ΚΥΡΙΟΣ – Proper Name or Title in Greek Exodus

The use of the article with proper nouns in the Greek translation of the Old Testament is influenced by various factors. Funk-Blass-Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other early Christian Literature* (Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Presss, 1961) (p.133) affirm the conclusion of Weiss and Debrunner that

> In the LXX literalistic translators like to render anarthrous יהוה with anarthrous κύριος, but ל, אל, and את with τῷ κ., τὸν κ.; …the less literalistic translators of the OT and NT prefer a general conformity to the Greek usage of the article:…

There is no doubt that the Greek translator of Exodus regarded κύριος, when it was the equivalent of יהוה, as a proper name.[1] In the vast majority of contexts in Exodus where יהוה/κύριος occurs no Greek article fronts this noun.[2] This is consistent with how this translator treats proper names. However, the most common proper names in Greek Exodus do occasionally occur with the article and κύριος is no exception. It is the contention of this paper that this translator was guided more by Greek usage of the article with proper names, than by a desire to represent certain Hebrew lexemes in his Greek translation. This practice extends to the rendering of יהוה/κύριος.

We will examine those contexts in the Göttingen edition of the Greek Exodus where κύριος as a proper name is arthrous. We seek to discern why in these particular situations the translation has chosen to use the article with this proper noun and will argue that the occurrence of the article is due to a nuance the translator desired to communicate, and not due to the translator's attempt to represent some element in his Hebrew text. Although segments of the Greek Old Testament may have represented elements in the Hebrew text by the article, this does not seem to be the case with the translator of Exodus.

The Greek translator of Exodus normally used proper names anarthrously and in this followed Classical Greek conventions. As Smyth observes:

> Names of *persons* and *places* are individual and therefore omit the article unless previously mentioned …or specially marked as well known.[3]

---

[1] The occurrence of the name of God in Hebrew letters and the Greek name ΙΑΩ in some pre-Christian fragments of the Septuagint has led to the suggestion that the original translators used the Tetragram in their text and that κύριος later was substituted for this Hebrew (or Greek) form. In this paper I support the position that the translator originally used κύριος. Cf. Albert Pietersma, "Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original Septuagint," in *De Septuaginta. Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Alberta Pietersma and Claude Cox (Mississauga, Ontario: Benben Publications 1984):85-102.

[2] Previous studies of the use of κύριος in Exodus would include: W.W. Grafen Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religiongeschichte. Ester Teil: Der Gebrauch des Gottesnamens Kyrios in Septuaginta* (Giessen: Alfred Töpplemann, 1929); Albert Debrunner, "Zur Uebersetzungstechnik der Septuaginta. Der Gebrauch des Artikels bei *κύριος*," BZAW 41(1925):69-78; Lucien Cerfaux, "Le Nom Divin <<KYRIOS>> Dans La Bible Grecque," Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologique 20(1931):27-51.P.W. Skehan, "The Divine Name in Qumran, in the Masada-Scroll and in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 13(1980):14-44. John Wevers, "The Rendering of the Tetragram in the Psalter and Pentateuch: A Comparative Study," in R.J.V. Hiebert, C.E. Cox, and P.J. Gentry (eds). *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honor of Albert Pietersma* (JSOTSup, 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001):21-35. Martin Rösel, "The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31(2001):411-428. I have not had access to the dissertation by Frank Shaw, entitled "The Earliest Non-mystical Jewish Use of ΙΑΩ".

[3] Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1920): 289 [paragraph 1136].

The statistical proportions[4] of arthrous and anarthrous usage of proper nouns in Greek Exodus are quite consistent:

Proper Noun	Total Occurrences	Arthrous occurrences	Anarthrous occurrences	Proportion
Μωυσῆς	292	28	264	9.5% are arthrous
Ἀαρών	118	9[5]	109	7.6% are arthrous
Ἰσραήλ	169	10	159	5.9% are arthrous
Φαραώ	122	7	115	5.7% are arthrous
Κύριος	**359**[6]	**22**	**338**	**6.1% are arthrous**
Total	1042	75	967	7.2% are arthrous

These statistics[7] support Smyth's general observation, but we have yet to demonstrate that the occurrence of the article is due to inner Greek issues, rather than interference from a Hebrew *Vorlage*. The exceptional number of arthrous occurrences in the case of Μωυσῆς arises because the translator regularly rendered צוה יהוה את-משה as συνέταξεν κύριος τῷ Μωυσῇ (eighteen times in Exodus. See footnote 11). The proportion of arthrous and anarthrous uses of κύριος when representing the Tetragram is well within the range of arthrous uses of other proper names.

The Exodus translator "generally adhered closely to a form of the Hebrew text similar to the MT…The terms 'interlinearity' or 'isomorphism' appropriately describe how the translator seems to have proceeded."[8] However, the statistics in the following table indicate that this tendency to isomorphism did not extend to all elements in the Hebrew text, or it if did, it was not followed consistently. As well Greek Exodus has been characterized as "one of the most freely translated books in the Septuagint and one of those in which the requirements of Greek idiom

---

[4] The figures provided are based on the edited text of Greek Exodus prepared by John Wevers. There may be very minor variations in these figures depending upon specific textual variants. However, the percentages would not change appreciably if other counts were made. These figures do not include the sections added by Origin in his Hexaplaric edition. The actual statistics arise from my own analysis of the occurrences.

[5] In some cases the proper name is in a compound structure with another proper name and a single article fronts the compound structure. When Ἀαρών is the second member of such a compound structure I have included in as arthrous.

[6] This number does not include the 19 contexts where κύριος refers to a human husband or slave-owner. Wevers' statistics are slightly different as reported in *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), page 262. He notes the 11 occurrences of the nominative form κύριος to represent a human master, but does not mention the other 6 occurrences in other cases. We agree that arthrous forms of κύριος occur 22 times in Greek Exodus. We differ on our analysis of 24:1. His total occurrences of κύριος to represent God in Greek Exodus adds up to 354. I am not sure what is causing the discrepancy. However, the proportionality of arthrous to anarthrous usage is not affected by this difference.

[7] These statistics are based on my own count of occurrences as expressed in Wevers' Göttingen edition of Greek Exodus.

[8] L. Perkins, "Exodus. To the Reader," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007): 43.

have been best taken into account."[9] These factors would suggest that in cases where the article occurs with proper names and κύριος/יהוה in particular the translator is being guided by Greek syntax and idiom, rather than by a requirement to represent each element in his Hebrew *Vorlage* with some Greek element. Isomorphism has its limits.

I do not doubt that in general the Exodus translator did seek generally to represent his Hebrew text in an isomorphic fashion. Wevers is right to consider first whether the occurrence of the article with proper nouns in Greek Exodus does in fact represent some element in the Hebrew text. However, when we discern that in many cases the proper noun is anarthrous and only a very small percentage are arthrous and, in addition, that the arthrous forms, for example, only rendered twelve of forty-four occurrences of ליהוה, this suggests, in my opinion, that the rationale for the occurrence of arthrous forms is due primarily to inner Greek requirements. We should seek the answer for the occurrence of the article with κύριος in Greek idiom and syntax, not in the translator's attempt to render some element in his Hebrew text. This suggests that the translator nuanced his Greek text, at least to some degree.

Greek and Hebrew Equivalencies

When we compare the occurrences of selected lexemes in the Masoretic text (presuming that this Hebrew text for the most part represents the *Vorlage* used by the translator of Exodus) with the most commonly occurring proper names in Exodus, it is clear that the Greek translator did not use the Greek article to represent any particular Hebrew lexeme. What the chart does show, however, is that the translator does use the article with κύριος in twelve cases where his Hebrew text read ליהוה, but in twenty-eight other cases he has the anathrous form, and in four cases he used a prepositional phrase without the article.

---

[9] Annali Aejmelaeus, "The Problem of the Tabernacle Account," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators. Collected Essays* (Kampen: The Netherlands, 1993):122.

Proper Name	את		ל			אל [10]		
	Ar.	Ana.	**Ar.**	Ana.	Prp.	**Ar.**	Ana.	**Prp.**
Μωυσῆς	**20**[11]	2[12]	**0**	8[13]	0	2[14]	8[15]	65
Ἀαρών	5	8[16]	0	17	1[17]	0	5[18]	10[19]
Ἰσραήλ	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Φαραώ	0	0	4[20]	2[21]	1[22]	2	1	14[23]
Κύριος	2[24]	8[25]	12	28[26]	4[27]	0	0	14

Κύριος in the Original Translation

The statistics I have used relate to the edited text of Greek Exodus created by John Wevers. As the textual apparatus quickly reveals, however, almost every occurrence of κύριος that represents the Tetragram shows some textual variation, usually related to the presence or absence of the article. So the statistics of the usage of the article with κύριος will vary from manuscript to manuscript. Often the presence of the article will signal later scribal adjustments due to the changing conventions that governed the use of the article with proper names.

Another issue that we must consider is the debate concerning what term the original translators of the Pentateuch used to represent the Tetragram. Pre-Christian Jewish papyri of the Septuagint show mixed practices. The scroll of the Minor Prophets (8 HevXIIgr), written in late first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E., used paleo-Hebrew characters to write the

---

[10] In three contexts πρὸς Μωυσῆν occurs where no Hebrew equivalent is found (3:7; 32:22; 34:10). At 3:12 the translator used simply Μωυσῆ.

[11] 16:34; 36:8,12,14,29,34,37,40; 37:20; 38:27; 39:11,22,23; 40:17,19,21,23,25. These represent all the cases in Greek Exodus where a proper name is the indirect object of the verb συντάσσειν. In each case the translator has τῷ Μωυσῆ, except for 37:19. At 16:34 the translator used τῷ Μωυσῆ, but the MT has אל משה. However, the Samaritan text reads את. Wevers does not comment on this. At 37:19 the Greek translator used the aorist passive καθὰ συνετάγη Μωυσῆ to render אשר פקד על־פי משה. This is the only context in Greek Exodus where this equivalence occurs. Consider also the comments of M.Wade, *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek*, pages 103-105. It also occurs in 12:28,50, but in these contexts the verb used is ἐνετείλατο

[12] 2:15; 5:20

[13] 2:21; 4:18; 8:8; 9:27; 10:15; 12:31; 16:22; 19:20.

[14] 9:12; 16:34

[15] 6:9,28; 8:25; 10:24; 16:20; 24:1,16; 31:18

[16] In five cases the proper name is compounded with an articulated noun (29:44; 30:30; 40:10) or is followed by an articulated appositional noun (28:37; 29:5).

[17] This occurs in the unusual expression ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀαρών rendering מאשר לאהרן in 29:27.

[18] In three cases it is followed by the appositional expression τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου (7:9, 19: 8:5).

[19] In five cases the name occurs in the compound expression πρὸς Μωυσῆν καὶ Ἀαρών (6:13; 7:8; 9:8; 12:1,43).

[20] 1:11; 4:22; 6:1; 18:8

[21] 7:1; 8:12.

[22] On one occasion לפרעה is rendered as πρὸς Φαραώ (8:9).

[23] In addition πρὸς Φαραώ is in the Greek text but not the MT at 5:1. At 3:18 Φαραώ is added into a phrase following πρός, but it has no equivalent in the MT.

[24] 5:2; 14:31

[25] 10:7,8,24,26(2x); 12:31; 17:2,7.

[26] There are several places where ליהוה is rendered by other prepositions (ἐναντίον 10:16; πρός 10:17; 32:36; πλήν 22:20) but there is no article used in these contexts.

[27] This includes ἐναντίον κυρίου 10:16; πλὴν κυρίῳ 22:20; πρὸς κύριον 10:17; 32:26.

Tetragram. However, at Hab 2:20 the Greek article precedes the Tetragram, suggesting that the Tetragram might well be secondary.

LXX:	ὁ δὲ κύριος ἐν ναῷ ἁγίῳ αὐτου
8HevXIIgr:[28]	καὶ ὁ **tetr** ἐν ναῷ ἁγίῳ [α]υτοῦ
MT:	ויהוה בהיכל קדשו

A similar phenomenon occurs in this scroll at Zechariah 9:1:

LXX:	διότι κύριος ἐφορᾷ ἀνθρώπους
8HevXIIgr:	ὅτι τῷ **tetr** ὀφθα[λμὸς τῶν ἀν]θρώπων
MT:	כי ליהוה עין אדם.

With respect to the dative function in Zechariah 9:1, it is possible to explain the occurrence of the article to define the function of the proper noun in its clause, because the Hebrew form inserted into the Greek text would give no indication as to case. It may also simultaneously reflect the preposition ל in the Hebrew text. However, with respect to the example from Habakkuk 2:20 the nominative function would not require the article in Greek, but its presence does remove any possible ambiguity. Further there is no element in the Hebrew text that the article represents.

      Martin Rösel also notes the occurrence of the Tetragram in paleo-Hebrew script in Oxyrynchus Papyrus 3522 which has Job 42 and is dated to first century CE.[29]

      Papyrus Fouad 266 (Rahlfs 848) has portions of Greek Deuteronomy dated to first century BCE or early first century C.E. The fragments use the Hebrew square script to render the Tetragram in the Greek translation.

      Skehan[30] published fragrments of a Greek Leviticus scroll (4QLXXLev[b]), a late first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E. text. At 4:27 it reads των εντολων Ιαω. The Old Greek translation has τῶν ἐντολῶν κυρίου. At 3:12 "the final *omega* and enough of the preceding *alpha* are present in the fragments to preclude any other reading there. The first century B.C.E Diodorus of Sicily (I, 94,2) says "that Moses referred his laws to τον Ιαω επικαλουμενον θεον."[31]

      The evidence from Philo and his quotations from the Septuagint and exposition of these texts has received various interpretations. Royse summarizes the various views well.[32] He notes that in various contexts (e.g. *Her.*23, *Somn.*2.29, *Ios.*28, *Spec.*1.30, *QE.* 2.62) Philo comments on the etymology of κύριος. The way he incorporates κύριος into his exposition of the biblical texts would indicate that this is what Philo wrote in his compositions. However, Royse argues that this does not necessarily mean that this is what Philo read in his Septuagint texts. Further evidence is adduced from Philo's comments about the inscription on the gold plate affixed to the high priest's turban. At *Mos.* 2:114-115 and 2.132 Philo comments that the Tetragram is inscribed on this plate and "that name has four letters (τετραγράμματον), so says that master learned in divine verities." Royse concludes that Philo's "remarks at *Mos* 2.114 and 2.132 can be explained if we suppose that he saw the Tetragrammaton untranslated (in either Aramaic or palaeo-Hebrew

---

[28] The text is cited from the reconstruction given by Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers D'Aquila. Première Publication Intégrale du Texte Des Fragments du Dodécaprophéton* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963):176, 178. A photo of the column which has Habakkuk 2:20 is found on page 168. The text is clear. A photo of Zechariah 9:1 occurs on page 170. Again the text is clear.

[29] Martin Rösel, op.cit., 415.

[30] Patrick Skehan, "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 13(1980):14-44.

[31] Ibid., 29. Various Greek onomastica explain Hebrew names which incorporate the Tetragram by using the Greek equivalent ΙΑΩ. What this evidence suggests is that in the period prior to Origin the Hebrew divine name was known, written and read as ΙΑΩ.

[32] James R. Royse, "Philo, ΚΥΡΙΣ, and the Tetragrammaton," in *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism,* Volume III, 1991, pages 167-183.

script) in his Bible."[33] There is no doubt that Philo new that the divine name had four letters in Hebrew, but I am not sure that Royse's argument is convincing, namely that this is evidence that Philo read an Aramaic or palaeo-Hebrew from of the divine name in his Septuagint text. Why could Philo not have known this independently of his interaction with the Septuagint text?

Some conclude from this evidence and other materials that the original translators of the Greek Pentateuch represented the Tetragram in the Greek text either by Hebrew characters or as ΙΑΩ.[34] As is well known, Origen himself in the third century C.E. wrote:

> In the more accurate exemplars [of the LXX] the (divine) name is written in Hebrew characters; not, however, in the current script, but in the most ancient.[35]

In almost all other Septuagint texts, however, the usual rendering is κύριος. So we have at least three possible ways in which the original translator may have represented the Tetragram. This variation in the textual evidence needs serious reflection. As far as the evidence shows, the translators or scribes who transmitted the texts did not mix their choice of rendering.

We must also consider when the qere/kethibh practice of reading אדוני for the Tetragrammaton in the Hebrew text became standard. Was this occurring in public, synagogue readings of the Hebrew text in the third century BCE in Alexandria or in Palestine? What evidence would support this? Or is it the case that the Old Greek translation started or at least gave strong impetus to this practice?[36]

This study accepts the hypothesis that the original translators used κύριος as the rendering of the Tetragram. Pietersma's argument that since sometimes the translator used the genitive article and sometimes the dative article to represent ליהוה, a *"kyrios surrogator"* would more likely have been consistent in his rendering, rather than choosing now one and now another, has considerable cogency.[37] Further as Rösel notes, normally the Greek translator used κύριος to translate יהוה and θεός to render אלהים. However, there are several places in Greek Exodus where κύριος renders אלהים and 41 cases where θεός is the equivalent for יהוה. While there may be dispute in some cases as to whether Wevers textual decision represents what the original translator wrote, the vast majority of these cases are quite firm textually. There is no evidence in these situations that the Greek translator's Hebrew *Vorlage* was different from the Masoretic text that we possess today. If the original translator used either ΙΑΩ or Hebrew script to represent the Tetragram, then we are left supposing that a later revisor decided when to render this transcription as κύριος or θεός. Again, one might suppose some variation ascribed to a revisor, but to have such a large number of cases stretches the probability to an unreasonable extent. I think we have to attribute this alteration to the original translator which also means that the translator used κύριος or as occasion demanded in his mind θεός to translate the Tetragram.

Rösel also uses the Greek translation of Leviticus 24:16 ("but he that names (ὀνομάζων) the name of the Lord, let him die the death") to argue for κύριος being original, because the translator in the very act of using either ΙΑΩ or Hebrew letters of the Tetragram might be

---

[33] Ibid., 183.

[34] P. Skehan and Emmanual Tov have concluded that the original rendering was ΙΑΩ and Frank Shaw has reached the same conclusion in "The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of ΙΑΩ" (PhD dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 2002).

[35] Migne, *PG* 12 1104(b):
καὶ, ἐν τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων Ἑβραίοις χαρακτῆρσι κεῖται τὸ ὄνομα, Ἑβραϊκοῖς δὲ οὐ τοῖς νῦν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀρχαιοτάτοις. Jerome repeats this in *Prologus Galeatus* (*PL* 28 594-95).

[36] Wolf Wilhelm Graf Baudissin *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte* four volumes (Giessen, 1929) concluded that "the ancient LXX read *kyrios* as a surrogate for *Yhwh*, and not a form of the Hebrew tetragram" (as summarized by A. Pietersama in "Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX" in *De Septuaginta* (Toronto: Benben Publications, 1984):85).

[37] Ibid., p.95.

violating this command.[38] However, whether writing the name came under the same curse is uncertain. It is also possible that in an oral reading of the text a *qere* was used, thus avoiding the problem.

Although Skehan proposed[39] a sequential development in the representation of the Tetragram in the Greek translation and revisions of the Old Testament (ΙΑΩ was first, then the Hebrew square script, followed by paleo-Hebrew script and lastly κύριος), it is clear from Qumran materials that אל and אדני both were used to represent the Tetragram. It is difficult given the paucity of evidence and the challenge of dating the current evidence with precision to support Skehan's proposal. It would seem that various conventions were employed concurrently, with one convention favoured in one circle and another by another circle.

Κύριος

Pietersma stats that "a basic rule in the Pentateuch is that *kyrios* is unarticulated in the nominative case, the genitive, as object of a preposition and as subject of an infinitive. *Kyrios* is articulated most often in the dative when rendering Hebrew *le-* prefixed to the tetragram."[40] In Exodus κύριος occurs primarily without the article.[41] If κύριος is bound with a preposition, no article will be present.

Context	Hebrew Text	Old Greek	Variants
5:2	את־יהוה	τὸν κύριον	
9:27	יהוה	ὁ κύριος	
9:29	ליהוה	τοῦ κυρίου	om του 527 Phil III 160
9:30	מפני יהוה	τὸν κύριον	Sup ras 527; > 56*
12:42[42]	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	κυ *oI C* ″ *-126 131* 106* 75'Bo Syh; deo* Arab; om τῷ 131* 118' - 537 106ᶜ 129 127-628
13:12	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	
13:12	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	κω τω θω σου 527;

---

[38] Rösel, op. cit., 418.

[39] Skehan, op. cit., 28-34.

[40] A. Pietersma, "Kyrios or Tetragram…", 93. He notes that it occurs "in Exodus twelve times against twenty-three without articulation" (p.94).

[41] It has frequently been noted that in Greek Exodus when κύριος refers to a human master or lord, rendering אדון (21:4(2x),5,6(2x),8,32) or בעל (21:28,29(2x),34(2x); 22:8,11,12,14,15) it regularly occurs with the article. Wevers in *The Rendering of the Tetragram in the Psalter and Pentateuch: A Comparative Study*, 23 identifies nine instances where κύριος represents a human אדון or אדני. In addition to those occurring in chapter 21, there is Aaron's address to Moses in 32:22. I am only able to account for eight. All of the vocative forms of κύριε in Exodus (except for 32:22) rendering אדון or אדני refer to Yahweh, not to a human agent. We also have the exceptional text at 21:8 where the anarthrous κύριος refers to "a husband" generically. In this case there is no equivalent to κύριος in the MT, but if there was a Hebrew equivalent in the translator's text, then it probably was a form of אדון, given the surrounding uses. A similar situation occurs in 21:36. The Greek translation has the clause καὶ διαμεμαρτυρημένοι ὦσιν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ and in this setting τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ refers to the owner of an ox. MT has no equivalent text. However, the parallel in 21:29 has בבעליו as the equivalent and so presumably the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator in 21:36 did not read a form of אדון.

[42] In the same verse we also read ἡ νύξ αὕτη προφυλακὴ κυρίῳ. Here again there are significant variants: pr τω F 135-426-707⁽ᵐᵍ⁾ *d n s t*⁽⁻⁷⁴⁾ 59; κυ 376 *C* ″ 53' ᴸᵃᵗcodd 101 104 Bo; >15.

			om τῷ 707.
13:15	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	τῷ θεῷ Cyr X 701; om τῷ 707 422 *s* 509 Chr I 354; > Sict
14:25	כי־יהוה	ὁ γὰρ κύριος	
14:31	את־יהוה	τὸν κύριον	προς 68' (sed hab Ald)
15:1	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	*deo* Sah
15:21[43]	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	
16:23	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	om τῷ 707
16:25[44]	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	κω 59; κω τω θω 707
16:29	כי־יהוה	ὁ γὰρ κύριος	om ὁ 76'
24:1	_____מרחק	μακρόθεν τῷ κυρίῳ	Sub obelus Syh; > 58 = MT
30:12	ליהוה	τῷ κυρίῳ	om τῷ B 15-707 *b*[-19] *n* 55 426 Cyr *Ad* 344[PR] (sed hab X 700 Compl)
31:15	קדש ליהוה	ἅγιος τῷ κυρίῳ	*deo* [Lat]cod 100; om τῷ M[txt] *C* 18 426 509
32:5	הג ליהוה	ἑορτὴ τοῦ κυρίου αὔριον	τοῦ] > A F(vid) M[txt] 29-708 *b f* 134 318 *z* 18 46 799 (sed hab Ald)
34:9	אדני(1?)	ὁ κύριός μου	om ὁ A M' 29-58-376-*oI C˝ s* 121' 68' 18 46 59 319 509
34:14	כי־יהוה	ὁ γὰρ κύριος	

In six contexts a nominative form of κύριος occurs with the article.[45] At 9:27 Pharoah confesses his sinful response to Yahweh's requirements.

> LXX: ἡμάρτηκα τὸ νῦν. ὁ κύριος δίκαιος, ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ὁ λαός μου ἀσεβεῖς.
> NETS: "Now I have sinned. The Lord is just but I and my people are impious."
> MT: חטאתי הפעם יהוה הצדיק ואני ועמי הרשעים:
> NRSV: "This time I have sinned; the LORD is in the right, and I and my people are in the wrong."

The Greek text is quite certain, only 126 68'-120 read ο δε κυριος. The article in this case could be emphatic, i.e. deictic, i.e. "This Kyrios is just! But I and my people are impious!", or used to mark the subject of this nominal expression. Another nominal clause with κύριος as subject occurs at 17:15 (κύριός μου καταφυγή יהוה נסי) and κύριος is anarthrous. It is unclear whether

---

[43] Parallels the text in 15:1.

[44] Compare the parallel constructions in 20:10 and 35:2 where the lemma has an unarticulated κύριος. There are no variants for 20:10 with the article. However, the textual tradition is split somewhat at 35:2.

[45] Wevers in *The Rendering of the Tetragram…,* 24 indicates that the nominative form of κύριος is arthrous only three times in Exodus (9:27; 16:29; 34:14). I have noted four cases where ὁ κύριος represents יהוה – the three mentioned by Wevers, plus 14:25. The case of 8:22(18) is unusual, but should also be noted. Once at 34:9 ὁ κύριος represents אדוני.

the translation should be "The Lord is my refuge" or "My Lord is a refuge". The placement of the possessive pronoun creates ambiguity. However, if μου is intended to modify καταφυγή then its placement does not follow the translator's normal practice of maintaining Hebrew word order in such situations. Also in the nominal clause with initial κύριος κύριος at 34:6 the translator used no article, but in this case the appositional ὁ θεός follows. So there does not seem to be a consistent pattern where initial κύριος in a nominal clause is arthrous or anarthrous. We find both situations and so conclude that this is an inner Greek issue and the syntax chosen by the translator is designed to convey some nuance of interpretation, but the presence or absence of the article does not represent anything specific in his Hebrew text.

Three times when the translator chooses to initiate a clause with γάρ and the subject is Yahweh, he renders it as ὁ γὰρ κύριος (14:25 πολεμεῖ; 16:29 ἔδωκεν; 34:14 (nominal clause)). The textual tradition is remarkably uniform in each case. In these cases the articulated nominative κύριος occurs at the beginning of a γάρ clause and represents the structure כי יהוה. These are the only contexts where the nominative form of κύριος occurs in Exodus in this kind of structure.[46] Since γάρ is a postpositive particle this may have influenced the translator's use of the article in these three contexts.

Only once in Greek Exodus does κύριος initiate a clause that begins with δέ (11:3) and in this case the proper name is anarthrous (κύριος δὲ ἔδωκεν).[47]

At 8:22(18) the Greek text represents its Hebrew text by ἵνα εἰδῇς ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος, ὁ κύριος πάσης τῆς γῆς ((NETS) "so that you may know that I am the Lord, the Lord of all the land (or all the earth)") (למען תדע כי אני יהוה בקרב הארץ) (NRSV) "that you may know that I the LORD am in this land"). It would seem that the distinction between κύριος / ὁ κύριος is designed to express "Yahweh, the Lord/Master of all the land/earth". Since the Greek translation is an interpretation of the Hebrew text, we have an example where κύριος, standing for the divine proper name, is distinguished from the ὁ κύριος which means "the one who is lord/master". Plainly ὁ κύριος is an appellative in this context. Perhaps this sense also colours other contexts where an arthrous form of κύριος occurs in Greek Exodus. This text is also a good example of a situation where transliterating κύριος as Kyrios in the English text may be the best way to express the meaning of the Greek translator, i.e. "so that you may know that I am Kyrios, the Lord of all the land."

Finally, there is the peculiar rendering at 34:9:

> MT: אם־נא מצאתי חן בעיניך אדני ילך־נא אדני בקרבנו
> NRSV: "If now I have found favor in your sight, O Lord, I pray, let the Lord go with us."
> LXX:
> εἰ εὕρηκα χάριν ἐνώπιόν σου, συμπορευθήτω ὁ κύριός μου μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν.
> NETS: "If I have found favor before you, let my Lord go together with us."

Plainly אדני is a reference to Yahweh.[48] There is considerable textual variation within the tradition about the rendering in the Greek translation. However, Wevers has evaluated the

---

[46] There are two other contexts in Greek Exodus where a proper name fronts a γάρ clause and in each case the article is used with the proper name (32:1,23 ὁ γὰρ Μωυσῆς). Each time this represents כי זה משה.

[47] In the case of Μωυσῆς the translation usually has the anarthrous form with δέ (7:7; 11:10; 20:21), but in the case of Ἀαρών we find both arthous (7:7; 17:12) and anarthrous (7:2) forms with δέ, when these proper nouns are the subject of a clause. In the case of θεός we find ὁ γὰρ θεός (18:1 כי אלהי) and ὁ δὲ θεός (13:21 ויהוה; 19:19 ואלהים).

[48] Wevers notes in *The Rendering of the Tetragram...*, 23 that "אדני as a designation for God is rare [in Greek Exodus]." He then comments on 4:10; 23:17; 34:9, 23 and seems to suggest that only four examples of this equivalence occur in Greek Exodus. However, the equivalence of δέομαι κύριε for בי אדני is found

evidence with his usual skill and insight. What is clear is that the translator provides here a very literal translation of אדני, i.e. my lord. Probably the translator did not consider אדני as a reference to the Tetragram in this context. Thus, κύριος is not a proper name in this context and so the use of the article is quite appropriate.

In 2 cases the Greek article with κύριον may reflect the nota accusativa in the Hebrew text (5:2; 14:31).[49] However, there are many other cases where את־יהוה is rendered by the unarticulated κύριον (10:7,8,24,26(2x);12:31; 17:2,7). The data indicates that use of the article with κύριον in these two cases does not represent a default rendering of the Hebrew nota accusativa, but more probably represents Greek idiomatic or stylistic elements.

The translator by using the article in these two instances is seeking to express some nuance that he regarded as relevant to these contexts. At 5:2 the translator renders Pharaoh's response to Moses' demand as:

Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν κύριον, καὶ τὸν᾽ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἐξαποστέλλω.

The use of the article both with κύριον and᾽ Ἰσραήλ is unusual, and perhaps expresses a pejorative nuance, i.e. "I do not know this Kyrios and this Israel I am not sending away!"

The case of 14:31 should be compared to 9:30.[50] In both Greek contexts we have a form of φοβεῖσθαι + τὸν κύριον and these are the only two contexts in Greek Exodus where κύριον is the object of φοβεῖσθαι. The Hebrew text is quite different in each context:

9:30 כי תיראון מפני יהוה אלהים "that you do not yet fear the LORD God" (NRSV)
ὅτι οὐδέπω πεφόβησθε τὸν κύριον [51] (subject is Pharoah and his servants)[52]
14:31 וייראו העם את־יהוה "so the people feared the LORD" (NRSV).
ἐφοβήθη δὲ ὁ λαὸς τὸν κύριον.

There is some leveling occurring in the Greek translation.[53] It is possible to read the article in both cases with an anaphoric sense. In the case of 9:30 Moses has told Pharoah that he will pray to Yahweh for the thunder, hail and rain to cease "in order that he [Pharoah] might know that the earth [or land] belongs to Kyrios." In the following verse Moses acknowledges that Pharoah and his leaders do not yet fear "this Kyrios". With respect to 14:31 Yahweh has just destroyed the

---

not only at 4:10, but also at 4:13. In addition the vocative κύριε renders אדוני at 5:22; 15:17 and in each context this refers to Yahweh

[49] Wevers comments in *The Rendering of the Tetragram...,* 24 "The structure τὸν κύριον occurs three times in Exodus. In two cases the τὸν represents the preposition in את־י־יהוה (5,2;14,31), but at 9,30, the LXX uniquely reads τὸν κύριον for יהוה…." The Hebrew preposition in both cases is the nota accusativa.

[50] R. Sollamo comments on these passages in *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979): 91: "Instead of a preposition construction a simple accusative is employed three times to translate מפני + the following noun (Ex 9,30; 10, 3 Prv 30,30),… These accusatives follow the verbs φοβεῖσθαι (Ex 9,30; Is 51,13), ἐντρέπεσθαι (Ex 10,3)…and agree with normal Greek practice."

[51] In 8:10 the double divine name יהוה אלהים is also rendered by the singular κύριος. Only Hexaplaric witnesses have the addition ο θεος ημων. This is the only other context in Greek Exodus where this equivalent occurs. In three contexts the reverse occurs, namely a form of θεός represents this expression (3:18 (2x); 5:3). In the two occurrences in 3:18 θεος is the minority reading, as at 5:3, but accepted by Wevers as original, presumably because in these cases manuscripts A and B support it. As he says, "A very popular F M variant has added κυριος and κυριω resp., thereby conforming to MT" (*Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus,* 36. Cf. page 60.).

[52] There is a textual variant: κύριον] θεον B 29' 44 392 76' 130 646' Bo[A] (sed hab Sixt).

[53] Wevers, *Notes*, p. 141 says that "κύριον when referring to God is hardly ever articulated in Exod (elsewhere only at 5:2 and 14:31), whereas θεόν lacks the article only once (7:1) where the unarticulated form is exegetically necessary." If Wevers' is referring specifically to the accusative form κύριον, then he is correct.

Egyptian army in the Red Sea. Israel has seen "what Kyrios did to the Egyptians". As a result "the people feared this Kyrios".[54]

As other scholars have noted, arthrous forms of κύριος in Greek Exodus occur primarily in the genitive and dative cases, as renderings of the phrase ליהוה. In 12 of the cases in Exodus an arthrous form of κύριος represents the Hebrew prepositional phrase ליהוה.[55]

Twice the translator used the genitive τοῦ κυρίου to indicate how ליהוה defines another noun (9:29; 32:5).[56] In the case of 9:29 the translator renders the Hebrew as:

ἵνα γνῷς ὅτι τοῦ κυρίου ἡ γῆ   למען תדע כי ליהוה הארץ

Nominal clauses that have a genitive in the predicate can define possession.[57] Whether ἡ γῆ refers to the earth or the land of Egypt is unclear. However, the translator affirms that when Yahweh answers Moses prayer for the thunder, hail and rain to stop, Pharoah will know "that the land (or earth) is the Lord's." The article in this context probably conveys the sense that the land belongs to "this Kyrios", the one to whom Pharoah has asked Moses to pray for relief from the devastating weather. Pharoah has recognized that "this Kyrios is just" (ὁ κύριος δίκαιος 9:27) and has asked Moses to pray "for me to Kyrios" (περὶ ἐμοῦ πρὸς κύριον 9:28). So Moses complies and the translator emphasizes by the use of the article that Kyrios (Yahweh) is the one responsible and Pharoah is acknowledging this reality.

The expression חג ליהוה occurs in 12:14 (Passover – ἑορτὴν κυρίῳ); 13:6 (seventh day feast of unleavened bread – ἑορτὴ κυρίου) and 32:5 (Aaron's feast before the Golden Calf – ἑορτὴ τοῦ κυρίου). We also find חג־יהוה at 10:9 (ἑορτὴ κυρίου), where it describes the reason Moses and Aaron give to Pharoah for releasing Israel. The alteration between genitive and dative reflects the translator's understanding of the Hebrew text. The genitive probably signifies a feast ordered by Yahweh (10:9 (bound construction in Hebrew and subjective genitive in Greek); 13:6), whereas the dative probably represents a feast dedicated to Yahweh (12:14).

In the case of 32:5 the translator used a genitive construction to represent חג ליהוה, suggesting that Aaron is claiming that this is a feast ordered by Yahweh.

32:5 καὶ ἐκήρυξεν Ἀαρὼν λέγων Ἑορτὴ τοῦ κυρίου αὔριον   ויקרא אהרן
ויאמר חג ליהוה מחר

This may be part of the larger interpretative framework in Greek Exodus 32ff that tends to enhance Aaron's responsibility for Israel's idolatry.

But why did the translator[58] use the arthrous τοῦ κυρίου here, but not in the other contexts of Exodus?[59] Wevers suggests that "it contrasts with legitimate feasts of the Lord; i.e. the

---

[54] Wevers in *Text History of the Greek Exodus,* 262. suggests that "τὸν κύριον stands for את יהוה", but if so, this does not explain the other contexts where the nota accusativa with the Tetragram is rendered anarthrously in Greek Exodus. In fact, this would be only the second case.

[55] 9:29; 12:42; 13:12(2x), 15; 15:1,21; 16:23,25; 30:12; 31:15; 32:5.

[56] An anarthrous κυρίου represents ליהוה in Wevers edition at 13:6; 28:32; 35:22. At 28:32 many witnesses read κυρίῳ: O-29 414' *b* 107'-125 *n s* 71' 426 Phil II 288 ^Lat codd 91 94-96 100 Aeth Syh (sed hab Compl) = MT (as noted by Wevers). In his *Text History of the Greek Exodus*, 262, Wevers explains the arthrous τοῦ κυρίου at 9:29 (he cites 8:29) and 32:5 as "intended by the translator as a representation of the preposition." But this begs the question why the translator is so inconsistent in this representation of the Hebrew preposition by the article in so many other instances.

[57] Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Volume III Syntax* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963): 231.

[58] W.W. Grafen Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religiongeschichte. Ester Teil: Der Gebrauch des Gottesnamens Kyrios in Septuaginta* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1929): 24. Baudissin suggests that the presence of the article may imply an "appellative Färbung", reflecting a sense of "'Herr'." But in saying this he wants to be careful to emphasize that this is a nuance and the sense of κύριος as the proper name for Yahweh is never overshadowed. Later Baudisson (page 72) suggests that

rarely articulated genitive is intentional…."[60] Certainly the context is unusual. In 32:1 the people demand that Aaron make them "gods, who will go before us." Aaron responds by fashioning the Golden Calf and declaring (v.4) that the calf represents Israel's "gods", plural. This is repeated in Yahweh's revelation to Moses on Sinai (v.9). Aaron blames the people (v.23) who demanded, "Make us gods who will go before us." Finally, when Moses pleads with God not to destroy Israel, Moses admits their great sin in producing "gold gods" (v.31). So the passage is consistent in using the plural to describe the Golden Calf as representing plural gods for Israel. This plurality is already indicated in the Hebrew text through the plural form of the verbs in 32:1,23. However, in the Greek text of 32:5 Aaron uses the singular τοῦ κυρίου, representing the Hebrew ליהוה. Perhaps then the Greek translator is indicating a meaning such as "a feast established by this Yahweh", i.e. the one represented now by the Golden Calf, not by Moses or the Law that Moses is transmitting.

Ten times in Wevers' edition of Greek Exodus the articulated dative form τῷ κυρίῳ represents ליהוה.[61] Usually, as Baudisson noted, it is "in Verbindung mit sakralen Ausdrücken."[62] Sometimes the simple dative τῷ κυρίῳ (12:42; 16:23, 25; 31:15) may mark possession or reference:

12:42a νυκτός.[63] (42) προφυλακή ἐστιν τῷ κυρίῳ (ליל שמרים הוא ליהוה)

[12:42b ἐκείνη ἡ νὺξ αὕτη προφυλακὴ κυρίῳ
הוא־הלילה הזה ליהוה שמרים]

16:23 σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ αὔριον שבתון שבת־קדש ליהוה מחר

16:25 ἔστιν γὰρ σάββατα σήμερον τῷ κυρίῳ כי־שבת היום ליהוה

[20:10 τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ σάββατα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ
ויום השביעי שבת ליהוה]

31:15 σάββατα, ἀνάπαυσις ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ שבת שבתון קדש ליהוה

In three of these cases the context relates to Sabbath observance (16:23,25; 31:15), while the other is linked with Passover ritual (12:42). We also find cases where Sabbath observance (35:2 reads σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις κυρίῳ שבת שבתון ליהוה) is expressed by anarthrous κυρίῳ. With respect to Passover we also find τὰ πάσχα κυρίῳ פסח ליהוה (12:48). We find similar formations in other places in Exodus where an unarticulated form of κύριος is used.[64] So the translator was not consistent in rendering ליהוה in such cases. In some contexts such as 12:42 in the same verse we read the arthrous and then anarthrous form. Whether we should see some sense

---

simple genitive κυρίου "ist also eine Art genitivus subjectivus" notion, in the sense of something established "by the Lord."

[59] It should be noted that a significant number of manuscripts omit the article: A F(vid) M^txt 29-708 *b f* 134 318 *z*18 46 799, as Wevers' edition indicates. 106* and Syh read τω.

[60] Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus,* 520.

[61] Wevers asserts that "the τῷ represents the preposition of ליהוה (in *The Rendering of the Tetragram...,* page 24). However, this does not explain the many other cases in Exodus where no article is present in the Greek rendering of this phrase.

[62] Baudissin, op.cit., 72.

[63] In the MT ליל begins v. 42. However, in the Greek and Samaritan texts is seems to be conjoined with v.41.

[64] ליהוה = κυρίῳ : 8:8,26,27,28,29; 10:25; 12:14,27,42,48; 29:18,25,28,41; 30:10,13,20,37; 32:29; 35:2,5, 29; 36:39. Pietersma counts twenty-three also. In some of these contexts (e.g. 29:18; 30:10) a minority of witnesses place an article before κυρίῳ. As well, in some contexts Hexaplaric influence may be evident with the addition of the article (12:14; 29:28; 30:20; 35:5, 22). At 17:15 there is no Hebrew equivalent in MT but Wevers shows κυρίῳ as original, even though many manuscripts omit it. Wevers wonders whether the omission represents a pre-Origenic revision towards a Hebrew text (*Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 272.) At 17:16 the Hebrew text is rendered in quite a different manner: πολεμεῖ κύριος ἐπὶ Αμαλὴκ מלחמה ליהוה בעמלק.

of "Herr" in the arthrous examples, as Baudisson proposed, remains an open question. There does not seem to be anything specifically in the context that would suggest this emphasis in these cases, as opposed to contexts such as 35:2 or 12:48.

Sometimes it marks an indirect object (13:12(2x),15; 15:1,21; 30:12):

13:12 καὶ ἀφελεῖς πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν…τῷ κυρίῳ

והעברת כל־פטר־רחם ליהוה

τὰ ἀρσενικὰ ἁγιάσεις τῷ κυρίῳ הזכרים ליהוה

13:15 διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ θύω τῷ κυρίῳ πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν

על־כן אני זבח ליהוה הכל־פטר רחם

15:1 ἄισωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ אשירה ליהוה

15:21 ἄισωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ שירו ליהוה

30:12 καὶ δώσουσιν ἕκαστος λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ

ונתנו איש כפר נפשו ליהוה [65]

In some contexts it might be argued that the presence of the article fills an anaphoric and somewhat emphatic function. For example, in Exodus 13 Moses instructs Israel about the way they are to remember and celebrate God's preservation of Israel during the night when He slaughtered Egypt's firstborn. In 13:9 Moses affirms that κύριος is responsible for their escape from Egypt. This same κύριος ὁ θεός (v.11) will lead them into the land of the Canaanites. When they arrive there, they must dedicate all their firstborn to τῷ κυρίῳ "this Kyrios" (v.12) and they must consecrate the males τῷ κυρίῳ "this Kyrios". In v.14 Moses instructs them how to respond to their children's questions about this ritual. It is κύριος (v.14) who has led them from Egypt and therefore "I am sacrificing to τῷ κυρίῳ 'this Kyrios' everything opening the womb, the males,.." (v.15). In other words the use of the article is referential in the context and reflects a Greek discourse element. A similar argument can be made with respect to the arthrous τῷ κυρίῳ in 15:1,21. Note the arthrous τὸν κύριον in 14:31, which just precedes.

The occurrence of the arthrous τῷ κυρίῳ in 30:12 is more difficult. Yahweh is giving instruction to Moses for the half didrachma payment that each Israelite male must pay as a "ransom of his soul to the Lord" when a census is taken. This is the first occurrence of κύριος in this section (30:11-16), other than the initial discourse note in v.11 that "the Lord spoke to Moses, saying,…" In verses 13-16 κύριος occurs four more times, but is always anarthrous (as it is throughout this chapter apart from v.12). The article probably then is not functioning in any anaphoric sense. It is the case that B 15-707 *b*[-19] *n* 55 426 Cyr *Ad* 344[PR] do not have the article here. Perhaps the anarthrous form is the original reading.[66] In 30:10 A 25 *b d f*[129] 84 121 799 Cyr *Ad* 617 read τῷ κυρίῳ also, but Wevers has accepted κυρίῳ as the most likely reading.

At Exodus 24:1 τῷ κυρίῳ occurs but the MT has no Hebrew equivalent.[67]

LXX: καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν μακρόθεν τῷ κυρίῳ

MT: והשתחויתם מרחק.

τῷ κυρίῳ seems to be the original Greek text because the manuscript tradition shows sub obelus Syh and its omission in 58. Wevers considers this an "epexegetical" addition, clarifying whom the people are to worship "at a distance."[68] Whether or not the translator's Hebrew *Vorlage* had

---

[65] In 30:10,13,20,37 ליהוה is rendered by anarthrous κυρίῳ.

[66] In the data provided by Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Exodus*, 81-92, manuscript B supported by a minority of manuscripts at 8:8 and 24:1 has the article with κύριος where Wevers has opted for an anarthrous form. So this manuscript is not in the habit of adding or deleting the article with κύριος.

[67] Wevers in *Text History o f the Greek Exodus*, 262 says that at 24:1 the articulated noun represents אל־יהוה, but this must be an error, because there is no such phrase in the MT at the end of 24:1. It does occur earlier in 24:1 but there it is rendered by πρὸς κύριον, as it normally is in Greek Exodus.

[68] Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 379.

ליהוה, he may have chosen the articulated form to emphasize anaphorically that this is the same Kyrios that the elders will ascend Sinai to worship (πρὸς κύριον 24:1).

In Exodus 23:17 and its parallel 34:23 the translator had to deal with the unusual phrase אל־פני האדן יהוה (at 34:23 this is את־פני־האדן יהוה אלהי ישראל). If he followed his normal equivalencies, we would expect κυρίου κυρίου, a rather awkward expression. In both cases he opts for ἐνώπιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ (adding σου in 23:17 and including in 34:23 the equivalent Ἰσραήλ), presumably because he wants to avoid the repetition. Wevers believes that the rendering at 23:17 is influenced by 34:23. Further, he thinks that the MT was not the Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the translator.[69] He may well be correct. We should note 34:6 where the translator does render יהוה יהוה אל as κύριος κύριος ὁ θεός, faithfully representing the repeated Tetragram. However, many manuscripts only have κύριος ὁ θεός, which creates some uncertainty as to what the original translator wrote in this context. Rahlfs follows the shorter reading in his text. Wevers' explains the shorter text as due to haplography.

The common anarthrous use of κύριος in Greek Exodus to represent the Tetragram demonstrated by this investigation confirms that it functions primarily as a proper name.[70] A second conclusion is that the Greek translator probably employed an article with κύριος (when representing the Tetragram directly or אדוני when referring to Yahweh) because of internal Greek requirements, rather than a means of rendering some element in the Hebrew text. The infrequent arthrous constructions in Greek Exodus do not reflect an element in his Hebrew text (i.e. the preposition ל or the nota accusativa את). Rather we have sought to demonstrate that the occurrence of the article probably reflects some emphasis the translator wanted to express in a specific context. Whether we can recover these nuances of meaning correctly and fully remains to be seen. If this second conclusion has correctly interpreted the data, it indicates that the Exodus translator paid attention to larger discourse structures and used Greek structures to communicate specific nuances in his text. The fact that these Greek structures on occasion occur where corresponding elements may be found in the Hebrew text, does not mean that the translator intended them to represent Hebrew elements, given their inconsistent occurrence. Finally, I would observe that if the translator did use Hebrew characters to represent the Tetragram in his translation, the inconsistent use of the article, particularly when rendering the phrase ליהוה is even more difficult to understand.

---

[69] Wevers, "The Rendering of the Tetragram…," op.cit., pages 23-24.

[70] The reasons why the Greek translators of the Hebrew text chose κύριος as the rendering of the divine name remain somewhat unclear. It is quite possible that the use of this term within Egyptian documents to describe the Pharaoh and divine beings gave its use in the Jewish Alexandrian community for יהוה an ironic and somewhat politically charged significance, serving to express the unique position Yahweh occupies, despite the pretensions of the Ptolemies.