguishing a theology of the Septuagint from a theological interpretation of the Septuagint

If scholars are in search of the particular theology of a Septuagint text (let alone of 'the' Septuagint in general), it is indispensable to respect the distinction between the (recovered) intention of the translator and the way in which his translation has been used and interpreted in the course of the theological tradition. This observation is particularly important from a Christian point of view. It is absolutely true that the New Testament authors have based themselves quite a lot on the Septuagint, even if we do not know exactly on which version or manuscript. However, in many instances, these Greek Old Testament texts have been adapted, actualized and interpreted in a christological or messianic way.[83] And more importantly in our context, the fact that a Greek Old Testament text has been read in a messianic or christological way does not imply automatically that this messianism or this christology would already have been present in the Greek translation itself.[84]

In this respect, the verse of Isa 7:14, that has been interpreted in the gospels in a messianic way, is the outstanding example, even if there are many more texts that could be referred to. One could also think of Jesus' baptism, in the context of which the synoptic gospels (Mt 3:17; Mk 1:11; Lk 3:22) refer to Gen 22:2,12,16, characterizing Jesus as "the beloved son". However, the fact that the gospels have interpreted the Greek version of the latter text (τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν) in a messianic way does not imply by necessity that the Septuagint itself would have been messianic nor that it would be more messianic than the Hebrew parallel text. The Septuagint's reading ἀγαπητός (your beloved son) as a rendering of the Hebrew יחיד (your only son) should

---

83. Ample reflection on the question of the importance of the reception history of Is 7,14 can be found in Aejmelaeus, "Von Sprache zur Theologie," 24-26.

84. See Seeligmann, "Problems and Perspectives," 72-73.

not automatically be interpreted as an indication of a stronger tendency towards messianic thinking.[85]

6. Ten commandments guiding the study of the Septuagint's theology

Given the complexity of the search for a theology of the Septuagint, as it has been described above, it is clear that Albert Pietersma's warning against a serious risk of simplification when talking about 'the' theology of 'the' Septuagint is certainly relevant and valid.[86] Indeed, the challenges which present themselves in the analysis of the theology of the Septuagint are numerous and complex. In what follows, we try to resume ten reminders which one could call something like the ten commandments for the study of the theology of the Septuagint. Parallel to the biblical Decalogue, providing a space of life in dignity and responsibility within the fundamental borders of ʏʜᴡʜ's prescriptions, the reminders following could provide a space in which the careful and critical exploration and description of the theology of the Septuagint could be reached for.

1. One should be seriously aware of the fact that the Septuagint as such does not exist. The actual Septuagint is a collection of translations that have been made by several translators over a period of several centuries, in different places and undoubtedly also with different intentions, that, moreover, cannot be easily traced back.

2. Moreover, the textual evidence of the Septuagint demonstrates the existence of multiple manuscripts of the Septuagint, in which the sequence of the books is not identical. This reality urges us to be cautious in front of every generalization concerning the Septuagint in its 'canonical' form.[87]

3. In this context, it is important to decide on whether or not one accepts the possibility of reconstructing the 'Old Greek' or alternatively, whether one rather opts for the presumption that multiple translations have been made independently and simultaneously, from the beginning. Either option will have implications on the answer to the question on whether or not 'a theology of the Septuagint' is possible as such.

4. In light of the foregoing remarks, it is evident that it is practically impossible to analyze specific theological concepts within 'the' Septuagint with a view to provide systematic answers to general questions like: What does the Septuagint state on this or that subject?[88]

85. See H. Ausloos / B. Lemmelijn, "'Your Only Son, Your Beloved One' (Genesis 22): When Septuagint and Messianism Meet" in: F. García Martínez / M. Vervenne (eds.), *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the ʟxx and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (BETL 192), Leuven 2005, 19-31.

86. A. Pietersma, "Messianism and the Greek Psalter: In Search of the Messiah" in: M. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195), Leuven 2006, 49-75, esp. 50.

87. See on the problem of the interpretation of the 'canonical' text, H. Ausloos, "Mal 3:22-24 (4:1-6) in Hebrew and Greek: Some Remarks Concerning Its Function in the Canon" in: K. De Troyer / T. M. Law / M. Liljeström (eds.), *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (CBET 72), Leuven 2014, 479-491.

88. Contra M. Rösel, "Towards a 'Theology of the Septuagint'" in: W. Kraus / G. Wooden (eds.),

5. Nevertheless, dealing with the theology of the particular books originally written in Greek is perfectly possible. However, also in this case, and parallel to the books of the Hebrew Bible, one has to take into account the possibility of different redactions that could have given rise to multiple theologies, which can even sometimes contradict each other (also like in the Hebrew books).

6. Concerning the books translated from Hebrew, however, it must be taken into account that they are fundamentally translations of a Hebrew *Vorlage*. Therefore, only a meticulous and accurate comparison of the Greek translations to the Hebrew texts could offer some reliable results. In this process, however, one should again be aware of several elements.

7. Generally speaking, a particular theology comes to the fore within variants between the Septuagint and the Hebrew text. However, in order not to jump to rash conclusions concerning the theological nature of a variant, one should consider other possibilities of how the difference may have originated. A variant is not necessarily intentional. It can be incidental, the result from a mistake during the process of transmission of the text or it can even simply be the outcome of 'translation technique', sometimes without any specific theological intention. To say even more, one should continuously be mindful of the fact that the *Vorlage* used by the translators is not even known to us.

8. The only basis to arrive at the discovery, exploration and evaluation of theological accents in the Septuagint, is the Greek text itself. One should be very careful not to develop arguments on the basis of the socio-historical context in which the translation would have been made. For indeed, that would result in circular reasoning, since the Septuagint itself is one of the most important elements to construct our knowledge of that very context.[89]

9. As a main principle, only the differences between the Greek and the Hebrew text(s) could reveal to us in what way and where a particular theology would appear. However, this principle needs to be nuanced and complemented. It is also important to note that the choice of vocabulary could testify of another theology even if, at first sight, there would not seem to be a difference with the Hebrew text.

10. Moreover, the Hebrew text in all its semantic, linguistic and theological nuances, has not always been adequately understood by the translator, completely parallel to the situation of the modern reader. In this context, the translator has been obliged to make choices, which have not been influenced necessarily by any theological concerns. That is why it is of the utmost importance not to identify the theological accents of the Septuagint with its later theological interpretation, e.g. within Christianity.

Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges on the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures (SBL SCS 53), Atlanta, GA 2006, 239-252, esp. 241-242: "A treatise on the theology of the Septuagint should be more than a collection of unrelated studies on some or all of the books; it needs unifying elements such as theological topics". One is confronted, moreover, to the same problem even within a single book. For example, even if the LXX seems to leave out the vision of God present in the Masoretic text of Exod 24:10, it introduces it however in Exod 25:8, where, in turn, it is absent from the Masoretic text. In this respect, see also J. JOOSTEN, "To See God: Conflicting Exegetical Tendencies in the Septuagint" in: M. KARRER / W. KRAUS / M. MEISER (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (WUNT 219), Tübingen 2008, 287-299.

89. See K. H. JOBES / M. SILVA, *Invitation to the Septuagint,* Grand Rapids, MI 2001, 89.

Concluding, we return to the opening question in the title of this contribution: Is there such a thing as 'the theology of the Septuagint'? In view of the elements that have been discussed and illustrated above, it seems hardly possible to speak about 'the' theology of 'the' Septuagint.[90] Rather, one should allow each Greek text to speak for itself independently and draw cautious conclusions only after a meticulous analysis of its translation and in comparison to the Hebrew text.[91] We would, therefore, strongly recommend to rather discuss 'theological elements' or 'theological accents' (be they possibly also called 'ideological' or 'exegetical') within the Septuagint, and more particularly within the often 'implicit theology' of a well-defined pericope or even minor textual fragment of the Septuagint, bearing in mind to avoid any simplistic generalizations.[92]

And although this conclusion might sound minimalistic, it is, after all, not so different from the situation in the Hebrew Bible. Also, in that respect, and as already indicated above, 'the' theology of 'the' Hebrew Bible can only be formulated if one would be satisfied with simplistic generalizing statements. In fact, one can only speak of diverging 'theologies', in plural. And that is the case for all kinds of aspects, simply because the texts reflect the work of different authors from different times, and redactors having reworked them time after time. One example makes it clear: what would be 'the' marriage in 'the' Hebrew Bible?[93] There is monogamy and polygamy, there is exogamy and endogamy, all depending on which books/pericopes one reads. And moreover, wouldn't it be a rather 'fundamentalistic' aim to posit one single truth once and for all. Maybe this kind of 'absolute' truth is simply not possible.

90. See Tov, "Die Septuaginta in ihrem theologischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Verhältnis," 239: "Es gibt keine 'Theologie' der ganzen LXX". See equally T. McLay, "Why Not a Theology of the Septuagint?" in: W. Kraus / M. Karrer / M. Meiser, *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse* (WUNT 252), Tübingen 2010, 607-20, esp. 618: "The idea of 'a theology' normally suggests a structured and comprehensive description, but the reality is that no theology for such a large corpus of books can be comprehensive."

91. Sollamo, "Translation Technique," 41: "Theology needs to be demonstrated, not presupposed." See already J. Cook, "The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis" in: C. E. Cox (ed.), VI *Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986* (SBL SCS 23), Atlanta, GA 1987, 91-125, esp. 103: "LXX should be analysed ad hoc. One needs to analyse the Greek Version in close conjunction with MT and with the other Versions in order to determine possible exegetical approaches".

92. See equally C. Ziegert, *Diaspora als Wüstenzeit. Übersetzungswissenschaftliche und theologische Aspekte des griechischen Numeribuches* (BZAW 480), Berlin 2015, 79: "Die beste Lösung scheint zu sein, statt von der 'Theologie des griechischen Numeribuches' oder der Theologie des Numeri-Übersetzers etwas bescheidener von der *theologischen Tendenz* des Numeri-Übersetzers zu sprechen."

93. See H. Ausloos / B. Lemmelijn, "'Man en vrouw schiep Hij hen' (Gn 1,27): Het bijbelse concept van het huwelijk en zijn receptie in de conciliaire documenten van Vaticanum II" in: L. Leijssen / R. Burggraeve / K. Dobbelaere / M. Cloet (eds.), *Levensrituelen: Relatie en huwelijk*, Leuven 2000, 164-178, esp. 164-174.

II. Der eine Gott und sein Verständnis

Pentateuch

Emanuel Tov

1. Background

When the Greek translator of Genesis embarked on his translation he had to locate equivalents for all the words in that book, a challenging task at the beginning of the 3rd century BCE. We can still find signs of his trial and error procedure, especially in the first eleven chapters of Gen.[1] Many of the translation equivalents were exegetical, some theological, and in connection with these one wonders whether the most theological of all nouns in the LXX, namely the divine names, were given theological equivalents in the target language.

Theological exegesis of the LXX may be defined as elements added to or sometimes omitted from the source text by the translator. Most exegetical elements are reflected in the lexical choices, which were influenced by the immediate context and the conceptual world of the translators.

2. Equivalents of divine names in the Pentateuch

2.1. אלהים (ʾᵃlohîm)

The first divine name met by the translator was the plural noun אלהים (Gen 1:1), which is best translated into English as the singular 'God'. This word has been rendered by θεός, which has become the standard equivalent of אלהים, אל (ʾel) and אלה (ʾᵃloᵃh) in the LXX. This equivalence is based on the understanding that the Greek word for 'deity' represents the Hebrew word for 'God' in the best way possible, there not being a better Greek equivalent. While the etymological meaning of the two words may be different, the depiction of θεός in the LXX closely follows that of אלהים in the Hebrew Bible and therefore may differ from its depiction in classical Greek sources. In my view, this is a linguistic equation, and does not represent a theological choice. One therefore needs to be somewhat skeptical of generalizing statements such as that of Dodd "… it is not an exact equivalent (…) Thus, the substitution of θεός for אלהים necessarily involves some readjustment of thought".[2] Thoughts of this kind should not be ascribed to the Greek translators even though it is inevitable that they developed in later generations.

---

1. See my study "The Septuagint Translation of Genesis as the First Scripture Translation" in: K. De Troyer / T. M. Law / M. Liljeström (eds.), *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (CBET 72), Leuven 2013, 47-64.
2. C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, London 1935, 7.

Thus, Philo made a distinction between the creative and benevolent aspects of the deity expressed by θεός and the dominating and punishing elements of κύριος.[3]

Because of the overlap between the LXX and MT this lexical choice is not of major importance, but the exceptions to this equivalence are exegetically significant.

1. One area of unusual equivalents pertains to those cases in which אלהים does not represent the God of Israel, but god(s) in general, the god of another nation, or an 'idol'. In these cases, the translators of the Pentateuch were usually *not* sensitive to the use of θεός as representing both the God of Israel and the god(s) of another nation (twenty times in the plural between Exod 12:12 and 34:17). Likewise, the translator of Gen 31:30, 32; 35:2, 4 rendered אלהים (idols) with θεοί. The translator of Lev 19:4 had no problem in presenting אלהי מסכה ("molten gods" NJPS) with θεοὺς χωνευτούς (adjacent to אלילים [ʾæ̆lîlîm] "idols"). The words "man-made gods of wood and stone" in Deut 4:28 were rendered by θεοί, and the words "other gods" were rendered *passim* in Deuteronomy by θεοὶ ἕτεροι (e. g. 5:7; 6:14).

2. Where the plural form of אלהים may be taken as a sign of polytheism, it has invariably been rendered as θεοί, apparently without suspecting such polytheistic nuances: Gen 3:5 "like divine beings who know good and bad" (NJPS) is such a case, while other ones occur in the post-Pentateuchal books.[4] Further, in Exod 22:27 אלהים לא תקלל – θεοὺς οὐ κακολογήσεις *could* refer to 'gods' rather than 'God', possibly reflecting an openness to a pluralistic society, but more likely this rendering represents an internal translational harmonizing since also the parallel נשיא is rendered by a plural form (ἄρχοντας).

3. On the other hand, in one instance non-Israelite gods were represented by εἴ-δωλον, in Num 25:2 (and likewise in 1 Kings 11:2, 8 (7), Isa 37:19, and Dan 3:12, 18; 5:4, 23; 6:28; 14:3 [the consistent equivalents in Daniel were influenced by the phrase "golden statue" in the immediate vicinity]). This is arguably the only case of a theological rendering of אלהים in the Torah.[5]

2.2. יהוה (Jhwh)

κύριος is the standard equivalent of יהוה in all manuscripts of the LXX. The background of this equivalent is contested, and various options are open. In my view this translation represents a straightforward linguistic equation of κύριος = ʾᵃdonāy (= יהוה),[6] but such a view involves certain assumptions, and all possibilities ought to be reviewed. The following options are considered.

1. The use of κύριος ("Lord", usually unarticulated) for יהוה goes back to the approach to יהוה within Judaism and the Hebrew text tradition. Traditionally the pro-

---

3. For a discussion, see Z. Frankel, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, Leipzig 1851, 26.

4. See S. Olofsson, *God is My Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (CBOTS 31), Stockholm 1990, 93.

5. See further § 4 ("Theology?") regarding possible theological equivalents.

6. Discussing the background of the equation of יהוה and κύριος, J. A. Smith, "The Meaning of ΚΫΡΙΟΣ" *JTS* 31 (1930), 155–160, esp. 158 realizes that "[s]o far as the language of the O.T. goes I see no evidence that אדון ever meant more than κύριος, that it ever suggested a 'strict despotism'."

nunciation of that word was avoided, replaced by ʾᵃdonāy ("my Lord"), of which κύ-ριος was an exact equivalent. This equivalent is also used for the biblical divine name אדני (ʾᵃdonāy, Lord), usually articulated as ὁ κύριος and pronounced in the same way, and for the secular 'master' (e. g., Gen 39:2), articulated when needed. This explanation would make the LXX translation of the Pentateuch dating to the third pre-Christian century the earliest source evidencing the avoidance of the pronunciation of יהוה. This would be a very early date for the custom of avoiding the pronunciation of יהוה other-wise reflected at a later stage in the Talmud and the Masoretic *Qere perpetuum* ʾᵃdonāy ("my Lord"). Accordingly, it has often been doubted whether the LXX could reflect this custom at such an early date.

2. Doubting the early date of the assumed LXX pronunciation of יהוה as ʾᵃdonāy, it has often been suggested that the Masoretic *Qere perpetuum* is a later Hebrew retro-version of the LXX equivalent of יהוה, κύριος.

In this scenario, the equivalent יהוה – κύριος is not a straightforward linguistic equivalent, but it involves the theological rendering of the name of the God of Israel with a Greek noun designating the 'master of the universe'. Some scholars indeed con-sider this equivalent one of the major characteristics of the theology of the LXX trans-lators of the Pentateuch. No less a scholar than Deissmann claimed that "[t]he Bible whose God is *Yahweh* is a national Bible; the Bible whose God is κύριος is a universal Bible".[7] Major LXX scholars followed in his footsteps. This theory has the strong back-ing of Baudissin in his monumental monograph on κύριος.[8] According to Baudissin, the ancient translators wished to reflect the ancient Semitic view[9] that God was the 'ruler', and 'master', thus employing a theological equivalent. Only later was ʾᵃdonāy employed in the synagogue as a replacement of יהוה. A similar view was expressed by Dodd, who suggested that the renderings of יהוה by κύριος and of אלהים by θεός, as well as many other fixed equivalents, were determined by theological factors.[10] Dodd, as well as others, noted that the use of κύριος in the Greek LXX differed from its use in the Greek world or in the 'Greek East'. Similar views were expressed later by J. Ziegler, R. Hanhart, and M. Harl, for all of whom יהוה – κύριος represents a major building block in their creation of a Septuagint theology.[11]

---

7. A. Deissmann, *Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus* (NJA 11), Leipzig 1903, 161-177, esp. 174: "Die Bibel deren Gott *Jahveh* heißt, ist die Bibel eines Volkes; die Bibel, deren Gott κυριος heißt, ist die Weltbibel."

8. W. W. Graf von Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Reli-gionsgeschichte*, vols. 1-2, Giessen 1926-1929. For a discussion of this view, see in detail L. Cer-faux, "Le nom divin «Kyrios» dans la Bible grecque" *RSPT* 20 (1931), 27-51 and R. Hanhart, "Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta-Forschung für die Theologie" *ThEx* 140 (1967), 38-64 [re-printed in: S. Jellicoe (ed.), *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (LBS), New York, NY 1974, 583-609]. Both scholars quote the views of many others.

9. See W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, New York, NY 1972, 68.

10. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, 3-24.

11. J. Ziegler, *Die Septuaginta. Erbe und Auftrag. Festvortrag gehalten beim 380. Stiftungsfest der Julius-Maximilians-Universität zu Würzburg im Kaisersaal der Residenz am 11. Mai 1962* (WUR 33), Würzburg 1962; = *Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* (MSU 10), Göttin-gen 1971, 590-614 (605-613); Hanhart, "Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta-Forschung für die Theologie," 602-608; G. Dorival / M. Harl / O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque de Septante: Du*

However, the assumed replacement of יהוה in the Masoretic tradition by ʾᵃdonāy in the wake of κύριος in the lxx is unparalleled in the relation between the Greek and Hebrew Bible and should therefore be strongly doubted. It is highly unlikely that the Masorah would adopt a reading tradition from the lxx which by then was considered a Christian text. Besides, the *Qere perpetuum* was mentioned already in the Talmud,[12] and it is equally unlikely that the rabbis would have turned to the lxx for guidance in matters relating to the pronunciation of the divine name as the lxx was never quoted in the Talmud and was strongly disliked.

3. Alternatively, it has been suggested that κύριος does not represent the first layer of the lxx translation and that the original representation of that divine name was a transliteration as of any other personal name in the lxx. This argument, suggested by Skehan, Stegemann, Tov, and Shaw, is based mainly on the evidence of the early lxx papyrus 4QpapLXXLev[b] in Lev 3:12 and 4:27 as well as additional arguments.[13] An important advantage of this view is that it is based on the earliest evidence for the Old Greek translation (evidence for early revisions of that translation is quoted below). Furthermore, this view allows for the possibility of a direct link between the replacement of יהוה by ʾᵃdonāy and the lxx tradition, not by the earliest Greek translators, but in a later layer of the lxx transmission. This development could have taken place around the turn of the era and would parallel the avoidance of the Tetragrammaton in the Qumran texts.

The Qumran Leviticus papyrus transliterated the Tetragrammaton in *Greek* characters (preceded and followed by a space), a practice that is not known from other biblical manuscripts, in which two alternative systems are known:[14]

– The writing of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters, either in the paleo-Hebrew[15] or in the square Aramaic script.[16] 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, even though this practice only entered the transmission of Greek Scriptures at a second stage.[17]

judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien, Paris 1988. All three scholars quote the views of many others.

12. See *b Talm Pesahim* 50a: "I am not read as I am written. I am written with *yod he*, but read as *aleph daleth*."

13. For bibliography, see below.

14. For a detailed analysis, see H. Stegemann, ΚΥΡΙΟΣ Ο ΘΕΟΣ *und* ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ: *Aufkommen und Ausbreitung des religiösen Gebrauchs von* ΚΥΡΙΟΣ *und seine Verwendung im Neuen Testament*, Bonn 1969, 110-133; 194-228.

15. The Aquila fragments of Kings and Psalms of the 5th-6th century ce published by F. C. Burkitt (1897) and C. Taylor (1900); the Psalms fragments of Symmachus of the 3rd–4th century ce published, among others, by G. Mercati, "Frammenti di Aquila o di Simmaco" *RBNS* 8 (1911), 266-272; P. Oxy. 1007 of Genesis (3rd century ce; double *yod*); P. Oxy. 3522 of Job (1st century ce); and both scribes of 8HevXII gr (1st century bce).

16. P. Fouad 266b (848) of Deuteronomy (the first scribe left spaces filled in with the Tetragrammaton by a later scribe) and the Psalms fragments of the Hexapla published by G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae*, Vatican 1958. For a detailed analysis, see Stegemann, ΚΥΡΙΟΣ, 110-133; 194-228.

17. For an analysis, see E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54), Leiden 2004, 218-221.

– κύριος, usually without the article, especially in the nominative, and less frequently with the article.[18]

In the reconstruction of the history of the Greek versions, the writing of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters 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 (options 1 and 2 above) or ΙΑΩ (option 3). According to Pietersma, the first translators wrote κύριος, mainly without the article, considered a personal name in the Greek Torah, as "the written surrogate for the tetragram".[19] 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 Christian scribes.

On the other hand, according to Stegemann, Skehan, Tov, and Shaw, 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.[20] Skehan, provided important early parallels for the use of ΙΑΩ and similar forms representing the Tetragrammaton: Diodorus of Sicily I,29,2 (1st century BCE) records that Moses referred his laws to τὸν Ιαω ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν;[21] 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.[22] The later magical papyri likewise invoke ΙΑΩ, a fact that is much stressed by Shaw who assumes a continued line of using that title from the earliest translation onwards. In a similar vein, Stegemann gives a long list of arguments in favor of the assumption of the

---

18. Thus, all the uncial manuscripts of the LXX as well as P. Oxy. 656 of Genesis (2nd century CE); P. Chester Beatty VI (Numbers-Deuteronomy). See Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname*, vols. 1-2, Giessen 1926-1929 and Stegemann, ΚΎΡΙΟΣ, 200-202. For a discussion of the use of the article, see J. W. Wevers, "The Rendering of the Tetragram in the Psalter and Pentateuch: A Comparative Study" in: R. J. V. Hiebert / C. E. Cox / P. J. Gentry (eds.), *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (JSOT SS 332), Sheffield 2001, 21-35. According to Wevers, κύριος is unarticulated when representing יהוה but articulated when representing אדני. However, there are exceptions, and according to L. Perkins, "ΚΎΡΙΟΣ: Articulation and Non-Articulation in Greek Exodus" BIOSCS 41 (2008), 17-33 their number does not exceed that of the other personal names.

19. A. Pietersma, "Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX" in: A. Pietersma / C. E. Cox (eds.), *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Mississauga, ON 1984, 85-101, esp. 98. Pietersma's suggestion has been accepted by Wevers, "Tetragram," Perkins, "ΚΎΡΙΟΣ," and M. Rösel, "The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch" JSOT 31 (2007), 411-428, with additional arguments.

20. Stegemann, ΚΎΡΙΟΣ, 197; P. W. Skehan, "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint" BIOSCS 13 (1980), 14-44; E. Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121), Tübingen 2008, 339-364, esp. 356-357; F. E. Shaw, *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of ΙΑΩ* (CBET 70), Leuven 2014.

21. Skehan, "Divine Name," 29.

22. For full details, see Skehan, "Divine Name."

priority of the transliteration.[23] This transliteration reflects an unusual pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton to which יהו in the Elephantine papyri should be compared.

According to the above analysis, the equivalent יהוה – κύριος reflects a linguistic equation either inserted at the initial stage of the translation in the 3rd century BCE (option 1) or at a later stage replacing an original transcription ΙΑΩ (option 3). In these cases, κύριος is not a theological equivalent, although the decision to use κύριος is based on theological considerations. On the contrary, the often voiced view that the first translators chose κύριος (option 2) involves a full theological equivalent.

2.3. אדני (ʾᵃdonāy)

As expected, the translation of אדני was identical to that of יהוה since the latter's equivalent κύριος is based on a pronunciation of יהוה as ʾᵃdonāy. In the overwhelming majority of its occurrences, אדני was represented in this way in the Pentateuch, but the first two occurrences in Genesis were rendered differently, by δεσπότης. This may be a special case since the two words occur in juxtaposition: 15:2 אדני יהוה (ʾᵃdonāy + Tetragramm) – δέσποτα; 15:8 אדני יהוה – κύριε δέσποτα. Elsewhere this double phrase is rare in the Pentateuch: In Deut 3:24 and 9:26 it is rendered by κύριε κύριε.

2.4. צור (ṣûr)

The LXX consistently avoided a literal translation of צור ("rock") as an appellation of God, probably because a literal rendering would have created the impression of paganism. The translator of Deuteronomy, who was the first to face this issue, consistently rendered this word with θεός (God) in poetic contexts in 32:4, 15, 18 (parallels: אל and אלוה [θεός]), 30 (parallel: יהוה [κύριος]), 31, 37. The most frequent equivalents elsewhere in the LXX are: θεός (God), βοηθός (helper), φύλαξ (guardian), and ἀντιλήμπτωρ (protector).[24] All these are theological equivalents.

2.5. אהיה אשר אהיה (ʾæhjæh ʾᵃšær ʾæhjæh)

In Exod 3:13 Moses asked God which name he should use when referring to God, upon which God replies in v. 14 אהיה אשר אהיה rendered into Greek as Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν ("I am

---

23. 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.

24. For details, see Oloffson, *God is My Rock,* 35-45; A. Wiegand, "Der Gottesname צור und seine Deutung in dem Sinne Bildner oder Schöpfer in der alten jüdischen Litteratur" *ZAW* 10 (1890), 85-96; A. Passoni dell'Acqua, "La metafora biblica di Dio Roccia e la sua soppressione nelle antiche versioni" *EL* 91 (1977), 417-453.

The One Who Is").[25] In the continuation of this verse God suggests to Moses that he should say to the Israelites that ὁ ὤν (אהיה [ʼæhjæh]) has sent him. ὁ ὤν thus clearly serves as the name of God in this context. This rendering represents an etymological understanding of אהיה based on the root היה, and at the same time it presents a philosophical statement about the existence of God. Philo uses this phrase as well as the neuter τὸ ὄν ("that which is").[26]

2.6. שדי (šaddaj)

In most of its occurrences, this divine name was not recognized by the translators of the Pentateuch unlike in the later books. In most instances the word was rendered as if it were שלי ("my"), the pronominal suffix in rabbinic Hebrew, e.g. Gen 28:3 ואל שדי (wᵉʼel šaddaj) – ὁ δὲ θεός μου ("my God").[27] This rendering recurs in Gen 43:14; 48:3; 49:25 (ὁ ἐμός). Twice the translator uses the 2nd person pronominal suffix (Gen 17:1; 35:11), and once that of the 3rd person (Exod 6:3). Only the translator of Num 24:4, 16 recognized the noun שדי, rendering it as θεός.

3. Unusual translations: variants, theology, or translation technique?

The equivalents of the divine names in the LXX have often been discussed in the literature, especially since the appearance of Baudissin's monograph on κύριος, which contains a wealth of data.[28] Most of these variations pertain to deviations from the standard LXX equivalents יהוה – κύριος and אלהים – θεός. Some of the nonstandard renderings in the LXX books (that is, θεός for יהוה, and κύριος for אלהים) may have been created by the first translators, who may not have had a fixed translation vocabulary. In other instances, the deviations reflect Hebrew variants, that is LXX אלהים for MT יהוה and LXX יהוה for MT אלהים. And again in other instances the translator applied special techniques to the rendering of these nouns.

The translation vocabulary is rather stable for the divine names in the post-pentateuchal books, but less so in the Pentateuch, either because the translators had not yet settled on a translation vocabulary or because the Greek Pentateuch reflects a less stable textual picture regarding the divine names. At the same time, Genesis 1-11 presents special challenges since the LXX appears to differ frequently from the other sources. The equivalents in the LXX could be relevant to the Documentary Hypothesis, and this issue was hotly debated at the beginning of the twentieth century.

I therefore summarize all the equivalents in Genesis 1-11, and subsequently focus on the unusual ones underlined in the table:

25. For a discussion and references to earlier discussions, see S. D. GOITEIN, "YHWH the Passionate: The Monotheistic Meaning and Origin of the Name YHWH" *VT* 6 (1956), 1-9.
26. See H. A. WOLFSON, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam,* Cambridge, MA 1962, 210.
27. Thus, also DODD, *The Bible and the Greeks,* 14 ("etymological theories"). See further OLOFFSON, *God is My Rock,* 111-112.
28. BAUDISSIN, *Kyrios als Gottesname.*

Table 1. *The LXX Equivalents of the Divine Names in Genesis 1-11*

59 ×	אלהים	θεός
4 ×	אלהים	κύριος ὁ θεός
14 ×	יהוה אלהים	κύριος ὁ θεός
7 ×	יהוה אלהים	θεός
6 ×	יהוה	θεός
7 ×	יהוה	κύριος
16 ×	יהוה	κύριος ὁ θεός

When appearing alone, אלהים is rendered mainly by θεός (59 ×), but rarely also by κύριος ὁ θεός (4 ×). Further, in these chapters, the phrase יהוה אלהים is usually rendered by κύριος ὁ θεός (14 ×), but surprisingly also by θεός alone (7 × in 2:4b–3:22). With regard to אלהים, the major problem thus seems to be centered round the combination יהוה אלהים, for which no standard equivalent is visible. Thus, the alternation of the different equivalents in chapters 2 and 6 defies all explanations. The only possible clue seems to be that after a steady row of thirty-five equivalents of אלהים – θεός in the first creation story (1:1-2:3), the translator continued using this equivalent also in 2:4-7, 9, 19-21 (7 ×), in disregard of the Hebrew, יהוה אלהים. The idea behind such a harmonizing rendering[29] would be that the translator was attempting to represent the deity throughout with the same equivalent. However, in such a scenario, the translator's plan was carried out very inconsistently: sometimes he rendered the two components of this phrase with κύριος ὁ θεός, while at other times he continued to use the equivalent of 1:1-2:3, θεός.[30] While such inconsistency is not unusual in the Septuagint,[31] it is not a good basis for a theory.

The equivalents of יהוה seem to defy all explanations as in the case of אלהים. However, there seems to be a possible explanation for the renderings of יהוה אלהים in 2:4b–3:22 (7 ×) with θεός, since they continue the equivalent used in the first creation story, 1:1-2:3 (see Table 3). This harmonizing rendering, executed inconsistently, was analyzed above for אלהים.

If the rendering of יהוה with θεός in 4:1-8:20 (7 ×) reflects a similar wish to continue the use of θεός of chapter 1, this tendency was carried out equally inconsistently as the rendering of יהוה אלהים with θεός, since יהוה was also rendered often by κύριος

---

29. R. S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1-11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition,* New York, NY 1998, 35-39 likewise turns to the assumption of harmonization, but according to him this process took place in Hebrew manuscripts. He supports this assumption with five instances of an interchange of יהוה (sometimes followed by אלהים) with אלהים in Qumran scrolls in Numbers, Deuteronomy and 1 Samuel. However, evidence from books other than Genesis may not be relevant; moreover, the assumption of different Hebrew readings has not been substantiated.

30. For details see my study "The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1-11" in W. Kraus / S. Kreuzer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta: Text – Wirkung – Rezeption* (WUNT 325), Tübingen 2014, 315-332.

31. See my study "Some Reflections on Consistency in the Activity of Scribes and Translators" in: U. Dahmen / J. Schnocks (eds.), *Juda und Jerusalem in der Seleukidenzeit. Herrschaft – Widerstand – Identität: Festschrift für Heinz-Josef Fabry* (BBB 159), Göttingen 2010, 325-337.

in 4:1-9:28. Particularly intriguing is the equivalent יהוה – κύριος ὁ θεός in these chapters (14 × in 4:1-10:9) used alongside יהוה – θεός (7 ×). In these chapters, we thus witness two possible harmonizing tendencies alongside the rendering יהוה – κύριος (8 ×). The equivalent יהוה – κύριος ὁ θεός may display continuity with the text of 2:4-3:23 in which the *main* phrase used is יהוה אלהים, usually rendered by κύριος ὁ θεός. Secondly, the other equivalent used in these chapters, יהוה – θεός (7 ×), may hark back to Gen 1:1-2:4a where the equivalent אלהים – θεός (35 ×) is the only one used. Both developments would be inner-Greek, in defiance of the Hebrew.

Thus, the emerging harmonizing pattern in 2:4-3:22 is that the renderings of unit (1)

Table 2

1:1-2:3 (35 ×)	אלהים	θεός

are followed inconsistently by the LXX in unit (2):[32]

Table 3

2:4-3:22 (7 ×)	יהוה אלהים	θεός

This harmonizing tendency is more clearly visible in the next units (3:23-11:9), in which two different harmonizing renderings are used, again inconsistently, continuing the rendering of unit (1): יהוה – θεός and יהוה – κύριος ὁ θεός, with several exceptions of יהוה – κύριος (8 ×), which later became the standard LXX rendering. These harmonizing tendencies by the translator involved pluses, minuses and changes. Of these eight "exceptions" to the translation pattern of יהוה, five occur at the end of this unit (10:9b–11:9), possibly indicating that at that point a translation equivalent emerged that was to become the main LXX equivalent in the later chapters of Genesis and in the next books.[33]

It has often been suggested that the unusual equivalents of the LXX reflect Hebrew variants, possibly shedding light on the Documentary Hypothesis. In 2:4b–3:24, in particular, this suggestion is intriguing. The MT of this unit (source J) uses mainly יהוה אלהים (twenty times), but also features אלהים in verses 3:1b–5 (5 ×). If the LXX reflected a different Hebrew text, this chapter in the LXX would present a different grouping of יהוה אלהים (thirteen times) and יהוה (five + seven times). In sum, this evidence would somewhat alter the analysis of the divine names, but in my view, it is irrelevant to the Documentary Hypothesis.

The LXX renderings of the divine names in Genesis were brought to bear on the Documentary Hypothesis, especially in the beginning of the twentieth century,[34] and

32. In Gen 2:4-3:23, the majority rendering is κύριος ὁ θεός (13 times).

33. The suggestion of HENDEL, *Genesis 1-11* is not worked out in detail. In his monumental study, BAUDISSIN, *Kyrios als Gottesname*, vol. 1, 453, fn. 1, ascribes the double divine name κύριος ὁ θεός for אלהים to the translator's preference ("Liebhaberei") or textual corruption, while he assigns the double divine name κύριος ὁ θεός for יהוה to a different *Vorlage*, יהוה אלהים, to be taken into consideration in the Documentary Hypothesis.

34. See H. M. WIENER, *Pentateuchal Studies,* London 1912; idem, *Essays in Pentateuch Criticism*, London 1913, 13-41; J. SKINNER, *The Divine Names in Genesis*, London 1914; idem, *The Penta-*

in recent years by Carr,[35] but no firm suggestions have been made. One argument against the relevance of the LXX for the Documentary Hypothesis was presented by Dahse, who claimed that scores of inner-Greek variants uproot the validity of the evidence of the LXX for the Documentary Hypothesis.[36] However, most of these variants actually adapt the Old Greek to MT in manuscripts of the LXX revisions and therefore are irrelevant to the issue under investigation.[37] In my view, the LXX reflects harmonizing renderings that were carried out inconsistently (see above). The most cogent argument against the assumption of the relevance of the LXX for any literary analysis of the Hebrew Bible is that there is no visible pattern that could be used for any source-critical analysis.[38] Furthermore, the choice of equivalents for the divine names in the LXX is *not* determined by any context considerations.[39] Besides, the Documentary Hypothesis depends only partially on the distinctive use of the divine names.

4. Theology?

The possibility of the theological background of the יהוה – κύριος equivalent has been discussed above. Even if that possibility was not favorably regarded, the LXX certainly contains several theological equivalents, although in my view their number is limited in the field of the divine names. Undoubtedly the equivalent יהוה צבאות (Jhwh ṣᵉbā'ôt; the Lord of Hosts (armies) – κύριος παντοκράτωρ (the Lord who rules everything) reflects a certain view of the essence of God, and hence is theological.[40] This equivalent

teuchal Text: A Reply to Dr. Skinner, London 1914; J. B. Harford, *Since Wellhausen: A Brief Survey of Recent Pentateuchal Criticism*, London 1926; Hendel, *Genesis 1-11*, 35-39 likewise assumes that the LXX representation of the divine names reflects Hebrew variants, but he did not connect the evidence with the Documentary Hypothesis.

35. D. M. Carr, *The Formation of the Bible: A New Reconstruction*, New York, NY 2011, 106-110.

36. J. Dahse, *Textkritische Materialen zur Hexateuchfrage*, Giessen 1912, 104-121; see also idem, "Textkritische Bedenken gegen den Ausgangspunkt der heutigen Pentateuchkritik" *AR* 6 (1903), 305-319.

37. Thus already Skinner, *Divine Names*, 253-261 reacting to Dahse.

38. Table 2 shows that most of the unusual renderings are in the J section, as expected, since the rendering of אלהים is rather stable. The breakdown of the renderings in Tables 3 and 4 does not add new information, since the rearrangement of the chapters in J and P according to the Lxx makes little sense from the point of view of content. Thus, in the long J section 2:4b–4:24, if the renderings of יהוה אלהים and יהוה with θεός pointed to אלהים, possibly reflecting the P source, these chapters would be composed of patches of J and P without any discernible logic.

39. For example: 4:26 אז הוחל לקרא בשם יהוה – οὗτος ἤλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ. According to MT, God's personal name יהוה was being used from that point onwards, and it would have been appropriate had the LXX used κύριος. The use of the double name in the LXX does not seem to reflect any logic or a specific context in Gen 7:16 ויסגר יהוה בעדו כאשר צוה אתו אלהים – καθὰ ἐνετείλατο ὁ θεὸς τῷ Νωε. Καὶ ἔκλεισεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἔξωθεν αὐτοῦ τὴν κιβωτόν. The use of two different divine names does not seem to be logical, neither in the LXX nor in MT. The translator or his *Vorlage* probably harmonized the two parts of the sentence. In the translation the same θεός acted in both parts, but in the second one he is also named κύριος.

40. For a discussion, see Harl, *La Bible grecque*, 256. On the original meaning of this designation