

ABSENTIA NOMINUM SACRORUM IN LIBRO IOB 2.0: THE EXAMINATION OF THE
MINUSES OF אֱלֹהִים, יְהוָה, אֵל AND שְׁדֵי IN LXX JOB

Recently, there is a renewed interest in whether the Septuagint (LXX) books reflect a different theology than their Hebrew counterpart preserved in the Masoretic text (MT) ¹. In order to contribute to this question, I have analysed the pluses containing θεός and κύριος in LXX Job as well as the minuses in LXX Job where MT attests אֱלֹהִים ². Since pluses and minuses are explicit differences between the Greek and Hebrew text, these might reveal theological nuances between the two versions ³. Indeed, the study on the pluses in LXX Job has shed more light on the theology of the LXX translator. The LXX translator has stressed the piety of Job, God's omnipotence and the importance of observing the Mosaic Law ⁴. Remarkably, however, although the study on the pluses has indicated that a more nuanced theology can be detected, the study on the minuses of אֱלֹהִים in LXX Job did not ⁵. Still, next to אֱלֹהִים, there are other divine names, *i.e.* יְהוָה, אֵל and שְׁדֵי, that are attested in MT but which have no reading in LXX Job. Therefore, in order to contribute to the question of a possible diverging theology in LXX Job, this article will examine these minuses ⁶.

The minuses will be registered and, consequently, evaluated in order to discern

¹ The recent volume of the Septuagint Handbook/Handbuch zur Septuaginta (LXX.H) is a prime example of this. See H. AUSLOOS – B. LEMMELIJN (eds.), *Die Theologie der Septuaginta / The Theology of the Septuagint* (LXX.H 5; Gütersloh 2020).

² See XXX and XXX.

³ The importance of looking at explicit differences between MT and the LXX in order to see whether the LXX reflects theological nuances has been underscored by several scholars. See *i.a.*, E. DAFNI, "Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta", *TZ* 58 (2002) 315-328, here 327; A. AEJMELAEUS, "Von Sprache zur Theologie. Methodologische Überlegungen zur Theologie der Septuaginta", *The Septuagint and Messianism* (eds. in M. A. KNIBB) (BETL 195; Leuven 2006), 21-48, here 30; J. COOK, "Towards the Formulation of a Theology of the Septuagint", *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (ed. A. LEMAIRE) (VTS 133; Leiden – Boston, MA 2010) 621-640, here 622; H. AUSLOOS, "Sept défis posés à une theologie de la Septante", *Congress Volume IOSOT Stellenbosch 2016* (eds. L. C. JONKER – G. R. KOTZÉ – C. M. MAIER) (SVT 177; Leiden – Boston, MA, 2017, 228-250, here 249-250; H. AUSLOOS – B. LEMMELIJN, "Theology or not? That's the Question. Is There Such a Thing as 'The Theology of the Septuagint'?", *Die Theologie der Septuaginta / The Theology of the Septuagint* (eds. H. AUSLOOS – B. LEMMELIJN) (LXX.H 5; Gütersloh 2020) 19-45.

⁴ See XXX.

⁵ See XXX.

⁶ In this article, we are solely interested in the minuses of the LXX where MT records אֱלֹהִים, יְהוָה, אֵל or שְׁדֵי. The instances where the LXX presents a different rendering such as αὐτός for אֵל (אַל-ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ) in Job 13,3 will not be discussed. However, an examination of these renderings might be interesting to examine as well.

whether the Greek text entails a different theology than the Hebrew text. By studying the remaining minuses concerning a divine name in LXX Job, this article aims at obtaining a better understanding of the translation technique and theology of the LXX translator.

I. THE REGISTRATION OF THE MINUSES IN LXX JOB WHERE MT READS יהוה, אֱלֹהִים, אֵל AND שְׁדִי

Before evaluating the minuses in LXX Job where MT reads a divine name, they need to be registered. In his unpublished doctoral dissertation entitled *Le texte court de la version grecque du livre de Job*, Dominique Mangin has catalogued all the divine names in MT Job and their Greek rendering in the LXX ⁷. Concerning the minuses in the LXX where MT records יהוה, אֱלֹהִים, אֵל and שְׁדִי, the following distribution can be found ⁸:

Divine name	Verse(s)	Amount
יהוה	2,1; 12,9 (※); 40,1 (※); 42,9	4
אֱלֹהִים	1,16	1
אֵל	13,8; 15,11; 22,13 (※); 22,17; 33,6; 33,29 (※); 34,31 (※); 36,22a (※); 36,26 (※); 37,5a (※); 37,10 (※)	11
שְׁדִי	21,15 (※); 29,5; 31,2b (※); 40,2 (※)	4

However, several of these verses are marked with an asterisk (※) in Ziegler's critical edition of LXX Job ⁹. Since these verses do not belong to the original, Old Greek (OG), translator of Job and since it can be debated whether these verses were omitted by the OG translator or caused by a diverging Hebrew *Vorlage* ¹⁰, these

⁷ See D. MANGIN, *Le texte court de la version grecque du livre de Job et la double interprétation du personnage jusqu'au II^e siècle*. Tome I (Ph.D. Diss.; Aix-en-Provence 2005) 46-57.

⁸ List based upon the analysis made by Mangin. For his analysis, see D. MANGIN, *Le texte court*, 46-57.

⁹ For Ziegler's critical edition of LXX Job, see J. ZIEGLER, *Job* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum XI/4; Göttingen 1982). Peter Gentry has corrected Ziegler's demarcation of the asterisked material. See P. J. GENTRY, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SBLSCS 38; Atlanta, GA 1995) esp. 31.

¹⁰ For an overview regarding the question of whether the shorter Greek text can be explained due to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* or the translation technique of the LXX translator, see M. DHONT, *Style and Context of Old Greek Job* (SJSJ 183; Leiden – Boston, MA 2016) 28-33. However, nowadays, scholars seem to agree that the shorter Greek text can be explained due to the translator's

verses will not be discussed in this article ¹¹. Therefore, we will only discuss the following verses:

<i>Divine name</i>	<i>Verse(s)</i>	<i>Amount</i>
יהוה	2,1; 42,9	2
אֱלֹהִים	1,16	1
אֵל	13,8; 15,11; 22,17; 33,6	4
שְׁדִי	29,5	1

As can be seen from the list *supra*, there are 8 instances where יהוה, אֱלֹהִים, אֵל or שְׁדִי are not attested in the LXX version of Job. In the following paragraph these minuses will be evaluated in order to examine whether these minuses in LXX Job reflect a different theology than MT.

II. THE EVALUATION OF THE MINUSES IN LXX JOB WHERE MT READS יהוה, אֱלֹהִים, אֵל AND שְׁדִי

Now that all the minuses in LXX Job where MT attests יהוה, אֱלֹהִים, אֵל and שְׁדִי have been registered, we can start evaluating them. By doing so, it is necessary to examine whether these minuses are due to a diverging Hebrew *Vorlage*, the translation technique of the LXX translator or the textual transmission of the Hebrew or Greek text. If a minus can be ascribed to the translation technique of the LXX translator, it needs to be determined whether the LXX translator was motivated by theological considerations to omit the divine name in his Greek translation.

2.1. The minuses of יהוה

The divine name יהוה occurs 32 times in MT Job. In the LXX it is always rendered by (ὁ) κύριος. Only in two instances, LXX Job records a minus where MT attests יהוה, *i.e.* in 2,1 and 42,9. These verses will be discussed *infra*.

translation technique. See *ibid.*, 33.

¹¹ It is interesting to note that in the asterisked material, יהוה has been rendered by κύριος (12,9) and κύριος ὁ θεός (40,1); אֵל by ὁ ἱσχυρός (in all 7 instances) and שְׁדִי by ἰκανός (in all 3 instances).

2.1.1. Job 2,1

MT ¹²	LXX ¹³
וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם וַיָּבֹאוּ בְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים לְהִתְיַצֵּב עַל־ יְהוָה וַיָּבֹא גַם־הַשָּׂטָן בְּתוֹכָם לְהִתְיַצֵּב עַל־ יְהוָה:	Ἐγένετο δὲ ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ παραστῆναι ἔναντι κυρίου, καὶ ὁ διάβολος ἦλθεν ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.
One day the heavenly beings came to present themselves before the Lord, and the accuser also came among them to present himself before the Lord ¹⁴ .	Now it happened, when it was the set day and the angels of God came to present themselves before the Lord, the slanderer also came among them ¹⁵ .

The LXX text has a minus where MT reads *לְהִתְיַצֵּב עַל־יְהוָה* ('to present himself before the Lord'). Although the LXX does not have a translation for this phrase, both Aquila (α') and Theodotion (θ') read *παραστῆναι ἔναντιον τοῦ κυρίου*. Also the Vulgate, Targum and Peshitta have a reading for *לְהִתְיַצֵּב עַל־יְהוָה* ¹⁶. Therefore, this phrase cannot be considered a gloss in MT as several commentators have proposed ¹⁷. One might perhaps argue that the LXX translator deliberately did not render *לְהִתְיַצֵּב עַל־יְהוָה* based upon theological motives. August Dillmann argues that it is possible that the LXX has opted not to translate the phrase in order to convey that the slanderer cannot be considered equal to the rest of the angels of God ¹⁸. However, in 1,9 the expression *ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου* and in 2,2 *ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου* is used to convey that the slanderer spoke before the Lord. Thus, it seems improbable that the LXX translator did not use *παραστῆναι ἔναντιον τοῦ κυρίου* to translate *לְהִתְיַצֵּב עַל־יְהוָה*, since the same expression, with only a difference in the verb used, is also applied elsewhere in his translation. Claude E. Cox, on the other hand,

¹² For MT, the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia has been used since the Biblia Hebraica Quinta (BHQ) is still in preparation. For the BHS, see K. ELLIGER et al., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart ⁵1977).

¹³ The text of the LXX of Job is taken from the Göttingen edition. See ZIEGLER, *Job*.

¹⁴ English translation taken from NRSV.

¹⁵ English translation of the LXX taken from NETS. See C. E. COX, "Iob", *A New English Translation of the Septuagint. And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (eds. A. PIETERSMA – B. G. WRIGHT) (New York — Oxford 2007) 667-696.

¹⁶ See C. L. SEOW, *Job 1-21. Interpretation and Commentary* (Illuminations; Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge 2013) 300.

¹⁷ See i.a. . G. BEER, *Der Text des Buches Hiob* (Marburg 1897) 11.

¹⁸ A. DILLMANN, "Textkritisches zum Buche Ijob", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 53 (1890) 1345-1373, here 1353.

proposes that the LXX translator deliberately opted not to render **עַל־יְהוָה לְהִתְיַצֵּב** to avoid repetition with the first stich of the verse where **עַל־יְהוָה** is attested as well ¹⁹. Since the avoidance of repetition is indeed a trait of the LXX translator of Job ²⁰, this might be the most plausible explanation. Moreover, Edouard Dhorme comments that the LXX has not rendered this phrase to enhance uniformity with 1,6 ²¹:

MT	LXX
וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם וַיָּבֹאוּ בְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים לְהִתְיַצֵּב עַל־יְהוָה וַיָּבֹא גַם־הַשָּׂטָן בְּתוֹכָם:	Καὶ ὡς ἐγένετο ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἦλθον οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ παραστῆναι ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ὁ διάβολος ἦλθεν μετ’ αὐτῶν.
One day the heavenly beings came to present themselves before the Lord, and the accuser also came among them.	And when the set day came, then, look, the angels of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and the slanderer came with them.

Indeed, the similarities between the two verses are striking. In MT, the only difference found is the absence of a second **עַל־יְהוָה** in 1,6. In the LXX, there are several minor nonsignificant differences, which also points at the translator’s tendency to create variation ²²:

1,6	2,1
καὶ	δὲ
/	ἰδοὺ
ἐναντι κυρίου	ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου
ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν	μετ’ αὐτῶν

Thus, the LXX translator of Job did not render **עַל־יְהוָה לְהִתְיַצֵּב** to (a) avoid repetition in the same verse and (b) to create textual unity with 1,6. There is no need to resort

¹⁹ See. C. E. COX, *Job* (SBL.CS) (forthcoming). I am grateful that Claude E. Cox has provided me access to his provisional manuscript of his commentary. C. L. Seow also agrees with Cox, see C. L. SEOW, *Job 1-21*, 300. Also Dillmann leaves this possibility open next to the possibility of a theological motive. See DILLMANN, “Textkritisches zum Buche Ijob”, 1353.

²⁰ See XXX.

²¹ E. DHORME, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (London 1967) 15.

²² See e.g. XXX; XXX.

to a theological explanation for the minus in 2,1 ²³.

2.1.2. Job 42,9

MT	LXX	11QtgJob ²⁴
וַיִּלְכוּ אֵלֶיפָז הַתִּימָנִי וּבְלָדָד הַשְׁוּחִי צִפֹּר הַנַּעֲמָתִי וַיַּעֲשׂוּ כְּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה וַיִּשְׁמָע יְהוָה אֶת־פְּנֵי אִיּוֹב:	ἐπορεύθη δὲ Ἐλιφας ὁ Θαιμανίτης καὶ Βαλδαδ ὁ Σαυχίτης καὶ Σωφαρ ὁ Μιναῖος καὶ ἐποίησαν καθὼς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος, καὶ ἔλυσεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῖς διὰ Ἰώβ.	[שחיא וצפר נעמתיא ו]עבדו[כדי אמר להון] אלהא ושמע א[ל]הא בקלה די איוב ושבק להון חטאיהון בדילה
So Eliphaz the Temanite and Bildad the Shuhite and Zophar the Naamathite went and did what the Lord had told them, and the Lord accepted Job's prayer.	Then Eliphaz the Thaimanite went, and Baldad the Sauchite and Sophar the Minite, and they did as the Lord instructed them, and he absolved them of their sin on Iob's account.	[the Shutite and Zophar the Naamathite, and] they did [as they were told by] God. And G[o]d listened to the voice of Job and forgave them their sins because of him ²⁵ .

In Job 42,9, יהוה is mentioned twice. However, in the LXX it is rendered only once, *i.e.*, by ὁ κύριος. The Hebrew phrase יהוה אֶת־פְּנֵי אִיּוֹב וַיִּשְׁמָע is rendered by καὶ ἔλυσεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῖς διὰ Ἰωβ ²⁶. Strikingly, 11QtgJob does not align with MT but agrees in a certain degree with the LXX: ושבק להון חטאיהון בדילה. However, 11QtgJob attests the divine name (אלהא instead of יהוה) two times as well ²⁷.

²³ Even Donald H. Gard, who is well known of reading a lot of theological changes in the LXX of Job, does not ascribe a theological reasoning behind the minus of 2,1. He simply observes that there is a minus without elaborating why this minus came to be. See D. H. GARD, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job* (JBL.MS 8; Philadelphia, PA 1952) 28.

²⁴ For the text of 11QtgJob, see F. GARCIA MARTÍNEZ – E. TIGCHELAAR – A. S. VAN DER WOUDE (eds.), *Qumran Cave 11 II*. 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31 (DJD XXIII; Oxford 1998) 79-180 (= DJD).

²⁵ The translation of 11QtgJob is taken from DJD XXIII, 79-180.

²⁶ Symmachus (σ') provides a literal rendering of MT: καὶ προσήκατο ὁ θεὸς τὸ πρόσωπον Ἰώβ.

²⁷ Although DJD XXIII notes א[ל]הא for the second divine name in 42,9, the only thing that is visible on the manuscript are the two *alephs*. The place where *lamed* and *he* should be attested is not readable. However, the scroll probably read the divine name since that is the only word that would fit within the context of that verse. Moreover, both the *lamed* and *he* certainly fit the gap where the

Both 11QtgJob as the LXX attest of a different interpretation of MT. In both versions, God forgave the sins of Job's friends on Job's account. Markus Witte is one of the few scholars who has noted and tried to explain this similarity ²⁸. According to him, both versions attest that the idea of a person stepping in for the forgiveness of the sins for others is present in ancient Judaism in the late 2nd century BCE ²⁹. Although both textual witnesses convey this idea, this does not explain their difference *vis-à-vis* MT, nor does it explain the nonrendering of יהוה.

Given the fact that the LXX more or less aligns with 11QtgJob, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX must have had a different text that resembled the text attested in 11QtgJob and which differed from MT. However, the translator's *Vorlage* probably attested the divine name twice as in 11QtgJob. Given the translator's tendency to avoid repetition, he must have deemed it unnecessary and redundant to render the divine name another time directly after rendering the first *κύριος/יהוה* ³⁰. Nonetheless, there must have been a textual tradition where the idea that somebody was a mediator for the forgiveness of others' sins was preserved. However, this theological change was not introduced by the LXX translator.

2.2. The minus of אֱלֹהִים

The divine name אֱלֹהִים occurs 17 times in MT Job. In LXX Job, it is mostly

text is missing between the two *alephs*. For the manuscript see Plate 638, Frag 1, B-370953 (<https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-370953>).

²⁸ See M. WITTE, *Das Buch Hiob* (ATD 13; Göttingen 2021) 689. Claude E. Cox has written an article on chapter 42 whereby he also discusses the differences between MT and the LXX. However, although he mentions Job 42,9 in his presentation of the variant readings, he does not explain this difference in his article. See C. E. COX, "Old Greek Job 42 – A Surprise at the End of the Road: Intertextual Connections between the Epilogue and Prologue Introduced by the Translator", *Septuagint, Sages and Scripture. Studies in Honour of Johann Cook* (eds. R. X. GAUTHIER – G. R. KOTZÉ – G. J. STEYN) (SVT 172; Leiden – Boston, MA 2016) 180-189, here esp. 184-185. Also Kenneth Numfor Ngwa has noted the similarity between 11QtgJob and the LXX but does not elaborate on why there is a similarity. See K. NUMFOR NGWA, *The Hermeneutics of the 'Happy' Ending in Job 42:7-17* (BZAW 354; Berlin – New York, NY 2005) 18.

²⁹ See WITTE, *Das Buch Hiob*, 689. According to Johann Cook, the LXX translator has emphasized the role of Job as intercessor in multiple places throughout his translation. He also mentions 42,9 in this regard. However, he does not mention the nonrendering of יהוה, nor the text as preserved in 11QtgJob. See J. COOK – A. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom* (CBET 68; Leuven 2012) 206.

³⁰ Otherwise, this would have led to *ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ κύριος* which only occurs two times in the LXX and is used to render יהוה וְאֵלֶּיךָ (*cfr.* Psalms 135[MT 134],5 and Isa 49,19).

rendered by θεός, κύριος and θεοσεβής³¹. Only in Job 1,16 it has not been translated:

MT	LXX
עוד זֶה מְדַבֵּר וְזֶה בָּא וַיֹּאמֶר אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים נִפְלְאָה מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם וַתִּבְעַר בְּצֹאן וּבְנַעֲרִים וַתֹּאכֶלֶם וְאִמְלָטָה רַק־אֲנִי לְבַדִּי לְהִגִּיד לָךְ:	Ἐτι τούτου λαλοῦντος ἦλθεν ἕτερος ἄγγελος καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς Ἰώβ Πῦρ ἔπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέκαυσεν τὰ πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς ποιμένας κατέφαγεν ὁμοίως· καὶ σωθεὶς ἐγὼ μόνος ἦλθον τοῦ ἀπαγγεῖλαι σοι.
While he was still speaking, another came and said, “The fire of God fell from heaven and burned up the sheep and the servants and consumed them; I alone have escaped to tell you”.	While he was still speaking, a further messenger came and said to Iob, “Fire fell from heaven and burned up the sheep, and it likewise consumed the shepherds, and when I alone escaped, I came to tell you”.

MT records אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים (‘fire of the Lord’) whereas the LXX solely reads πῦρ (‘fire’). Both α’ and θ’ follow MT and render it by πῦρ θεοῦ, σ’ has πῦρ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. Also the Vulgate aligns with MT: *ignis Dei*³².

Several scholars, such as Donald H. Gard and Gillis Gerleman, have explained the missing rendering of אֱלֹהִים in the LXX as a deliberate omission by the translator on theological grounds³³. Both state that the LXX translator wanted to acquit God from the suffering of Job³⁴. However, Homer Heater does not agree with this hypothesis³⁵. The phrase אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים occurs only once elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, *i.e.*, in 2 Kgs 1,12. The LXX, as well as the Targum and the Vulgate, have no rendering for אֱלֹהִים in this instance. Moreover, several Hebrew manuscripts do not attest אֱלֹהִים for 2 Kgs 1,12. This leads Heater to the conclusion that the LXX

³¹ For a full overview of the renderings of אֱלֹהִים in LXX Job, see MANGIN, *Le texte court*, 56-57.

³² For the text of the Vulgate of 1,16, see B. FISCHER et al. (eds.), *Biblia Sacra. Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. Tomus I: Genesis – Psalmi (red. R. WEBER; Stuttgart 1969) 733.

³³ See GARD, *The Exegetical Method*, 61; G. GERLEMAN, *Studies in the Septuagint*. I. Book of Job (LUA 1/43/2; Lund 1946) 58. Also Beer and Witte claim that it is possible that the LXX did not render אֱלֹהִים on theological grounds. See BEER, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 7-8; WITTE, *Das Buch Hiob*, 93, n. 86. However, both do not explain what those theological motivations entail.

³⁴ See GARD, *The Exegetical Method*, 61; GERLEMAN, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 58.

³⁵ See H. HEATER, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (CBQ.MS 11; Washington, DC 1982) 20-21, esp. 20.

of 2 Kgs 1,12 attests the more original reading ³⁶. Consequently, he argues that it might be the case that, just as in 2 Kgs 1,12, the LXX preserves the more original reading and that אלהים was not present in the translator's *Vorlage* ³⁷.

However, the phrase 'fire of the Lord out of heaven', where יהוה is used instead of אלהים, occurs multiple times throughout the LXX:

Verse	MT	LXX
Gen 19,24	וַאֲשׁ מֵאֵת יְהוָה מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם	καὶ πῦρ παρὰ κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.
1 Kgs 18,38 / 3 Kgdms 18,38	אֵשׁ־יְהוָה	πῦρ παρὰ κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Since most versions attest the divine name in Job 1,16 and since the divine name is also rendered in other parts of the LXX in connection to 'fire out of heaven', it must have been that the LXX translator of Job indeed deliberately opted to omit אלהים. Moreover, when looking at the translation of the rest of the phrase, we can observe that the LXX translator consistently rendered his Hebrew *Vorlage* (albeit with several slight variations):

MT	LXX
אֵשׁ	Πῦρ
אלהים	/
נפלה	ἔπεσεν
מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם	ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
וַתִּבָּעַר	καὶ κατέκαυσεν ³⁸

³⁶ See HEATER, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*, 21.

³⁷ See HEATER, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*, 21. He borrows this idea from Samuel Rolles Driver and George Buchanan Gray. For the textual discussion of Driver and Gray on this verse, see S. R. DRIVER – G. B. GRAY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*. Together with a New Translation. Volume II (ICC; New York 1921) 8-9. Moreover, although he explains the nonrendering of אלהים on the basis of its parallel with 2 Kgs 1,12, he also leaves room for another (more contextual) explanation. He states that it might also be that "the translator of Job was thinking of a vivid description of fire falling from heaven at Elijah's command" and therefore left אלהים unrendered. HEATER, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*, 21.

³⁸ Although κατακαίω is often used to render שרף, it is also used to translate בער in several instances, see e.g. Is 1,31; 43,3 and Ez 5,2; 39,10. See E. HATCH – H. A. REDPATH, *A Concordance*

בָּצֵאן	τὰ πρόβατα
וּבְנֵעָרִים	καὶ τοὺς ποιμένας ³⁹
וּבְנֵעָרִים	κατέφαγεν
/	ὁμοίως ⁴⁰

Since he consistently rendered the Hebrew verse and since there is no textual basis to explain the nonrendering of אֱלֹהִים, it must have been the LXX translator's deliberate choice not to translate this divine name. However, instead of postulating a theological motivated omission, it might also be that the LXX translator found it redundant to translate אֱלֹהִים since it is already implied in ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ that the fire came from God.

2.3. The minuses of אֱל

The divine name אֱל is attested 55 times in MT. In the majority of instances, the LXX translator has translated it by (ὁ) κύριος⁴¹. There are four minuses in the LXX where MT attests אֱל, i.e. in 13,8; 15,11; 22,17 and 33,6. These instances will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

2.3.1. Job 13,8

MT	LXX
הֲפָנִיו תִּשְׁאָן אִם-לֹאֲלִ תִּרְיָבוֹן:	ἢ ὑποστελεῖσθε; ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτοὶ κριταὶ γένεσθε.
Will you show partiality toward him; will you plead the case for God?	Really? Will you prevaricate? Go ahead; become judges yourselves!

In Job 13,8 לֹאֲלִ, which contains the divine name אֱל, is not rendered in the LXX. Nor is there any attestation of the divine name in other manuscripts nor in the

to the Septuagint. And the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books). Second Edition (Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 732 (= HR).

³⁹ The LXX translator has probably read a form of רעה or interpreted as such in order to link it more closely to בָּצֵאן/τὰ πρόβατα.

⁴⁰ The adverb ὁμοίως was probably added by the translator to stress that both the sheep as the shepherd underwent the same fate. See C. E. COX, *Iob* (forthcoming).

⁴¹ For a list containing all the renderings of אֱל in LXX Job, see MANGIN, *Le texte court*, 48-52.

revisions. Moreover, the whole verse is interpreted differently in the LXX than MT.

The LXX translator has rendered הִי ('whether, if') by the interrogative particle ἤ ('surely, truly, indeed')⁴². This is a rendering that occurs 15 times throughout LXX Job⁴³.

In a study concerning the Hebrew idiom נִשָּׂא פָנָיו and its rendering in LXX Job, Douglas Magnum observes that this idiom is seldomly rendered stereotypically by the LXX translator⁴⁴. Concerning Job 13,8, he notes that the usage of ὑποστέλλω ('to shrink before, to draw back, to hold back') to render נִשָּׂא פָנָיו, captures the meaning of the idiom while not resorting to a quantitative representation of the Hebrew⁴⁵.

The verb תִּרְיֹבֹן is rendered by κριταὶ γένεσθε. In LXX Job, the verb רִיב ('to strife, to contend') is rendered almost always by κρίνω ('to judge') (e.g. 9,3; 10,2; 13,19 and 31,2) or κρίσις ('judgment') (e.g. 13,6 and 40,2). The addition of γένεσθε creates assonance with ὑποστέλεισθε of the first stich of the verse, thereby maintaining the assonance that is present in the Hebrew text (תִּרְיֹבֹן/תִּשְׁאֹן). Thus, the choice to opt for κριταὶ γένεσθε as a rendering of תִּרְיֹבֹן not only renders the meaning of the Hebrew but also preserves the poetic nature of the verse.

Concerning the nonrendering of the divine name אֱלֹהִים in Job 13,8, only Claude E. Cox has tried to come up with an explanation. According to him, the LXX translator skipped over אֱלֹהִים since it did not fit within his translation of the rest of the verse⁴⁶. I do agree with Cox, since the translation of אֱלֹהִים would have been redundant considering the rest of the verse. However, another (additional) explanation can be given. In the preceding verse, i.e. 13,7, אֱלֹהִים is attested and rendered by ἔναντι κυρίου. In my opinion, the LXX translator also opted not to render אֱלֹהִים in 13,8 to avoid repetition with the preceding verse.

⁴² See resp. D. J. A. CLINES, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew Volume I–IX* (Sheffield 1993–2016) vol. II, 481–484 (= DCH); T. MURAOKA, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven 2009) 317 (= GELS); J. LUST – E. EYNIKEL – K. HAUSPIE, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Third Corrected Edition (Stuttgart 2015) 264 (= LEH).

⁴³ See COX, *Iob* (forthcoming).

⁴⁴ See D. MAGNUM, “‘The Biblical Hebrew Idiom ‘Lift the Face’ in the Septuagint of Job’, *HTS* 74/3 (2018) 1–6.

⁴⁵ See MAGNUM, “‘The Biblical Hebrew Idiom’”, 4. He also argues, together with Harry M. Orlinsky and contra Dhorme, that the LXX translator did not render נִשָּׂא פָנָיו based upon a tendency to avoid anthropomorphisms since he rendered multiple so-called anthropomorphisms from his source text into Greek. See *ibid.*, *loc. cit.* For the translation of ὑποστέλλω, see GELS, 705; LEH, 637.

⁴⁶ See COX, *Iob* (forthcoming).

2.3.2. Job 15,11

MT	LXX
הַמַּעֲט מִמָּה תְנַחֲמוֹת אֱלֹהִים וְדִבָּר לְאִט עִמָּךְ:	ὀλίγα ὧν ἡμάρτηκας μεμαστίγῳσαι, μεγάλως ὑπερβαλλόντως λελάληκας.
Are the consolations of God too small for you or the word that deals gently with you?	You have been scourged for but few of your sins; you have spoken wildly extravagantly.

The LXX of this verse presents a different reading than MT. Several scholars have tried to reconstruct the Hebrew underlying the LXX ⁴⁷. Beer, for example, argues that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the first stich of the verse, wherein לֵא (lā) occurs, reads: *הַמַּעֲט מִמָּה תְנַחֲמוֹת אֱלֹהִים וְדִבָּר לְאִט עִמָּךְ* ⁴⁸. Consequently, the translator did not read the divine name (אֱלֹהִים) ⁴⁹. However, Harry M. Orlinsky argues that there is no need to postulate a *Vorlage* that differed from MT ⁵⁰. He states that the LXX translator interpreted his source text correctly as “Haven’t you received enough consolations from God?” and turned it into “For few of your sins have you been punished” ⁵¹. Witte, on the other hand, remarks that in the LXX, contrary to MT, Eliphaz claims that Job has been insufficiently punished for his sins and uncontrolled speeches ⁵². However, he does not elaborate on why the LXX presents a different reading.

Concerning the nonrendering of לֵא, as already noted, Beer comments that the translator skipped over the divine name. However, Cox comes up with a more plausible explanation. He argues that the translator has interpreted לֵא as a adverbial

⁴⁷ For an overview of several reconstructions, see H. M. ORLINSKY, “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter II The Character of the Septuagint Translation of the Book of Job”, *HUCA* 29 (1958) 229-271, here 245.

⁴⁸ See BEER, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 91.

⁴⁹ See BEER, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 91-92.

⁵⁰ See ORLINSKY, “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter II”, 245-246, esp. 246. Henry S. Gehman also thinks the LXX translator did not have a different Hebrew text. He notes that the translator rewrote the verse without giving further details on why the translator made this change. See H. S. GEHMAN, “The Theological Approach of the Greek Translator of Job 1-15”, *JBL* 68/3 (1949) 231-240, here 232-233.

⁵¹ See ORLINSKY, “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter II”, 246. According to him, there is no reason to attribute a secondary meaning, *i.e.* to console oneself with, to the root נחם as other scholars, such as Dhorme, did. Otherwise, this would lead to the odd statement that God has consoled himself with punishments. See *ibid.*, *loc. cit.*

⁵² See WITTE, *Das Buch Hiob*, 256.

accusative and translates it by *μεγάλως* ('very [much], greatly, exceedingly, to a great extent')⁵³. By doing so he creates an hyperbolic emphasis with the Greek hapax *ὑπερβαλλόντως* ('above measure, much more, exceedingly')⁵⁴. Indeed, next to God, *ל* can also denote 'power'⁵⁵. Although *μεγάλως* is never used as a rendering of *ל* throughout the LXX, there seems to be no other explanation why the LXX translator of Job decided not to render *ל* with a Greek divine name. Moreover, by using the verb *μαστιγώω* ('to scourge, to whip, to flog')⁵⁶, God is already implied. It is clear to the reader that Job has been scourged insufficiently by God. Thus, although Mangin noted that *ל* was not rendered in the LXX, it has been rendered by *μεγάλως*. Therefore, it cannot be considered a minus *vis-à-vis* MT.

2.3.3. Job 22,17

MT	LXX	11QtgJob
הַאֱמָרִים לֵאלֹהִים סֹר מִמֶּנּוּ וּמֵה־ יַפְעֵל שְׂדֵי לְמוֹ:	οἱ λέγοντες Κύριος τί ποιήσῃ ἡμῖν; ἢ τί ἐπάξεται ἡμῖν ὁ παντοκράτωρ;	אמרין ל]אלהא לנא אלהא]
They said to God, "Leave us alone", and "What can the Almighty do to us?"	Those who say, "What will the Lord do to us?" or, "What will the Almighty bring against us?"	said to [God God for us [

In the MT version of Job 22,17, two divine names are attested: *ל* and *שְׂדֵי*. The LXX also has two divine names, i.e., *κύριος* and *παντοκράτωρ*. 11QtgJob only preserves several letters of the second name, *א]להא*, which is the common rendering of *שְׂדֵי* in 11QtgJob⁵⁷.

One might argue that *ל* has been rendered by *κύριος* in the LXX⁵⁸. However,

⁵³ See COX, *Job* (forthcoming); GELS, 445; LEH, 388.

⁵⁴ See C. E. COX, "'Ipsissima Verba': The Translator's 'Actual Words' in Old Greek Job and What They Tell Us About the Translator and the Nature of the Translation", *JSCS* 49 (2016) 61-81, here 67. For the translation of *ὑπερβαλλόντως*, see GELS, 698; LEH, 630.

⁵⁵ See DCH, vol. I, 259-260.

⁵⁶ See GELS, 442; LEH, 385. The same verb also occurs in Job 30,21, where Job tells the Lord that He has scourged him with a strong hand (*χειρὶ κραταιᾷ με ἐμαστίγωσας*).

⁵⁷ See DJD XXIII, 100.

⁵⁸ In his article regarding the theology of LXX Job, Jiseong J. Kwon argues that in 22,17 *ל* is

scholars agree that κύριος and παντοκράτωρ are a double translation of שׁדִי in this verse ⁵⁹. This is a plausible explanation since double translations are common throughout LXX Job ⁶⁰. Moreover, the words לֵאל סוֹר מִמֶּנּוּ are the same as 21,14 where it is rendered by κυρίῳ ἀπόστα ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ in the LXX. Therefore, the LXX translator must have opted not to render these words and, consequently, created a new stich whereby the divine name is attested twice. Probably he has done so to avoid repetition with 21,14 ⁶¹.

2.3.4. Job 33,6

MT	LXX	11QtgJob
הֲנֶאֱנִי כַפִּי־לְאֵל מִחֶמֶר קִרְצָתִי גַם־אֲנִי:	ἐκ πηλοῦ διήρτισαι σὺ ὡς καὶ ἐγώ, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ διηρτίσμεθα.	[אנה]
See, before God I am as you are; I, too, was formed from a piece of clay.	You have been fashioned from clay, even as I am; we have been fashioned from the same thing.	[I (too)]

The LXX presents a different reading of the verse than MT. Although Job 33,6 is mentioned in DJD XXIII, nothing can be made of 11QtgJob since only several vertical markings can be observed which might (!) indicate a *he* ⁶². Scholars agree that the first part of MT 33,6 (הֲנֶאֱנִי כַפִּי־) has been rendered by καὶ ἐγὼ κατὰ σέ in the LXX as part of LXX 33,5 ⁶³. The second stich of MT 33,6, *i.e.*, מִחֶמֶר קִרְצָתִי גַם־

rendered by κύριος. However, אֱלֹהִים does not occur in this verse. See J. J. KWON, “Rewritten Theology in the Greek Book of Job”, *Biblica* 100/3 (2019) 339-352, here 348.

⁵⁹ See BEER, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 147; DHORME, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 334; COX, *Iob* (forthcoming); MANGIN, *Le texte court*, 53. Orlinsky does not regard it as a double translation. See H. M. ORLINKSY, “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter V: The Hebrew ‘Vorlage’ of the Septuagint of Job: The Text and the Script”, *HUCA* 35 (1964) 57-78, here 61.

⁶⁰ See M. DHONT, “Double Translations in Old Greek Job”, *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen*. 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.–27. Juli 2014 (eds. in S. KREUZER – M. MEISER – M. SIGISMUND) (WUNT 361; Tübingen 2016) 475–490.

⁶¹ See also COX, *Iob* (forthcoming).

⁶² See DJD XXIII, 129.

⁶³ See BEER, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 209; DHORME, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 487-488; D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*. Tome 5: Job, Proverbes, Qohélet et Cantique des Cantiques (Fribourg – Göttingen 2015) 315; C. E. COX, *Iob* (forthcoming).

אֲנִי, is rendered by ἐκ πηλοῦ διήρτισαι σὺ ὥς καὶ ἐγώ⁶⁴. The second stich of the Greek verse, i.e. ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ διηρτίσμεθα, is either considered to be a double translation of MT 33,6b or an exegetical addition⁶⁵. Concerning the divine name, they agree that the translator did not render לֹאֲלִי (‘before God’) albeit giving no explanation⁶⁶.

The explanation for this nonrendering might be a simple one. Since the LXX translator thought that הִנֵּנִי אֲנִי כְּפִיךָ was part of 33,5, he rendered it as such:

MT	LXX
אֶס-תּוֹכַל הַשִּׁיבֵנִי עֲרֹכָה לְפָנַי הַתִּיצֵבָה:	ἐὰν δύνῃ, δός μοι ἀπόκρισιν πρὸς ταῦτα· ὑπόμεινον, στήθι κατ’ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐγὼ κατὰ σέ.
Answer me, if you can; set your words in order before me; take your stand.	Give me an answer to these things, if you can; wait, take a stand against me, and I against you.

However, as Cox has observed⁶⁷, the translator read כְּפִיךָ instead of בְּפִיךָ and therefore used κατὰ + accusative which also aligns with לְפָנַי/κατ’ ἐμὲ. Since translating לֹאֲלִי after his rendering of הִנֵּנִי אֲנִי כְּפִיךָ or adding it to the next verse would not make sense, he considered לֹאֲלִי to be redundant and opted not to render it. Thus, the nonrendering of this divine name is based upon contextual and content-related concerns instead of theological concerns.

2.4. The minus of שְׁדִי

The divine name שְׁדִי occurs 31 times in MT Job. In the LXX, it has mostly been

⁶⁴ See BEER, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 209; DHORME, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 488; M. DHONT, *Style and Context of Old Greek Job*, 258; COX, *Iob* (forthcoming).

⁶⁵ See BEER, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 209; DHORME, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 488; COX, *Iob* (forthcoming). Marieke Dhont calls it a “restatement of Elihu’s words in 6a”. DHONT, *Style and Context of Old Greek Job*, 258. In the hexapla, the second stich is marked with an obelus (÷). See also J. D. MEADE, *A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job 22-42* (Origen’s Hexapla: A Critical Edition of the Extant Fragments; Leuven – Paris – Bristol, CT 2020) 191.

⁶⁶ See BEER, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 209; DHORME, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 488; BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*. Tome 5, 315; COX, *Iob* (forthcoming). Of the revisions, σ’ is the only one that does render לֹאֲלִי, namely by θεός.

⁶⁷ See COX, *Iob* (forthcoming).

translated by (ὁ) παντοκράτωρ and (ὁ) κύριος ⁶⁸. Only in 29,5 we find a minus in the LXX where MT reads שְׁדִי:

MT	LXX
בְּעוֹד שְׁדִי עִמָּדִי סְבִיבוֹתַי נְעָרִי:	ὅτε ἤμην ὑλώδης λίαν, κύκλω δέ μου οἱ παῖδες·
When the Almighty was still with me, when my children were around me.	When I was very much a person of substance and my children were around me.

Neither in the revisions, nor elsewhere in the manuscript tradition of the LXX, a divine name is attested for 29,5. Beer and Dhorme propose that the LXX translator read בְּעוֹד שְׁדִי מָאֵד (‘when my field was great’) ⁶⁹. Gard, on the other hand, argues that the LXX translator was motivated by theological motives ⁷⁰. According to him, “[t]he translator objects to the idea that God has deserted Job” ⁷¹. Therefore, he (a) changed בְּעוֹד to מְעוֹד (‘exceedingly’) and (b) treats שְׁדִי as שָׂדֵה (‘field’) ⁷². The latter has also been proposed by Beer and Dhorme (see *supra*). However, the adverb he proposes does not exist. The suggestion by Dhorme and Beer, *i.e.* מָאֵד, does exist, but that lexeme does not contain the *ayin*. Therefore, the explanation by Gard only partially makes sense.

Gerleman has proposed a different explanation for the LXX’s strange rendering.

⁶⁸ For an overview of all the renderings of שְׁדִי in LXX Job, see MANGIN, *Le texte court*, 51-54. Moreover, as noted *supra*, ἰκανός is used as a rendering of שְׁדִי in the asterisked material, *i.e.*, Job 21,15; 31,2b, and 40,2. For additional information on this rendering, see *e.g.* G. BERTRAM, “IKANOS in den griechischen Übersetzungen des ATs als Wiedergabe von schaddaj”, *ZAW* 70/1 (1958) 20-31; M. WITTE, “Vom El Schaddaj zum Pantokrator. Ein Überblick zur israelitisch-jüdischen Religionsgeschichte”, *Studien zur Hebräischen Bibel und ihrer Nachgeschichte*. Beiträge der 32. Internationalen Ökumenischen Konferenz der Hebräischlehrenden, Frankfurt a.M. 2009 (eds. J. F. DIEHL – M. WITTE) (KUSATU 12–13; Kamen 2011) 215–241, here 230–232.

⁶⁹ See BEER, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 185; DHORME, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 417. Georg Bertram does also accept that the LXX translator has read something different than MT. However, he does not explicate what he might have read. See G. BERTRAM, “Zur Prägung der biblischen Gottesvorstellung in der griechischen Übersetzung des Alten Testaments. Die Wiedergabe von schadad und schaddaj im Griechischen”, *Die Welts des Orients* vol. 2 5/6 (1959) 502-513, here 511.

⁷⁰ See GARD, *The Exegetical Method*, 26.

⁷¹ GARD, *The Exegetical Method*, 26.

⁷² See GARD, *The Exegetical Method*, 26.

He observes that the LXX translator has confused ט – ר and ע – ח⁷³. By doing so he read בְּחֵרֶשׁ דִּי עֲמָדִי (‘while there was enough timber with me’)⁷⁴. He goes on to argue that although the “use of ב in a temporal sense before a nominal clause is unknown in Hebrew [...], ב has very often a temporal sense before infinitives, which may have confused the translator”⁷⁵. Indeed, the reading of חֵרֶשׁ (‘wood’) is able to account for the rendering ὑλώδης (‘woody, wooden, wooded, full of matter’) which is a hapax in the LXX⁷⁶. Moreover, דִּי (‘sufficiency, enough’) might explain λίαν (‘exceedingly, very, extremely’) although the former is often rendered by ἰκανός (‘sufficient, adequate’) and the latter to render מְאֹד (‘very, much, greatly’)⁷⁷. The LXX translator must have opted for λίαν instead of ἰκανός to express the abundance of wealth Job had which is in accordance with the following verse that elaborates on how well off he was (ὅτε ἐχέοντό μου αἱ ὁδοὶ βουτύρῳ τὰ δὲ ὄρη μου ἐχέοντο γάλακτι; When my roads were flowing with butter and my hills flowed with milk! [29,6]). Thus, the explanation given by Gerleman makes the most sense. The LXX translator has read something similar to בְּחֵרֶשׁ דִּי עֲמָדִי instead of בְּעוֹד שְׂדֵי עֲמָדִי.

III. CONCLUSION

This article has examined the minuses in the LXX of Job where MT reads יהוה, אֱלֹהִים, אֵל and שְׂדֵי, in order to investigate the translation technique of the LXX translator and in order to discern whether the LXX reflects a different theology than its Hebrew counterpart. After analysing the eight minuses in the LXX, we come to the following conclusions:

- (1) In one instance, *i.e.* 29,5, the LXX translator did not deliberately opt to leave the divine name unrendered since he confused several letters of his unvocalised Hebrew text.

⁷³ See GERLEMAN, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 20. He lists Job 29,5 in a list of examples where the LXX translator confused the (unvocalised) text of his Hebrew *Vorlage*. For more examples see *ibid.*, p. 20-21.

⁷⁴ See GERLEMAN, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 20.

⁷⁵ G. GERLEMAN, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 20.

⁷⁶ See DCH, vol. III, p. 325; LEH, p. 627. GELS opts to translate it by its symbolic meaning, *i.e.* ‘prosperous, thriving’ in contrast to LEH and the Liddell, Scott and Jones (LSJ). See GELS, p. 694; H. G. LIDDELL – R. SCOTT – H. S. JONES, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ninth Revised Edition (Oxford 1996) (= *The Online Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon*, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsg/>) 109627.

⁷⁷ See resp. DCH, vol. II, 432; GELS, 430; LEH, 372; DCH, vol. V, 103-107; GELS, 339; LEH, 286.

- (2) In several instances, the LXX translator chose not to translate the divine name on the basis of stylistic considerations, *i.e.* the avoidance of repetition (2,1; 13,8; 22,17; 42,9) and the creation of textual unity (2,1).
- (3) Sometimes, the divine name has not been rendered for contextual reasons, such as redundancy (1,16; 13,8; 33,6) or because the divine name was already implied in the translation of the rest of the verse (1,16).
- (4) In one instance, Mangin's observation that the LXX records a minus in 15,11 where MT reads אֱלֹהִים is incorrect. The LXX translator did not consider אֱלֹהִים to denote the divine name in this verse but understood אֱלֹהִים as 'power, might' and, consequently, rendered it by *μεγάλως*.

Thus, just as was the case with the minuses in LXX Job where MT reads אֱלֹהִים, the minuses of the other divine names in LXX Job do not attest a diverging theology *vis-à-vis* MT. Even though the LXX translator did deliberately opt not to render the divine names in most cases ⁷⁸, this was never prompted by theological motives or concerns but by stylistic and contextual considerations. Even in 42,9 where the LXX and 11Q¹Job attest of a person who functions as a mediator for the forgiveness of other people's sins, which is not present in MT, this change in meaning cannot be ascribed to the LXX translator.

Still, although this research has answered the question of a different theology between LXX and MT Job negatively, more research on the rendering of divine names in LXX Job can be done. For example, an analysis of the nonstandard rendering of אֱלֹהִים by *κύριος* in LXX Job might be worthwhile to undertake. Consequently, the results of such a study can be compared to this and previous studies on the divine names in MT and LXX Job in order to come to a more nuanced answer to the question whether the LXX text reflects a diverging theology than MT or not.

SUMMARY

Recently, more attention has been given to the question whether the Septuagint (LXX) text attest a different theology than the Masoretic text. In order to contribute to this question, this article examines the minuses in LXX Job where MT records יהוה, אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים and שְׁדֵי. Since these minuses are explicit differences between the LXX and MT and since they pertain to the divine name, studying them might shed more light on the translation technique and theology of the LXX translator of Job.

⁷⁸ This in contrast to the minuses of אֱלֹהִים in LXX Job whereby the LXX translator deliberately chose not to render the divine name in only one out of five instances. See XXX.