CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The intent with this research venture is to ***determine the extent of the impact the explicit κύριος and θεός citations, as found in the authentic Pauline letters, might have had on Paul's conceptual understanding of θεός and κύριος specifically in relation to Jesus as the Χριστός and κύριος***. If the study succeeds in determining a reasonable Pauline concept, the ultimate objective would then be to a.) determine to what extent the κύριος and θεός concepts propose a 'unique' Pauline theo-*logie,* Christo-*logie* and what is termed here a kyrio-*logie*; b.) formulate a plausible Pauline concept of a Hebrew deity. This would inevitably lead to a better understanding between the Jewish text and its Jewish-Christian context. The study will thus limit itself to Pauline literature, while considering these explicit citations against a larger literary backdrop. An investigation into the explicit and non-explicit citations in Pauline literature is surely not something new, neither are the attempts to establish the nature of the relationship between Jewish text and Christian context; not to mention the endeavours intended to construct a Pauline theology and Christology. The purpose here is not to repeat, nor to reformulate what has been done in the past on the Pauline citations. This study is a humble attempt to ***consider the explicit κύριος and θεός citations within its immediate literary conceptual (κύριος and θεός) context against a wider Jewish-Hellenistic literary backdrop***. The thrust of this endeavour is ***the theory that Paul is, for the most part, conceptually consistent in his use of the term θεός, which principally refers to the monotheistic Hebrew deity, while the term κύριος is used ambiguously as a reference for the Tetragram and Jesus as the κύριος.*** The term κύριος, in the mind of Paul, is conceptually not consistent, nor is the term consistently applied when a.) Jesus is being called into mind as the κύριος, and, b.) the term θεός as reference to a monotheistic Hebrew deity.[1] Paul struggled with the Hellenistic semantic possibilities of the term, what it implied when used in association with Jesus and what such a term might implicate when citing content from the Hebrew Scriptures. The latter might suggest an incoherent understanding of a Hebrew deity. Evaluating the validity of such a theory and to create a platform for critiquing the theory will be made possible through the implementation of the historical-critical method, which will be applied in gathering, structuring and evaluating the data, while a synchronic analysis (literary context) would assist in constructing plausible arguments as support for the

---

[1] The inconsistencies apply to both the explicit citations and its immediate literary context.

formulated theory, or to propose an alternative solution. This study will therefore attempt to find a solution for:

Paul's 'inconsistent' use of the term κύριος within his literary context, as well as the inconsistent association of both the term θεός and κύριος in relation to Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός.

1.2 FIELD OF RESEARCH

The research field that will be focused upon is the explicit κύριος and θεός citations in the Pauline literature.[2] One could define this problem area, in a broader sense, as the explicit use of Jewish scripture by Paul within a Christian literary conceptual context. As mentioned earlier, these citations are important for ***a better understanding of Paul's* theo-*logie,* christo-*logie and his* kyrio-*logie i.e. his understanding of the Hebrew deity as the monotheistic creator θεός or יהוה and of Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός*. Although the main focus will be the explicit κύριος and θεός citations (κύριος and θεός being Greek equivalents for the Hebrew deity), the nature of the study demands a broader literary field of research, namely that of manuscripts dated between the 3rd century BCE and 2nd century CE attesting to those Hebrew and Greek terms used in referring to the Hebrew deity. This broad literary frame of reference would include the works of both Philo of Alexandria and Flavius Josephus. Even though the works of the latter two authors are not considered to be manuscripts *per se*, nor are they 'critical' eclectic text editions. They do, if one accepts that the editions consulted represent a plausible account of their theological concepts respectively, that these two Jewish-Hellenistic writers would then provide an invaluable Jewish-Hellenistic concept of a Hebrew deity as captured in the literature of that time. ***These so-called explicit κύριος and θεός citations hold significant potential in determining the most 'suitable' Greek equivalents used if and when rendering the Hebrew deity; and also to determine what concept underlies the terms.*** The first necessary step venturing into the field of research would be to *identify* the explicit κύριος and θεός citations which will be dealt with in the section below.

---

[2] Rom 4:8; 9:28-29; 10:13,16; 11:34; 14:11; 15:11; 1 Cor 1:31; 2:16; 3:20; 10:26; 2 Cor 10:17. The two κύριος citations in 2 Cor 6:17 and 18 as part of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 has been left out of the discussion due to the possibility that it could be a later redaction to the epistle. Cf. Koch, D.-A. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums.* Tübingen: Mohr & Siebeck, 1986.

1.2.1 Identified Citations[3]

Reference – *target text*	Reference – *source text*	Citation - *text*
ROMANS EPISTLE		
Rom 2:24	Isa 52:5c	τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα **τοῦ θεοῦ** δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καθὼς γέγραπται
Rom 3:11	Ps 13:2c	οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν **τὸν θεόν**
Rom 3:18	Ps 35:2b	οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος **θεοῦ** ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν
Rom 4:3	Gen 15:6	τί γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει; ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ **τῷ θεῷ** καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην
Rom 4:8	Ps 31:2a	μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται **κύριος** ἁμαρτίαν
Rom 9:26	Hos 2:1c-d	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς· οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ **θεοῦ** ζῶντος
Rom 9:28	Isa 10:22c-23	λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ποιήσει **κύριος** ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
Rom 9:29	Isa 1:9	καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας· εἰ μὴ **κύριος** σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὡμοιώθημεν.
Rom 10:13	Joel 3:5a	πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα **κυρίου** σωθήσεται
Rom 10:16	Isa 53:1a	Ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει· **κύριε**, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν
Rom 11:2c-3	3 Kgdms 19:10	ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἐντυγχάνει **τῷ θεῷ** κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; 3 **κύριε**, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν, κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος καὶ ζητοῦσιν τὴν ψυχήν μου
Rom 11:8	Deut 29:3	καθὼς γέγραπται· ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς **ὁ θεὸς** πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας
Rom 11:34	Isa 40:13a-b1	τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν **κυρίου**; ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο
Rom 12:19c	Deut 32:35a	μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπητοί, ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ, γέγραπται γάρ· ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει **κύριος**
Rom 14:11a	Isa 49:18c	γέγραπται γάρ· ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος**, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ
Rom 14:11b-c	Is 45:23c	ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται **τῷ θεῷ**

---

[3] Cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 21-23.

Rom 15:9b-d	Ps 17:50	καθὼς γέγραπται· διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ
CORINTHIAN CORRESPONDENCE		
1 Cor 1:31	Jer 9:23a	ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται· ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν **κυρίῳ** καυχάσθω
1 Cor 2:9	Isa 64:3	ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἡτοίμασεν **ὁ θεὸς** τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν
1 Cor 2:16	Isa 40:13a..c	τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν **κυρίου**, ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν; ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν
1 Cor 3:20	Ps 93:11	καὶ πάλιν· **κύριος** γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῶν σοφῶν ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι
1 Cor 10:26	Ps 23:1b	**τοῦ κυρίου** γὰρ ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς
1 Cor 14:21	Isa 28:11	ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ καὶ οὐδ᾽ οὕτως εἰσακούσονταί μου, λέγει **κύριος**
2 Cor 3:16	Exod 34:34a	ἡνίκα δὲ ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς **κύριον**, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα
2 Cor 10:17	Jer 9:23a	Ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος ἐν **κυρίῳ** καυχάσθω

1.2.2 Target and Source Contexts

These explicit κύριος and θεός citations can be divided into two groups, each of which contains sub-groups. The primary groups are defined as the 'literary target context'[4] and 'literary source context'[5] followed by the obvious sub-groups. Both these 'sub-groups' are represented in what appears to be one table; in fact the table below should be viewed as two independent tables placed next to one another and should thus in no way be viewed in comparison to each other.

Literary target context	Literary source context
Romans epistle	**Pentateuch (Torah / five books of Moses)**
2:24	Gen 15:6
3:11	Deut 29:3
3:18	Deut 32:35a
4:3	Exod 34:34a
4:8	
9:26	**The prophet Isaiah**
9:28	Isa 52:5c

---

[4] With 'literary target context' is meant the literary context (a pericope or a well defined and functional unit of text) in which the citation has been placed. This is also referred to in this study as the rhetorical context, conceptual context or literary thought structure.

[5] The 'literary source context' implies everything described at the 'literary target context' with one exception; the so-called 'source' is the literary context from where a citation has been taken.

9:29	Isa 10:22c-23
10:13	Isa 1:9
10:16	Isa 53:1a
11:2c-3	Isa 40:13a-b1
11:8	Isa 49:18d
11:34	Isa 45:22c, 23d
12:19	Isa 64:3
14:11	Isa 28:11
15:11	
1ˢᵗ Corinthian epistle	**The Psalms**
1 Cor 1:31	Ps 13:2c
1 Cor 2:9	Ps 35:2b
1 Cor 2:16	Ps 31:2a
1 Cor 3:20	Ps 116:1
1 Cor 10:26	Ps 17:50
1 Cor 14:21	Ps 93:11
2ⁿᵈ Corinthian epistle	Ps 23:1b
2 Cor 3:16	
2 Cor 10:17	**Other**
	Hos 2:1c-d
	Joel 3:5a
	3 Kgdms 19:10

Deduced from the table above, Paul cited content taking primarily from the *Pentateuch,* the prophecies assigned to Isaiah and the Psalms, while their re-working seems to be limited to Romans and Corinthian correspondence. Therefore, apart from the significance of the *Corpus Paulinum's* 50% occupation of the New Testament, the parameters set by the literary source context (the *Torah*, Isaiah and the Psalms in particular) would also prove to be of importance due to the frequency of use throughout the New Testament as well as the significant role they played throughout the translation process of the Hebrew Scriptures. The problem, however, associated with these explicit citations requires a more nuanced formulation and explanation.

1.3 PROBLEM FORMULATION

Paul's inconsistent[6] and varied[7] use of the term κύριος within its literary conceptual context, as well as the inconsistent association of both the term θεός and κύριος in relation to Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός.

A pertinent question is: *Does the formulated problem suggest a possible incoherent[8] understanding of a 'Hebrew deity' on the part of Paul?* A good example of such a varied use is found in Rom 2:24. Paul is quoting from Isa 52:5c, a passage which clearly speaks of κύριος and the blasphemy of 'his' name. The Hebrew counterpart, in turn reads יהוה; Paul on the other hand, implemented the term θεός. If one assumes that a Hebrew *Vorlage* reading the Tetragram (יהוה) and the often used Greek translation for it (the Greek representative term κύριος used for יהוה) is upheld, then either Paul's *Vorlage* could be regarded as being inconsistent in representing the Hebrew deity, or alternatively, Paul deviated from his *Vorlage* to be more in tune with his own conceptual thoughts. Paul is, however, consistent in his use of the term θεός within its immediate literary conceptual context; the latter which proves conceptual consistency. The primary inconsistency revolves around the inter-relatedness of the term κύριος and θεός, captured in the explicit citations, within its immediate literary context. The intent with the concept, inter-relatedness, is to emphasise the dualistic relational potential between a.) the term κύριος and θεός within the explicit citations (conceptual source relatedness), b.) the term κύριος of the explicit citations and the term κύριος found in the literary context, c.) either the term κύριος or θεός contained in the explicit citations, with Jesus as the χριστός, and d.) the term κύριος, θεός and χριστός within the immediate literary context. It might also come to light that the claim that Paul is inconsistent is proven to be false during the course of this study, but until then, at first glance inconsistencies appear to be dominant.[9]

---

[6] The inconsistency is two-fold: a.) In some instances Paul deviates from his *Vorlage* (or at least the best constructed text *Vorlage*) b.) Relating the term θεός and κύριος contained within the explicit citations with the relevant terms in its immediate literary context, as well as with one another.

[7] Paul is not consistent in his implementation of terms such as θεός or κύριος. Stated differently, it seems as if the concept underlying these terms vary. The inconsistency is thus observable on a literary level (but not limited to), while the varied used function on a conceptual level, although its functionality should not be limited to such. Cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 86-87.

[8] With the incoherent idea is meant Paul's conceptual struggle reconciling the monotheistic Hebrew deity with Jesus from Nazareth.

[9] Cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 86.

With the construction and formulation of the inconsistency claim, a number of important questions come to mind: *What are the literary sources of these κύριος and θεός citations? Why are there so many variations and inconsistencies, particularly with theological significant terms such as these?* One might be inclined to assume that Paul merely copied from a Greek text similar to the 'reconstructed'[10] Greek Old Testament text as represented in the *Vetus Testamentum Graecum – Gottingensis editum* (hereafter referred to as LXX^{Gött}.[11] This assumption, however, is flawed, because such a reconstructed text was not yet in existence at the time of Paul. One could however, presuppose that the reconstructed text provided by the LXX^{Gött} is a plausible representation resembling a Greek Old Testament text(s) (i.e. an "Old Greek version" = OG) that might have been in circulation during the first century CE. Unfortunately, the LXX^{Gött}, although of extreme importance, would not be able to answer all the lingering questions regarding the literary source of the two terms.

There are additional questions such as: *to what extent did other Hellenistic and Jewish literature influence Paul? And to what extent was Paul influenced by a 'general' Hellenistic and Jewish concept of terms such as κύριος and θεός? Did Paul develop his own concept of κύριος and θεός? And to what extent did his concept influence his attempt to relate, if indeed, these terms to Jesus of Nazareth?* The answers to the latter questions are of course quite difficult to determine, if not impossible. Moreover, one could also ask *what was the relationship between the Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic languages at the time of Paul? Did Paul make use of oral or literary sources, or both? Which concepts can be identified as the creative process of Paul and which formed part of his written Vorlage, or were these concepts conceivably taken from memory, or liturgical traditions? Where and how did Paul find the content he is citing?* These are all valid questions that need to be attended to; some more difficult than others and some more verifiable than others.

With the proposed research problem one would have difficulty in escaping the questions: *What is the relationship between the Old Testament concept and terms used for the Hebrew deity, and that which is used by Paul? How does Paul conceptually 'connect' Jesus of Nazareth with the Hebrew deity?* And *what is the relationship between the terms implemented?* One would eventually have to ask *what was Paul's concept of a Hebrew*

---

[10] The term 'reconstruction' should not be interpreted as an indiction that the LXX^{Gött} offers a 'reworked' or 'copied' version of a 2nd century 'constructed' OG text. With reconstruction is meant a best possible and responsible attempt to construct a plausible OG text.

[11] Koch, *Schrift,* 86, remarks, rightly so, that the constructed Greek text is fundamentally a later Christian text.

deity?[12] These are all questions boiling at the core of the problem of *how the Hebrew deity is represented in the Pauline literature? Did these quotations assist Paul's understanding and portrayal of Jesus of Nazareth as the same divine being as the Yahweh of Israel? How does the terms κύριος and θεός in the Pauline literature assist one to answer all the above mentioned questions? How does Paul implement his citations as a bridge between Jesus of Nazareth and יהוה, אדוני, and מרי to make Jesus the κύριος and/or θεός?* Questions such as these are fundamental for New Testament scholarship, biblical scholarship in general and for the Christian faith in particular. These questions come to mind and are perceptible because Paul is citing scripture and content in his epistles containing terms such as κύριος and θεός, and by doing so he is interpreting literature. Paul seems to be representing the Hebrew deity in the light of Jesus and the events surrounding him for the Christian movement of the first half of the 1st century; while such a re-representation of the Hebrew deity would unavoidably cause theological and Christological complexities.

What comes to the fore when one considers related terms, particularly from the 3rd century BCE onwards, is the relationship between יהוה, אדוני, אל and אלהים; κύριος, θεός, δέσποτης and מרי. The complexity level of these questions are further emphasised by the realisation that there is no Greek manuscript of Jewish origin[13] in existence – as far as it is known today – where the term יהוה is rendered by an uncontracted[14] term κύριος.[15] Furthermore, there are only two or three Old Testament[16] manuscripts dated to the 3rd century BCE up until the 2nd century CE that attests to an uncontracted θεός term; and no New

---

[12] ‚Hebrew deity' is a technical phrase used when dealing with Old Testament terms such as יהוה, אל, אלהים, אדני and their related Greek equivalents, which refers to the deity of a group of people defined by their language, namely Hebrew. A modern example of such is those South Africans, referred to as 'Afrikaners.' The ethnic group is not defined as such purely due to the continent they find themselves on. They are primarily defined based on the language they speak, being 'Afrikaans'. The implementation of the phrase 'Hebrew deity' should thus not necessarily imply that the author distances himself from such a deity who claimed to be the 'Creator' and 'Living God.' It should first and foremost be regarded as an attempt to ensure 'objective-distance' while investigating terms that might suggest explicit references to such a deity.

[13] Manuscripts accounting for Old Testament and related content.

[14] The so-called 'contracted' form of certain words, investigated as *Nomina Sacra* (see Hurtado, L. W. "The Origin of the *Nomina Sacra:* A Proposal." *JBL* 117.4, (1998), 655-673, is when the first and last letter of such word is contracted, while disposing the letters in between. The uncontracted form is where such a process is not visible, in other words, the word is written out in full.

[15] See 4QLXXLev^b (4Q120) Lev 2-5 [Göttingen #802, dated 1st century BCE] reproducing the Tetragram with ΙΑΩ, PFouad 266^b [Göttingen #848, 1st century BCE] attesting to the Tetragram utilising square Hebrew characters; while 8ḤevXIIpr [Göttingen #943, dated 50 BCE – 50 CE] Hab 2-3, reading paleo-hebrew characters for the Tetragram as examples.

[16] P. Oxy. 1007 [Göttingen #907, 1st century CE] Gen 2-3 and P.Oxy. 656 [Göttingen #905] Gen 14-27 as examples.

Testament Greek [17] manuscript of Christian origin dated to the first two centuries CE, attesting to an uncontracted term κύριος or θεός.

Paul is citing scripture for a specific purpose. He cited scripture containing both the terms κύριος and θεός, which forces one to ask the question *what is the concept underlying the κύριος and θεός terms in the explicit citations and how did the latter concept influence his concept of the earthly Jesus, or Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός?* One has to be realistic and assert that not all of the questions would be answered throughout this study. The extent of these questions, and possible answers, is the product of many doctoral theses and other research ventures. An attempt will be made to pursue these issues through which some, if indeed any, of these questions might be answered. The primary objective with this research study, however, is a humble first step towards *a formulation of a plausible Pauline concept of a Hebrew deity in relation to Jesus of Nazareth*.

The problem can thus be confined and summarised as follows:

- Which biblical manuscripts were available to Paul, containing the term κύριος and θεός, when he wrote his epistles?[18]
- What biblical terms were used between the 3rd century BCE and 2nd century CE when referring to the 'Hebrew deity'?
- How did Paul re-interpret the term κύριος and θεός in both its intratextual and intertextual contexts?

The problem and the primary questions construed from such a problem should thus be limited to Paul's concept of a Hebrew deity in relation to Jesus of Nazareth as the κύριος and χριστός, as inferred from Paul's explicit κύριος and θεός citations and against the literary backdrop provided by manuscripts dated from the 3rd century before and 2nd century CE.

---

[17] All available New Testament manuscripts considered and reworked in the Nestle-Aland 27 edition, notably 𝔓[46], represent the terms κύριος and θεός using the early Christian scribal practice referred to as *nomina sacra*.
[18] Koch, *Schrift,* extensively dealt with the manuscripts available to Paul when conducting his study more than twenty six years ago. Since then newly discovered manuscripts have been uncovered, which should also be considered.

Deduced from the latter, the following steps needs to be taken:

a.) The first step would be to establish a broad literary backdrop of the terms κύριος and θεός and their related Hebrew counterparts which will illuminate the literary problem. A second and related step would be to briefly reflect on text critical discrepancies and variants presented by the text critical apparatus of both the Old Testament (LXX^{Gött}) and New Testament (Nestle-Aland 27) eclectic texts, with regard to the terms θεός and κύριος. One could then, based on the evidence, formulate a workable literary problem which would in turn be a plausible literary backdrop against which the explicit κύριος and θεός citations will be discussed (this endeavour will be unfolded in Chapter 2 – Literary Problem).

b.) The logical necessary step would be to discuss the explicit κύριος and θεός citations within its immediate literary context (Chapter 3 will be dealing with the explicit citations in the Roman epistle, while Chapter 4 will be focusing on explicit citations in the Corinthian epistle).

c.) Finally it would be essential to determine the impact that these explicit citations might have had on how Paul conceptualised a Hebrew deity on the one hand; while determing to what extent one could infer continuities and discontinuities between the Jewish text and Christian context on the other hand (Chapter 5 – Conclusion – Some observations on Paul's concept of a Hebrew deity) on the other hand.

Formulating a problem and presenting a structure through which such a problem will be dealt with, is but one aspect of this research. This research venture is in no way considered as an *Epoch* in time isolated from previous studies related to the same issue. This study, however, intends not only to be in dialogue with prior research endeavours, but to build on valuable theories, hypotheses and arguments inferred over many years, related to Pauline thought in general and the citations in the Pauline literature in particular.

1.4 A HISTORY OF RESEARCH

1.4.1 Old Testament Citations in the Pauline Literature

Countless proposals from various viewpoints and approaches have been made by scholars with regard to Paul's citations since the late 19th century.[19] Not much has been done to get

---

[19] The first attempt was made by Kautsch, E. *De Veteris Testamenti loci a Paulo Apostolo allegatis.* Leipzig: Lipsiae, 1869, who claimed that Paul cited biblical text taken from the Septuagint text. Koch, *Schift,* 4-10,

involved in the problematic field of Paul's use of the so-called κύριος citations – not to mention the possibility of the θεός citations. One such exception is the investigation done by **Lucien Cerfaux** who published an article in 1943.[20] Cerfaux investigated those citations that attested to the term κύριος, which he then interpreted as "texts applied to God" as well as "texts applied to Christ" not allowing much scope for exceptions. The reason for the almost 'natural' tendency towards the citations in Pauline literature, supposedly, is that it is filled with numerous citations from literature available to Paul. Not less than 89 explicit citations are found in the 'genuine' Pauline letters.[21]

Following onto this is the work of **E. Earle Ellis**[22] who is clear on his approach that it would not be a textual one. He intends to focus on the rationale underlying the use of the citations by Paul and its theological application.[23] Apart from the overall appreciation for his attempt, the section on the nature of the quotations,[24] the introductory formulae[25] and the λέγει κύριος citations[26] would prove to be of value, particularly in establishing the explicit κύριος and θεός citations. **Otto Michel's** work, titled *Paulus und seine Bibel*[27] (and particularly the chapter devoted to what Paul understood as 'holy scripture'), conveys necessary insights into what Paul would have understood as 'authoritive' scripture.[28] A 'new' era was introduced when **Dietrich-Alex Koch** realised the magnitude of the problem when dealing with citations in the Pauline literature in his extensive and pioneering work. He states that *"Zu nennen sind hier die Frage nach der jeweiligen Textvorlage und Textabänderungen in den zahlreichen abweichenden Zitatwiedergaben durch Paulus,…"*[29] Koch's statement captures the essence of the dynamics of these citations and their content, and because of his sensitivity towards the complexity of the problem, the work he has done is ground breaking, especially with his meticulous and comprehensive investigation into the various text readings. Koch also dealt, in short, with the issue of the *"Herkunft von KYRIOS in den Schriftzitaten*

present a detailed overview on the history of research done in this field of study, at least up until 1986. Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture – Citation technique in the Pauline Epistles and contemporary literature.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992, also offers an extensive list of studies undertaken in light of Paul's use of scripture, 3-28.

[20] Cerfaux, L. "'Kyrios' dans les citations pauliniennes de l'Ancien Testament." *ETL* 20, (1943), 5–17.

[21] See Koch, *Schrift,* 21-22; cf. Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 92-95.

[22] Ellis, E. Earle. *Paul's use of the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1957.

[23] Ellis, *Paul's use,* 1.

[24] Ibid., 11-20.

[25] Ibid., 22-37.

[26] Ibid., 107-113.

[27] Michel, O. *Paulus und seine Bibel.* Darmstadt: Wissenschafliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.

[28] Michel, *Seine Bibel,* 8-18.

[29] Koch, *Schrift,* 9.

des Paulus."[30] He presented the complexity in bridging between יהוה, אלהים - κύριος and θεός.[31] He then made three preliminary conclusions based on literary findings:[32]

a.) Paul was acquainted with and trusted the fact that the term κύριος was considered to be a suitable equivalent for the Tetragram within the oral tradition, which in turn might imply that the term had no new meaning for both Paul and his readers when he employed the citations that contained such a term.

b.) Paul was conscious that whenever he used an explicit κύριος citation that its Hebrew counterpart reads יהוה.

c.) Paul considered and interpreted such citations as being Christological in nature.

Koch's work was followed by the study of **Richard Hays**, who re-iterated that he pursues questions that deviated considerably from those posed by historical criticism.[33] Hays' approach is to read the letters as literary texts shaped by complex intertextual relations with Scripture.[34] Hays is of the opinion that his intertextual approach may prove theologically fruitful in an attempt to answer questions about the relation between Judaism and Christianity, and the authority of Scripture, among others.[35] His approach is noted here, but is not considered to be relevant in answering the question posed in this study, namely that of Paul's concept of the Hebrew deity through the lens of the explicit κύριος and θεός citations. **David Capes** did, however, focus his attention on the term κύριος, while dealing with the citations implemented by Paul.[36] He investigates the problem through the so-called *"Old Testament Yahweh-Texts"* which culminates for him into Paul's Christology. Capes structures his line of thought through which he firstly deals with the term κύριος in 'the' Septuagint;[37] secondly he deals with Paul's use of κύριος;[38] finally he moves onto the so-

---

[30] Ibid., 84-88.
[31] Ibid., 84-87.
[32] Ibid., 87-88. The monographical work of Koch was followed three articles which continues his line of thought and approach: *"Beobachtungen zum christologischen Schriftgebrauch in den vorpaulinischen Gemeinden."* ZNW 71.3/4, (1980), 174-191; *"Der Text von Hab.2.4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament."* ZNW 76.1/2, (1985), 68-85 and *"The Quotations of Isaiah 8,14 and 28,16 in Romans 9,33 and 1 Peter 2,6.8 as Test Case for Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament."* ZNW 101. 2, (2010), 223-240.
[33] Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the letters of Paul.* London: Yale University Press, 1989, xi.
[34] *Idem,* xi.
[35] *Idem,* xii.
[36] Capes, David B. *Paul's use of Old Testament Yahweh-Texts and its Implications for his Christology.* Tübingen: Mohr & Paul Siebeck.
[37] Capes, *Yahweh Texts,* 34-42.
[38] *Idem,* 43-89.

called *Yahweh texts* in Paul's letters, followed by some conclusions.[39] One cannot help but to describe some of Cape's conclusions as 'giant leaps' from one assumption to another without verifying his arguments. Romans 4:7-8 can be taken as an example.

The text in Rom 4:7-8 is presented[40] with some text critical notes after which Capes immediately assumes that 'the' LXX text is a *verbatim* account of its Hebrew counterpart and thus making Rom 4:7-8 a *Yahweh-Text*.[41] From there the conclusion is drawn from the literary context of the LXX, as well as the context of Rom 3:21 to 4:7-8 respectively.[42] Moreover, Capes based his conclusions on so-called general themes 'traditionally' used by Paul.[43] Another example is Rom 11:34. Once again Capes immediately links 'the' LXX to the Hebrew text and therefore makes the citation in Rom 11:34 out as a *Yahweh-Text*.[44] His concluding remarks are again based on the context in Romans 11.[45]

He has indeed provided an overview of the possible origin of κύριος in the LXX,[46] while a synchronical approach of Paul's use of κύριος[47] was the denominator when he dealt with those citations containing the term κύριος. Cape's assumption that these citations should be regarded as *Yahweh-Texts* as if Paul read יהוה when he cited scripture cannot be accepted. The textual complexity has not been given enough consideration by Capes, and therefore some crucial discontinuities exist between the aspects considered in his work.

In the same year that the publication of Capes' monograph was published, **Christopher D. Stanley's** inquest into Paul and the language of Scripture were also made public. Stanley, while relying to a great extent on the work of Koch, did however notice and commented on some of the issues surrounding the term κύριος and θεός, but to a limited degree.[48] He focused on the technique implemented by Paul when he (Paul) used Scripture.[49] Stanley presented the various proposed techniques of scholars in understanding Paul's use of Scripture.[50] He then poses the two theses that are demonstrated in his study namely, 1. *"that Paul actively adapted the wording of his biblical quotations to communicate his own understanding of the passage in question… and* 2. *that, in offering such 'interpretative*

---

[39] Idem, 90 – 183.
[40] Idem, 156.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid., 157.
[43] Ibid., 157.
[44] Ibid., 168-172.
[45] Ibid., 172.
[46] Ibid., 56-72
[47] Ibid., 72-151.
[48] See Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* 67-87, in his attempt to establish the text. Another example can be found in 84-86 and 176-182
[49] Stanley, *Language of Scripture.*
[50] Ibid., 8-28.

renderings' of the biblical text, Paul was working consciously but unreflectively within the accepted literary conventions of his day."[51] The study of both Koch and Stanley has argued, rightly and convincingly so, that Paul relied on Greek *Vorlagen*.[52] A year later, another monograph was published under the editorship of **Craig Evans and James Sanders** which included contributions from sixteen essayists on Paul and the use of Scripture of Israel.[53] At first glance contributions such as *Paul and Theological History* and *Echoes*,[54] as well as **J Beker's** *Intertextuality: On the Role of Scripture in Paul's Theology*[55] appear to be noteworthy, but a closer reading attests to the contrary. Neither of these two authors considered it necessary to reflect on, what should be considered theologically significant, the terms κύριος and θεός in their discussion. Some of the titles of these contributions are misleading; they do not fulfil the expectations raised by the title of the compilation of essays. In fact they merely reflect on the work of Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture* in relation to the introduced topic as presented.[56]

Florian Wilk[57] also perceived the κύριος-*Tetragram* problem when he dealt with the Isaiah citations in Paul, but he did not pursue the issue any further than mere reference.[58] Wilk's study is introduced by means of two assumptions, a) it is not to assume *a priori* that Paul's multi-thematic use of scripture resembling Isaiah content implies that Isaiah was in Paul's view a literary unit from which he addressed various themes,[59] and b) because of the uneven separation of the citation in the Pauline literature, he rightfully assumes, *"daß der Einfluß des Jesajabuches sich nicht überall in derselben Weise vollzieht, sondern Entwicklungen oder Wandlungen unterworfen ist."*[60] Although Wilk's insight into the use of the Isaiah citations in the Pauline literature would be undeniably valuable to this study, he

---

[51] Ibid., 29.

[52] Cf. Wagner, J. Ross. *Herhalds of the Good News – Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans.* Leiden: Brill, 2003, 6 (see also Wagner's representation of Lim's critique against the stance of Koch and Stanley on page 7).

[53] Evans, Craig A. and Sanders, James A. *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

[54] Sanders, James A. "Paul and Theological History." Pages 52-57 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel.* Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

[55] Beker, J. Christiaan. "Echoes and Intertextuality: On the Role of Scripture in Paul's Theology." Pages 64-69 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

[56] In the same year as the publication of *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel,* Aageson, James W. Published his monograph, *Written Also for Our sake – Paul and the Art of Biblical Interpretation.*Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992 was published. Aageson's approach is very similar as that of Hays, due to his (Aageson's) interest in how biblical text are used, interpreted, and taught, xi. It is clear that Aageson's intent was to focus on 'Old Testament' themes interpreted by Paul for the Christian tradition.

[57] Wilk, F. *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

[58] See Wilk, *Bedeutung,* 364-367, as an example.

[59] Wilk, *Bedeutung,* 12.

[60] Wilk, *Bedeutung,* 13.

does not conversely deal with the κύριος or the θεός citations as such. One would have expected some reflection from Wilk on this matter due to the fact that at least 25 explicit citations, of which 10 are taken from Isaiah, reflect the term κύριος and θεός.[61] In an essay published in the same year as Wilk's monograph, **J. Ross Wagner** also dealt with Isaiah citations in Paul, but he narrowed it down to Isa 51-55.[62] What Wagner does in this study is to apply the thematic criterion, proposed in an article by Hays, to the question of Paul's use of Isaiah in Romans.[63] Wagner also mentions that he will *"attempt a more wide-ranging account of the influence of the larger 'story' of Isaiah 51-55 on the 'story' underlying Paul's argument in Romans."*[64] In 2002 another attempt was made to account for the use of the Isaiah content by Paul, while limiting the investigation to the Roman epistle.[65]

Shui-Lun Shum is of the opinion that the uniqueness of Paul's use of Scripture can only be clearly and fully appreciated if it is considered in comparison with his fellow kinsmen.[66] Shum made a decision to use "Jewish Sibyls" as well as Qumran sectarian manuscripts as comparative literature, while limiting himself to the Book of Isaiah in particular. His interest, though, is the hermeneutical techniques and the theological interests that emerge in these writings.[67] Shui-Lun's work does open a variety of 'source' possibilities. He did not, however, appreciate the complexity of the κύριος or θεός problem in his reference to Paul's possible *Vorlage* while referring to *Yahweh*.[68] The most recent monographical work on Paul's use of scripture was done by **J. Ross Wagner**, published in 2003.[69] Although Wagner recognises the work of Koch, Stanley and Lim in terms of detail and their approach, his approach in reconstructing Paul's *Vorlage* would be more in line with the work of Hays in that he seeks to uncover the hermeneutical logic that guides Paul's reinterpretation of scripture.[70] His methodology, however, deviates from that of Hays when he systematically employs a text-critical investigation of Paul's *Vorlage* as a tool for exposing Paul's interpretive strategies and aims.

---

[61] See Rom 9:29; Rom 10:16; Rom 14:11 [quoting Isa 45:23 and Isa 49:18]; 1 Cor 2:16.
[62] Wagner, J. R. "The Heralds of Isaiah and the Mission of Paul – An Investigation of Paul's Use of Isaiah 51-55 in Romans." Pages 193-222 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant Isaiah Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins.* Edited by J. R. Bellinger & W. R. Farmer. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1998.
[63] Wagner, *The Heralds of Isaiah,* 194.
[64] Ibid., 195.
[65] Shum, Shui-Lun. *Paul's use of Isaiah in Romans.* Tübingen: Mohr & Siebeck, 2002.
[66] Shum, *Isaiah in Romans,* 1.
[67] Ibid., 2.
[68] Ibid., 205-215 onwards.
[69] Wagner, *Herhalds of the Good News.*
[70] Ibid., 13.

Some scholars, working in the same research area as mentioned above, further defined the broader research area by focusing on specific aspects of Paul's use of Scripture. Examples include **Richard B. Hughes**[71] who zooms into the textual and hermeneutical issues contained in 1 & 2 Corinthians. Hughes' study researched the textual and hermeneutical aspects of Paul's use of the Old Testament in 1 and 2 Corinthians. Hughes writes that his study will *"endeavour to understand the Old Testament through the mind of one New Testament writer, the Apostle Paul, as seen in his use of explicit quotations in 1 and 2 Corinthians."*[72] In an article published in 1985, **Roy Harrisville** presents a 'formal study' of Paul and the Psalms,[73] in which he deals with some peculiarities in Paul's use of the Psalms. **Wendell L. Willis** also dealt with a specific aspect of Paul's use of scripture by focusing on 1 Cor 2:16.[74] Willis makes it clear that his study will not seek to resolve the background issue, but to approach the text from another angle.[75] Willis thus aimed to approach the problem of the "Mind of Christ" by focusing on the literary context in 1 Cor 2:6-16.[76] Willis deals with 1 Cor 2:16 within the context of 1 Cor 2:6-16. **C. Kavin Rowe** searched for the name of the Lord through the lens of Rom 10:13.[77] In a recent study **Jean-Noël Aletti** points his attention to Romans 4 and the role played by Genesis 17.[78] In this article he proposes the technique called *gezerah shawah*[79] used by Paul for understanding of his (Paul's) citations, and specifically Genesis 17 in Romans 4.[80] **James W. Aageson** also narrows down the field of research in his monograph when he focused his attention on Romans 9-11 in a comparative study of biblical interpretation.[81] His thesis is based on two basic arguments: the first being that Paul's methods in using scripture are largely adaptations of methods found in a wide range of early Jewish sources, and secondly that the latter method is fundamental to the theological development of Romans 9-11.[82] In a very recent publication, **Brian J. Abasciano** focused his investigation on Paul's use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:10-18.[83] The value of

---

[71] Hughes, R. B. "Textual & Hermeneutical Aspects of Paul's use of the O.T. in 1 & 2 Corinthians." Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1978.

[72] Ibid., 2.

[73] Harrisville, R. A. "Paul and the Psalms A Formal Study." *Word & World* 5.2, (1985), 168-179.

[74] Willis, W. "The "Mind of Christ" in 1 Corinthians 2,16." *Biblica* 70, (1989), 110-122.

[75] Ibid., 111.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Rowe, C. K. "Romans 10:13: What is the name of the Lord?" *HBT* 22.1, (2000), 135-173.

[78] Aletti, Jean-Noël. "Romans 4 et Genese 17 Quelle énigme et quelle solution?" *Biblica* 84, (2003), 305-325.

[79] A rabbinic principle, the second of Hillel's exegetical rules.

[80] Aletti, "Romans 4 et Genese."*; cf. Capes, *Yahweh-Texts,* p. 155.

[81] Aageson, J. W. *Paul's Use of Scripture: A Comparative Study of Biblical Interpretation in Early Palestinian Judaism and the New Testament With Special Reference to Romans 9-11.* Oxford, London: Oxford University Press, 1983.

[82] Ibid., "Abstract."

[83] Abasciano, Brian J. *Paul's use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.10-18.* New York: T & T Clark, 2011.

Abasciano's work for this study in particular is the fact that he deals with the 'source-context' of the citations, in his own words on intertextual exegesis of Romans 9: *The term refers to standard grammatical-historical exegesis of a New Testament text...that alludes to the Old Testament, informed by a detailed analysis of the author's use of Scripture. Such analysis involves exegeting the Old Testament text[84] in its original context.[85]*

One has to note that the research presented above, based on both its broader and narrower fields of research, is a solid base from where this research study could be undertaken. Although Harrisville,[86] Willis,[87] Wagner,[88] and Aletti[89] implicitly deal with the κύριος citations in one way or another, they do not consider it necessary to investigate the apparent questions posed by the appearance of the term κύριος in the citations. Rowe, on the other hand, does indeed find it necessary to pursue problems posed by the latter term.[90] He does this by means of a synchronical analysis[91] in both the literary contexts of Rom 10:13 and Joel 2:32.[92]

1.4.2 Research done on the Origin of ΚΥΡΙΟΣ

From very early in the 20th century scholars have been fascinated with the term κύριος and its origin(s). The reason for this is, of course, linked to the whole debate about the continuity between the Old Testament and New Testament, the relation between Judaism and Christianity and ultimately between the God of Israel and Jesus Christ, the central figure in the Jesus movement. One such study is the ground breaking work of **Wilhelm Bousset**,[93] in which he dealt with the 'titles' assigned to Jesus,[94] as well as the *kyrios* title in particular,[95] among others. Bousset comes to the conclusion that the κύριος title was assigned to Jesus

---

[84] Referred to in this study as 'source-context'.

[85] Abasciano, *Romans 9.10-18,* 1.

[86] Harrisville, "Paul and the Psalms."

[87] Willis, *"*Mind of Christ."

[88] Wagner, "Heralds of Isaiah."

[89] Aletti, "Romans 4 et Genese 17."

[90] Rowe., *Romans.*

[91] A similar approach as followed by Hays, *Echoes of Scripture.*

[92] Rowe, *Romans,* 137-162.

[93] A well known and respected study in this regard was the work done by Bousset, W. *Kyrios Christos – Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926; see also Hurtado, Larry W. "New Testament Christology: A Critique of Bousset's Influence." *TS* 40.2, (1979), 306-317. Hurtado offers in summary Bousset's primary contributions, 307-308 after which he critically engages with Bousset, based on the notion of "Jewish" and "Hellenistic" categories, 308-316; cf. Hurtado, Larry W. "Forschungen zur neutestamentlichen Christologie seit Bousset – Forschungrichtungen und bedeutende Beiträge." *TB* 11.4, (1980), 158-171.

[94] Bousset, *Kyrios – Christos,* 1-22.

[95] Ibid., 75-104.

under Hellenistic influence and because of the Hellenistic environment.[96] Bousset is further of the opinion that the 'absolute' use of κύριος, as it is found in John and Paul's documents, is because of Hellenised influence and that Jesus was only called κύριος in the secular sense of the word.[97] **Oscar Cullmann** disagrees with Bousset in the sense that he was certain of Jewish influence[98] that played a role in the conceptualising process of the early Christian writers, such as Paul.[99]

Ferdinand Hahn points to both the Hellenistic and Jewish influence on the term κύριος assigned to Jesus in the early Church.[100] He also emphasised the Palestinian tradition with regard to the κύριος title.[101] **Leonhard Goppelt** follows on similar lines when he deals with the *"KYRIOS-Confession"* in the Hellenistic Church[102] and the origin and content of the Hellenistic *"KYRIOS-Concept"*.[103] No final answer has been given by scholars on the origin of the term κύριος. There is, however, general consensus among scholars that the Hellenistic emperor cults, deity designations and secular use of the term κύριος had a significant influence on the authors of the New Testament.[104] One would be safe to assume that the origin of the term κύριος can be characterised as polarity in nature.[105] Furthermore, most scholars[106] will also agree to the fact that Judaism played a major part in the early Christian concept linked to the term κύριος. Hahn refers to Paul's use of κύριος,[107] whereby he comments "*dieser Anwendung von ὁ κύριος ist der Blick primär auf den irdischen Jesus gerichtet."*[108] Hahn deals with very few passages in the Pauline literature, but he does not refer to any citation being under discussion in this study. **Larry Hurtado** briefly investigates

---

[96] Ibid., 94.

[97] Ibid.

[98] Cullmann, O. *The Christology of the New Testament.* London: SCM Press LTD, 1963, 199-203.

[99] Ibid., 203-237.

[100] Hahn, F. *The Titles of Jesus in Christology – Their History in Early Christianity.* England: James Clark Co., Ltd, 2002, 74-82.

[101] Ibid., 74-82.

[102] Goppelt, L. *Theology of the New Testament, 2 vols.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982, 79-81.

[103] Ibid., 81-86.

[104] Cullmann, *Christology,* deals with the Hellenistic influence in 195-199; Hahn, F. *Christologische Hoheitstitel – ihre Geschichte im fruhen Christentum.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964, considers this aspect in 68-70; Goppelt, Theology, places emphasis on the κύριος-confession in the Hellenistic church, 79-81, as well as on other Hellenistic content and origin, 81-86; Perrot, C. "Kyrios/Herr." *RGG* 4, (1921-1924); Rösel, M. "אדון," *ThWQ* 1:37-46; Frenschkowski, M. "Kyrios in context; Q 6:46, the emperor as lord and the political implications of Christology in Q." Pages 95-118 in *Zwischen den Reichen: Neues Testament und romische Herrschaft: Vorträge auf der ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies*. Edited by Michael Labahn & Jürgen Zangenberg. Tübingen: Francke, 2002.

[105] This statement is emphasised by Frenschkowski, "Kyrios in context," 96-101.

[106] Cullmann, *Christology,* 199-203; Hahn, *Titles of Jesus,* 74-80; Berger, K. *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums 2.Auflage-UTB Für Wissenschaft.* Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 1995; Perrot. *RGG* 4, (1922); Hurtado, Larry W. "Lord II." 723-724.

[107] Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, 91-94.

[108] Ibid., 91

all of the citations under discussion here, as well as other references to κύριος in the Pauline literature and the *deutero-pauline* letters.[109] Hurtado then implements 'themes' which, in his opinion, describe the use of κύριος by Paul.[110] Hurtado further argues that the origins of the Christian use of the term κύριος are to be found in the Pauline literature, as well as in Aramaic sources.[111] In a renewed quest for answers on the relationship between, and origin of, *"Kyrios or Tetragram"* in the Septuagint,[112] **Albert Pietersma** indicates that those texts that were traditionally used in the discussion of this topic,[113] are long overdue and dated. He thus bases his argument on three new texts found[114] at that time, focusing on the Pentateuch, from where he concluded that κύριος was indeed the primary replacement in the LXX for the Hebrew designation of God.[115] **Berger** understands the κύριος term *"als die Übertragung des 'Names' Gottes, wie er in den Septuaginta-Handscriften und besonders bei Philo v.A. im 1.Jh.n.Chr. belegt ist, auf Jesus."*[116] Clearly the last words on the origin of the term κύριος and its influence on early Christian writers such as Paul, has not yet been spoken; even more so with regard to the term θεός. Visible and verifiable continuities between the origin of the term κύριος and θεός and Paul's concept of these terms are yet to be constructed.

Based on the few studies mentioned above, it seems obvious that interest in the citations present in the Pauline literature is not something new, to say the least. Nor are the endeavours to account, to explain and to formulate the so-called term κύριος or θεός, especially in relation to Jesus of Nazareth. The intention of this research study is not to focus on the Old Testament citation in the Pauline literature in general, nor to address the issue surrounding the religious-cultural background of the term κύριος *per se*. ***This investigation will focus its intention on those explicit citations accounting for both the term κύριος and θεός. These citations will be dealt with from a text critical and a historical critical perspective, through which the text tradition and transmission of these terms and relevant text references, would be analysed, evaluated and scrutinised***.

---

[109] Ibid., 725-726.

[110] *Ibid*., 726-731.

[111] Hurtado., 724-725. Other scholars like Cullmann., 203-216; Hahn., *Hoheitstitel,* 81-81 would agree with Hurtado with regard to the Aramaic sources.

[112] Pietersma, A. "Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX." Pages 85-114 in *De Septuaginta Studies in honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday.* Edited by A. Pietersma & C. Cox. Canada: Benben Publications, 1984.

[113] Pietersma, "Kyrios or Tetragram*,"* 87.

[114] Ibid*.,* 88-91.

[115] Ibid*.,* 100-101.

[116] Berger, *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums,* 61-65.

1.5 THE THEORY

The theory pivotal to this research study is the assumption that Paul used the term κύριος and θεός inconsistently in relation to one another and in relation to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος. Secondly, Paul conceptualised the term κύριος as referring to both Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, as well as the Tetragram – the latter which is almost exclusively limited to the explicit κύριος citation. Finally, the historical Jesus figure as χριστός is conceptually in the mind of Paul, the 'closest' the historical Jesus would come to θεός as a term used to refer to the Hebrew deity proper. This does not necessitate that Paul conceptualised Jesus as the χριστός as being existentially-substantially 'equal' to the Hebrew deity. What it indeed it does suggest is that in some instances Paul's use of the term χριστός opens the conceptual possibility that the χριστός entity belongs to the same 'conceptual domain' as the Hebrew deity. These concepts seem to suggest an 'incoherent' understanding of both Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός as well as the Hebrew deity on the part of Paul. Moreover, it is also the theory adopted here that the socio-cultural concept underlying the term κύριος is not to be considered the dominant or primary concept influencing Pauline thought.[117] In order to prove the validity of this theory(s) or deny it as fallible, sound arguments are required based on solid evidence. The historical-critical method of problem solving will form the scientific backbone from where reasonably sound arguments will be formulated and critiqued.

1.6 METHOD OF RESEARCH

This proposed study will follow a diachronical approach similar to that of Koch,[118] Stanley[119] and Wilk.[120] The primary method within such an approach will be a historical-critical method of investigation, with its components of text, source, tradition, form criticism and redaction criticism. The latter will form a web of methods, networking and interrelating with one another, through and against which the data will be accumulated, evaluated, structured and scrutinised. Source, redaction, form and text criticism will be the dominant elements applied within the scope of chapter 2, but to a limited degree in chapters 3 and 4. The discussion of the explicit κύριος and θεός citations latched within its immediate literary conceptual context suggests an exegetical-hermeneutical approach. This approach will be supported and

---

[117] Such an influencial concept, that of the emperor as κύριος, might have become more prevalent from the end of the 1st century, but more probable from the 2nd century onwards.
[118] Koch, *Schrift.*
[119] Stanley, *Language of Scripture.*
[120] Wilk, *Bedeutung.*

critiqued, where needed, using the historical-critical methodology. A theological-hermeneutical approach would be present in both chapters 3 and 4, but will dominate the concluding chapter 5. Due to the fact that explicit κύριος and θεός citations will be dealt with against a literary-historical background, together with a text critical reflection in determining the citations, a historical-critical method would thus be the most suitable method to approach this investigation.

The insights brought to the fore by socio-scientific methods of analyses are intentionally underplayed for the purposes of this investigation which is driven by its particular research question. To state it differently, the socio-historical context is intentionally made silent, to ensure that one could hear the text historical voice of the Jewish Scriptures. This author is aware of the value and importance of the socio-scientific approach towards analysing the text within its cultural context and could prove to be a necessary approach in solving some of the problems noted here. However, the historical-critical method as a scientific approach to investigate the problem at hand is considered a non-negotiable first step in addressing the explicit κύριος and θεός citations in the Pauline literature.

The method opted for in this study would thus implicitly imply a presupposition, namely that the Jewish scriptures were the primary sources that influenced Paul's theological conceptualisation processes and thoughts. This presupposition does not necessarily exclude a socio-cultural context and the influence it might have had on Pauline thought; it does however suggest that:

a.) the socio-cultural context with regard to the first century Mediterranean political and social systems, dominated by imperialism, should not be considered to be the primary dictating force feeding the Pauline thought with regard to the terms κύριος and θεός;

b.) the Jewish scriptures, in its Hellenistic form, were the primary theological-conceptual sources influencing Pauline thought.

1.7 OBJECTIVES

This study would endeavour to gather and evaluate the data necessary to deal with the issues at hand, from where one would be able to formulate sound arguments as support for the formulated theory, or to ultimately provide an alternative solution to the suggested problem. The primary objectives thus required to achieve the above are the following:

1. Determining the literary problem by establishing a *Vorgeschichte* of the term κύριος and θεός as 'suitable' Greek terms in reproducing and representing the Hebrew deity;

2. Determining if textual traditions, with regard to the terms κύριος and θεός, are available in the New Testament tradition;

3. Establishing the explicit κύριος and θεός citations;

4. Establishing the literary and conceptual relationship between κύριος and θεός, as well as with Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος in both the Roman and Corinthian correspondence;

5. Concluding if, and to what extent, the evidence presented could assist in understanding the continuities and discontinuities between the Jewish text and the Christian context. These objectives will unfold with the scope of chapters 1-5 with the assistance of all facets offered by a historical-critical approach.