Israel's best kings undertake military and missionary expeditions into Ephraim. Representatives of the north participate both in the worship of the Jerusalem temple, where they are accepted as brothers even when ritually unclean, as well as in reforming activities in both north and south. On one occasion northern leaders, many of whom bear Yahwistic names, respond positively to prophetic admonition and deal mercifully with Judean captives.

This does not negate the fact that it was probably the author of Chronicles who first made Jeroboam responsible for the schism between north and south,[13] nor does it suggest that the writer has wavered in his insistence upon the legitimacy of the Davidic monarchy and the Levitical priesthood, as he has expressed it most strongly in Abijah's discourse (2 Chronicles 13). But it should mean that the invitation extended to the north by Hezekiah has likewise not been revoked, and if these estranged brothers will return, they will be accepted both by a merciful God and their southern kinsmen.

That such a message would be relevant to the north (and south!) at almost any time during the post exilic period is unfortunately true. Too, there may always have been differing positions within the community regarding foreigners, including the north, as Jonah and Ruth would suggest. But that the same writer who showed such openness toward the north could also have written such passages as Ezra 4:1-4 and Neh 10:28-31 I find difficult to accept. Assuming that Judah's position toward her neighbors became more severe as years passed, it would also suggest that Chronicles ought to be dated earlier rather than later than those passages.[14]

[13] Roddy L. Braun, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles, *JBL* 92 (1973) 503-16, esp. p. 512.

[14] Among works appearing too late to be considered in this article and contributing to the discussion of the unity and date of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah should now be listed the perceptive work of S. Talmon, "Ezra and Nehemiah," *IDBS* (1976) 317-28; D. N. Freedman, "Son of Man, Can These Bones Live," *Int* 29 (1975) 171-84, esp. pp. 182-84; R. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (HSM 12; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976).

JBL 96/1 (1977) 63-83

THE TETRAGRAM AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

GEORGE HOWARD
THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA 30602

RECENT discoveries in Egypt and the Judean Desert allow us to see first hand the use of God's name in pre-Christian times. These discoveries are significant for NT studies in that they form a literary analogy with the earliest Christian documents and may explain how NT authors used the divine name. In the following pages we will set forth a theory that the divine name, יהוה (and possibly abbreviations of it), was originally written in the NT quotations of and allusions to the OT and that in the course of time it was replaced mainly with the surrogate $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$. This removal of the Tetragram, in our view, created a confusion in the minds of early Gentile Christians about the relationship between the "Lord God" and the "Lord Christ" which is reflected in the MS tradition of the NT text itself. In order to support this theory we will describe the relevant pre-Christian and post-NT evidence for use of the divine name in written documents[1] and explore its implications for the NT.

I

(1) *Pre-Christian Greek MSS of the OT.* In 1936 C. H. Roberts published fragments of a papyrus MS in the John Rylands Library, P. Ryl. Gk. 458, containing in Greek portions of Deuteronomy 23–28.[2] He dated the MS to the middle of the second century B.C. Unfortunately, none of the *nomina sacra* are extant in the fragments. However, for a lacuna at Deut 26:18, where the word κύριος appears in the Christian codices of the LXX, Roberts conjectured, on the basis of the number of letters required to fill out the line, that the word κύριος originally stood written out in full, not abbreviated as $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$. Paul Kahle later suggested to him that the word κύριος did not occur here but rather the Hebrew Tetragram, יהוה. He based his reasoning on other pre-Christian copies of the Greek Bible where the Tetragram is preserved. When he drew Roberts' attention to this, Roberts agreed with him.[3]

Another specimen of the pre-Christian Greek Bible is P. Fuad 266, containing fragments of Genesis 7 and 38 and extensive portions of Deuteronomy 17-33. It dates to the first or second century B.C.[4] In 1944 W. G.

[1] In order to avoid any confusion, it should be stated at the beginning that we are dealing primarily with the divine name as it was actually *written* in ancient documents, not with what word or words a reader pronounced when he came across the divine name in a document. What was pronounced is a different matter and, though of consequence in another context, it will be mentioned only briefly in the following discussion.

[2] *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester* (Manchester: University Press, 1936).

[3] "Problems of the Septuagint," *Studia patristica* I (TU 63; Berlin: Akademie, 1957) 328-30.

[4] H. C. Youtie dates it to 75-25 B.C. See W. F. Albright, "On the Date of the Scrolls from ʿAin Feshkha and the Nash Papyrus," *BASOR* 115 (1949) 10-19, esp. 18-19.

Waddell published a fragment of this MS covering Deut 31:28–32:7.[5] In 1950 photographs of 12 fragments of the MS appeared in print, though in a poor reproduction.[6] In 1966 a transcription of the entire MS was produced by Françoise Dunand in *Etudes de Papyrologie* 9; but for some reason it was never actually published, in spite of the fact that a few copies were circulated among libraries and scholars. That same year, however, Dunand published a lengthy discussion of the papyrus.[7] The MS is significant in that, instead of using κύριος which in the Christian codices of LXX stands for the divine name, יהוה, it writes the Tetragram in Aramaic letters within the Greek text itself.

In 1952 fragments of a scroll of the Twelve Prophets in Greek were found in a cave in Naḥal Ḥever in the Judean Desert. The first announcement, along with a brief analysis of the fragments, came from D. Barthélemy in 1953.[8] Ten years later he published most of the fragments with a full analysis of the text and the place that it holds in the transmission history of the LXX[9]. According to him the text belongs to a *Kaige*, recension portions of which appear elsewhere in the Greek Bible.[10] Barthélemy dated the scroll toward the end of the first century A.D.[11] But C. H. Roberts has preferred an earlier date, ascribing it to the century 50 B.C.-A.D. 50.[12] Sometime around the beginning of the first Christian century is probably correct.[13] The MS is distinguished for its closeness to MT against the Christian MSS of the LXX and for its preservation of the Tetragram where the Christian codices employ the word κύριος. It differs from P. Fuad 266 in that it writes the Tetragram not in Aramaic letters, but in paleo-Hebrew letters.

[5] "The Tetragrammaton in the LXX," *JTS* 45 (1944) 158-61.

[6] *New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures* (Brooklyn: Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, 1950) 13-14. A transcription of nine of these fragments may now be found in G. Howard, "The Oldest Greek Text of Deuteronomy," *HUCA* 42 (1971) 125-31.

[7] *Papyrus grecs bibliques (Papyrus F. Inv. 266) Volumina de la Genèse et du Deutéronome* (Le Caire: L'institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1966). Professor J. W. Wevers of Toronto has informed me that a new edition of the papyrus is now in preparation.

[8] "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," *RB* 60 (1953) 18-29.

[9] *Les devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

[10] The Kaige recension has attracted wide attention among OT textual critics. Among the vast literature on it, the reader is referred to the following: Reviews of Barthélemy, *Devanciers d'Aquila* by S. Jellicoe, *JAOS* 84 (1964) 178-82, and by R. A. Kraft, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 474-83. P. Kahle, "A Leather Scroll of the Greek Minor Prophets and the Problem of the Septuagint," *Opera Minora* (Leiden: Brill, 1956) 113-27 [first published in German, *TLZ* 79 (1954) 81-94]; P. Katz, "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll," *Studia patristica I*, 343-53; S. P. Brock, "Lucian *redivivus:* Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," *SE* V (TU 103; Berlin: Akademie, 1968) 176-81; F. M. Cross, Jr., "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964) 281-99; "The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," *IEJ* 16 (1966) 81-95; "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," *1972 Proceedings IOSCS Pseudepigrapha* (ed. R. A. Kraft; SBL SCS 2; Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972) 108-26.

[11] "Redécouverte," 19.

[12] See P. Kahle, *Opera Minora*, 113.

[13] Cf. F. M. Cross, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," 115.

In 1962 B. Lifshitz published nine fragments of a Greek scroll which he believed to belong to Barthélemy's MS.[14] According to Lifshitz's reconstructions they include: (1) Hos 2:8; (2) Amos 1:5; (3) Joel 1:14; (4) Jonah 3:2-5; (5) Nah 1:9; (6) Nah 2:8-9; (7) Zech 3:1-2; (8) Zech 4:8-9; (9) Zech 8:21. Barthélemy accepted the fragments as belonging to his scroll but he did not agree with all of Lifshitz's identifications.[15] In our judgment Lifshitz's identifications fit quite well with our LXX MSS with only few alterations in the direction of MT. If Lifshitz is correct, some of these fragments must not come from Barthélemy's scroll, but from another MS of the Twelve Prophets in Greek, since Lifshitz's fragments overlap twice with the fragments published by Barthélemy: viz., Nah 2:8 and Zech 8:21. Furthermore, if Lifshitz's restorations are correct, the text represented by his fragments differs in character from Barthélemy's in that the word θεός appears at least once (Zech 4:9) and possibly twice (Joel 1:14), where the MT has the Tetragram. In Jonah 3:3, on the other hand, it preserves the Tetragram in a similar fashion to Barthélemy's scroll. The one (or two) place(s) where θεός appears instead of יהוה possibly represents a textual variation to the MT. If this is the case, θεός must not be considered a substitute for the Tetragram. However, it is possible that this MS represents a later transitional period in which the Tetragram was being replaced by θεός. The date of these fragments, therefore, may need reevaluating in the light of this.

From the Qumran caves we now have at least five fragments of the Greek Bible. In 1957 P. W. Skehan discussed and partially published three Greek fragments from cave 4:[16] (1) 4QLXXNum (= Num 3:30-4:14); (2) 4QLXXLev^a (= Lev 26:2-16); and (3) 4QLXXLev^b (= fragments of chaps. 2–5). Skehan dates 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev^b to the first century B.C. and 4QLXXLev^a to the first century A.D. Only in 4QLXXLev^b does the divine name appear, and this twice in the form of ΙΑΩ not κύριος. Skehan says that "this new evidence strongly suggests that the usage in question goes back for some books at least to the beginnings of the Septuagint rendering, and antedates such devices as that in the Fuad papyrus or the special scripts in the more recent Hebrew manuscripts of Qumran and in later Greek witnesses."[17]

Two other fragments of the Greek Bible come from Qumran cave 7.[18] They include parts of Exod 28:4-7 and the Letter of Jeremiah 43–44. Both date ca. 100 B.C. The divine name appears in neither.

From these findings we can now say with almost absolute certainty that the divine name, יהוה, was not rendered by κύριος in the pre-Christian Greek Bible, as so often has been thought. Usually the Tetragram was written out in Aramaic or in paleo-Hebrew letters or was transliterated into Greek letters.[19]

[14] "The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror," *IEJ* 12 (1962) 201-7.

[15] *Devanciers d'Aquila*, 168 n. 9.

[16] "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism," *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957) 148-60.

[17] Ibid., 157. For ΙΑΩ used elsewhere, see A. Lukyn Williams, "The Tetragrammaton — Jahweh, Name or Surrogate?" *ZAW* 54 (1936) 266.

[18] See DJD, 3. 142-43.

[19] For an excellent survey, with bibliography, of the evidence of the non-Christian Jewish

At a later time, about which we will have more to say soon, surrogates replaced the Tetragram. The first surrogates, as we will see, were θεός and κύριος.

(2) *Hebrew and Aramaic Documents from the Judean Desert.* In the Qumran Scrolls the divine name, יהוה, is written either in Aramaic characters as it appears, for example, in the great Isaiah scroll (1QIsa[a]), or in paleo-Hebrew script, as it appears, for example, in the Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab).[20] The word for God, אל, also appears occasionally in paleo-Hebrew script in the scrolls[21] as well as occasionally אדוני, צבאות, and אלוהים.[22] This must signify a special sanctity for these words as well in the minds of various Qumran scribes.[23]

The normal procedure for the Qumran scribe was to write the Tetragram freely while copying biblical MSS. But in biblical commentaries such as 1QpHab, 1QpZeph, etc., where there is a biblical quotation or *lemma* followed by a commentary, the scribe wrote the Tetragram in the quotation only,[24] but in the commentary he would write the word אל. Two examples from the Habakkuk Commentary will illustrate this significant point.

1QpHab 10:6-7 (= Hab 2:13)

Quotation:	
Behold, it is not from *YHWH*	הלוא הנה מעם יהוה
of hosts the people have	צבאות יגעו עמים
labored for fire.	בדי אש
Commentary (10:9-13):	
The interpretation of the	פשר הדבר . . .
matter . . . they will come into	יבואו למשפטי
the judgments of fire those	אש אשר
who reviled and defied the chosen	נדפו ויחרפו את בחירי
ones of *God.*	אל

Greek Bible, see J. A. Fitzmyer, "Der semitische Hintergrund des neutestamentlichen Kyriostitels," in *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie: Neutestamentliche Festschrist für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. Georg Strecker; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1975) 267-98, especially pp. 282-85.

[20] For photos of both, see Millar Burrows (with the assistance of J. C. Trever and W. H. Brownlee), *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery: Volume I. The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven: ASOR, 1950). There are, of course, some entire MSS from Qumran written in the paleo-Hebrew script. See F. M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumrān* (revised ed.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1961) 43; "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times," *HTR* 59 (1966) 210. According to Cross, only scrolls of the Palestinian textual family are in this script.

[21] 1Q*14*, *27*; 4Q*180*, *183*, etc.

[22] P. W. Skehan, "The Text of Isaias at Qumran," *CBQ* 17 (1955) 42-43.

[23] J. P. Siegel ("The Employment of Palaeo-Hebrew Characters for the Divine Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaitic Sources," *HUCA* 42 [1971] 159-72) says that the divine name, *Yhwh*, was written in paleo-Hebrew letters in order to secure it against erasures and thus to secure its permanence.

[24] There are, of course, some variations: e.g., 11QMelch. In the quotation of Ps 7:8-9 (line 11) אל is written where the MT has יהוה. See J. A. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *JBL* 86 (1967) 25-41, esp. pp. 27, 37.

1QpHab 11:10 (= Hab 2:16)

Quotation:	
The cup of the right hand	תסוב עליכה
of *YHWH* will surround you	כוס ימין יהוה
Commentary (11:12-15):	
Its interpretation . . . and the cup	פשרו . . . וכוס
of the wrath of [*G*]*od* will	חמת [א]ל
confound him.	תבלענו

A similar avoidance of the Tetragram in non-biblical material extends to the sectarian documents used by the Qumran sect, such as the Community Rule (1QS) and the Damascus Rule (CD). The Damascus Rule has been known for some time since copies of it were found in the Cairo Geniza.[25] A point of interest in it is that while all our copies of it avoid the Tetragram, the fragments found at Qumran contain the word אל twice written in paleo-Hebrew script and once in ordinary script.[26] Moreover, it seems to place the word אדני on a par with אל in sanctity in at least one place: "Swear not either by the Aleph and Lamedh or by the Aleph and the Daleth" (CD 15:1).

In the Community Rule there are two major points of interest: (1) In its quotation of Isa 40:3, found at 8:14, the scribe substituted four dots for the Tetragram. The passage reads:

As it is written, 'Prepare	כאשר כתוב במדבר
in the wilderness the way of	פנו דרך . . . .
make straight in the desert	ישרו בערבה
a path for our God.'	מסלה לאלוהינו

The same quotation appears in 4QTanḥūmîm (4Q*176*) with four dots again representing *Yhwh*. The four dots as a substitute for the divine name occur several more times in these fragments.[27] Dots occur also in 1QIsa[a] at 40:7. The words in MT, כי רוח יהוה נשבה בו, were omitted by the original scribe and were later written above the line with four dots used as a surrogate for the divine name: כי רוח . . . . נשבה בוא. In 1QIsa[a] 3:17 אדוני appears in the text with five dots below it and with יהוה written above it. In v. 18 יהוה appears in the text with four dots below it and with אדוני written above it. In 42:6 יהוה (which appears in MT) is omitted, and five dots are placed above the next word.[28] (2)

[25] For editions, see C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954); L. Rost, *Die Damaskusschrift* (KIT 167; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933). Photographs of the Geniza fragments may be found in Solomon Zeitlin, *The Zadokite Fragments: Facsimile of the Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection in the Possession of the University Library, Cambridge, England* (JQR MS 1: Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1952).

[26] See the photographs and discussion of these fragments in M. Baillet, "Fragments du Document de Damas: Qumrân, Grotte 6," *RB* 63 (1956) 513-23, pl. II. Cf. DJD, 3. 128-31.

[27] DJD, 5. 60-63, pls. xxii-xxiii. The dots also appear in 4QTestim (4Q*175*), DJD, 5. 57-58, pl. xxi.

[28] See M. Burrows, "Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript," *BASOR* 113 (1949) 24-32. esp. p. 31. J. P. Siegel points out that twice in 11QPs[a] (16:7 and 21:2 [MT Ps 145:1; 138:1]) the

The second point of interest in the Community Rule is found at 8:13, where the writer introduces the quotation of Isa 40:3. He uses the elongated pronoun הוֹאהא to represent God. The text reads:

To go into the wilderness	ללכת למדבר
to prepare there	לפנות שם
the way of Him.	את דרך הוֹאהא

Some interpreters think that the pronoun is a surrogate for the Tetragram.[29] But it seems more likely that the elongated pronoun refers to God[30] and is possibly an abbreviation for הוא האלהים, "He is God."[31] If this is the case, the pronoun is probably under the influence of the fully written phrase הוא האלהים found in Isa 45:18 (הואה האלהים in 1QIsa[a]; cf. 1 Kgs 18:39).

The Tetragram appears occasionally in non-biblical passages in the Qumran scrolls; but these are rare and they usually have a biblical ring to them.[32] It also occurs in the biblical paraphrases, of which we have so many from Cave 4.[33]

Of particular note is the case of Ben Sira. This document has been known mainly in its versions especially in Greek. But in 1896 Solomon Schechter identified a small section of it among the Hebrew material from the Cairo Geniza. There are today portions of five Hebrew copies of this document from the Geniza, designated as MSS A, B, C, D, E.[34] They date from somewhere anterior to the twelfth century A.D. In addition to these portions of the document there are now two minor fragments of the Hebrew Ben Sira among the findings of Qumran Cave 2. These are dated to the second half of the first century B.C.[35] There is also a good part of 51:13-30 preserved among the contents of the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 of Qumran.[36]

But the real breakthrough for the Hebrew text came with the discovery of

Tetragram in paleo-Hebrew script was written superfluously and dots above and below were used as a device to cancel the name from reading without having to erase it from existence ("Palaeo-Hebrew Characters," 162).

[29] E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964) 31, 281 n. 66; W. H. Brownlee, "Further Light on Habakkuk," *BASOR* 114 (1949) 10. See also A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966) 222.

[30] See P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline Translated and Annotated with Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 129.

[31] This suggestion is also found in W. H. Brownlee, "Further Light on Habakkuk," 10; and A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran*, 222. It is possible that דרכי in 1QS 9:20 is also a reference to "His (God's) way," rather than to "his (man's) way." See S. V. McCasland, "'The Way,'" *JBL* 77 (1958) 224-26.

[32] 4Q*185* 2:3 (DJD, 5. 85); 2Q*22* 1 (DJD, 3. 81); 8Q5 2:3 (DJD, 3. 162).

[33] Thus 4Q*158* 1-2:15, 16, 18 (DJD, 5. 1); 4Q*185* 2:3 (DJD, 5. 85). It appears in a *florilegium*, 4Q*174* 21 (DJD, 5. 57).

[34] For accounts, see I. Lévi, *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus* (Leiden: Brill, 1904) v-xiii; Y. Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965) 5-11.

[35] DJD, 3. 75-77.

[36] DJD, 4. 42-43, 79-85. For a discussion, see I. Rabinowitz, "The Qumran Hebrew Original of Ben Sira's Concluding Acrostic on Wisdom," *HUCA* 42 (1971) 173-84.

the Ben Sira Scroll from Masada.[37] It dates to ca. 100-75 B.C. and thus lies within approximately one century of its original composition. It comprises sections of chaps. 39–44 and so overlaps only with MS B of the Cairo Geniza fragments. According to Y. Yadin, the Masada scroll confirms that MS B from the Cairo Geniza, along with its marginal glosses, basically represents the original Hebrew.[38]

A comparison of the Masada scroll with MS B in regard to the divine name is fascinating. The Geniza MS frequently uses the Tetragram in the form of a triple *Yodh* (יי); the Masada scroll never uses the Tetragram at all. In 42:16 and 43:5, where the triple *Yodh* appears in MS B, the Masada scroll writes אדני. In 42:15 and 17 MS B uses אלהים, where the Masada scroll has אדני, and 43:10 MS B has the word אל, where the Masada scroll has אדני. A most curious instance is at 42:17, where MS B reads יי נפלאות and the Masada scroll reads נפלאתיו. This resembles the earlier instance where the pronoun הוֹאהא in 1QS 8:13 is a possible abbreviation for הוא האלהים, except that in this instance the pronominal suffix (ו) appears to be a surrogate for the Tetragram.

It is not clear how one ought to interpret particularly 42:16 and 43:5. It hardly seems likely that the original Ben Sira read אדני and that this was replaced in later times with the Tetragram. The most probable explanation is that the late Geniza MS B, in these instances, represents the original text and that the Masada scroll represents an early attempt to replace the Tetragram with אדני.

Just when אדני first was read where the divine name occurs in the Hebrew Bible is not known. In 1949 Millar Burrows suggested that the numerous corrections in 1QIsa[a] of יהוה with אדני and vice versa point to the conclusion that the Qumran MS "was written from dictation, that the reader probably read אדני wherever the Tetragram occurred in his copy, and that the scribe wrote either יהוה or אדני whichever first occurred to him in each instance. The notations above the line were doubtless added later, following either the same or another copy."[39] If this is the case, we can date the oral pronouncement of אדני, whenever יהוה occurred in the text, to at least the third century B.C.

That the Tetragram was surrogated with Aramaic מרא in pre-Christian times is demonstrable from findings at Qumran. However, this form of substitution is rare. There are six passages where יהוה occurs in MT which are translated in 11QtgJob.[40] In all six instances the targum reads אלהא: Job 40:6;

[37] For an account of the find along with photographs, transcriptions and notes on the scroll see Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada*.

[38] Ibid., 7.

[39] M. Burrows, "Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript," 31. See also S. T. Byington, "יהוה and אדני," *JBL* 76 (1957) 58-59. He concludes: "Some passages indicate that יהוה was pronounced אדני at the time and place of the writing of 1QIsa[a]; no passage indicates the contrary." Cf. the comment of J. A. Sanders, DJD, 5. 6. Speaking of the Tetragram, he says: "It may be omitted where MT has it (e.g. iii 6); it may be replaced by אדני (e.g. vi 1) or by אלהים (e.g. xxiii 14), or it may appear in the scroll where no other witness has it (xvi 7 and xxi 2, both with scribal dots). But wherever it occurs it is in the ancient script."

[40] The definitive publication of the targum with introduction and notes: J. P. M. van der Ploeg and A. S. van der Woude (in collaboration with B. Jongeling), *Le targum de Job de la grotte xi de Qumrân* (Leiden: Brill, 1971).

42:1, 9 (twice), 10, 11. The LXX, in these instances, invariably reads some form of *κύριος*, except for 42:9 (second instance), where it lacks a correspondent to the divine name. The word מרא occurs twice in 11QtgJob (34:10, 12 [the former is a conjecture]), where the MT reads שדי and the LXX reads a form of *παντοκράτωρ*. The appearance of מרא, used in a non-suffixal state, is in itself of interest in regard to the Palestinian Aramaic background it provides for the absolute use of *κύριος* in the NT.[41] But מרא never appears as a surrogate for the Tetragram in the existing fragments of the targum.

In the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen) the case is slightly different.[42] In Gen 13:4 where the MT reads יהוה (LXX *κυρίου*) 1QapGen (21:2) reads מרה עלמיא, "Lord of the ages. This is offset by several other instances where the Tetragram is rendered differently. In Gen 13:14 and 15:1 the Tetragram of the MT (LXX *ὁ θεός* / *κυρίου*) appears in the paraphrase of 1QapGen as אלהא (21:8; 22:27). In Gen 15:2 the phrase אדני יהוה in the MT (LXX *Δέσποτα*) appears in the paraphrase of 1QapGen as מרי אלהא (22:32). In Gen 14:22 יהוה אל עליון of the MT (LXX *τὸν θεὸν τὸν ὕψιστον*) is read simply as אל עליון by 1QapGen (22:21). However, in this instance 1QapGen may reflect an ancient form of the text in which יהוה did not occur with אל עליון.[43] In Gen 13:18, where יהוה appears in the MT (LXX *κυρίῳ*), אל עליון occurs in the corresponding paraphrase of 1QapGen (21:20). In Gen 15:4, where דבר יהוה appears in the MT (LXX *φωνὴ κυρίου*), אמר occurs in the corresponding paraphrase of 1QapGen (22:34). Thus in seven passages where the Tetragram appears in MT and where the text overlaps with the fragments of 1QapGen, יהוה is represented by מרה once, אלהא three times, אל עליון once, and by an understood pronoun once. In the one remaining occurrence 1QapGen may not have a corresponding word.

(3) *Philo.* When we come to Philo, the use of *κύριος* for the Tetragram is frequent. This is true both in regard to the biblical quotations, where most MSS of Philo follow a basic Septuagintal text, and in the exposition, where the word *κύριος* is regularly used in reference to God. There are also many examples where Philo uses the word *θεός*.

However, some qualification is necessary at this point since Philo has been preserved only by Christians. It is quite possible that the Philonic MSS

[41] For a discussion, see J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *NTS* 20 (1973-74) 382-407. From the time of G. Dalman it has been popular to deny the absolute use of מרא as customary Palestinian usage. See *The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1902) 326. As is well known, W. Bousset used this argument to oppose the notion that the absolute forms, *ὁ κύριος* / *κύριε*, in the gospel literature went back to an Aramaic original. See *Kyrios Christos* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970) 126-27.

[42] For the text with an introduction and notes, see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1966). Fitzmyer accepts a date of the last half of the first century B.C. or the first half of the first century A.D. (p. 13). For an earlier preliminary publication (actually the *editio princeps*), see N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea: Description and Contents of the Scroll, Facsimiles, Transcription and Translation of Columns II, XIX-XXII* Jerusalem: Magnes Press of the Hebrew University and Heikhal Ha-Sefer, 1956).

[43] See J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Genesis Apocryphon," *CBQ* 22 (1960) 291.

underwent a change in regard to the divine name along with those of the Christian LXX, as we will later point out. In fact there is very good reason to argue that this is the case. In 1950 W. P. M. Walters, better known as Peter Katz, published a book[44] in which he argued that in some Philonic MSS the *lemmata* of Philo's treatises were omitted in the course of transmission, only to be reinserted at a later stage. The reinserted quotations were sometimes placed in the wrong position, sometimes made longer than the original citation, and sometimes given a different form. Walters' conclusion, based on his comparison of the *lemmata* and the OT text reflected in Philo's exposition, is that Philo's Bible was basically that of the LXX. In spite of the fact that there are some problems connected with Walters' work,[45] he is right in observing that the Philonic MS tradition reflects a certain amount of scribal alteration. The fact that most Philonic MSS preserve the Septuagintal reading of *κύριος* for the divine name, therefore, should cause us hesitation in accepting his quotations as they now stand since we know that LXX MSS in his day generally preserved the Tetragram, not surrogates of it.

As for Philo's exposition, alterations may not have been as plentiful as those within the quotations. However, it too received some modification, as the MS tradition shows.[46] In spite of this, however, his weaving together of biblical quotation and exposition at times leaves hardly any doubt that Philo was perfectly capable of using *κύριος* as a surrogate for the Tetragram within his exposition.[47] It may be then that our earliest witness to this particular Greek substitute for the divine name in an expositional reference is Philo.[48]

Before entering the post-NT era, a brief summary of the data gathered thus far should be helpful.

(1) In pre-Christian Greek MSS of the OT, the divine name normally appears not in the form of *κύριος*, as it does in the great Christian codices of the LXX known today, but either in the form of the Hebrew Tetragram (written in Aramaic or paleo-Hebrew letters) or in the transliterated form of ΙΑΩ.

(2) In the Hebrew documents from the Judean Desert the Tetragram appears in copies of the Bible, in quotations of the Bible, and in biblical-type passages such as *florilegia* and biblical paraphrases. Occasionally, it appears in non-biblical material; but this is not often and the material is Bible-like in nature. In the Aramaic documents of 11QtgJob and 1QapGen the Tetragram never appears. In the targum it is surrogated by אלהא. In 1QapGen it is surrogated by אלהא three times, אל עליון once, and מרה once.

(3) The most commonly used word for God in the non-biblical Hebrew

[44] Peter Katz, *Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and Its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible* (Cambridge: University Press, 1950).

[45] See G. Howard, "The 'Aberrant' Text of Philo's Quotations Reconsidered," *HUCA* 44 (1973) 197-209.

[46] The variants are carefully recorded in the edition of L. Cohn and P. Wendland (eds.), *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt* (6 vols.; Berlin: G. Reimer, 1896-1915). The two index volumes are by J. Leisegang (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1926-1930).

[47] See esp. *De mut. nom.* 18-24.

[48] On this point, see Siegfried Schulz, "Maranatha und Kyrios Jesus," *ZNW* 53 (1962) 124-

documents from the Judean Desert is אל (or אלהים). In the Qumran commentaries the Tetragram regularly appears in the *lemma*-quotations from Scripture; in the following commentary on the text the word אל is used as a secondary reference to God.

(4) There is some evidence from the Hebrew documents from the Judean Desert that the word אדני was pronounced where the Tetragram appeared in the biblical text. This is possibly demonstrated by the corrections in 1QIsa^a. In a comparison of the Ben Sira scroll from Masada with MS B from the Cairo Geniza it appears that אדני was even used as a written surrogate for the Tetragram in copying non-biblical literature that originally employed it.

(5) There are two unusual abbreviations for God's name that appear in the scrolls from the Judean Desert: one is the use of four or five dots; the other is the use of the Hebrew pronoun הוא (in 1QS 8:13 in the elongated form of הואהא) or the masculine suffix, ו. It is possible that the pronoun was used both in reference to the Tetragram (cf. Ben Sira 42:17 in the Masada scroll and in MS B from the Cairo Geniza) and as an abbreviation for the phrase הוא האלהים.

(6) Although it is improbable that Philo varied from the custom of writing the Tetragram when quoting from Scripture, it is likely that he used the word κύριος when making a secondary reference to the divine name in his exposition.

Perhaps the most significant observation we can draw from this pattern of variegated usage of the divine name is that the Tetragram was held to be very sacred. One could either use it or a surrogate for it within non-biblical material depending on one's individual taste. But in copying the biblical text itself the Tetragram was carefully guarded. This protection of the Tetragram was extended even to the Greek translation of the biblical text, though for some reason not to the Aramaic Targum.

(4) *Post-New Testament Usage of God's Name.* A. *Jewish Usage:* By the beginning of the second century A.D. (plus or minus a few years) a *textus receptus* of the Hebrew Bible emerged among the Jews.[49] In Rabbinic circles its victory over other text-types was complete, leading to the demise of rival textual traditions except insofar as they were frozen in ancient versions or maintained in sects such as that of the Samaritans.[50] Greek versions of this standard text followed in Jewish circles. The best known of these are those of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. If we may dispense with detailed background information on these versions, since it is readily available elsewhere,[51] it is important for us to note that the practice of writing the

[49] See F. M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text," 287-92.

[50] F. M. Cross, "The Contribution of the Qumrâm Discoveries," 95. See also S. Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964) 98.

[51] See especially H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (rev. R. R Ottley, reprinted, New York: Ktav, 1968) 29-58; S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 74-99.

Hebrew Tetragram in the Greek text was continued by these Jewish versions.[52]

In 1897 F. C. Burkitt published some fragments of Aquila found as the underwriting of some palimpsests scraps among the debris in the old Cairo Geniza.[53] The fragments show clearly that the Hebrew Tetragram (in this case in paleo-Hebrew script) was retained by Aquila.[54] About this same time Giovanni Cardinal Mercati discovered in the Ambrosian Library of Milan a palimpsest containing parts of the Psalter to Origen's Hexapla (lacking the Hebrew column).[55] The interesting thing about these fragments from the Hexapla is that all five columns, not just the transliterated Hebrew column and that of Aquila, contain the Tetragram written in square Hebrew letters.[56]

Paul Kahle suggested, on the basis that the Tetragram appears in all five columns, including that of the LXX, that Origen originally used a Jewish text for his LXX column as well as Jewish texts for the other columns. He argued this because he knew of no evidence of Christian MSS using the Tetragram dating in the time of Origen.[57] But according to Eusebius, Origen searched out copies of ancient Greek versions and reported that one was found at Jericho in a jar.[58] In view of his desire to acquire ancient copies it does not seem unreasonable to believe that he could have searched out old Christian copies of the LXX which dated to the first century itself. If so, it would have been

[52] At times the Tetragram was written in Greek letters that looked like the Hebrew: ΠΠΠΠ. See Jerome, *Ep.* 25 (*ad Marcellam*); also Giovanni Card. Mercati, "Sulla scrittura del tetragramma nelle antiche versioni greche del Vecchio Testamento," *Bib* 22 (1941) 340-42; and most recently N. Fernandez Marcos, "*ἰαλέ, ἐσερέ, ἀϊαί* y otros nombres de Dios entre los hebreos," *Sefarad* 35 (1975) 91-106. It is possible that יָהֹוָה in the LXX of Dan 9:2 = an original ΠΠΠΠ; cf; J. A. Montgomery, "A Survival of the Tetragrammation in Daniel," *JBL* 40 (1921) 86.

[53] F. C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge: University Press, 1897).

[54] Cf. Jerome's statement in *Praef. in libr. Sam. et Mal.* (Migne, *PL*, 28. 549-50).

[55] These fragments along with Mercati's commentary were published posthumously under the direction of Georgio Castellino. See G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae cura et studio Iohannis Cardinal Mercati bybliothecarii et scriniarii S. R. Ecclesiae editae. Pars Prima: Codex rescriptus bybliothecae ambrosianae O 39 sup. phototypice expressus et transcriptus* (Vatican City, 1958); *Pars Prima: 'Osservazioni': Commento critico al testo dei frammenti esaplari* (Vatican City, 1965).

[56] The Tetragram appears as יהוה. On this form, see Fernandez Marcos, "*ἰαλέ, ἐσερέ, ἀϊαί*," 98-99. For the name *ἀϊαί*, compare Fernandez Marcos with the earlier work of Joh. Brinktrine, "Der Gottesname 'AIA bei Theodoret von Cyrus," *Bib* 30 (1949) 520-23. The Cairo Geniza fragment of Psalm 22 from Origen's Hexapla contains the Tetragram in the form of ΠΠΠΠ written in the columns of Aquila, Symmachus, and the LXX. See C. Taylor, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection Including a Fragment of the Twenty-Second Psalm according to Origen's Hexapla* (Cambridge: University Press, 1900).

[57] "The Greek Bible Manuscripts Used by Origen," *JBL* 79 (1960) 116-17.

[58] Eusebius, *HE* 6. 16. 3. Eusebius is apparently dependent on some notes of Origen. These notes have been found and are published by G. Mercati, "D'alcuni frammenti esaplari sulla V^a e VI^a edizione greca della Bibbia," *Studi e Testi* 5 (1901) 28-46. The Eusebian passage is discussed by Eduard Schwartz, "Zur Geschichte der Hexapla," *Nachrichten von der (kgl.) Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1903/6, 693-700 (= *Gesammelte Schriften* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963] chap. vi).

possible for him to use a Christian copy (perhaps of early Jewish Christian origin) of the LXX which contained the Tetragram.[59]

In early rabbinic literature we have recorded debates about the proper means of preserving the Tetragram in copying MSS and what to do in case a scribal error involves the Tetragram.[60] As a whole these debates emphasize the sanctity of the divine name and the precaution that is to be taken in order to maintain its permanence. If we permit ourselves to extend the precautionary devices of preserving the Tetragram in copying Hebrew MSS to Greek MSS of the OT as well we will probably have touched upon a vital difference in the Jewish mentality toward a biblical text and that of the Gentile Christian. This will become apparent in the next section.

B. *Christian Usage:* When we come to Christian copies of the LXX, we are immediately struck by the absence of the Tetragram and its almost universal replacement by κύριος. This means that sometime between the beginning of the Christian movement and the earliest extant copies of the Christian LXX a change had taken place. Just when the change occurred is impossible to date with absoluteness. But by the time we reach the Christian codices of the LXX, the Tetragram is not to be found. Instead the words κύριος, and occasionally θεός, stand for the divine name and are abbreviated as $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ and $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$. In addition to these words there are a number of other *nomina sacra* (as they are called) in abbreviated form.[61]

In all probability the Tetragram in the Christian LXX began to be surrogated with the contracted words $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ and $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ at least by the beginning of the

[59] Origen seems to have known of Greek MSS which employed even the paleo-Hebrew script for the Tetragrammaton; see Psalm 2 (Migne, *PG*, 12. 1104): *καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀκριβεστέριος δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἑβραϊκοῖς χαρακτῆρσι κεῖται τὸ ὄνομα, ἑβραϊκοῖς δὲ οὐ τοῖς νῦν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀρχαιοτέροις.*

[60] This material is documented in J. P. Siegel, "Palaeo-Hebrew Characters." His whole article is relevant to our present subject.

[61] There are a few LXX fragments which date between the pre-Christian copies of the LXX already mentioned and at least the great majority of the LXX codices of the church. We note here two which may be either Jewish or Christian in origin: (1) P. Oxy. 656, an early third-century fragment covering portions of Genesis 14–27. It is characterized by a lack of the usual abbreviations for θεός and κύριος. At least twice where the Tetragram appears in the MT it reads θεός (Gen 15:6, line 11; Gen 24:40, line 155). Once where the MT has the Tetragram it leaves a blank space which was later filled in by a second hand with κύριος (Gen 15:8, line 17). Twice the divine name is lacking at the end of a line (and thus possibly omitted by the first scribe). In each instance κύριος has been added by a second hand (Gen 24:31, line 122; Gen 24:42, line 166). Once the divine name is omitted completely (Gen 14:22, line 5).

(2) P. Oxy. 1007, a late third-century fragment covering parts of Genesis 2–3. θεός is contracted in the usual way, $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$. The most interesting aspect of the papyrus is that twice the Tetragram is written in the contracted form of a double *Yodh* written as a Z with a horizontal stroke through the middle: ZZ (Gen 2:8, line 4 and Gen 2:18, line 14).

See further Kurt Treu, "Die Bedeutung des Griechischen für die Juden im römischen Reich," *Kairos* 15 (1973) 123-44. Treu argues that the abbreviations of κύριος and θεός were of Jewish origin, that the Jews did not actually reject the LXX in the second and third centuries, and that many of our early copies of the Greek Bible may be Jewish. For the earliest Christian texts, see C. H. Roberts, "P. Yale I and the Early Christian Book," *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles* (American Studies in Papyrology, 1; New Haven: American Society of Papyrologists, 1966) 25-28.

second century.[62] For our purposes the point that is most important is that these same abbreviated words appear also in the earliest copies of the NT. These abbreviations, as we will argue, are important for understanding the use of God's name in the New Testament.

In 1907 Ludwig Traube suggested that the abbreviated *nomina sacra* were of Jewish origin, having developed within the circle of Hellenistic Judaism.[63] According to him the Tetragram was first translated θεός; following the Hebrew custom of no vowels it appeared as $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$. This soon was followed by the alternate surrogate κύριος written $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$. These abbreviations gave rise to the view that the important thing was to write sacred words with the first and last letters. The result was a series of abbreviated forms for other words such as πνεῦμα, πατήρ, οὐρανός, ἄνθρωπος, Δαυείδ, Ἰσραήλ, and Ἰερουσαλήμ. Traube argued that the method of contraction had nothing to do with saving space and had no connection with cursive abbreviations found in documentary papyri.

In 1959 A. H. R. E. Paap took up the issue again using the immense amount of new material, especially papyrological, which had come to light since Traube.[64] He concluded, against Traube,[65] that the system of contracting the *nomina sacra* was of Jewish Christian origin, emanating from Alexandria somewhere around ± A.D. 100. These Jewish Christians, who held the Greek Bible to be as sacred as the Hebrew, considered θεός to have the same value as the Tetragram, which they knew always received special treatment in reading and sometimes in writing. Thus they first employed the principle of consonantal writing for θεός resulting in θς. As Christianity spread, this principle was forgotten and was replaced with the notion that the writing of the first and last letters of a word carried with it a sacred meaning. This led to the abbreviation of other sacred words. A stroke above the abbreviation was used to attract the reader's attention and to avoid confusion in continuous script. Paap suggested that θεός was soon followed by κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, and Χριστός. These words formed the first group of *nomina sacra* but were shortly followed by the others.[66]

In our judgment Paap's evidence, which he carefully documents, is basically sound.[67] But the evidence does not point unambiguously to a Jewish Christian origin for the abbreviated forms of the *nomina sacra* in the LXX.

[62] According to C. H. Roberts (*The [London] Times Literary Supplement* [March 10, 1961, 160), the contracting of *nomina sacra* began in the first century A.D.

[63] *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1907).

[64] *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D.: The Sources and Some Deductions* (Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 8; Leiden: Brill, 1959).

[65] See also F. Bedodi, "I 'nomina sacra' nei papiri greci veterotestamentari precristiani," *SPap* 13 (1974) 89-103, who finds no abbreviations in pre-Christian OT Greek papyri.

[66] There are 15 abbreviated *nomina sacra* in Christian MSS: θεός, κύριος, πνεῦμα, πατήρ, οὐρανός, ἄνθρωπος, Δαυείδ, Ἰσραήλ, Ἰερουσαλήμ, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, υἱός, σωτήρ, σταυρός, and μήτηρ.

[67] See C. H. Roberts' favorable review of Paap in *JTS* ns 11 (1960) 410-12. Hans Gerstinger, in his review (*Gnomon* 32 [1960] 371-74), disagrees with Paap's interpretation that the origin of the *nomina sacra* was on the analogy of the Hebrew Tetragram. He says that they are not contracted

From all that we know, the Tetragram was the most sacred word in the Hebrew religion. While Hellenistic Jews and Jewish Christians held the LXX to be as valid as the Hebrew text,[68] it is clear from the former's preservation of the Tetragram within the Greek Scriptures that θεός was not generally held to be equal to יהוה, nor was it held to be suitable as a replacement for the Tetragram within the written text of the Bible. We know for a fact that Greek-speaking Jews continued to write יהוה within their Greek Scriptures. Moreover, it is most unlikely that early conservative Greek-speaking Jewish Christians varied from this practice. Although in secondary references to God they probably used the words θεός and κύριος, it would have been extremely unusual for them to have dismissed the Tetragram from the biblical text itself.

It is much more likely that the contracted $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ and $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ go back to Gentile Christians who lacked the support of tradition to retain the Tetragram in their copies of the Bible. If any Jewish Christians accepted these forms as early surrogates for it, they were probably liberal Greek-speaking Jewish Christians under the influence of their Gentile brothers. The contracted forms of $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ and $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ may have been a compromise on the part of the Gentiles, out of deference to the Jewish Christians, to mark the sacredness of the divine name which stood behind these surrogates.[69]

II

(1) *The Tetragram and the New Testament.* We are now in a position to trace the history of the Tetragram in the Greek Bible as a whole, including both Testaments. As we have seen the normal practice was for it to be written in paleo-Hebrew or Aramaic letters, or to be transliterated into Greek letters, in pre-Christian copies of the LXX. Jewish scribes never abandoned this practice but continued to use it both in their copies of the LXX and in the later versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. On the Christian side, conservative Jewish Christians probably continued to write the Tetragram in their copies of the LXX. Toward the end of the first century Gentile

consistently enough at first to warrant this conclusion. He opts rather for an explanation of just pure abbreviation of frequently occurring words, perhaps under the influence of similar abbreviations in secular Greek writing. In the present writer's judgment, however, Gerstinger's objections are unwarranted for two reasons: (1) In some MSS there is evidence that one or more of the first *nomina sacra* were abbreviated only when they stood for the divine name (see, e.g., F. G. Kenyon, "Nomina Sacra in the Chester Beatty Papyri," *Aegyptus* 13 [1933] 5-10, esp. p. 9.) (2) The abbreviated *nomina sacra* represent a development, going from small beginnings, which no doubt were sporadic at first, until they include all fifteen *nomina sacra* on a fairly regular basis.

[68] This appears to be the point of the *Letter of Aristeas.* For my views on this document, see "The Letter of Aristeas and Diaspora Judaism," *JTS* 22 (1971) 337-48.

[69] Paap rejects the notion of G. Rudberg (*Eranos* 10 [1910] 71-100) and E. Nachmanson (*Eranos* 10 (1910) 101-44) that the contraction of *nomina sacra* is related to abbreviations found in ancient secular Greek: *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri*, 122-23. For more on the issue of the *nomina sacra* see S. Brown, "Concerning the Origin of the Nomina Sacra," *S Pap* 9 (1970) 7-19; K. Aland, "Bemerkungen zum Alter um zur Entstehung des Christogrammes anhand von Beobachtungen bei P^{66} und P^{75}," *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes* (Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, 2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967) 173.

Christians, lacking a motive for retaining the Hebrew name for God, substituted the words κύριος and θεός (κύριος being used more often than θεός) for the Tetragram. Both were written in abbreviated form in a conscious effort to preserve the sacral nature of the divine name.[70] Soon the original significance of the abbreviated surrogates was lost, however, and many other contracted words were added to the list.

When we come to the NT, there is good reason to believe that a similar pattern evolved. Since the Tetragram was still written in the copies of the Greek Bible which made up the Scriptures of the early church, it is reasonable to believe that the NT writers, when quoting from Scripture, preserved the Tetragram within the biblical text. On the analogy of pre-Christian Jewish practice we can imagine that the NT text incorporated the Tetragram into its OT quotations and that the words κύριος and θεός were used when secondary references to God were made in the comments that were based upon the quotations. The Tetragram in these quotations would, of course, have remained as long as it continued to be used in the Christian copies of the LXX. But when it was removed from the Greek OT, it was also removed from the quotations of the OT in the NT. Thus somewhere around the beginning of the second century the use of surrogates must have crowded out the Tetragram in both Testaments. Before long the divine name was lost to the Gentile church altogether except insofar as it was reflected in the contracted surrogates or occasionally remembered by scholars. The original purpose of the surrogates themselves was soon forgotten and this in turn gave rise to a host of abbreviated *nomina sacra* which were connected with the Tetragram in no way at all. At the same time, however, it is possible that conservative Jewish Christians, such as, say, the Ebionites, preserved the Tetragram wherever it was found in both the Old and the New Testaments.[71] Their conservative Jewish heritage would have demanded it.

The removal of the Tetragram in the NT of the Gentile church obviously affected the appearance of the NT text and no doubt influenced the theological outlook of second century Gentile Christianity; just how much we may never know. But if we permit our mind's eye to compare the original OT quotations in the NT with the way they appeared after the Tetragram was removed, we can imagine that the theological change was significant. In many passages where the persons of God and Christ were clearly distinguishable, the removal of the Tetragram must have created considerable ambiguity.[72] For

[70] J. H. Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964) 30-31.

[71] This possibly forms the background to the famous rabbinic passage, *t. Šabb.* 13. 5: "The margins and books of the Minim do not save. . . ." The debate that follows concerning what is to be done with the heretical books concerns the issue of the divine names, אזכרות, that are found in them. The reference is possibly to the writings of conservative Jewish Christians (and perhaps other heretical Jewish groups). On the whole issue see R. T. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (reprinted, Clifton, NJ: Reference Book, 1966) 155-57.

[72] R. H. Fuller, working under the impression that the original LXX translators used κύριος to translate יהוה, says that once κύριος was established as a title for Jesus many LXX passages which originally referred to *Yhwh* could be applied to Jesus. "This does not mean however that the

example, if our theory is correct, the first century church saw: *εἶπεν* יהוה *τῷ κυρίῳ μου* (Matt 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42), while that of the second century saw: *εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου*. To the second-century church *ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου* (Mark 1:3) must have meant one thing, since it immediately followed the words: *ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*,[73] but quite something else to the first-century church which saw *ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν* יהוה. To the second-century church *ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω*, in 1 Cor 1:31, probably referred to Christ mentioned in v. 30. But to the first-century church *ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν* יהוה *καυχάσθω* probably referred to God mentioned in v. 29.

It is interesting to note that the confusion that emerged from such passages in the second century is reflected in the MS tradition of the NT. A large number of variants in the NT MS tradition involve the words *θεός*, *κύριος*, *Ἰησοῦς*, *Χριστος*, *υἱός* and combinations of them. The theory we suggest to explain the origin of many of these variants (though, of course, not all) is that the removal of the Tetragram from the OT quotations in the NT created a confusion in the minds of scribes as to which person was referred to in the discussion surrounding the quotation. Once the confusion was caused by the change in the divine name in the quotations, the same confusion spread to other parts of the NT where quotations were not involved at all. In other words once the names of God and Christ were confused in the vicinity of quotations, the names were generally confused elsewhere.

The following examples illustrate this scribal confusion over the divine personages within the area of quotations.

A. *Rom 10:16-17*

16 ᶜΗσαίας γὰρ λέγε,
κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;
17 *ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ / θεοῦ*

Χριστοῦ	$P^{46\ vid}$ ℵ BCD* min versions Fathers
θεοῦ	$ℵ^{c}AD^{b,c}$ KPΨ min versions Fathers
OMIT	G $it^{f,g}$ Fathers

The words: "Lord, who has believed our report" (v. 16), are shown to be a genuine quotation (Isa 53:1) by the introductory formula: "For Isaiah says." B. M. Metzger, commenting on the Greek NT of the United Bible Societies

distinction between Jesus and God is blurred, or that Jesus was by now regarded as a divine being in an ontological sense. All that the LXX usage opens up at this stage is a functional identity between the exalted Kyrios and the Yahweh-Kyrios of the Old Testament and LXX" (*The Foundations of New Testament Christology* [New York: Scribner, 1965] 68). If the Tetragram was not removed until the second century, however, the original NT text may have contained less "functional identity" between God and Christ than is thought. The title *κύριος Ἰησοῦς* in the first century hardly had the significance it later came to have when *κύριος* became a written surrogate for the divine name in the biblical text.

[73] V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1963) 153-154. Taylor says that Mark possibly has the Messiah in mind by the word *κυρίου*.

(UBS),[74] accepts *Χριστοῦ* as original in v. 17 because: (a) it is strongly attested by early and diverse witnesses; and (b) the expression *ῥῆμα χριστοῦ* occurs only here in the NT while *ῥῆμα θεοῦ* is more common (Luke 3:2; John 3:34; Eph 6:17; Heb 6:5; 11:3). The omission of the name altogether in several Western witnesses he ascribes to carelessness.

Without doubting the judgment of the committee in regard to the textual principles under which it worked, we now may have other criteria by which to analyze the variants. If we assume that the original *lemma* employed the Tetragram, the quotation would have appeared to the first-century church as: יהוה *τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν*. It can be argued from this that *θεοῦ* in the following comment is the original reading, not *Χριστοῦ*, since it corresponds to the Jewish practice of using the Tetragram in the quotation and the word for "God" in the comment. *Χριστοῦ* would have arisen from a confusion in the mind of later scribes as to which person *κύριε* referred, once it had replaced the Tetragram in the *lemma*. This confusion would have been encouraged by the ambiguity of *κύριος* in early Christian times; thus the shift from *θεοῦ* to *Χριστοῦ*, scribally speaking, would have been quite insignificant. The omission of both *θεοῦ* and *Χριστοῦ* in some Western witnesses, on the other hand, may go back to a time before the Tetragram was removed. Some Gentile scribe, totally bewildered by the Hebrew word, failed to recognize it as the antecedent to the word *θεοῦ*. By eliminating the word "God" in the comment (and perhaps even the Tetragram itself in the *lemma*, though we have no evidence for it) the problem of antecedence was solved.

B. *Rom 14:10-11*

10 *πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ / Χριστοῦ*
11 *γέγραπται γάρ,*
ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ,
καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ.

θεοῦ	ℵ*ABC*DG min versions Fathers
Χριστοῦ	$ℵ^{c}C^{2\ vid}$ PΨ min versions Fathers

Again we are assured that v. 11 (a combination of Isa 49:18 and 45:23) is a genuine quotation because of the introductory formula. It corresponds closely to the wording of the LXX. The Tetragram appears in Isa 49:18 (חי־אני נאם־יהוה), and we can presume that it did so in the Greek copy of the text with which Paul was familiar. The UBS committee accepts the reading of *θεοῦ* as the original text in v. 10. Metzger,[75] speaking for the committee, suggests that *Χριστοῦ* probably appeared as an influence from 2 Cor 5:10, which speaks of the "judgment seat of Christ." This is perhaps offset, however, by the fact that in Rom 3:6 Paul speaks of God judging the world. The concept of the judgment seat of God, therefore, lies within the range of Pauline

[74] *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (Third Edition)* (London: United Bible Societies, 1971) 525.

[75] Ibid., 531.

thought in the Roman letter. Moreover, another explanation is possible if we assume that the Tetragram stood in the original *lemma* of v. 11. At an early time a confusion could have arisen over which person κύριος represented, once it had replaced the Tetragram. A shift from the indefinite κύριος to Χριστοῦ, therefore, could have happened without problem. This means that the judgment of the committee is probably right, but for a different reason than it states.

C. *1 Cor 2:16*

τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου
ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;
ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ / κυρίου ἔχομεν

κυρίου	BD*G it
Χριστοῦ	*rell*

Here it is not quite as clear that we have a genuine quotation. However, γάρ forms a type of introduction, and since the text corresponds roughly with both the LXX and the MT of Isa 40:13 (see Rom 11:34), we can be relatively safe in viewing it as a free quotation. The Tetragram appears in the MT and is, therefore, possible here. A. Robertson and A. Plummer prefer the reading of Χριστοῦ in Paul's comment because: "Χριστοῦ would be likely to be altered to conform with the previous κυρίου."[76] If, however, the Tetragram stood in the original *lemma*, this explanation would be invalid. The most likely explanation for the variant is that Paul originally wrote: "For who has known the mind of *Yhwh* . . . but we have the mind of the Lord." Κυρίου is an appropriate word according to early practice for a secondary reference to *Yhwh*, but not "Christ." Later, when the Tetragram of the *lemma* was replaced with κυρίου, it was little trouble for the second κυρίου to be changed to the more definite Χριστοῦ.

D. *1 Pet 3:14-15*

14 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε
15 κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν / θεὸν ἁγιάσατε

Χριστόν	P^{72} ℵABCΨ min versions Clement
θεόν	KLP min Fathers
OMIT	de Promissionibus

The passage contains an allusion to the LXX of Isa 8:12-13 in spite of its lack of a more formal introduction than δέ.[77] The best NT witnesses read

[76] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (2d ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1914) 51. This also seems to be the reasoning of G. G. Findlay, "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians," *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (ed. W. R. Nicoll; reprinted, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 2. 785.

[77] See F. F. Bruce, "Jesus is Lord," *Soli Deo Gloria: New Testament Studies in Honor of*

Χριστόν; the *Textus Receptus* with the later uncials KLP and many minuscules read θεόν. The reading Χριστόν, though better attested, is probably secondary, if we suppose that the Tetragram stood in the original citation. In that case the original text would have read: יהוה δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἁγιάσατε. The author would hardly have written Χριστόν since that would have identified Christ with *Yhwh*. In v. 18 he distinguishes the two when he says that Χριστός died in order to bring man τῷ θεῷ, and in v. 22 he says that Christ is at the right hand τοῦ θεοῦ. Once the Tetragram had been replaced with κύριον, however, this obstacle vanished and the way was cleared for Χριστόν.

These examples support the theory that the removal of the Tetragram from the NT quotations of the Greek OT created confusion in the minds of early scribes which resulted in scribal alterations designed to clarify the text. If we permit ourselves to extend such examples to passages that are merely paraphrastic of the OT narrative, we will find the same scribal confusion. Such an extension is not beyond the realm of probability; we have seen in the scrolls from the Judean desert that the Tetragram at times was used in paraphrastic biblical passages and in narrative that is Bible-like in character.

E. *1 Cor 10:9*

μηδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστόν / κύριον / θεόν, καθώς
τινες αὐτῶν ἐξεπείρασαν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ὄφεων ἀπώλλυντο.

Χρίστον	P^{46}DGKΨ min versions Fathers
κύριον	ℵBCP min versions Fathers
θεόν	A 81 Euthalius
OMIT	1985

The UBS committee accepts Χριστόν as the original reading but assigns a "C" judgment to it. Metzger[78] explains the committee's selection as due to the witness of P^{46}, the oldest Greek MS in this case, and to the reading's wide diversity of use in the early patristic and versional period. He explains the appearance of κύριον and θεόν as scribal attempts to remove the idea that the Israelites tempted Christ in the wilderness.

The passage is a paraphrastic allusion to Num 21:5-6, where the MT says that *Yhwh* sent fiery serpents among the people. On the analogy of the Qumran documents, it is possible that an original Tetragram stood here in Paul's words. If so, θεόν and κύριον are most likely to be the first substitutes for it and Χριστόν a later scribal interpretation.

F. *Jude 5*

ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ἅπαξ πάντα,

William Childs Robinson (ed. J. McDowell Richards; Richmond: John Knox, 1968) 33. Bruce calls the passage "an unmistakable quotation from Isaiah 8:12-13."

[78] *Textual Commentary*, 560.

ὅτι ὁ κύριος / Ἰησοῦς / θεός / θεὸς Χριστὸς λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας

κύριος	ℵCKΨ min Syr^{h} Fathers
Ἰησοῦς	AB min versions Fathers
θεός	C^{2} 2492 versions Lucifer
θεὸς Χριστός	P^{72}

The UBS committee assigns a "D" judgment to *κύριος*. Metzger[79] explains that although Ἰησοῦς has weighty attestation, the majority of the committee explained it as an oversight $\overline{\text{KC}}$ taken as $\overline{\text{IC}}$).[80]

The passage is a paraphrastic allusion to the Exodus narrative and the subsequent vicissitudes of the people of Israel. It is possible, therefore, that the Tetragram stood in the original text which in turn gave rise to *θεός* and *κύριος* and then to interpretive variants. The reading of P^{72}, *θεὸς Χριστός*, is fascinating due to its antiquity.[81]

(2) *Concluding Observations.* The above examples are, of course, only exploratory in nature and are set forth here programatically. Nevertheless, the evidence is sufficiently strong to suggest that the thesis of this paper is quite possible. We have refrained from drawing too many conclusions due to the revolutionary nature of the thesis. Rather than state conclusions now in a positive manner it seems better only to raise some questions that suggest a need for further explanation.

(a) If the Tetragram was used in the NT, how extensively was it used? Was it confined to OT quotations and OT paraphrastic allusions, or was it used in traditional phrases, such as "the word of God / Lord" (see the variants in Acts 6:7; 8:25; 12:24; 13:5; 13:44, 48; 14:25; 16:6, 32), "in the day of the Lord" (cf. variants in 1 Cor 5:5), "through the will of God" (cf. variants in Rom 15:32)? Was it also used in OT-like narratives such as we have in the first two chapters of Luke?[82]

(b) Was the third person singular pronoun ever used in the NT as a surrogate for "God"? The quotation of Isa 40:3 in Mark 1:3; Matt 3:3; Luke 3:4 ends with *εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ*. Αὐτοῦ stands for לאלהינו in the MT and *τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν* in the majority of the LXX MSS. The fact that in 1QS 8:13 the elongated pronoun הוא־הוא is used in a reference to this exact

[79] Ibid., 725-26.

[80] Allen Wikgren ("Some Problems in Jude 5," *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in Honor of Kenneth Willis Clark* [ed. B. L. Daniels & M. J. Suggs; SD 29; Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1967] 148-49) prefers the reading of Ἰησοῦς on the basis of 'logos Christology.'—J. N. D. Kelly (*A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* [HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1969] 255) prefers *κύριος* as original, which meant "God" but, under logos Christology, was later changed to mean "Christ."

[81] J. Neville Birdsall ("The Text of Jude in P^{72}," *JTS* ns 14 [1963] 394-99) suggests that the Latin version of Clement of Alexandria (though not the Greek) agrees with P^{72}, reading *dominus deus*.

[82] On this point, see the interesting remarks of Paul Winter, "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel," *NTS* 1 (1954-55) 113.

phrase suggests that *αὐτοῦ* is possibly an abbreviation in the Synoptics.[83]

(c) How great was the impact of the removal of the Tetragram from the NT? Were only those passages affected in which God and Christ were confused by the ambiguity of the immediate context; or were other passages, which reflected a low christology even after the change, later altered to reflect a high christology? Did such restructuring of the text give rise to the later christological controversies within the church, and were the NT passages involved in these controversies identical with those which in the NT era apparently created no problems at all?

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

(e) What are the implications of the use of the divine name in the NT for current christological studies? Are these studies based on the NT text as it appeared in the first century, or are they based on an altered text which represents a time in church history when the difference between God and Christ was confused in the text and blurred in the minds of churchmen? Can it be that current scenarios of NT christology are descriptions of second- and third-century theology and not that of the first?[84]

[83] Krister Stendahl argues that *αὐτοῦ* is a Christological adaptation (*The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (2d pr.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968) 48. But cf. J. De Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (STDJ 4; Leiden: Brill, 1966) 50-51; R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 1967) 10. We cannot go into the possible connection between the Hebrew pronoun in the expression אני הוא and the *ἐγώ εἰμι* formula in the NT. See R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (AB 29; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), I, 533-38, esp. pp. 536-37.

[84] The most recent and provocative study of the subject of this paper as a whole has been done by J. A. Fitzmyer, "Der semitische Hintergrund des neutestamentlichen Kyriostitels". He deals specifically with the issue of the origin of the title *Kyrios* as used in the NT in relation to various historical interpretations.