

THE ΘΕΟΣ AND ΚΥΡΙΟΣ TERMS IN THE ISALIAH TEXT AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE NEW TESTAMENT: SOME OBSERVATIONS

Peter Nagel

1. INTRODUCTION

According to the MT, the Hebrew deity is not only referred to using the terms אלהים, אלוה, אל,¹ but also named יהוה while being called אדני.² In addition, one should also consider the so-called “biblical” manuscripts found in and around the Judean desert, in which the paleo-Hebrew terms, such as אלהים (אלהים), אל (ל), יהוה (יהוה) and אדנאי (Adonai), among others, were used to represent the Hebrew deity.³ It goes without saying that these terms had to be translated into the Greek frame of conceptual reference; hence the Hebrew deity “became” θεός, was ‘named’ κύριος, while being ‘called’ δεσποτής. The latter is not to say that the Hebrew deity was called “δεσποτής” as such, but according to the “rule of thumb” accepted by scholars in general, these terms are considered to

¹ Noteworthy is the philological and literary approach of A. Murtonen, *A Philological and literary treatise on the Old Testament divine names [El, Eloha, Elohim] and [Yahweh]* (Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1952); see also Gericke’s philosophical approach towards *El*-ness in J. W. Gericke, “What is an אֱלֹהִים? A Philosophical Analysis of the Concept of Generic Godhood in the Hebrew Bible,” *OTE* 22/1 (2008): 21–46.

² The in-depth investigation of M. Rösel, *Adonaj—warum Gott ‘Herr’ genannt wird* (Göttingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), is considered to be foundational regarding the “naming” and “calling upon” the Hebrew deity using *Adonaj*; see also Rösel’s thorough yet condensed contribution “אֱדֹנָי,” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten* ([*ThWQ*]; Bd. 1; eds. H.-J. Fabry and U. Dahmen; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011); cf. M. Delcor, “Des diverses manières d’écrire le tétragramme sacré dans les anciens documents hébraïques,” *RHR* 147 (1955): 145–173, as well as S. T. Byington, “יהוה אֱדֹנָי,” *JBL* 76/1 (1957): 58–59, who treats of the attestation of יהוה and אֱדֹנָי in the Hebrew tradition.

³ Cf. J. P. Siegel, “The Employment of Paleo-Hebrew Characters for the Divine Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaitic Sources,” *HUCA* 42 (1971): 159–172; see also, what is considered to be a “new” substitute for the *Tetragrammaton*, J. M. Baumgarten, “A New Qumran Substitute for the Divine Name and Mishnah Sukkah 4.5,” *JQR* 83/1–2 (1992): 1–5. Another valuable study in this regard is D. W. Parry, “4QSam^a and the Tetragrammaton,” in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem* (eds. D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 106–125; cf. idem, “Notes on Divine Name avoidance in Scriptural Units of the Legal texts of Qumran,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (eds. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 437–439.

be the most suitable Greek equivalents for their corresponding Hebrew counterparts. Hence, θεός = אֱלֹהִים, κύριος = יהוה and δεσποτής = דָּנָא. The problem with such a “rule of thumb” presupposition is that one has a tendency to overlook the discrepancies, even though they might seem to occur infrequently. The question, is how valid and useful such a “one-to-one” literary and conceptual transmission is? The intent with this study is not to answer the latter question, but to make some preliminary remarks based on observations on the use of the θεός, κύριος and δεσποτής terms in the Isaiah text against its Hebrew backdrop.⁴ It would be beyond the scope of this study to discuss the use of θεός, κύριος and δεσποτής in the whole of the Isaiah corpus; the study would therefore limit itself to those “out-of-the-ordinary” occurrences. Stated differently, those occurrences that deviate from the so-called “rule of thumb” will be the focal point of the investigation. The theory that the term θεός could have been the “first suitable” Greek term used as equivalent for the Tetragram in particular and for the Hebrew deity in general sprung from this; a theory introduced by Traube;⁵ summarised, together with other theories, by Hurtado⁶; and later re-interpreted by De Troyer.⁷

The first step in this investigation would be to briefly consider the *Vorgeschichte* of these terms as per the Isaiah text; stated differently, one is compelled to consider the state of a possible Hebrew *Vorlage* in this regard.⁸ This section of the investigation will be followed by an overview

⁴ Numerous studies pertinent to the issue of the term κύριος as a reproduction of the Tetragram have seen the light of day; the monumental work of W. W. Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte* (ed. O. Eissfeldt; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1926) as a standard reference work on the term κύριος deserves to be named in particular; for references made to the Hebrew deity in the Greek Psalter, see H. U. Steymans, “Die Gottesbezeichnung kyrios im Psalter der Septuaginta,” *L’Ecrit et l’Esprit: Etudes d’histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Shenker* (OBO 214; eds. D. Böhler, I. Himbaza and P. Hugo; Fribourg / Göttingen: Academic Press / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 325–338.

⁵ L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung* (München: C. H. Beck, 1907).

⁶ L. W. Hurtado, “The Origin of the Nomina Sacra: A Proposal,” *JBL* 117/14 (1998): 655–673; see the summary on pp. 664–671.

⁷ K. de Troyer, “The Pronunciation of the Names of God,” in *Gott Nennen* (eds. I. U. Dalferth and P. Stoellger; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 145–172.

⁸ For a thorough and comprehensive investigation into the *Textgeschichte* of the Isaiah text, see A. van der Kooij, *Die Alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981); see also idem, “Isaiah in the Septuaginta,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah* (eds. C. C. Broyles and C. E. Evans; Leiden / New York / Köln: Brill, 2008), 513–529 (517); cf. the work of Rösel, *Adonaj*, esp. 78–124 with regard to Isaiah; J. Lust in turn investigated “The Divine Titles אֱלֹהִים and דָּנָא in Proto-Isaiah and Ezekiel,” in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of*

of possible tendencies where “disregarding” the “rule of thumb” would demonstrate to be most prolific.⁹ The third and final step will reflect on the impact these discrepancies might have had on the New Testament authors. The comparison of the “Old” Greek (hereafter OG) Isaiah with the MT¹⁰ as well as witnesses from the Judean desert¹¹ will be done on a textual level.

2. VORGESCHICHTE—THE HEBREW VORLAGE

There are principally three terms used in the Hebrew dialect when and if reference is made to an omnipotent, transcendental, all-powerful being (translated in virtually all English translations as “God” with a capital “G”); they are אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים, and אֱלֹהִים.¹² The Isaiah text is no exception; the term אֱלֹהִים is used in 94 instances consisting of 84 phrase structures of which most occur in Isa 21–66; the term אֱלֹהִים is attested in more than 10 verses;¹³ while אֱלֹהִים is deployed only once, in Isa 44:8. The term אֱלֹהִים is used

Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday (eds. M. N. van der Meer et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 131–149. For an investigation into the translation of the divine name limited to the Pentateuch see M. Rösel, “The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch,” *JOT* 31/4 (2007): 411–428. For “names” of deities in the Ancient Near East with specialized focus on Mesopotamia as a region, with Sumerian and Akkadian as relevant dialects, see C. Uehlinger, “Arbeit an altorientalischen Gottesnamen—Theonomastik im Spannungsfeld von Sprache, Schrift und Textpragmatik,” in *Gott Nennen* (eds. I. U. Dalferth and P. Stoellger; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 23–72. In turn, F. Hartenstein, “Die Geschichte JHWHs im Spiegel seiner Namen,” in *Gott Nennen* (eds. I. U. Dalferth and P. Stoellger; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 73–96, focused his attention on the history of YHWH as “name” of the Hebrew deity (cf. W. H. Brownlee, “The Ineffable Name of God,” *BASOR* 226 [1977]: 39–46) counterbalanced by the treatment of *Elohim* as the so-called “name” for the Hebrew deity. He does this by probing semantics and grammatical characteristics, among others. For “Gottesnamekriterium” see E. Blum, “Der vermeintliche Gottesname ‘Elohim,’” in *Gott Nennen* (eds. I. U. Dalferth and P. Stoellger; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 97–119. For an investigation of the “substitutes” of the Tetragram see J. Z. Lauterbach, “Substitutes for the Tetragrammaton,” *PAAR* 2 (1930–1931): 39–46.

⁹ Cf. De Troyer, “Pronunciation,” 144–150, who offers a brief but thorough overview if and to what extent the Tetragram was pronounced or not and how the oldest Hebrew manuscripts assist in determining this.

¹⁰ The MT as represented by the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: SESB Version* (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 2003).

¹¹ As confirmed by A. Aejmelaeus, “What can we know about the Hebrew ‘Vorlage’ of the Septuagint,” *ZAW* 99/1 (1987): 58–89 (58), the manuscripts found in and around the Judean desert assist us in getting closer to how the OG’s Hebrew *Vorlage* might have looked.

¹² Gericke, “What is an אֱלֹהִים?” 21.

¹³ Cf. Isa 8:5; 10:21; 12:2; 40:18; 42:10; 44:10, 15; 45:14, 15, 20, 21; 46:6, 9.

Reference	1QIsa ^a	MT	Notes	LXX
3:15a	יהוה	אדני	Superscript י אדני 1QIsa ^a	–
3:15b		יהוה		–
3:16	יהוה	יהוה		κύριος
3:17a	אדני ¹⁴	אדני	Superscript יהוה in 1QIsa ^a	ὁ θεός
3:17b	אדני	יהוה		κύριος
3:18	יהוה	אדני	Superscript אדני in 1QIsa ^a	κύριος

in correlation with יהוה in more than twenty instances,¹⁵ with the term אדני deployed in 48 verses in comparison to יהוה utilised in 450 verses, occurring 394 times.¹⁶ In addition to the use of the term אדני in Isaiah, the author(s) also made use of the term אדון.¹⁷

If one compares the MT with 1QIsa^a and other related manuscripts found in and around the Judean desert, the Hebrew text tradition appears for the most part intact. There are, however, some small variations which require reflection. The variants found in Isa 3:15–18 are a classic example of Hebrew variants used to represent the Hebrew deity. The table below presents the Hebrew variants in comparison to their Greek equivalents.

The data suggest that the scribes responsible for 1QIsa^a as well as the Masoretes appear inconsistent in applying the terms used when referring to the Hebrew deity. The underlying issue at hand is one definable as the *K^etib-Q^ere* problem, which requires some clarification. The standard explanation is represented by Rösel; the Masoretes vocalised יהוה with the vowels assigned to אדני. The latter “forced” the reader to pronounce (*Q^ere*—what ought to be read) against what was written (*K^etib*—what ought to be written).¹⁸ The exception would be that if and when אדני יהוה is written in combination, the term יהוה would be vocalised to read אלהים, this would counter the duplicate reading of *Adonai Adonai*.¹⁹ An opposing stance on this matter, of which De Troyer is a representative, is that the most “usual” form of the Tetragram in Codex Leningrad as well as in Codex Aleppo testifies to יהוה (*shema*—what ought to be read) and

¹⁴ 4QIsa^b (4Q56) reads אדני.

¹⁵ Cf. Isa 7:11; 17:6; 21:10, 17; 24:15; 25:1; 26:13; 35:2; 36:7; 37:4², 16, 20, 21; 40:28; 41:13; 48:1; 17; 49:4, 5; 51:15, 22; 55:5; 60:9.

¹⁶ The use of אדון and אדני in relation to יהוה and צבאות in Isaiah has been covered for the most part by Rösel, *Adonaj*, 78–124; see also Lust, “The Divine Titles”, 131–149.

¹⁷ Cf. Rösel, *Adonaj*, 79.

¹⁸ Cf. Rösel, *Adonaj*, 2.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 3; cf. De Troyer, “Pronunciation,” 144–145.

not יהוה (Adonai), implying that the vowels adopted from the Aramaic אֲדֹנָי indicated what ought to be read;²⁰ even though there are exceptions to the rule.²¹

Returning to Isa 3:15–18, it is thus reasonable to assume that a redactor of 1QIsa^a wanted to make sure that the Tetragram in Isa 3:15a is pronounced *Adonai* while the Masoretes “wrote” what they in all probability heard, but wrote יהוה as an indication of what was implied by what was read.²² Isa 3:17a in turn seems to indicate that the Masoretes copied what ought to be read, while Isa 3:17b testifies to the fact that they interpreted the term אֲדֹנָי (1QIsa^a) as an indication of what ought to be read, but wrote what should be written. The reverse is again visible in Isa 3:18, with 1QIsa^a bearing witness to the *K^etib* form יהוה, while the redactor of 1QIsa^a indicated what ought to be read, אֲדֹנָי. In Isa 3:18 the Masoretes thus “inserted” אֲדֹנָי into the main body of the text either based on the superscript or they wanted the *K^etib* form to be representative of the *Q^ere* form;²³ the latter explanation could be rejected as mere speculation. It could also be argued that a Hebrew *Vorlage* was available to the Masoretes from where they copied the text verbatim. A similar attested issue is found in Isa 28:16, where the MT reads יהוה אֲדֹנָי while 1QIsa^a attests to יהוה with a superscript אֲדֹנָי.²⁴ The יהוה־אֲדֹנָי alternating readings continue in Isa 28:22 with 1QIsa^a reading יהוה in comparison to the MT reading אֲדֹנָי. Furthermore, the MT appears to have “ignored” יהוה in Isa 30:19 while 1QIsa^a does indeed read the Tetragram.²⁵ These יהוה־אֲדֹנָי alternating variants, particularly attested to in Isa 3:15–18 (1QIsa^a), confirm and reinforce Rösel’s position that the vocalisation of *Adonai* testifies what ought to be read when

²⁰ De Troyer, “Pronunciation,” 145.

²¹ E.g. Exod 3:2 (MT).

²² Cf. De Troyer, “Pronunciation,” 144.

²³ Cf. D. Trobisch, *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments: Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 21 n. 19. Note-worthy is the fact that the Greek counterpart of Isa 3:18, as represented by the LXX^{Göt}, does not attest to any equivalent of these terms, while some Greek manuscripts read κύριος κύριος (cf. [∗ 22-48-763-96] φησι[ν] κύριος κύριος [> *oII* 233]) others read πτω πτω (cf. ∗ φησι κύριος κύριος [adn. πτω πτω]). Similar cases of *K^etib*-*Q^ere* “confusion” are detectable in Isa 6:11; 7:14; 8:7 (אֲדֹנָי as superscript in 1QIsa^a with a probable reading of יהוה); Isa 9:7; 21:16; 28:2, 16; 30:15; 49:7; 61:1.

²⁴ 1QIsa^b however, appears to be closer to the MT with the second יהוה reading, with an uncertainty of what term is to be read in the first instance. Isa 30:15 attests to a similar issue; 1QIsa^a again reads יהוה with אֲדֹנָי superscript, compared to 4QIsa^c most probably reading יהוה יהוה.

²⁵ Additional discrepancies are found in Isa 9:7, where 1QIsa^a reads יהוה as opposed to אֲדֹנָי attested in the MT. A similar case is found in Isa 28:2.

יהוה was written.²⁶ However, such alternating readings are very limited and should thus not be taken as the “standard” practice of the time. The *K^etib-Q^ere* problem surrounding the “naming” of the Hebrew deity might not have been a case of reading aloud אֱלֹהִים, שְׁמָא or אֲדֹנָי for יהוה; but it is indeed plausible that both practices could have been employed simultaneously by different scribes or scribal groups. It is nevertheless clear that “naming” or making reference to the Hebrew deity was a complex matter, at least from the 3rd century B.C.E. onwards.

Variant readings revolving around the term אֱלֹהִים also occur; 1QIsa^a (Isa 37:20) has יהוה אֱלֹהִים while the MT only reads יהוה.²⁷ Furthermore, Isa 49:14 (1QIsa^a) reads יהוה ואֲדֹנָי with a superscript ואלוהי directly above ואֲדֹנָי presumably implying that *Elohim* is to be read which would support the argument that if and when יהוה and אֲדֹנָי is consecutively read, יהוה should be pronounced אֱלֹהִים to avoid the repetition of *Adonai*.²⁸ A slightly different but related issue is the MT reading in Isa 50:5 attesting to both אֲדֹנָי and יהוה compared to 1QIsa^a reading אֱלֹהִים אֲדֹנָי; the latter seems to indicate that the Masoretes wrote what they considered to be an indication of what ought to be read with the term אֱלֹהִים in 1QIsa^a.²⁹ Finally, Isa 61:1 and Isa 61:11 testify to interesting variants, presented in the table below.

Ref	1QIsa ^a	1QIsa ^b	4QIsa ^m	MT
Isa 61:1	יהוה אֱלֹהִים	יהוה אֱלֹהִים	אֲד	אֲדֹנָי יהוה
Isa 61:11	יהוה אֱלֹהִים	–	–	אֲדֹנָי יהוה

Thus, both 1QIsa^a as well as the MT were consistent in applying the same terms in Isa 61:1 and Isa 61:11. The only plausible assumption one could draw from the data is that 1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b present a text tradition, opposing the text tradition offered by 4QIsa^m and the MT, if a יהוה אֲדֹנָי reconstruction for 4QIsa^m is accepted. The Greek text traditions might shed some light on the matter, and will consequently be considered in the section to follow.

²⁶ Cf. Rösel, *Adonaj*, 2ff.

²⁷ The Greek and Syriac equivalents in turn only account for the term אֱלֹהִים.

²⁸ Both 1QIsa^b and 4QIsa^b (4Q56) do not attest to any superscript.

²⁹ Cf. Isa 54:6, which differs with regard to יהוה אֱלֹהִים (1QIsa^a) and אֱלֹהִים (MT).

3. THE ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ TERMS: AN OVERVIEW

The Greek manuscripts, dated to the 2nd century B.C.E. and 2nd century C.E., testifies to the following terms as “suitable” Greek equivalents for representing the Hebrew deity:³⁰

- ΙΑΩ (4QpapLXXLev^b)³¹—Tetragram representation
- θεος P.Fouad 266b—*Elohim* representation
- blank space P.Fouad 266b—most probably Tetragram representation
- יהוה θεος P.Fouad 266b—Tetragram and *Elohim* representation respectively
- יהוה 8HēvXIgr—Tetragram representation
- θεος κυριος P.Oxy 656—*Elohim* and *Adonai* representation

The data snippet above presents an array of Greek possibilities in representing the Hebrew deity; the variations and discrepancies found in the Greek version(s) of Isaiah also confirm the complexity in deciding on a “suitable” Greek equivalent for a Hebrew term used when representing the Hebrew deity. Sensitivity for this complexity intensifies with the realisation that even the Hebrew text tradition struggled with finding ways and means to refer to or “name” the Hebrew deity. The data from OG Isaiah, or rather, the data inferred from a reasonable critical construction of the OG Isaiah,³² reveals that the term δεσποτής is used as Greek equivalent for אֲדֹנָי in Isa 1:24; 3:1 and 10:33,³³ with the term κύριος utilised as a representation of אֲדֹנָי in a relatively large number of cases.³⁴ Moreover, the term θεός is used, not without exceptions, as an equivalent for אֱלֹהִים,³⁵ as well as for אֱלֹהִים³⁶ while the term κύριος is a rendition of יהוה. Below is a list of some supplementary characteristics and peculiarities:

³⁰ Cf. De Troyer, “Pronunciation,” 160–161.

³¹ Cf. Rösel, *Adonaj*, 4–5 and De Troyer, “Pronunciation,” 153.

³² J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, XIV: Isaias* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983).

³³ The term δεσποτής is also used, given the presumptions, as equivalent for אֲדֹנָי in Gen 15:2, 8; Jer 1:6; 4:10; as well as אֱלֹהִים in Job 5:8b and for יהוה in Jer 15:11.

³⁴ Cf. Isa 4:4, 6:1, 8, 11; 7:14, 20; 8:7; 9:8(7); 10:12; 11:11; 21:6, 8, 16; 24:2; 26:13b; 28:2; 29:13; 30:20; 36:12; 38:14, 16; 49:14.

³⁵ Cf. Isa 2:3; 5:16 (אֱלֹהִים); 7:11; 10:21 (אֱלֹהִים); 12:2 (אֱלֹהִים); 13:19; 14:13 (אֱלֹהִים); 17:6, 10; 21:10, 17; 25:1, 9.

³⁶ Cf. Isa 5:16; 8:8; 10:21.

- a.) Isaiah OG (Isa 4:5; 5:13; 16:14; 25:9b; 27:3; 28:21; 30:32; 41:16; 45:24; 53:1; 55:5; 58:5; 59:13) ≠ The MT reads יהוה;³⁷
- b.) Κύριος ὁ θεός in OG Isaiah = יהוה MT (Isa 17:6; 24:15; 25:1; 26:13; 30:18; 37:4, 20, 21; 38:5; 41:21; 42:5, 6, 8, 13, 21; 43:1, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15; 44:2; 45:1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11);³⁸
- c.) Isaiah OG reads the term θεός ≠ MT (Isa 9:11, 17; 13:6; 23:16; 26:9, 12; 28:13b; 41:17c; 45:23, 25; 49:7);³⁹ the opposite is in turn attested in Isa 21:9; 53:4;
- d.) The θεός = אֱלֹהִים (MT);
- e.) Κύριος ὁ θεός ≠ in MT (Isa 24:16; 27:4);⁴⁰
- f.) Κύριος = צוּר (Isa 17:10);
- g.) The term κύριος in Isa 40:18 = אֱלֹהִים in the MT;⁴¹
- h.) The 1st κύριος term in Isa 54:5 = בַּעַל in the MT;
- i.) The OG Isaiah ≠ The MT, the latter testifies to the term אֱלֹהִים in Isa 55:7; 61:2.

3.1. *The Term κύριος*

The term κύριος dominates the OG Isaiah, with 422 occurrences in 365 verses, 5 times of which κύριος is used in the vocative case in relation to the term θεός with its accompanying definite article;⁴² in 30 instances it is used in the nominative case in combination with the term θεός.⁴³ Caution is duly noted when concordance related statistics are given such as being offered here. The statistics should not be considered as necessarily “argumentatively sound data”, but merely introductory in nature. The first noteworthy issue brought to the fore by the term κύριος is found in Isa 3:15–18; it appears as if the Greek scribes “ignored” אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת

³⁷ In Isa 12:2; 37:14 the MT testifies to two יהוה terms, compared to one κύριος term each in both the references. The opposite is true in Isa 37:6 offering two κύριος terms weighed against the term יהוה by the MT; and in Isa 57:15 two κύριος terms are read in the LXX compared to no reference made in the MT or any other Hebrew text tradition for that matter; cf. Isa 58:6; 61:1 (2nd κύριος term); 63:7 (4th κύριος term); 64:2.

³⁸ This “equivalent” was consistently used, at least in Isa 41–45.

³⁹ In Isa 37:19 the OG Isaiah reads εἰδωλα as equivalent for אֱלֹהִים, while the Greek does not contest the term אֱלֹהִים in Isa 60:9.

⁴⁰ Another variant is attested in Isa 41:21, where the MT reads יהוה with κύριος ὁ θεός as the Greek equivalent; cf. Isa 42:5, 6, 8, 13, 21; 43:1, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15; 44:2; 45:1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11.

⁴¹ Cf. Isa 7:13 representing the term κύριος as equivalent for אֱלֹהִים.

⁴² Cf. Isa 24:16; 25:1; 26:12, 13 and Isa 37:20.

⁴³ Cf. Isa 8:10; 17:6; 27:4; 30:18; 37:4, 21; 38:5; 41:17, 21; 42:5, 6, 8, 13, 21; 43:1, 3, 10, 12, 14, 15; 44:2; 45:1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11; 51:22; 52:12 and 57:21.

(Isa 3:15).⁴⁴ Greek Isaiah continues opposing the “rule of thumb”; in Isa 3:17a with ὁ θεός seemingly representing אֲדֹנָי (MT, 4QIsa^b) or אֲדֹנָי with superscript יהוה (1QIsa^a). One could infer from the evidence that, as the term θεός is used to render יהוה in an overwhelming amount of cases, ὁ θεός probably represents the 1QIsa^a reading (אֲדֹנָי with superscript יהוה) in Isa 3:17a. The term κύριος in Isa 3:17b appears to be the equivalent for either אֲדֹנָי (1QIsa^a) or יהוה (MT), with the term κύριος again utilised to represent either אֲדֹנָי (MT) or יהוה with superscript אֲדֹנָי (1QIsa^a) in Isa 3:18. The reason for this “unusual” and inconsistent representation could be argued from both a theological as well as a literary stance.

There appears to be no obvious theological cue that supports a theologically determined reason why ὁ θεός was chosen as an equivalent for the terms in question (cf. Isa 3:17a). A literary induced reason, in combination with a theological-conceptual motivation is that the superscript יהוה is best rendered using ὁ θεός. The latter term would call the ‘אל-ness’ of the Hebrew deity to mind, a term that would encapsulate an *overarching monotheistic* deity, best represented by אֱלֹהִים, אֵל or צְבָאוֹת אֲדֹנָי יהוה צְבָאוֹת, none of which are present in the Hebrew of Isa 3:17a. The Hebrew text does however attest to אֲדֹנָי יהוה צְבָאוֹת in Isa 3:15, offering the translator ample opportunity to use ὁ θεός; instead, these terms are ironically ignored. It is, also possible that the translator completely ignored his *Vorlage* and followed his own conceptual “creativity”.

The avoidance or ignorance of the term אֲדֹנָי introduced in Isa 3:15–18, whereby a single κύριος term, or any other related term for that matter, is used as a Greek equivalent for אֲדֹנָי יהוה, is not confined to Isa 3:15–17.⁴⁵ Another intriguing Hebrew text tradition that requires due consideration in its Greek form is Isa 61:1 and Isa 61:11 (the table below summarises the various readings).

⁴⁴ Some Greek manuscripts read an additional κύριος κύριος (* 22-48-763-96) φησι(ν) κύριος κύριος (> oII 233) στρατιῶν V-ol' L''-46-233 C 403' 770 Chr.Tht. = M).

⁴⁵ Cf. Isa 7:7; 22:5, 12 (B-Q^{ms}-109 403' 538 read κύριος κύριος which is considered to be “closer” to the MT; minuscule 91 in turn reads κύριος ο θεος); 28:16, 22 (+* κυριου QSyh 86); 40:10 (The hexaplaric tradition, together with Eusebius, accounts for two κύριος terms; whereas Hieronymus “adds” *deus* equivalent for the term θεός); 49:22; 50:4, 5, 7, 9 (The BHS text-critical apparatus suggests that the LXX, Ethiopian and Arabic versions do not read an equivalent term for אֲדֹנָי. The textual evidence from the Judean desert (1Q8 Isaiah and 1QIsa^a) supports the MT text reading); 52:4; 56:8; 61:1, 11; 65:13 and Isa 65:15; Cf. Isa 36:9 where the Hebrew tradition reads אֲדֹנָי compared to the absolute silence of the Greek tradition.

Ref	1QIsa ^a	1QIsa ^b	4QIsa ^m	MT	LXX ^{Gött}	Q ^{mg} ⊖
Isa 61:1	יהוה אלהים	יהוה אלהים	אד	אדני יהוה	κύριος	κύριος κύριος
Isa 61:11	יהוה אלהים	–	–	אדני יהוה	κύριος	

If the “rule of thumb” presupposition is accepted as “reasonable”, then one could assume that in this case the term κύριος represents the reading of 1QIsa^a best. When dealing with the Isaiah text, however, the more argumentatively sound inference is that the only “rule of thumb” to be adopted in general is that there are not any.⁴⁶ The latter is confirmed when one considers Isa 61:11 in relation to Isa 61:1a; the former testifies to a single κύριος term as opposed to יהוה אדני (MT), while 1QIsa^a reads יהוה אלהים. Thus, in Isa 61:1a the term κύριος best represents either the MT (used once to avoid repetition of the term אדני), or 1QIsa^a. If the scribes are considered to be consistent, the term κύριος best represents the MT in Isa 61:11. One thing that could be deduced from the evidence is that LXX^{Gött} seems to have simplified the matter by consistently reading a single term κύριος, while manuscripts belonging to the hexaplaric tradition in general follow the MT, as expected.

Another captivating issue is the “omission” of both the יהוה terms, including צבאות in Isa 22:14a and צבאות... אדני in Isa 22:14b.⁴⁷ The latter two occurrences do indeed strengthen the idea that the term אדני is to a large extent “downplayed” by the translators of OG Isaiah. Isa 49:14 (יהוה אדני) offers another twist to the יהוה אדני—κύριος dilemma; the LXX^{Gött} renders κύριος ὁ κύριος as equivalent with an array of alternatives offered by manuscripts, varying between the term θεός in the first instance,⁴⁸ while one is expected to read the term θεός in the second instance.⁴⁹ The avoidance of the term אדני, especially when used in combination with יהוה, is wonderfully illustrated in the catena of occurrences found in Isa 50:1–10 (Isa 50:4, 5, 7 and 9); all the יהוה אדני (MT) occurrences are rendered

⁴⁶ Van der Kooij (“Isaiah in the Septuaginta,” 518) confirms that it is generally accepted that the LXX Isaiah follows a more “free” approach towards the original, while mentioning that Ziegler and Seeligmann are of the opinion, an opinion he supports, that the *Vorlage* of the LXX Isaiah does not differ much from the MT. These statements might appear to be confusing; why would a solid Hebrew text tradition cause such a “loose” or “free” Greek equivalent, especially with theologically significant terms such as discussed here?

⁴⁷ The “omission” of אדני in Isa 22:14b is also attested in the Syriac as well as in Theodotion.

⁴⁸ κύριος¹] ο θεός 538.

⁴⁹ κύριος²] θεός A' 88–*oll* L^m–86^c–233 564 403' 534.

with a single term κύριος. These instances, together with others, seem to indicate a “discomfort” with the term אֲדֹנָי on the part of the Greek translators, the reason of which is currently unknown and thus demands further investigation.

2.2. The Term θεός

The term θεός occurs 195 times in 174 verses; in almost all cases it is accompanied with a definite article and is a term that implies the Hebrew deity “proper”, except for its nominative plural use in Isa 37:19; 41:23; 42:17 and the accusative plural use in Isa 44:15, the latter which refers to deities in general, not the Hebrew deity in particular. The theory that the term θεός was considered to be the most suitable Greek equivalent to represent יהוה appears to be a plausible one, at least in OG Isaiah. The data produced from a “surface” comparison between the Hebrew and Greek text traditions of Isaiah, indicates that the term θεός is used, in a large number of cases, as an equivalent for the Tetragram.⁵⁰ Because the “general rule of thumb” states that θεός is the Greek equivalent for אֱלֹהִים, the term is conceptually devaluated as a reasonable candidate to represent יהוה. A channel of conceptual possibilities is opened up when θεός is seen as a significant Greek equivalent for the Tetragram from a very early stage in the Greek text tradition; a theory that would require a broader investigation into how the Tetragram was rendered elsewhere. For now the focus will be confined to the Isaiah text.

Ref	1QIsa ^a	MT	LXX ^{Gött}	S ^c 90–456	S* 36 377–cII 393 403'	O'-Q ^{mg}	oII	Rom 9:28
Isa 10:23	אֲדֹנָי יהוה	אֲדֹנָי יהוה	ὁ θεός			κύριος	ὁ κύριος	κύριος
Isa 10:24	אֲדֹנָי יהוה	אֲדֹנָי יהוה	κύριος	κύριος	ὁ θεός			
Isa 10:26	יהוה	יהוה	ὁ θεός					

⁵⁰ Cf. Isa 1:10; 2:2 4:2; 6:12; 7:17; 8:17, 18; 9:11(10); 10:20, 23, 26; 11:2, 3; 13:6; 14:2, 3, 5, 27; 24:21; 25:10; 26:4b; 27:1; 30:9, 18, 29; 31:1; 33:5, 22; 36:15, 18, 20b; 37:20b, 22; 38:7, 20b, 22; 40:7, 27, 28, 31; 41:4, 14; 42:12, 19, 24; 44:5, 6, 23; 48:17b; 51:13; 54:5, 13; 55:6; 58:8, 9, 11, 13; 61:2; 65:23. The reverse is attested in Isa 7:13, where the term κύριος appears to be an equivalent for אֱלֹהִים; cf. Isa 61:10; 62:5.

In Isa 10:23 the LXX^{Gött} reads ὁ θεός as an equivalent for יהוה אֱדֹנֵי יְהוּדָה supported by the first hand of codices A and S, while codex B reads the term κύριος. Other Greek manuscripts alternate between two possibilities; κύριος supported by some manuscripts belonging to the hexaplaric tradition,⁵¹ while others include the definite article.⁵² Isa 10:24 in turn opted for the term κύριος as an equivalent for יהוה אֱדֹנֵי יְהוּדָה. This reading is opposed by the first hand of codex S which reads κυριος ο θεος, supported by some manuscripts belonging to the hexaplaric tradition.⁵³ A corrector of S offers another possibility, reading κυριος κυριος.⁵⁴ In Isa 10:26, the translators again opted to use ὁ θεός to render יהוה. In all these cases, the Hebrew text tradition is supported by 1QIsa^a. The “out-of-the-ordinary” cluster of attested terms found in ch. 14 (Isa 14:2, 3, 5 and 27) all read the term θεός compared to the MT which only attest to the term יהוה. There seems to be no evidence to suggest the contrary, showing that the Hebrew text tradition is intact. Isa 26:12 testifies to κύριος ὁ θεός as equivalent for יהוה, the only occurrence of its kind in the LXX^{Gött}.⁵⁵ In 26:13, however, the MT reads יהוה אֱלֹהִים with the expected Greek counterpart κύριος ὁ θεός. The reading in Isa 26:12 only makes sense if a “being consistent” argument is adopted to explain the unusual Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. The reading κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ in Isa 28:13 is repeated only in Isa 51:20 in the whole of the LXX^{Gött},⁵⁶ while some manuscripts (Is 28:13) in the hexaplaric tradition together with the Lucianic tradition calls for an “omission” of τοῦ θεοῦ,⁵⁷ with the catena manuscript group supporting the “omission” of κυρίου.⁵⁸ A further noteworthy case is the θεός reading in Isa 37:20b; the MT reads יהוה with 1QIsa^a testifying to יהוה אֱלֹהִים, the latter which opens the possibility that the 1QIsa^a reading’s אֱלֹהִים could present a possible alternative Hebrew *Vorlage* for the LXX^{Gött} reading if the theory is not accepted that the term θεός was considered to be the most “suitable” Greek equivalent for יהוה.⁵⁹

⁵¹ O-Q^{mg}, a reading that is confirmed by the Syro-Palestinian translation and the church fathers Eusebius, Basilus and Tertullian.

⁵² (ο κυρ. oII).

⁵³ + ο θεος S* 36 377-cII 393 403; A 2nd hand of codex S reads κς ο κς while a 3rd hand opted for κς κς. Some manuscripts belonging to the Lucianic tradition “omits” the definite article.

⁵⁴ + (※) κυριος S^c 90-456 = M ↓.

⁵⁵ Cf. Isa 17:6; 24:15; 25:1; 26:13; 30:18; 37:4, 20, 21; 38:5; 42:6, 8, 13, 21.

⁵⁶ Cf. Isa 7:11; 48:1.

⁵⁷ om. τοῦ θεοῦ O' L"-233-456 301 403' 449' 534 Eus.Tht.Hi. = M; om. τοῦ 393.

⁵⁸ om. κυρίου C'-566.

⁵⁹ *Contra* Van der Kooij, “Isaiah in the Septuaginta,” 518–518. In Isa 41:13 one finds a similar case, where the MT reads יהוה אֱלֹהִים while the LXX only reads θεος; cf. Isa 51:15.

One would, however, have to justify why the translator would “discard” יהוה. It is, probable that the translator did not consider it necessary to reproduce an equivalent for both the Hebrew terms, as it was prohibited to pronounce the former. The occurrence in Isa 38:11 seems to confirm the theory that the term θεός is considered the most suitable equivalent for יהוה; the MT reads יה יה with two Hebrew manuscripts testifying to יהוה supported by both Symmachus as well as the Syriac translation with the LXX^{Gött} again reading θεός.

In Isa 41:17 κύριος ὁ θεός appears to represent יהוה (MT) with no text witnesses suggesting an alternative Hebrew reading,⁶⁰ while κύριος ὁ θεός reproduces יהוה אל in Isa 42:5; in the latter case an alternative Hebrew text reading is found in 1QIsa^a reading אל אלהים.⁶¹ It is suggested that the κύριος ὁ θεός reading in Isa 41:17 as well as Isa 42:5, among others, should not be explained on account of its Hebrew *Vorlage*. One should rather consider the κύριος ὁ θεός construction as theologically determined, especially in Isa 41–45. In these chapters, the κύριος ὁ θεός construction appears to be governed by the first personal pronoun ἐγώ together with λέγει,⁶² which could imply that for the translators, if and when the Hebrew deity declares or utters something in reference to the *godly self*, the existential theological *I*, as *logion*, the theological *maximus* is required. If this is a reasonable assumption, it fuels the proposal that neither κύριος nor θεός are “suitable” Greek equivalents to render the Hebrew deity *proper*. This theologically determined understanding of κύριος ὁ θεός is supported by Isa 57:21 reading κύριος ὁ θεός in comparison to the MT which reads אלהי only.⁶³

Another variant reading is attested in Isa 51:15; the term ὁ θεός with a definite article appears to be the Greek equivalent for יהוה אלהים⁶⁴ where one would have expected a Greek equivalent κύριος ὁ θεός.⁶⁵ In Isa 43:1 the Greek text reads κύριος ὁ θεός compared to the MT that only has

⁶⁰ Some Greek manuscripts opted for ὁ ἅγιος (Q ☉), while others “omitted” κυριος (198 538 Sa); cf. Isa 41:20.

⁶¹ Ms 51 “omits” κύριος while some manuscripts from the hexaplaric tradition, including early Church fathers (*oII* 407 410 Ir. [hab. Ir.^{lat}] Cyr.^{l^{em}}) in turn “omit” ὁ θεός.

⁶² A noteworthy exception is found in Isa 44:24, reading Οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ λυτρούμενός σε καὶ πλάσσω σε ἐκ κοιλίας Ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ συντελών πάντα ἐξέτεινα τὸν οὐρανὸν μόνος καὶ ἐστερέωσα τὴν γῆν; this phrase seems to suggest an opposing stance to what is offered as an explanation for the frequent use of κύριος ὁ θεός in Isa 41–45.

⁶³ 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b and 4QIsa^d confirm the Hebrew text reading.

⁶⁴ Cf. Isa 41:13; 48:17; 55:5.

⁶⁵ The Hebrew text tradition does not offer an alternative that would “justify” the current Greek equivalent.

the term יהוה. Why the inconsistency? In Isa 51:15 it is probably a case of influence from the *Vorlage*; such a possibility is introduced by 4QIsa^c which does not testify to the term אלהים, but only to יהוה, a term frequently represented by the term θεός, as shown above. In the case of Isa 43:1, the reason behind the “out-of-the-ordinary” reading could be theological consideration, as was pointed out above. Finally, in Isa 60:9 “naming” the Hebrew deity is brought to the fore; according to OG Isaiah it is the name κύριος that is deemed holy, while for the Hebrew text it is יהוה אלהים. Before moving on to how the variants, alternatives and peculiarities could have impacted the New Testament authors, it might be worthwhile to examine how the OG Isaiah dealt with עֲמֻנּוֹ אֱלֹהִים which came to be known in the New Testament as Ἐμμανουήλ (Matt 1:23). The concept עֲמֻנּוֹ אֱלֹהִים occurs only three times in the MT, all of which are confined to Isaiah. In 7:14 the Hebrew terms are rendered with Ἐμμανουήλ. In Isa 8:8 however, the Hebrew concept is translated with μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός. Finally, in Isa 8:10 the phrase in turn is represented using μεθ’ ἡμῶν κύριος ὁ θεός; three distinct Greek equivalents, one of which found its way into the New Testament (Isa 7:14 cited in Matt 1:23a) and one cited in Matt 1:23b (Isa 8:8).⁶⁶ The effect of this translation will be discussed in the next section of this paper.

4. THE NEW TESTAMENT IMPACT

Reflecting upon the Isaiah text, its history within Christianity and its use in the New Testament is by no means a new venture. A general overview of the history of such influence was undertaken by John Sawyer in 1996,⁶⁷ followed by a compilation of essays edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten Menken on those New Testament books that contain Isaiah citations.⁶⁸ Studies with a more focused and specialised approach are works such as

⁶⁶ NA²⁷ notes that the phrase μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός is sourced from either Isa 8:8 or Isa 8:10, which is technically incorrect; the reading in Isa 8:10 is clearly testifying to κύριος ὁ θεός and not ὁ θεός.

⁶⁷ J. F. A. Sawyer, *The fifth gospel: Isaiah in the history of Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁶⁸ S. Moyise and M. Menken, eds., *Isaiah in the New Testament: The New Testament and Scriptures of Israel* (London / New York: T & T Clark, 2005).

that of Koch,⁶⁹ Stanley,⁷⁰ Wilk,⁷¹ Shiu-Lun Shum⁷² and Wagner;⁷³ all of whom investigated in some way or form the use of Isaiah as scripture in the Pauline literature. Peter Mallen considered the reading and transformation of Isaiah in Luke–Acts.⁷⁴ The objective with this section of the investigation is to consider the impact the Isaianic use of the θεός and κύριος terms might have had on the New Testament authors, using Matt 1:23 (Isa 7:14 and Isa 8:8) and Rom 9:27–29 as test cases; the latter which testifies to two explicit Isaiah citations, Isa 10:22–23 (Rom 9:27–28) and Isa 1:9 (Rom 9:29).

4.1. *Isa 7:14; 8:8 (Matt 1:23)*

The impact of Isa 7:14 and 8:8 in the text of Matt 1:23 and the significance thereof should not be underestimated. The introductory formula launching the citation reads: ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (“for the fulfilment of what *kyrios* said through the prophet”). *Kyrios* is thus the primary acting agent, speaking through the prophet Isaiah, in this case, saying: ἴδου ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ (“behold, the virgin will have in her womb and she will give birth to a son, and they will call him Emmanuel”). The author continues by offering a translation of the Aramaic term with the words: ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεύμενον μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός (“which is translated: *Theos* with us”). Interpreting these citations within their immediate thought-structure (Matt 1:18–25), the import of the κύριος-θεός citation becomes evident. Logically inferred, it is Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Matt 1:18) who should be named Ἰησοῦν (Matt 1:21) and Ἐμμανουήλ (Matt 1:23a); the latter holding the semantic potential of μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός (Matt 1:23b). The citation in Matt 1:23a causes both author and reader to draw a direct conceptual link between Ἰησοῦν and Ἐμμανουήλ. The latter would supposedly

⁶⁹ D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986).

⁷⁰ C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the language of Scripture: Citation technique in the Pauline Epistles and contemporary literature* (Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

⁷¹ F. Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus* (FRLANT 179; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).

⁷² Shiu-Lun Shum, *Paul's use of Isaiah in Romans: a comparative study of Paul's Letter to the Romans and the Sibylline and Qumran sectarian texts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

⁷³ J. R. Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁷⁴ P. Mallen, *Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts* (London / New York: T & T Clark, 2007).

not have been an obvious link, if the Aramaic ܘܫܘܢ, semantically related to ܘܫܘܢܝܘܬܝ, was considered and understood as a literary-conceptual forerunner of Ἰησοῦς with the potential meaning “helper, saviour”. If such an assumption is accepted as plausible, then the citation taken from Isaiah expands the possible meanings of the term Ἰησοῦν from the semantic prospect of “saviour” to Emmanuel to the semantic value of *Theos* with us. This expansion of the semantic field results in the conclusion: Ἰησοῦς is *Theos* among us. It is doubtful that the author of the Matthean gospel could have “creatively” conceptualised that Ἰησοῦς is Ἐμμανουήλ and therefore μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός without the support of Isa 7:14 and Isa 8:8. It remains an open-ended question, if and to what extent the Matthean author considered the theological implication of his citation.

4.2. *Isa 10:22c–23 (Rom 9:27–28)*

The author creates a Χριστός—θεός theological frame of reference in Rom 9:1–25 with its theological thrust fixated in and around Rom 9:5.⁷⁵ The following *theos-kyrios* concept (Rom 9:26–33) is made possible by the three cited texts: Hos 2:1b–c (Rom 9:26), Isa 10:22c–23 (Rom 9:27–28) and Isa 1:9 (Rom 9:29).⁷⁶ Although the attention of this study is on the impact the Isaiah citations might have had on Pauline thought, it is worth noting that the textual integrity of both Hos 2:1b–c and Rom 9:26 in terms of θεός and κύριος appears to be intact.⁷⁷ Literarily and theological-conceptually speaking the term θεός in Hos 2:1b–c could not have referred to any other entity than ִלָּא, the “wisdom” deity of ancient Israel. The same, though, cannot be said for Isa 10:22c–23 in Rom 9:27–28. A variety of possibilities are presented by the Greek witnesses for both Old Testament (hereafter OT) and New Testament (hereafter NT) texts.⁷⁸ All the NT text witnesses

⁷⁵ Rom 9:5 sets the literary context in which the intriguing thrust of the inter-relatedness of the Χριστός and θεός is put to the fore.

⁷⁶ According to H. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief: Kommentar* (Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 303, Paul wants to appeal that the Gentiles belongs to the people of God with the Hos 2:1 citation; in turn, the Isa 10:22–23 confirms the true Israel as the Ekklesia. These citations also confirm the sovereign action of God (ibid., 304). For Schlier (ibid., 304), it is evident that ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος (Rom 9:26) indicates Paul’s apposing stance over and against the Jewish-Apocalyptic and Rabbinic position. Koch (*Schrift*, 146), in turn suggests that the redaction of the Israelites in Isa 10:22 is portrait as a legal act of *Yahweh*.

⁷⁷ The Hebrew text tradition reads ִלָּא with the Greek text tradition offering θεός as equivalent.

⁷⁸ The Hebrew text tradition seems to be intact for the most part, except for a text critical note in the BHS on Isa 10:23 that states that two Hebrew manuscripts “omits” יהוה צבאות.

read κύριος, while the OT text witnesses vary between ὁ θεός, κύριος κύριος and κύριος. From the textual evidence it can be deduced that the יהוה term was either “ignored” from a very early stage of transmission or it had been “omitted” by the Greek translators. The fact remains that יהוה יהוה, when used in combination, often appears to have been contracted into one single Greek equivalent. Paul’s “consistent” use of the term κύριος in Rom 9:28 and Rom 9:29 as sourced from Isa 10:23 and Isa 1:9 respectively, together with the fact that he had ample theologically determined reason to “alter” the citation, points to the fact that he stringently followed his *Vorlage*. If the term κύριος belongs to a *Vorlage*, the reading in Rom 9:28 would seem to be in line with some manuscripts from the hexapla. The theological thrust of יהוה יהוה יהוה “Lord God of Hosts” was already watered down by the Greek translators from a very early stage because they struggled to find a “suitable” Greek equivalent for these Hebrew terms in combination. This struggle spilled over into the New Testament. It is thus more than possible that “other” equivalents for these terms were available, one of which might have primarily impacted Paul. This would imply, taking Rom 9:26 which attests to the term θεός into consideration, that in Rom 9:28 and Rom 9:29 Paul regarded the referent of both the terms θεός and κύριος as one and the same entity: the Hebrew deity. Is this really the case?

What then is the implication of these κύριος citations? Is Paul calling Jesus to mind as the κύριος or as יהוה? In Rom 9:8 Paul speaks of τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ (“that is, not the children of flesh are these children of *Theos*”),⁷⁹ while he asserts in Rom 9:29 that εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαώθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα (“if *Kyrios, lord of hosts*, did not leave a remnant behind for us”). Both κύριος and θεός thus reserve the right to decide which nation or clan to accept or deny, to include or to exclude. Moreover, Paul also commands that ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 9:6) should not be considered invalid, for it will come to fulfilment once and for all on earth (λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [Rom 9:28]). The Hos 2:1b–c citation in Rom 9:26 reinforces the θεός concept introduced in Rom 9:1–25; a concept that called the “supreme” Hebrew deity to mind. The two κύριος citations (Isa 10:23 and Isa 1:9) seem out of place. However, with these two citations, due to their overlapping theme, Paul appears to regard the term θεός (Rom 9:6–8) and the term κύριος (Rom 9:28) as having the same referent; the same could be said

⁷⁹ Cf. Rom 9:7.

for Rom 9:29. It remains unclear if Paul adopted the “underlying” concept of the term κύριος to be a rendering of the Tetragram, although it seems quite plausible. Paul is thus not calling to mind Jesus as the κύριος, but the authoritative nature of the Hebrew deity. These two Isaiah citations suggest that the κύριος term within the explicit citations refers to a different entity than the κύριος term which clearly refers to Jesus as the Christ. The deployment of the two Isaiah citations would ultimately have an impact on how one interprets the conceptual “relationship” between the terms Χριστός and θεός in Rom 9:5. How do the quotations considered above and the conclusions drawn about their impact reflect on the interpretation and understanding of Rom 9:5?

The term Χριστός in Rom 9:5 should first and foremost be understood in relation to the Χριστός terms in Rom 9:1 and Rom 9:3. In both these instances the term Χριστός is presented within a prepositional clause: Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ and ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ respectively. It should further be noted that in both cases the first person singular pronoun in the relevant clause, which refers to Paul, is used. In Rom 9:1 Paul’s truth is considered to be justified ἐν Christ (Rom 9:1), while ἀπὸ refers to a secondary position over and against someone who is ἐν Christ (Rom 9:3).⁸⁰ One could thus, with a reasonable amount of certainty, conclude that the concept underlying the term Χριστός in these verses are one of Christ being a mediator. On the other hand, it would be difficult to deny that through this mediating role, Χριστός, in the mind of Paul, should be praised as θεός, who is θεός over all.⁸¹ This concept is strengthened when one considers the idea that ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα seamlessly fits into the concept of θεός’ free will to make or appoint nations, clans or any group as “his sons” or “his children” as is evidently assigned to both θεός and κύριος in ch. 9. Not only is θεός and κύριος conceptually considered terms referring to the Hebrew deity, but in this case the Χριστός term also belongs to this concept. The impact of the term κύριος in both Isa 1:9 and Isa 10:23 leads one to deduce: (1) Paul stringently follows his *Vorlage*. (2) He considered both the terms θεός and κύριος as terms that “translate” or “represent” the Hebrew deity, even though this is not always the case.

⁸⁰ Cf. E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (London: SCM Press, 1980), 259.

⁸¹ To quote H.-C. Kammler, “Die Prädikation Jesu Christi als ‘Gott’ und die paulinische Christologie: Erwägungen zur Exegese von Rom 9,5b,” *ZNW* 94/3–4 (2003): 171: “Der Begriff θεός wäre dabei nicht im Sinne eines *Nomen proprium* verwendet, sondern als *Wesensbezeichnung*.”

5. CONCLUSION

Rendering those Hebrew terms used when reference was made to the Hebrew deity was as complex as the transmission of the Hebrew text itself. The term אֱדֹנָי was frequently “misrepresented” if used in correlation with the term יְהוָה. Moreover, the *K^otib-Q^ure* perplexity had a major influence on how the terms referring to the Hebrew deity was rendered; this in turn spilled over and impacted the Greek translation of the Hebrew text. The sensitivity, and hence, the prohibition in uttering the “name” of the Hebrew deity became a major factor in the rendering of the terms referring to the Hebrew deity in its Greek conceptual frame of reference. The inference drawn from the investigated data of Isaiah is that the term אֱדֹנָי is consistently rendered using the term δεσποτής as a Greek equivalent, while the term κύριος was primarily employed as the Greek equivalent for the term אֱדֹנָי and יְהוָה. However, the Greek translation of יְהוָה by κύριος is not without exception; in fact, the evidence appears to suggest that the term θεός could be considered as the most suitable term not only as a Greek equivalent for יְהוָה, but as a term that represents the Hebrew deity in general. The data suggests that the term θεός was considered, from the 2nd century B.C.E. onwards, as a suitable Greek equivalent not only as a rendering of the terms referring to the Hebrew deity proper, but also for the personal Hebrew deity “named” יְהוָה. Therefore, the “rule of thumb” or any other systematised rendering of the Hebrew deity in OG Isaiah, at least, should be discarded. Finally, due to the Greek variants available to the New Testament authors, the theological and conceptual shift made by the Greek translators had an impact not so much on the structure of the New Testament text, but undoubtedly on the *theo*-logy and *kyrio*-logie of the New Testament.