THE EXPLICIT ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ CITATIONS BY PAUL: AN ATTEMPT AT UNDERSTANDING PAUL'S DEITY CONCEPTS

A Thesis

Submitted to

The Faculty of Theology (New Testament)

At the University of Pretoria

In Fulfilment

Of the Requirements for the degree

Philosophiae Doctor (Ph.D)

Promoter: Prof. Dr. Gert J Steyn

By

Peter Nagel

May, 2012

OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie ondersoek die eksplisiete κύριος en θεός aanhalings in die Pauliniese literatuur. Die studie evalueer ook die impak wat sodanige aanhalings op Paulus se konsep van 'n Hebreeuse godheid in verhouding tot Jesus as die χριστός en κύριος gehad het. Die ondersoek na die ekplisiete aanhalings word gedoen teen 'n breë literêre agtergrond, manuskrip data wat dateer tussen die 3de eeu VCE en 2de eeu NCE. Die omvang van die literêr-konseptuele impak van die eksplisiete aanhalings word dan oorweeg in beide die Romeine- en Korintiër-briewe. As konklussie, word die literêr-konseptuele waarde van die eksplisiete κύριος en θεός aanhalings ge-evalueer (a) ter bepaling van 'n meer komprehensiewe begrip van Paulus se konseptuele verstaan van die terme κύριος en θεός; en (b) ter formulering van 'n moontlike Pauliniese konsep van 'n Hebreeuse godheid.

SUMMARY

This study investigates the explicit κύριος and θεός citations in the Pauline literature and their impact on Paul's concept of a Hebrew deity in relation to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος. The investigation into the explicit citations is done against a broad literary backdrop, data from manuscripts dated between the 3rd century BCE and 2nd century CE. The extent of the literary conceptual impact of these citations is then considered in both the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. In conclusion, the literary conceptual value of the explicit κύριος and θεός citations is evaluated in an attempt (a) to determine a more comprehensive perception of Paul's conceptual understanding of the terms κύριος and θεός; and (b) to formulate a plausible Pauline concept of a Hebrew deity.

DEDICATION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dedicated to my two loving parents, Peter and Martie Nagel...you have given me the gift of life and the opportunity to learn. Without your unconditional love and support this study would not have been possible... for this I am eternally grateful.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are being used:
- Standard Latin abbreviations
- The SBL Handbook of Style (see Bibliography) – Biblical and other ancient authors
- Manuscript abbreviations used for the appropriate eclectic editions (e.g. Götingen LXX edition)

In addition to these, the following abbreviations are also used:

BCE	Before Common Era
BHS / BHS^5	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
CE	Common Era
Codex A	Codex Alexandrinus
Codex B	Codex Vaticanus
Codex D	Codex Claromontanus
Codex V	Codex Venetus
col. /Col.	Column
DJD	Documents from the Judean Desert
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
fr.	fragment
LXX	Septuagint
LXX^{Gött}	Septuagint (Göttingen edition)
MT	Masoretic Text
NA / NA27	Nestle/Aland 27th Edition
OG	Old Greek
OT	Old Testament
par.	paragraph
PFouad	Papyrus Fouad
POxy	Papyrus Oxyrhyncus
SamP	Samaritan Pentateuch
v. or vv.	verse or verses
p. or pp.	page or pages
pap.	papyrus

PREFACE

The Pauline literature[1], as the general consensus goes, consists of some of the oldest documents[2] in the New Testament. Furthermore, if one would take the so-called *deutero-pauline literature*[3] into account then it becomes clear that the *Corpus Paulinum*[4] occupies nearly 50% of the New Testament. Thus, the interpretation, conceptualisation, exegesis, hermeneutics and theologising of these letters are of the utmost importance for the reconstruction of early Christianity as a movement, first within Judaism[5] and soon afterwards outside of it. The Pauline literature in general and the explicit citations in particular, offers a valid point of entry into the literary history of the Greek terms θεός and κύριος used as equivalents for a Hebrew deity. It is thus reasonable to propose an in-depth investigation into 1.) the literary sources[6] of the 3rd century BCE and 2nd century CE with regard to the Hebrew and Greek terms used for a Hebrew deity, and 2.) the explicit κύριος and θεός citations in Pauline literature.

---

[1] These are the epistles addressed to the early Christian groups in Thessalonica (1st Thessalonians), Corinth (1 & 2 Corinthians), Philippi (Philippians), the province of Galatia – whether it be the northern or southern region, the latter is preferred here (Galatians), the Roman capital (Romans), and Philemon residing in Colossians; also referred to as the 'true', 'genuine' or 'authentic' letters of Paul.

[2] Dating from as early as 49 CE (1st Thessalonians), (some argue that James is the oldest document in the New Testament), up until between 55-59 CE (Romans).

[3] This includes the 'true' Pauline letters together with the so-called *deutero*-Pauline letters: Colossians, Ephesians, 2 Thessalonians (some consider 2nd Thessalonians as *post* Pauline), 1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus.

[4] All the letters that are traditionally linked to the Apostle Paul.

[5] This demands the identification of various traditional sources such as Christological and soteriological creeds (Rom 1:3-4; 10:9-10; 1 Cor 15:34b-5 respectively), as well as Christological hymns Phil 2:6-11; doxologies Rom 11:33-36), and baptism formulas (Gal 3:27-28); sin lists (Rom 1:29-31) in an attempt to reconstruct *pre*-Pauline traditions. It goes without saying that the latter sources include those explicit citations containing the terms κύριος and/or θεός.

[6] These sources would include both Hebrew and Greek Biblical manuscripts dated to this period of which the manuscripts found in and around the Judean desert and in Egypt would be of special significance. Some of the works of both Philo of Alexandria as well as Josephus will be included to provide a conceptual frame of reference from a Jewish perspective, that existed in the first century CE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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 𝔓⁴⁶, 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 emperer 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.

CHAPTER 2: LITERARY PROBLEM

2.1 INTRODUCTION

An attempt to establish, define and describe the literary problem with regard to the explicit κύριος and θεός citations require a literary backdrop broader than just the Pauline literature and even broader than the New Testament corpus itself. It would be imperative for this study to discuss these citations against a much broader literary Jewish-Hellenistic backdrop than what is offered by both the Old and New Testament text.[1] Pre-conceived parameters would however be necessary to ensure specialised focus on the issue at hand. This chapter therefore confines itself to the following restrictions to ensure that the literary problem is determined, evaluated and discussed effectively. Attention will thus be given to the following:

- a.) Biblical manuscripts (both Hebrew and Greek) dated between the 3rd century BCE and 2nd century CE;[2]
- b.) testifying to either the terms אלהים יהוה אדני and κύριος, θεός and δεσποτής;
- c.) while cross-checking against a critical text edition, where available, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia 5th edition* (*Biblia Hebraica Quinta* where obtainable), *Vetus Testamentum Graecum – Göttingensis editum* and *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece Editio XXVII* (*Editio Critica Maior*, where available);

The reason for these parameters is based upon the generally accepted and undisputed assumption that Hebrew and Greek manuscripts attesting to biblical content found in and around the Judean desert dating back to the third centurion BCE, is the oldest available to date.[3] Secondly, the manuscripts found in and around Upper Egypt attest to some of the oldest known Greek manuscripts testifying to biblical content. Thirdly, translating the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, were most probably initiated from the middle of the third century BCE onwards,[4] offering a wealth of information regarding the initiation and development of theological concepts and ideas. Finally, the text critical editions would prove

---

[1] Cf. Schnelle, Udo. *Leben und Denken.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003, who states – and with good reason – that the theological thought of Paul is rooted in Hellenistic Jewish context of his time, 56.

[2] The manuscript data will be sourced from the *DJD* (Documents from the Judean Desert) Series, published by Clarendon at Oxford.

[3] These would also include Greek text fragments, which formed part of the same batch of data found. Rasmussen, K. L. et al., "The effects of possible contamination on the radiocarbon dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls I: Castor Oil." *Radiocarbon* 43.1, (2001), 127-132, suggests that some contamination could have taken place in the 1950's with the dating of the DSS which, in his conclusion, might prove that some manuscripts might be slightly earlier than expected.

[4] For a re-evaluation on the dating procedure and integrity of dating the DSS see Jull, A. J. T. et al., "Radiocarbon dating of scrolls and linen fragments from the Judean desert," *Radiocarbon* 37.1, (1994), 11-19.

to be of immense importance not just for cross-checking purposes, but also to point out possible scribal and text traditional tendencies and practises. Some remarks should be in order regarding the inclusion of the works of Philo and Josephus. The importance of these authors' work should not be underestimated, even though the 'critical' editions of their work date back to at least the eighth century CE.[5]

The concepts and ideas formed as Hellenistic Jews, who wrote and communicated in Greek, would at least assist one to construct a reasonable first century conceptual frame of reference with regard to the terms κύριος and θεός,[6] as well as with related terms. The works of both Philo and Josephus would prove to be a fairly balanced view regarding theological Jewish concepts within Hellenistic thought. Such a balanced view is dependant on the acceptance of the presupposition that Philo represents *Hellenized* Jewish thoughts and concepts from a philosophical perspective, while Josephus as historian would be representative of *Jewish* thoughts with a Hellenistic colour. The inclusion of both the works of Philo and Josephus should thus not be regarded as an indication to deviate from a historical-critical, and in particular a text-critical approach of the New Testament documents *per se*, towards a more conceptual-philosophical methodology – although the latter cannot be completely dismissed.

These and other literary significant voices would prove to be invaluable in addressing the multi-dimensional character of this proposed literary problem. In the first instance, one is confronted with the problem relating to the *prohibition in pronouncing the Tetragram*,[7]

---

[5] The earliest and most complete compilation of Philo's work, which includes the manscripts that supports the best possible readings, is represented by Leopold Cohn, Leopold and Wendland, Paul (eds.). *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1896–1915. A later, well know and often used edition is preserved in the Loeb Classical Library, Colson, F. H. *Hypothetica* and *De Providentia* in the Philo–edition of the Loeb Classical Library, vol. IX. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1941. See also http://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/bap/bap04.htm (accessed on the 30th of May 2011) for a list and brief discussion on the Philo manuscripts as well as http://www.tertullian.org/rpearse/manuscripts/josephus_all.htm (accessed on the 30th of May 2011) for a complete list of Josephus manuscripts.

[6] For a thorough and an in-depth overview of the term κύριος in both the Hebrew and Greek OT as well as in later Judaism and in the New Testament, see Foerster, W. "κύριος." *TDNT* 3, 1039-1058; Foerster, W. "κύριος, D. 'Lord' in Later Judaism." *TDNT* 3, 1081-1085; Foerster, W. "κύριος, E. κύριος in the New Testament." *TDNT* 3, 1086-1095.

[7] One of the most recent and thorough studies with regard to the pronunciation of the Hebrew deity as *Adonaj* was done by Rösel, M. *Adonaj - Warum Gott ,Herr' genannt wird.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000. Rösel constructed a strong case why the term אדוני was regarded as the most suitable term when the 'name' of the Hebrew deity, the Tetragram, had to be pronounced (contra De Troyer, Kirsten. "The Pronunciation of the Names of God." Pages 143-172 in *Gott Nennen – Religion in Philosophy and Theology. 35.* Edited by Ingolf U. Dalferth and Phillip Stoellger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 145-146. Dating the prohibition of the Tetragram see de Troyer, "The Pronunciation," 146-148. The history of the Tetragram as the 'name' of the Hebrew deity is complex in its own right as is clear from a fairly recent essay by Hartenstein, Friedhelm. "Die Geschichte JHWH's im Spiegel seiner Namen." Pages 73-95 in *Gott Nennen – Religion in Philosophy and Theology 35.* Edited by Ingolf U. Dalferth and Phillip Stoellger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008. Hartenstein managed to achieve presenting a reasonable *Religiongeschictliche* backdrop against which the use and development of the

which in turn had implications for the transmission of the Hebrew text, especially from the third century BCE onwards.[8] Secondly, due to the intricacy in 'naming' the Hebrew deity, this had an impact on the translation process; *the issue surrounding the oral reproduction of the Tetragram spilled over into the process of finding a theological suitable Greek equivalent for the Tetragram* (a 'name' for the personal Hebrew deity) in particular and for the monotheistic Hebrew deity in general. It would be plausible to assume that the Greek translators of the Hebrew text were familiar with the dilemma surrounding the pronunciation and literary reproduction of the Tetragram.[9] Thirdly, due to the multitude of Hebrew text readings and the complexity surrounding such readings, one could expect the potential for various Greek text traditions. Finally, *the array of issues inevitably would have an impact on the Vorlage(n) available to the New Testament authors, including Paul*.

Approaching such a literary problem thus requires one to attend to all the dimensions involved, through which a more filtered problem would manifest itself, whilst keeping focus on the primary issue at hand; *what could one deduce from the explicit κύριος and θεός citations about the literary representation of the Hebrew deity in the Pauline literature?*

Tetragram should be discussed. Uehlinger, Christoph. "Arbeit an altorientalischen Gottesnamen." Pages 23-71 in *Gott Nennen – Religion in Philosophy and Theology 35*. Edited by Ingolf U. Dalferth and Phillip Stoellger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008. Uehlinger takes a few steps back in history with his discussion on the *Götterwelt im antiken Mesoptamien*. Both these contributions, and other alike, emphasise the fact that one should not attempt to deal with the Tetragram in particular or the 'name' of the Hebrew deity in general, in isolation; see also Blum, E. "Der vermeintliche Gottesname >Elohim<," in *Gott Nennen.*" Pages 98-119 in *Gott Nennen – Religion in Philosophy and Theology 35*. Edited by Ingolf U. Dalferth and Phillip Stoellger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008 as well as the discussion of Zeitlin, S. "The Origin of the Pharisees Reaffirmed." *JQR*, 59.4, (1969), 255-267, on this matter.

[8] See Brotzman's compact history on the transmission of the Old Testament Hebrew text prior to the third century BCE up until 1450 CE in Brotzman, Ellis R. *Old Testament – Textual Criticism – A Practical Introduction.* Michigan: Baker Books House Co, 1994, 37-62; see also the essay of Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The transmission history of the text of the Hebrew Bible in the light of biblical manuscripts from Qumran and other sites in Judean Desert." Pages 40-50 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery*. Edited by L. H. Shiffman et al., Israel: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.

[9] Pietersma, "Kyrios or Tetragram," refers to the immense study undertaken by Wolf Wilhelm Graf Boudissin in 1929, who concluded that the LXX read *kyrios* as a surrogate for *Yhwh* and should not be considered as a from of the Tetragram, 6; see Rostock, G. Quell. "κύριος, C. The Old Testament Name of God." *TDNT* 3, 1058-1081. For a designation to 'God' in die Psalm[LXX] see Steymans, H. Ulrich. "Die Gottesbezeichnung Kyrio im Psalter der Septuaginta." *L'Ecrit et l'Esprit* (2005), 325-338. In Steymans' own words: "Die Septuatinga gint Jhwh, aber auch andere Gottesbezeichnungen, mit Kyrios wieder. Daher ist es keineswegs selbstverständlich, in die Septuaginta dieselbe konzentrische Struktur wiederzufinden," 326; see alo Wevers, J. William. "The Rendering of the Tetragram in the Psalter and Pentateuch: A Comparative Study." Pages 21-35 in *The old Greek Psalter – Studies in honour of Albert Pietersma.* Edited by Robert J. Hiebert et al., *JSOTS* 332, 2001. The article on how the 'Divine Name' were read and translated in the Masoretic tradition and Greek Pentateuch, see Rösel, M. "The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch." *JSOT* 31.4, (2007), 411-428.

Formulating the question differently, ***what could one infer from the explicit κύριος and θεός citations about Paul's literary induced concept of the Hebrew deity?*** The intent and objective of this chapter would unfold primarily into the following sections:

a.) To determine a possible *Vorgeschichte*[10] within a literary conceptual context[11] of the:

    a. Hebrew terms אלהים, יהוה and אדני (transmission or reproduction problem);

    b. Greek terms κύριος, θεός and related terms such as δεσπότης (translation-conceptualisation problem);

b.) To determine, if possible, text traditions and/or scribal trends concerning the term κύριος and θεός and its Hebrew counterparts are observable from the critical constructed Greek and Hebrew Old Testament texts (transmission problem);[12]

c.) To clearly describe and define the core literary problem at hand.

2.1.1 Examples

The inconsistencies and so-called discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek versions of the Old Testament (hereafter OT) originated with the complexity surrounding the literary re-representation or reproduction of the Hebrew deity in the Hebrew text tradition. The examples to follow will illustrate the supposed 'transmission problem'. A comparison between the MT and manuscripts found in an around the Judean desert,[13] show that 11QLev[a] (Lev 9:24) read 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 while the Masoretic text (hereafter MT) text testifies to the term יהוה. Another example is attested in Deut 26:4 with the MT reading יהוה compared to the term 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 presented in 4QDeut[k2]. Another two examples from the text critical data as presented

---

[10] The *Vorgeschichte* entails a.) determing which Hebrew terms primarily used to reproduce the Tetragram and related terms when referring to the monotheistic Hebrew deity from at least the 3rd century BCE onwards; b.) determining which Greek term/s were used as suitable equivalent/s for the Tetragram in particular and related Hebrew terms from the 3rd century BCE – 2nd century CE.

[11] A 'literary conceptual context' should not be interpreted as a term synonomous with pericope, nor does it designate structuralism in the true sense of the word. It is intended however, to describe the attempt in mapping Paul's mind, with regard to θεός and κύριος in relation to the χριστός term. The *Vorgeschichte* would therefore describe the process of a much larger thought-structural map, extended over a far longer period of time. Per implication, determining a possible *Vorgeschicte* would ultimately lead to different literary thought structural contexts. Moreover, both the *Vorgeschichte* and literary thought context would in most cases be limited to biblical texts, with the exception of Philo and Josephus, both of whom does refer and deal with biblical texts and content to a larget extent.

[12] Both the New Testament (data provided by Nestle-Aland 27 together with NT Transcripts, including, where available, the *Editio Critica Miaor* editions) and Greek Old Testament (data used as supplied by the Göttingen edition of the Septuaginta text) text critical data will be anaylised to establish if any variations, defiations and alterations for the θεός and κύριος terms exist; and if any trend or pattern could be deduced.

13 Ulrich, E., Cross, F. M., et al. *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD XII). Oxford: Clarendon, 1994; reprinted 1999. xv + 272 pp. + xlix plates.

by the BHS should suffice. The dynamics of the issue at hand is accentuated when closer attention is given to relevant text critical data presented by the BHS. Take Gen 18:27 and Gen 18:31 as an example: The MT reads the term אדני in both cases with a few Hebrew manuscripts reading יהוה. Another example is Exod 3:4; the MT attests to the term יהוה while the Samaritan Pentateuch (SamP) suggests reading אלהים.[14] In other cases,[15] the Samaritan Pentateuch opposes the MT reading אלהים by suggesting the reading יהוה.

2.1.2 The General 'Rule of Thumb' – *a Problem of Rendition*

To truly grasp the complexity and admire the intricacies of a so-called problem or rendition, a short introduction into the general 'rule of thumb' should be in order.[16] First, if one compares the eclectic texts of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* 5th edition (representative of the *Masoretic text*) and the *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Scientiarum Gottingensis editum* (representing an authoritive construction of the translations made of 'the' Hebrew text from the 3rd century BCE onwards) with the manuscripts found in and around the Judean desert, the traces of the complexity surrounding the reproduction of the Tetragram as the personal deity of the Hebrew people, becomes evident. Some peculiar examples of how the Tetragram was reproduced from the 3rd century BCE onwards are listed in the comparative table below.

Reference	LXX[Gött]	MT (BHS)	DJD	
Exod 8:1	κς	יהוה	4QExod[j]	דוהד
Exod 12:27	κω	יהוה	2QExod[b]	דוהד
Lev 9:24	κυ	יהוה	11QLev[a]	דוהד
Ps 118:25	κε	יהוה	11QPs[a]	דוהד
Non-biblical			1QS 8:14	יייי
Non-biblical			4Q365f2:6	יהוה (with open dots above every letter)

---

[14] See also Gen 7:1; Num 14:17.

[15] See Gen 28:4; 31:7 and Gen 31:16.

[16] The generally accepted rule is expressed by Fischer, J. B. "The Term ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ in Josephus." *JQR* 49.2, (1958), 132-138, in his opening paragraph regarding the term δεσποτής.

Deut 19:14	κϛ	יהוה	P.Fouad 266	יהוה
Lev 4:27	κυ	יהוה	4QpapLXXLev^b	ΙΑΩ
Hab 2:16	κυ	יהוה	8HevXIIgr	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄

Inferred from the fragmentary data, the Hebrew text tradition attests to at least four variant terms used to render the Tetragram from the 3rd century BCE onwards.[17] The first, and the most frequent use, is the square Hebrew characters יהוה, the second is four *jod* Hebrew characters יייי, the third is old Hebrew characters 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 (also referred to as *Paleo-hebrew*) and finally four dots.[18] The Greek tradition from the same period, on the other hand, reproduces the Tetragram using the following Greek or other equivalents: ΙΑΩ, open space, יהוה and 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄.[19] Apart from the latter evidence, the comparison between the text critical data provided by the BHS and LXX^{Gött} will auxiliarate the complexity in reproducing the Tetragram and other terms used for the Hebrew deity. Some of these text critical variations and discrepancies would be addressed later in this chapter.

Second, if one compares the eclectic Hebrew (BHS) and Greek (LXX^{Gött)} texts with each other, in other words comparing text passages where the Hebrew terms אלהים (translated with 'God' in the English language) and יהוה (translated with 'Lord' in the English language) and their Greek counterpart's θεός and κύριος appear, the problem intensifies. The general accepted 'rule of thumb' among biblical scholars is that the term θεός is the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew term אלהים, which would also apply to the term אל; while the equivalent Greek term for יהוה is κύριος.[20] The inconsistencies in applying the so-called 'rule of thumb' is visible throughout the constructed LXX^{Gött} text, not to mention the variations and discrepancies pointed out by the text critical data. As can be expected, the 'rule of thumb' presupposition is not impervious to scrutiny. The following four examples from four distinct Hebrew texts confirm the fact that exceptions do exist and they require explanation.

---

[17] Cf. Parry, Donald W. "4QSam^a and the Tetragrammaton." Pages 106-124 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by D. W. Parry and S.D. Ricks. Leiden: Brill, 1996, 106-108.

[18] See Zimmerman, F. "A Suggested Source for some of the Substitute Names for YHWH." Pages 581-587 in *Studies in Jewish Bibliography, History, and literature in Honor of I. Edward*. Edited by Berlin Charles. Kiev: Ktav Publishing House, 1974 – a valuable attempt in arguing for a reasonable source or 'reason' for the substitute names for YHWH.

[19] Cf. De Troyer, "The Pronunciation," 150-153.

[20] Cf. Rösel, "Reading and Translating," 414 and Trobisch, D. *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments*. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996, 22-25. See also de Troyer, "The Pronunciation," 154-159.

Example I

Isaiah 52:12^{LXX}	Isaiah 52:12^{MT}
ὅτι οὐ μετὰ ταραχῆς	כִּי לֹא בְחִפָּזוֹן
ἐξελεύσεσθε	תֵּצֵאוּ
οὐδὲ φυγῇ πορεύσεσθε,	וּבִמְנוּסָה
Πορεύσεται	לֹא תֵלֵכוּן
πρότερος ὑμῶν	כִּי־הֹלֵךְ לִפְנֵיכֶם
Κύριος	**יְהוָה**
καὶ ὁ ἐπισυνάγων ὑμᾶς	וּמְאַסִּפְכֶם
κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ	**אֱלֹהֵי** יִשְׂרָאֵל

In Isa 52:12c^{LXX} the text reads κύριος ὁ θεὸς whereas Isa 52:12c^{MT}, in turn, reads אֱלֹהֵי. In addition to this, the text critical data presented by the LXX^{Gött} notes that the hexapla recension text, including recension *L,* 'omits' the term κύριος; while other authoritive text witnesses in turn, support the κύριος ὁ θεὸς reading.[21] *Why would some Greek manuscripts read* κύριος ὁ θεὸς *and not the expected* ὁ θεὸς? Should one consider a Hebrew *Vorlage* not extant today? Is this a sign of the translator's reworking of the text? Or is one persuaded to re-evaluate the 'validity' of the critically constructed Greek text, such as is presented by the LXX^{Gött}? The next example will further highlight the issue at hand.

Example II

Psalm 7:7^{LXX}	Psalm 7:7^{MT}
ἀνάστηθι, **κύριε**	קוּמָה **יְהוָה**
ἐν ὀργῇ σου	בְּאַפֶּךָ
ὑψώθητι	הִנָּשֵׂא
ἐν τοῖς πέρασι τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου	בְּעַבְרוֹת צוֹרְרָי
ἐξεγέρθητι	וְעוּרָה
κύριε ὁ θεός μου	**אֵלַי**
ἐν προστάγματι, ᾧ ἐνετείλω	מִשְׁפָּט צִוִּיתָ

---

[21] The text reading is supported by Unicials A B Q S and V, including numerous minuscules (the latter which includes papyri 965 and 958).

In this case, the 'rule of thumb' seems to be upheld with the first occurrence of κύριε with its Hebrew counterpart reading יהוה; the same cannot be said for κύριε ὁ θεός μου. The Hebrew counterpart for the latter Greek phrase reads אֵלִי.[22] A similar case is found in Ps 139:7, where the Hebrew text reads לַיהוָה אֵלִי with its Greek counterpart reading τῷ κυρίῳ θεός μου [Ps 139:7]. The latter would imply, given the fact that one accepts that the constructed MT and LXX eclectic texts are considered to be representative of a possible 'Old Greek' and its Hebrew *Vorlage* respectively, that the אל term was reproduced using either a.) κύριε ὁ θεός μου (Ps 7:7) and b.) θεός μου (Ps 139:7).[23] In both these cases, when the Tetragram occurs, it is inconsistently reproduced by the term κύριος.

Example III (1 Kgdms 2:10[LXX] and 1 Sam 2:10[MT]):

1 Kingdoms 2:1[LXX]	1 Samuel 2:1[MT]
	וַתִּתְפַּלֵּל חַנָּה֙
Καὶ εἶπεν Ἐστερεώθη	וַתֹּאמַ֣ר עָלַ֤ץ
ἡ καρδία μου ἐν **κυρίῳ**	לִבִּי֙ **בַּֽיהוָ֔ה**
ὑψώθη κέρας μου	רָ֥מָה קַרְנִ֖י
ἐν **θεῷ** μου	**בַּֽיהוָ֑ה**
ἐπλατύνθη	רָ֤חַב
ἐπὶ ἐχθροὺς τὸ στόμα μου	פִּי֙ עַל־א֣וֹיְבַ֔י
εὐφράνθην ἐν σωτηρίᾳ σου	כִּ֥י שָׂמַ֖חְתִּי בִּישׁוּעָתֶֽךָ

The κύριος term in the dative case parallels the first preposition בַּ + יְהוָה combination, while the second preposition יְהוָה combination is not reflected as the general assumption goes; the Greek text utilises the θεός term in its dative case. The MT notes that a large number of Hebrew manuscripts read באלהי, including other versions such us G L[115]S[AG corr] (not visible in S[rel] and V[Mss]). The latter would suggest that the constructed Greek OT reading corresponds with some Hebrew manuscripts and related versions. These text witnesses make it highly plausible that a different Hebrew *Vorlage* could have been used by the Greek translator. The final example taken from Genesis would indeed challenge Rösel's proposed solution, which accounts for the deviations from the general 'rule of thumb'. He proposes that the deviation

---

[22] The text critical data produced by the LXX[Gött], κυριε ult. > S = 𝔐, κυριε ο θεος μου > Sa, points out that the Syrian translation, whose reading is uncertain, does correspond to the Masoretic text, while the Sahidic translation does not read either of the terms.

[23] Also see Ps 12:4[LXX] [Ps 13:4[MT]]; Ps 17:3[LXX] [Ps 18:3[MT]].

should not be attributed to a different *Vorlage*, nor should one regard the transmission of the Greek reading as being insecure. According to Rösel these deviations should be ascribed to theological reasons such as, to avoid the impression that κύριος, in cases where the κύριος term represents יהוה, acts in an unjust way.

Example IV

Genesis 4:4^{LXX}	Genesis 4:4^{MT}
καὶ Αβελ ἤνεγκεν	וְהֶ֨בֶל הֵבִ֥יא
καὶ αὐτὸς	גַם־ה֛וּא
ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτοτόκων τῶν προβάτων αὐτοῦ	מִבְּכֹר֥וֹת צֹאנ֖וֹ
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν στεάτων αὐτῶν	וּמֵֽחֶלְבֵהֶ֑ן
καὶ ἐπεῖδεν **ὁ θεὸς**	וַיִּ֣שַׁע **יַהוָ֔ה**
ἐπὶ Αβελ	אֶל־הֶ֖בֶל
καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ	וְאֶל־מִנְחָתֽוֹ
Genesis 4:9-10^{LXX}	**Genesis 4:9-10^{MT}**
καὶ εἶπεν **ὁ θεὸς**	וַיֹּ֧אמֶר **יְהוָה֛**
πρὸς Καιν	אֶל־קַ֖יִן
Ποῦ ἐστιν Αβελ ὁ ἀδελφός σου;	אֵ֣י הֶ֣בֶל אָחִ֑יךָ
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν	וַיֹּ֙אמֶר֙
Οὐ γινώσκω	לֹ֣א יָדַ֔עְתִּי
μὴ φύλαξ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μού εἰμι ἐγώ;	הֲשֹׁמֵ֥ר אָחִ֖י אָנֹֽכִי
καὶ εἶπεν **ὁ θεός**	וַיֹּ֖אמֶר
Τί ἐποίησας;	מֶ֣ה עָשִׂ֑יתָ
φωνὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου	ק֚וֹל דְּמֵ֣י אָחִ֔יךָ צֹעֲקִ֥ים אֵלַ֖י
βοᾷ πρός με ἐκ τῆς γῆς	מִן־הָֽאֲדָמָֽה

In Gen 4:4^{LXX} the term θεός, together with the definite article is used, while the MT (Gen 4:4) reads יהוה. The action which the subject is acting out is ἐπεῖδεν or וַיִּשַׁע both of which can be translated with an English equivalent 'to observe, oversee' or 'look at.' In Gen 4:9 and Gen 4:10 the LXX utilised the term θεός twice as the one responsible for the act of speaking, with the MT (only in Gen 4:9) again reading יהוה. Rösel's proposal, that the term κύριος is

avoided whenever the text speaks of punishment and judgment,[24] does not hold water in these instances. The text does not appear to speak of punishment nor judgment *per se*. It might be interpreted as a premature reference to judgement or punishment, but such an interpretation would reject what the immediate literary context intends to achieve. There are other examples from the Pentateuch that could also be used as a critique against Rösel's proposal (see Exod 3:4; Lev 2:13; Num 5:5-8; Deut 12:14; to mention only four). Another two interesting cases should be noted, as they further demonstrate the inconsistencies and variations:

Genesis 15:2a[MT]	Genesis 15:2a[LXX]
λέγει δὲ Αβραμ	וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם
Δέσποτα	אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִה
Genesis 15:8a[MT]	**Genesis 15:8a[LXX]**
εἶπεν δέ	וַיֹּאמַר
Δέσποτα κύριε	אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה

The term δεσπότης is used only in Gen 15:2 and Gen 15:8, together with Jos 5:14 in the entire Greek OT corpus. In Gen 15:2 the term δεσπότης is used as the equivalent for both the term אדני and יהוה, while the term δεσπότης appears to be the equivalent for אדני in Gen 15:8 and Jos 5:14. In Gen 4:1 the LXX reads θεός as opposed to יהוה.[25] In Gen 7:1 an alternative reading, opposing יהוה is suggested by two Hebrew manuscripts, including the Samaritan Pentateuch and a Syriac version.[26] The latter opted for אלהים only, while the LXX[Gött] reads κύριος ὁ θεὸς. Most of the ca. 36 text critical notes on the Tetragram presented in the Genesis text are related to the LXX 'additions' or alternative readings such as θεός where one would have expected the term κύριος.[27] Interesting is that in Exod 3:4b the data ‖ [b] G κύριος; > V suggests that the LXX[Gött] does not read the expected term θεός,[28] while the Vulgate attests to no equivalent term. Another interesting discrepancy is presented in Deut 1:45. The MT notes

---

[24] Rösel, "Reading and Translating," 420.

[25] The LXX[Gött] in turn notes that Epiph II 76 (Epiphanius I –III) reads τοῦ] κ̄ῡ.

[26] 2 Mss 𝔖 ﻡ אֱלֹהִים, 𝔊 ad ὁ θεός, see also text critical note on Gen 28:4, where the ﻡ (Samaritan Pentateuch) again proposes יהוה as an alternative.

[27] See for example Exod 4.1[a]; 8.25[a]; 10.18[b]; 13.21[a]; 14.31[a]; 19.8[a] and 19.21[a]. Trobisch, *Die Endredaktion*, 20-21, refers to L. Traube who indicated that the Tetragram was written using square Hebrew characters, but that it was vocalised and pronounced as אדני. He also notes (see footnote 17, 21), that the latter is confirmed by the documents found at Qumran. This would be true, as indicated, for the square Hebrew characters used to reproduce the Tetragram, but it would be difficult to prove with a reasonable amount of certainty that the Tetragram was pronounced as אדני at that time.

[28] See also the text critical data on יהוה in Exod 4:1 (𝔊* ὁ θεός); the LXX text again opposes the general 'rule of thumb'; cf. The text critical data in Exod 4:11.

on the second Tetragram reading, that G[B min] ad reads τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν (ὑμῶν),[29] with papyrus 963 attesting to κυρίου του θεου υμων.[30] Finally, one or two examples from the text critical data, represented by the LXX[Gött], should be in order. In Isa 22:12 B-Q[mg]-109 403′ 538 reads κυριος κυριος which is considered to be "closer" to the MT. Minuscule 91 in turn, reads κυριος ο θεος. The text reading opted for κύριος σαβαωθ. In Isa 40:10 the hexaplaric tradition, together with Eusebius, accounts for two κυριος terms; whereas Hieronymus "adds" *deus* equivalent for the term θεός. The text reading again attests to a single κύριος term.

The small number of cases presented above, is but a mere spec of dust in the vast array of text critical discrepancies and variations noted by both Hebrew and Greek eclectic text editions. This was but an introductory attempt to introduce the reader into the complexity of the κύριος-θεός, יהוה-אלהים and אדוני problem. These examples should be viewed as merely introductory in nature. It presents but one aspect of the backdrop surrounding the literary problem that ***there exists an inconsistency in reproducing the Tetragram in the Greek biblical texts at least from the third century BCE onwards.***[31] It is thus of imminent importance as a first necessary step, to determine the extent of the alleged 'transmission problem'.

2.2 *VORGESCHICHTE* AND LITERARY CONTEXT

2.2.1 The Transmission Problem: *Hebrew Text Tradition*[32]

The evidence to be dealt with here will be, for the most part, limited to the Pentateuch[33], Isaiah and the Psalms.[34] These three 'sources' are considered to be significant for this study due to the overwhelming frequency of use in the New Testament. Moreover, the Pentateuch

---

[29] This data is confirmed by the LXX[Gött], while attesting to the fact that του θεου υμων (ημων B 16*-52-529[c]-551 *b*–[537] 30′ 71′-527 630 319 407 646) B *C''* *b* *f*[129] *s* 71′-527 630 28 319 407′ 646: ex par. The latter clearly indicates that codex Vaticanus not only read the κύριος term, but also του θεου υμων; while other minuscule manuscripts read the first person personal pronoun as opposed to the second person personal pronoun.

[30] See also Deut 2:14 (𝔊[B* min] ὁ θεός = אֱלֹהָים cf G[MN min]) and Deut 3:20 (G[963L min] ad ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (G[rel] ὑμῶν).

[31] Scholars specifialising in Septuagint studies, are to a large extent in agreement that the Pentateuch was one of the first compilation of manuscripts translated into Greek.

[32] Refer to *addendum A* for a more extensive list of occurrences and with that discrepencies regarding the terms אלהים and יהוה; see also Ulrich, E, Cross, F. M., et al. *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV). Oxford: Clarendon, 1995; reprinted 1999. xv + 183 pp. + xxxvii plates and Ulrich, E, Cross, F. M. *Qumran Cave 4.VII.*

[33] Referred to the Torah or 'first five books of Moses.'

[34] The reason for limiting the literary 'source' context for that matter to the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the Psalms is for the simple reason that the explicit κύριος and θεός citations found in the Pauline literature reflects content from these source contexts in at least 98% of the cases.

or rather the 'Torah' would not only be considered as the so-called 'authoritative scripture' for the Hebrew tradition, but it would most certainly be regarded as the 'flagship' for the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures.[35]

Finally, it is the primary sources Paul referenced to when he cited Old Testament content. Thus, in considering these three literary sources they would give one a fairly good idea of what the most suitable terms were when reproducing the Hebrew deity, and more specific the Tetragram available to Paul, in this particular case. Although countless text fragments containing content resembling the Pentateuch have been found in and around the Judean desert, not many contain the Tetragram. Those that do indeed present the Tetragram, attest to square Hebrew characters with a limited amount of exceptions.[36] Selected evidence and the alternatives are listed in the sequence of biblical books.[37]

    a.) Fragment 1-2 of 4QExod-Lev[f] (Exod 8:1a) and f. 2 (Exod 12:27), 7 (Exod 31:16), 8 (Exod 34.10) of 2QExod[b],[38] as well as 4QExod[j] PAM 43.012:1, present the יהוה as ꓕ꓿ꓕꓜ;[39]

    b.) 4Q158 f. 4-15 (alluding to Exod 3, 19, 20-21 and 30) testifies, in all cases, to the יהוה using square Hebrew characters; this is also true for 4Q365 f. 2, 6, 11 and 12 (Exod 8-39) and 4Q174 (Exod 15:17-18);[40]

---

c.) The manuscripts 4QLev[g] PAM 43.036 (Lev 7:25) and 11QLev[a] f. 2 (Lev 9:24 and 10.1)[41] are two other text witnesses which account for the Tetragram using square Hebrew characters. Moreover, none of the 'non-biblical' material, in this case 4Q365 f. 23 (Lev 23:42 – 24.2) and 4Q367 (Lev 15:14-15), make use of any other form of the Tetragram than square Hebrew characters;

d.) In further opposition to the use of 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄, are 4QLev[b] f.1:16 (Lev 1:13) and 4QLev[d] f. 4:4 (Lev 17:4), which implements square Hebrew characters;

e.) Manuscript 4QDeut[k2] f. 5:6 (Deut 26.3) is the only text witness referring to Deuteronomy, of which many were found in the caves of Qumran and in the Naḥal Ḥever area (see for example 4QDeut[a-n], 4QpaleoDeut[g] and XḤevSeDeut), which represents the Tetragram using 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄;[42]

f.) The representation of the Tetragram in the 'non-biblical' manuscript 4Q364 (fragments 14, 24, 25 and 26), which alludes to Deuteronomy, also implements square Hebrew characters for the Tetragram;

g.) Another exception is found in 4Q174 (col. i:1, 19), another allusion to Deuteronomy, presenting the יהוה using ייי.[43]

All Hebrew manuscripts associated with the Genesis text reproduce the Tetragram using square Hebrew characters (see for example 4QGen[b] f. 1 col. II:3 – Gen 2:16; 4QGen[j] f. 2, col. I - Gen 41.25). The latter is also true for the text witnesses assigned to Numbers, which utilised square Hebrew characters as a representation of the Tetragram. The text fragments found, allocated to the Psalm text,[44] all represent the Tetragram using square Hebrew characters, except for two instances in 11QPs[a] a.) fragment Ei (Ps 118:25-27) and b.) Eii (Ps 104:31) presents the Tetragram as 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄.[45] The use of *paleo-hebrew* characters were not only

---

biblical' texts when dealing with the representation of the יהוה; these categories established by scholars working on the Documents from the Judean Desert to group manuscripts are necessary but not per se that relevant when one deals with the representation of the יהו in Hebrew. This investigation is focused on the core theological content, which attests to the יהוה as presented by the Hebrew texts in the inclusive sense of the word.

[41] Cf. García, Martínez F., Tigchelaar, E. J. C. and van der Woude A. S. *Qumran Cave 11.II: (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)* (DJD XXIII). Oxford: Clarendon, 1998). xiii + 487 pp. + liv plates.

[42] Cf. Skehan, P.W., Ulrich, E. and Sanderson, J. E. *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX). Oxford: Clarendon, 1992. xiii + 250 pp. + xlvii plates.

[43] In col. i:1 of this manuscript the scribe assigns the citation to Deut 5.28-29 as "And JHWH spoke to Moses saying:". So technically it is not part of Deut 5.28-29, but as introductory formula to the citation. In col. i:19 the blessing of JHWH is called upon "Bless, JHWH, ..." – which correlates with Deut 33.11.

[44] Cf. Eshel, E et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and Brady, M. *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XI). Oxford: Clarendon, 1998. xi + 473 pp. + xxxii pl.

[45] Another manuscript from the same location indexed 11QPs[c] (11Q7) testifies to the use of square Hebrew characters for the Tetragram. Noteworthy is also that from the so-called 'non-biblical' manuscripts indexed as

limited to the יהוה; Paleo-hebrew characters were also used for אל in 6QCompositional Hymn f. 6:5, f. 8:1 and col. ii:5 (Deut 8.11). Another employment of 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 for the Tetragram is found in 3QLam 1:2 (Lam 1:11). Manuscripts 1QpMic, 1QpZaph and 1QpHab (*Pesharim*) also attest to the Tetragram using 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄, while 4QpsEzek[e] (*Pseudo-Ezekiel*) again used יייי.[46] Another manuscript, indexed as *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, utilised square Hebrew characters for the Tetragram.[47] The same can be said for the *Pesharim* manuscripts found in Cave 4 (4Q168, 4Q169, 4Q170), which all attest to the Tetragram using square Hebrew characters. The latter use is also attested in 2QJer f. 9:1 col. ii and f. 13 col. i as well as in 4QJer[a] col. iv f. 4:6 and 5QAmos 1:1.[48] One could thus deduce the obvious based on the manuscript evidence attesting to the Pentateuch: the Tetragram is reproduced using square Hebrew characters, with some exceptions. It should be noted at this point in time that there are principally three terms used in the Hebrew dialect, deduced from the evidence produced in and around the Judean desert, when and if reference is made to an omnipotent, transcendental, all-powerful being (translated in virtually all English translations as "God" with a capital "G"): they are אל, אלהים and אלוה.[49] The use of אלהים and אל does not seem to present a concept that one would consider 'out-of-the-ordinary', except for the occasional use of *palew-hebrew* characters for אלהים or אל.

11Q5 (also referred to as 11QPs[a]) יהוה is dominantly used for the Tetragram; cf. Wolters, A. "The Tetragrammaton in the Psalms Scroll." *Textus* 18, (1996), 87-99. Wolters focused his investigation on the Psalms scroll and how the Tetragram had been dealt with. Wolters is of the opinion that the 'original' scribe left blank spaces which were later filled with the Tetragram using paleo-hebrew script, 87-89; cf. Sanders, J.A. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs a)* (DJD IV). Oxford: Clarendon, 1965. xi + 97 pp. + xvii plates.

[46] Cf. Barthélemy, D. and Milik, J. T. *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I). Oxford: Clarendon, 1955. xi + 163 pp. + xxxvii plates.

[47] The content of these texts allude to Ezekiel in general, but it is difficult to establish a specific text reference with regard to 4Q386, 4Q388 and 4Q391. It is nevertheless possible to link the content with more certainty where the יהוה is also read in square Hebrew characters (see 4Q385 (*Pseudo-Ezekiel*), Ezek 37 (f. 2 and 3) and Ezek 10 (f. 4).

[48] See the article of Siegel, J. P. "The employment of Paleo-Hebrew Characters for the devine names at Qumran in the light of tannaic sources." *HUC* 42, (1971), 159-172. Siegel intended to show how theological significant considerations was translated into a scribal convention by both "normative" and "sectarian" Jewish scribes, 159 (see also a follow-up article "The Alexandrians in Jerusalem and their Torah Scroll with Gold Tetragrammata." *IEJ* 22, (1972), 39-43); see also Parry, D. W. "Notes on Divine Name Avoidance in Scriptural Units of the Legal Texts of Qumran." Pages 437-449 in *Legal texts and Legal issues – Proceeding of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*. Edited by M. Bernstein, et al., Leiden: Brill, 1997. Parry offers valuable notes on the avoidance of the Tetragram in legal text found in the caves near Qumran; cf. also Tov, E. *Scribal Practises and Approaches Reflected in the Texts found in the Judean Desert*. Leiden: Brill, 2004, 218 – 221. Tov offers valuable insights into the scribal pratices surrounding the Tetragram, particularly on the 'divine name'.

[49] Cf. Gericke, J. W. "What is an אל? A Philosophical Analysis of the Concept of Generic Godhood in the Hebrew Bible. " *OTE* 22.1, (2009), 21-46. Gericke offers valid and necessary argument ensuring nuanced reference to a Hebrew deity. Also Noteworthy is the philological and literary approach of Murtonen, A. *A Philological and Literature Treatise on the Old Testament Divine Names [El, Eloha, Elohim] and [Yahweh]*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1952.

The Isaiah text is no exception: the term אלהים is used in 94 instances consisting of 84 phrase structures, most of which occur in Isa 21-66; the term אל in turn, is attested in more than ten verses,[50] while אלוה is deployed only once in Isa 44:8. The term אלהים is used in correlation with יהוה in more than twenty instances,[51] with the term אדני deployed in 48 verses in comparison to יהוה utilised in 450 verses, occurring 394 times.[52] In addition to the use of the term אדני in Isaiah, the author/s also made use of the term אדון.[53] The so-called great Isaiah scroll is a comprehensive manuscript found in Cave 1 and indexed as 1QIsaᵃ.[54] The overwhelming evidence in this manuscript testifies to the Tetragram using square Hebrew characters. What is of particular interest is how the Tetragram is presented in lines 20, 24 and 25 (Isa 3:15, 17 and 18 respectively). If one compares the MT with 1QIsaᵃ and other related manuscripts found in and around the Judean desert, the Hebrew text tradition appears for the most part intact. There are, however, some trivial variations that require some reflection. The variants found in Isa 3:15-18 are classic examples of Hebrew variants used to represent the Hebrew deity. The table below presents the Hebrew variants in comparison to the Greek equivalents.

Reference	1QIsaᵃ	MT^BHS	LXX^Gött
Isa 3:15 (line 20)	מלכמה תדכאו עמי ופני עניים תטחנו נואם **יהוה**ᵃᵈᵒⁿⁱ	מַלָּכֶם תְּדַכְּאוּ עַמִּי וּפְנֵי עֲנִיִּים תִּטְחָנוּ נְאֻם־**אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה** צְבָאֹֽות	τί ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε τὸν λαόν μου καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον τῶν πτωχῶν καταισχύνετε
Isa 3:17 (line 24)	קשפח **אדוני**ʸʰʷʰ קדקד בנות ציון **ואדוני** פתהן פתהן יעדה	וְשִׂפַּח **אֲדֹנָי** קָדְקֹד בְּנֹות צִיֹּון **וַיהוָה** פָּתְהֵן יְעָרֶֽה	καὶ ταπεινώσει **ὁ θεὸς** ἀρχούσας θυγατέρας Σιων, καὶ **κύριος** ἀποκαλύψει τὸ σχῆμα αὐτῶν
Isa 3:18 (line 25)	ביום ההוא יסיר **יהוה**ᵃᵈᵒⁿⁱ	בַּיֹּום הַהוּא יָסִיר **אֲדֹנָי**	ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ καὶ ἀφελεῖ **κύριος**

---

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

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

[52] The use of אדון and אדני, in relation to יהוה and צבאות in Isaiah has been covered for the most part by Rösel, *Adonaj,* 78-124. See also Lust, J. "The Divine Titles האדון and אדני in Proto-Isaiah and Ezekiel," Pages 131-149 in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday.* Edited by M. N. van der Meer et al. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

[53] Cf. Rösel, *Adonaj,* 79.

[54] Cf. Flint, P. W. and Ulrich, E. *Qumran Cave 1.II: The Isaiah Scrolls* (DJD XXXII). Oxford: Clarendon, 2010.

| | תפארת העכיסימ | אֶת תִּפְאֶרֶת הָעֲכָסִים | τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν |
| | והשבישים והשהרנים | וְהַשְּׁבִיסִים וְהַשַּׂהֲרֹנִים | καὶ τοὺς κόσμους αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἐμπλόκια καὶ τοὺς κοσύμβους καὶ τοὺς μηνίσκους |

The data suggests that the scribes responsible for 1QIsa[a] as well as the Masoretes appear inconsistent in applying the terms used when referring to the Hebrew deity. The underlying issue at hand is one definable as the K[e]tib-Q[e]re problematic, which requires some clarification. The standard explanation is represented by Rösel: the Masoretes vocalised יהוה with the vowels assigned to אדני. The latter "forced" the reader to pronounce (Q[e]re – what ought to be read) against what was written (K[e]tib – what ought to be written).[55] The exception would be that if and when אדני יהוה is written in combination, the term יהוה would be vocalised to read אלהים. This would counter the duplicate reading of *Adonaj Adonaj*.[56] An opposing stance on this matter, of which De Troyer would be a representative, is that the most "usual" form of the Tetragram in Codex Leningrad, as well as in Codex Aleppo, testifies to יְהוָה (*shema* – what ought to be read) and not יְהֹוָה (*adonaj*), implying that the vowels adopted from the Aramaic שְׁמָא indicated what ought to be read,[57] given the fact that there are exceptions to the rule.[58]

Returning to Isa 3:15-18, it is thus reasonable to assume that a redactor of 1QIsa[a] wanted to make sure that the Tetragram in Isa 3:15a is pronounced *adonaj*, while the Masoretes "wrote" what they in all probability heard, but wrote יהוה as an indication of what was implied by what was read.[59] Isa 3:17a seems to indicate that the Masoretes copied what ought to be read, while Isa 3:17b testifies to the fact that they interpreted the term אדני (1QIsa[a]) as an indication of what ought to be read, but wrote what was written. The reverse is again evident in Isa 3:18, with 1QIsa[a] bearing witness to the K[e]tib form יהוה, while the redactor indicated what ought to be read: אדני. In Isa 3:18 the Masoretes thus "inserted" אדני into the main body of the text – either based on the superscript or because they wanted the

---

[55] Cf. Rösel, *Adonaj,* 2.
[56] Ibid., 3; cf. De Troyer, "The Pronunciation," 144-145.
[57] De Troyer, "The Pronunciation," 145.
[58] E.g. Exod 3:2.
[59] Cf. De Troyer, "The Pronunciation," 144.

K^e*tib* form to be representative of the Q^e*re* form.[60] The latter explanation could be rejected as mere speculation. It could also be argued that a Hebrew *Vorlage* was available to the Masoretes from where they copied the text verbatim. A similar attested issue is found in Isa 28:16, where the MT reads אדני יהוה, while 1QIsa[a] attests to יהוה with a superscript אדני.[61] The יהוה־אדני alternating reading continues in Isa 28:22 with 1QIsa[a] reading יהוה in comparison to the MT reading אדני. Furthermore, the MT appears to have "ignored" יהוה in Isa 30:19, while 1QIsa[a] does indeed read the Tetragram.[62] These יהוה־אדני alternating variants, particularly attested to in Isa 3:15-18 (1QIsa[a]), confirm and reinforce Rösel's position that the vocalisation of *adonaj* testifies what ought to be read if and when יהוה was written.[63] However, such alternating readings are very limited and should thus not be taken as the "standard" practice of the time. The K^e*tib*-Q^e*re* problematic surrounding the "naming" of the Hebrew deity might not have been a case of reading שְׁמָא, אלהים or אדני; but it is indeed plausible that both practices could have been deployed simultaneously by different scribes or scribal groups. It is nevertheless clear that "naming" or making a reference to the Hebrew deity was a complex matter, at least from the 3rd century BCE onwards.

Variant readings revolving around the term אלהים also occur. 1QIsa[a] (Isa 37:20) accounts for יהוה אלהים, while the MT only reads יהוה.[64] Furthermore, Isa 49:14 (1QIsa[a]) reads יהוה ואדוני with a superscript ואלֹהי directly above ואדוני, presumably implying that *Elohim* is to be read, which would support the argument that if and when יהוה and אדני are read consecutively, יהוה should be pronounced אלהים to avoid the repetition of *adonaj*.[65] A slightly different but related issue is the MT reading in Isa 50:5 attesting to both אדני and יהוה compared to 1QIsa[a] reading אדני אלֹהים. The latter seems to indicate that the Masoretes wrote what they considered to be an indication of what ought to be read with the term אלהים in 1QIsa[a].[66] Finally, Isa 61:1 and Isa 61:11 furthermore testify to interesting variants, presented in the table below.

---

[60] Cf. Trobisch, *Die Endredaction,* 21 n. 19. Noteworthy is the fact that the Greek counterpart of Isa 3:18, represented by the LXX[Gött], does not attest to any equivalent of these terms, while some Greek manuscripts read κύριος κύριος (cf. ※ 22-48-763-96) φησι(ν) κυριος κυριος (> *oII* 233) while others read πιπι πιπι (cf. ※ φησι κυριος κυριος (adn. πιπι πιπι). Similar cases of K^e*tib*-Q^e*re* "confusion" are detectable in Isa 6:11; 7:14; 8:7 (אדני as superscript in 1QIsa[a] with a probable reading of יהוה); Isa 9:7; 21:16; 28:2, 16; 30:15; 49:7; 61:1.

[61] 1QIsa[b] however, appears to be closer to the MT with the second יהוה reading, with an uncertainty of what term is to be read in the first instance. Isa 30:15 attested to a similar issue; 1QIsa[a] again reads יהוה with אדני superscript, compared to 4QIsa[c] most probable reading יהוה יהוה.

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

[63] Cf. Rösel, *Adonaj,* 2ff.

[64] The Greek and Syriac equivalents in turn only account for the term אלהים.

[65] Both 1QIsa[b] and 4QIsa[d] (4Q56) do not attest to any superscript.

[66] Cf. Isa 54:6 alternating between יהוה אלהים (1QIsa[a]) and אלהים (MT).

Ref	1QIsa[a]	1QIsa[b]	4QIsa[m]	MT
Isa 61:1	יהוה אלהים	יהוה אלהים	אד	אדני יהוה
Isa 61:11	יהוה אלהים	--	--	אדני יהוה

Thus both 1QIsa[a] as well as the MT were consistent in applying the same terms in Isa 61:1 and Isa 61:11. The only plausible assumption one could draw from the data is that 1QIsa[a] and 1QIsa[b] present a particular text tradition, opposing the text tradition offered by 4QIsa[m] and the MT, if a אדני יהוה reconstruction is accepted. The Greek text traditions might shed some light on the matter; a possibility considered in the next section.

2.2.2   The Translation Problem: *Greek Text Tradition (OG)*

The translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek was one of the biggest literary 'hellenised' undertakings of its kind. The project is not only known due to its sheer magnitude, but also for its theological significance.[67] A desire developed to translate the Hebrew Scriptures, which were considered to be nothing other than 'holy', into a new idiom using metaphors, rhetoric, allegory and typology as well as other known exegetical and hermeuntical methods to make the Hebrew text accessible to the Hellenistic population, whether they be Jew or Gentile. Such a translation process required a tremendous amount of skilled, literate and knowledgeable people. Surely this undertaking was not considered to be equal to any other 'profane' translation process; it demanded theological wisdom, sensitivity and a mind which could conceptualise theological thoughts and ideas caste in the Hebrew morpheme using 'suitable' Greek equivalent terms. The terms אלהים, יהוה and אדני would have been considered to be of the utmost theological value and meaning which required 'appropriate' Greek equivalents such as θεός, κύριος and δεσπότης. This was, to say the least, a complex task that necessitated theological-conceptual thought processes in the mind of ancient theologians like never before. The investigated, structured and conversed data in this regard would not prove otherwise.

The first problem one is confronted with is the limited data at one's disposal. The second issue that comes to the fore is the fragmentary nature of the data. Finally, the

---

[67] Cf. Marcos, Natalio Fernandez. *The Septuagint in Context – Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible.* Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2000, 18-20; cf. Hengel, M. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture – Its Prehistory and the Problem of its Canon.* London: T & T Clark International, 2004, xi. Hengel also considered the introductory remarks by Robert Hanhart, whose brief introduction proves to hold valuable insights, 2-18.

fragmentary data does not attest to the terms κύριος, θεός and/or related terms.[68] The data dated between the 3rd century BCE and 2nd century CE attesting to biblical content in Greek (separate from the New Testament manuscripts), is nonetheless worthwhile investigating. The validity of the investigation is confirmed by the data presented in the table below. The table attests to an array of possibilities in representing the Hebrew deity with 'suitable' Greek or related equivalents that would naturally instigate an enquiry into the matter. [69]

Text reference	Identification	Date	Material	Term
Deut 11:4	4QLXXDeut (4Q122), f. 1:5	2 BCE	pap.	blank space left in recon
Deut 23 -28	P Ryl 458 (#957)	2 BCE	pap.	----
Exod 28:4-7	7Q1 (4QLXXExodus)	2/1 BCE	pap.	----
Lev 26:2	4QLXXLevᵃ (4Q119) f. 1:1	2/1 BCE	pap.	blank space left in recon
Lev 26:13	4QLXXLevᵃ (4Q119) f. 1:18	2/1 BCE	pap.	blank space left in recon
Lev 1:11	4QpapLXXLevᵇ (4Q120) f. 1:11	2/1 BCE	pap.	[Ιαω in recon][70]
Lev 2:3	4QpapLXXLevᵇ (4Q120) f. 2:1	2/1 BCE	pap.	[Ιαω in recon]
Lev 3:12	4QpapLXXLevᵇ (4Q120) f. 7:12	2/1 BCE	pap.	Ιαω
Lev 3:14	4QpapLXXLevᵇ (4Q120) f. 8:2	2/1 BCE	pap.	[Ιαω]
Lev 4:27	4QpapLXXLevᵇ (4Q120) f. 20:4	2/1 BCE	pap.	Ιαω
Lev 2:3	4QLXXLevᵇ f. 2	1 BCE	pap.	[Ιαω in recon][71]
Lev 3:11	4QLXXLevᵇ f. 2	1 BCE	pap.	[Ιαω in recon][72]
Deut 18:15	P.Fouad 266b col. 4, f. 5	1 BCE	pap.	θεός
Deut 18:16	P.Fouad 266b col. 4, f. 6	1 BCE	pap.	blank space
Deut 19:10	P.Fouad 266b col. 4, f. 10	1BCE	pap.	blank space…θεός
Deut 19:14	P.Fouad 266b col.8, f. 11	1 BCE	pap.	יהוה
Deut 21:8	P.Fouad 266b col. 15, f. 21	1BCE	pap.	יהוה
Deut 25:15	P.Fouad 266b col. 34, f. 49	1 BCE	pap.	יהוה θεός
Deut 25:16	P.Fouad 266b col. 34, f. 149	1 BCE	pap.	יהוה
Deut 27:2	P.Fouad 266b col. 39, f. 59	1 BCE	pap.	יהוה θεός

[68] Hurtado, L. W. *The Earliest Christian ArtEfacts – Manuscripts and Christian Origin.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2006, recognises the complexity of the issue when dealing with such data, stating the difficulty is to determine if the artefact is indeed Jewish or Christian, 17. Those manuscripts that can be dated prior to the Christian era that are written in either Hebrew or Aramaic are for obvious reasons posit as Jewish, 18.

[69] For a more complete list of Greek manuscript readings see addendum B; see also Skehan, P. W., Ulrich, E. and J. E. Sanderson, J. E. *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX). Oxford: Clarendon, 1992. xiii + 250 pp. + xlvii plates.

[70] The manuscript allows enough space to insert the term κύριος in both 4QpapLXXLevᵇ f. 1:11 and 4QpapLXXLevᵇ 2:1.

[71] There appears to be enough space to insert the term κύριος.

[72] Again, the space used to reconstruct τω Ιαω does allow for the term κύριος.

Num 3:42	4QLXXNum (4Q121) col. I, f. 2:10	turn of century	pap.	blank space left in recon
Hab 2:16	8ḤevXIIgr[73] col. 18:24	turn of century	parchment	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
Hab 2:20	8ḤevXIIgr col. 18:39	turn of century	parchment	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
Jonah 4:2	8ḤevXIIgr col. 3:36	turn of century	parchment	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
Mi 1:3	8ḤevXIIgr col. 4:33	turn of century	parchment	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
Zeph 1:14	8ḤevXIIgr col. 21:29	turn of century	parchment	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
Zech 1:3	8ḤevXIIgr col. 28:37	turn of century	parchment	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
Job 42:11	P.Oxy 3522	1 CE	pap.	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
Es 8-9	P.Oxy 4443	1 / 2 CE	pap.	θεός
Gen 24	P.Oxy 656	2 / 3 CE	pap.	θεός κύριος
Gen 2-3	P.Oxy 1007	2 / 3 CE	parchment	ZZ

What the tabled data does suggest is that there appears to be neither a 'generally' accepted, nor a standardised Greek translation equivalent for the Hebrew deity in general and the Tetragram in particular, from the 2nd century BCE until at least the 3rd century CE. Second, one could also deduce from the data that certain scribal practices regarding the Tetragram were extant from the 3rd century BCE, even though their influence on other text traditions appears to be non existent. Although, the data will not be dealt with in detail here, some remarks would be made on key manuscript evidence.[74]

The Greek manuscripts found in and around the Judean desert, and in particular in the caves of Qumran, is the oldest known literary evidence of the Greek version of the Hebrew scriptures; 4QLXXDeut (4Q122) together with P. Ryl 458, both of which attest to content resembling Deuteronomy, are the oldest of its kind. P. Ryl 458, however, does not attest to the terms κύριος or θεός,[75] neither does 4QLXXDeut. The latter does in turn attest to an unusual blank space which might be an indication of the Tetragram reading at that particular point.[76] The 4QLXXLev[a] manuscript does present a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram, which is Ιαω; the consistent and widespread use of such is in no way certain, neither could one confirm its validity. According to Rösel, this scribal practise is not a translation of some sort, but rather an indication of that which was spoken.[77]

---

[73] The paleo-hebrew script used as representative of the Tetragram is characteristic of the entire Micah, Zeph, Zech and Jonah manuscripts.

[74] Cf. De Troyer, "The Pronunciation," 156-159.

[75] This is also true for 7Q1 (4QLXXExodus).

[76] Cf. Kraus, Thomas J. *Ad Fontes: Original Manuscripts and Their Significance for Studying Early Christianity*. Leidein: Brill, 2007, 239-240.

[77] Rösel, "Reading and Translation," 416. Frank Shaw dealt with this issue in his unpublished doctoral dissertation of 2002, in which he attempted to argue that it was an ongoing custom to pronounce the name IAW within some lower class groups of Hellenistic Judaism, pp. 201-202 and that there was knowledge outside Jewish circles that IAW was the name of the 'God' of the Jews. De Troyer, "The Pronunciation," is of the opinion that Ιαω is a transliteration of יהו, the three letter name of God, 153.

Even though the Greek Exodus manuscript found at Qumran (indexed as 4QLXXExodus [7Q1] and reflecting Exod 28), holds no reference to any form of the Tetragram, the character count of between 19 and 20 per line provides enough space to fit in κύριος based on the provided reconstruction offered in the DJD Series. The Greek manuscript indexed as P. Fouad 266a (Ralphs #942), which is dated to the middle of the first-century BCE, containing sections of Genesis (Gen 3, 4, 7, 37, 38), would have been valuable in this regard. Unfortunately the manuscript does not attest to the Tetragram (יהוה), nonetheless it is noted by Koenen that the use of the יהוה should be inferred due to the probability that it was written by the same hand as P. Fouad 266b (Göttingen #848), which does attest to the Tetragram.[78] Deduced from the table above, P. Fouad 266b, attesting to content from Deuteronomy, reads in almost all cases the square Hebrew characters, where one would have expected either the κύριος or equivalent term. Not only does this manuscript attest to the Tetragam in square Hebrew characters, but it also produces a.) an uncontracted term θεός and b.) the Tetragram – θεός combination, signicant in terms of how the Tetragram – Elohim combination was dealt with in the Greek. It seems to be quite obvious that the 'original' scribe left a blank space which was later filled, although not in all cases (e.g. col. 4, frg. 6 and col. 8, frg. 10), by a later scribe who opted for the square Hebrew script. The latter was not necessarily the intent of the first scribe due to the fact that there is ample room for both the Tetragram as well as the Greek κύριος to fill the blank spaces. Nevertheless, it does appear as if the Tetragram was considered to be the most suitable term to reproduce the 'name' of the Hebrew deity.

Another extraordinary find, attesting yet again to a unique representation of the Hebrew deity in a Greek manuscript, are those manuscripts from Naḥal Ḥever indexed as 8ḤevXIIgr (content reflecting the minor prophets).[79]

---

[78] Cf. Koenen, L. *Three Rolls of the Early Septuaginta: Geneis and Deuteronomy.* Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1980, 3.

[79] See Koch, D.-A. "Die Überlieferung und Verwendung der Septuagint aim ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert." Pages 42-65 in *Hellenistiches Christentum – Schriftverständnis – Ekklesiologie – Geschichte.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008. Repr. from *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter.* Edited by D.-A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993, 215-244, for a comparative analysis between 8ḤevXIIgr, the MT and LXX, 62.

E. Tov, with the collaboration of Kraft, R. A. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII). Oxford: Clarendon, 1990; reprinted with corrections 1995. x + 169 pp. + xx plates. Copyright the DJD Project.

The manuscript image above attests to Hab 2:20; interesting though is that this Greek manuscript reads the conjunction καί + the definite article in addition to the term 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 signifying lordship in its defining form. The LXX[Gött] in turn reads ὁ δὲ κύριος while the MT supports וַיהוָה as reading. The Hebrew counterpart found at Wadi Murabaat: Col. XIX: Hab 2:18-Zep 1:1 does not seem to attest to any related term with regard to Hab 2:20. Nevertheless, these Greek manuscripts (found at Naḥal Ḥever) attest to the consistent use of *paleo-hebrew* script as a reproduction of the Tetragram.[80] A similar scribal practise is detected in P. Oxy 3522 (Job 42:11):[81]

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Project, Oxford. Copyright, the Oxyrhynchus Papyri Project (red block inserted by author).

---

[80] See E. Tov, with the collaboration of Kraft, R. A. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII). Oxford: Clarendon, 1990; reprinted with corrections 1995. x + 169 pp. + xx plates.

[81] See Epp, Eldon J. "The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: 'Not without honor except in their hometown'?" Pages 743-801 in *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism – Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 116.* Edited by M. M. Mitchell and D. P. Moessner. Leiden, Brill, 2005, 760. Repr. from *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123.1 (2004), 5-55.

The LXX[Gött] is consistently applying the definite article in front of the term κύριος,[82] with the MT consistently deploying the term יהוה. Another peculiar reproduction of the Tetragram attested in a Greek manuscript is the letters Ƶ̶Ƶ̶ identified in P. Oxy 1007 (Gen 2:18):

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Project, Oxford. Copyright, the Oxyrhynchus Papyri Project (red block inserted by author).

The first red block should indicate the Ƶ̶Ƶ̶ followed by ο ΟϹ.[83] According to the Hebrew text tradition these terms are the Greek equivalents for יהוה אלהים.[84] If a 3rd century CE dating for this manuscript is accepted, it would indicate that sensitivity towards the pronunciation of the 'name' of the Hebrew deity remained an issue, even among the third and fourth generations of Christ followers. The Greek manuscript indexed P. Oxy 656 (plate 2 fr. c verso), dated to the second-century CE, requires special attention.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Project, Oxford. Copyright, the Oxyrhynchus Papyri Project (red blocks and arrows inserted by author)

---

[82] E.g. Job 42:7, 10, 11, 12, 17.
[83] The concept or idea of κύριος ὁ θεός is confirmed by the LXX[Gött].
[84] Cf. MT, 4Q2 Gen[b] frg. 1 Col. II and 4Q8a Gen[h2] fr. 1.

Gathered from the image above, at least one uncontracted κύριος term in line 3 (Gen 24:39) and another two in line 16 and 17 (Gen 24:42), as well as one uncontracted θεός term in line 16 and one contracted form in line 17 is visible. This is the only Greek witness of a biblical text dated before or after the Christian era that presents an uncontracted form of the κύριος term.[85]

Genesis 24:39, 40, 42			
Index	**P.Oxy 656 (Gött #905)**	**LXX**[Gött]	**MT**
Gen 24:39a (line 3)	ΕΙΠΑ ΔΕ Τω Κ[....]	εἶπα δὲ τῷ **κυρίῳ**	וָאֹמַ֖ר אֶל־אֲדֹנִ֑י
Gen 24:40a (line 16)	ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΜΟΙ Ο **ΘΕΟΣ**	καὶ εἶπέν μοι **Κύριος**,	וַיֹּ֥אמֶר אֵלַ֖י **יְהֹוָה**
Gen 24:42b (line 17)	ΕΙΠΑ **ΚΥ**... Ο **ΘΣ** ΤΟΥ **ΚΥΡΙΟΥ**	εἶπα **Κύριε ὁ θεὸς** τοῦ **κυρίου**	וָאֹמַ֖ר יְהֹוָה֙ אֱלֹהֵי֙ אֲדֹנִ֔י

Both the first (Gen 24:39) and second (Gen 24:42) uncontracted κύριος are used to translate אדוני, if one assumes that the MT is a plausible construction of a possible Hebrew *Vorlage*.[86] In line 16 (24:42), it seems as if the scribe left a blank space which was filled with ΚΥ by a redactor. The latter is confirmed in that the shape of the *kappa* used for Κ.... in line 3 and ΚΥ... line 16, compared to the *kappa* in line 17 differ in shape. Moreover, Ο ΘΕΟΣ in line 5 (Gen 24:40) diverge from the LXX[Gött] – which reads κύριος, while the MT reads יהוה. The scribes of P.Oxy 656 appear to be of the opinion that Ο ΘΕΟΣ was considered to be a suitable term to reproduce the Tetragram. In this fragment we thus have at least three possibilities to refer to the Tetragram: 1.) Blank space, 2.) contraction (*Nomina Sacra*) and 3.) the term θεός with the definite article.

---

[85] 4QUnidgr fr. 2.6 is another Greek fragment attesting to κύριος, and although it is not possible to assign it to any biblical content that these terms might have been used in Qumran not only for profane purposes, but also as an equivalent for יהוה; cf. Pike, D. M. and Skinner, A. with a contribution by Szink, T. L. in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, Qumran Cave 4.XXIII: Unidentified Fragments (DJD XXXIII). Oxford: Clarendon, 2001. xv + 376 pp. + xli plates.

[86] 1Q1Gen fr. 5, among the DSS, only accounts for Gen 24:22 and 24 not attesting to any term that might refer to the Hebrew deity.

2.2.3 Theological Explicit Renditions of the Hebrew Esther

The theological explicit renditions of the Hebrew Esther is included for the sole purpose that it is highly plausible that the Hebrew *Vorlage,*[87] irrespective of the amount of dependent or independent narratives that were used to construct Hebrew Esther, did not contain any explicit reference to the Hebrew deity. This implies that the theological concepts formed by the Greek translators were not directly influenced by the Hebrew text; but the Greek 'equivalent' terms applied were constructed and conceptualised 'purely' due to the creative and religious sensitive processes in the minds of the scribes. The latter could prove to be of value in determining which Greek terms were conceptualised and used as most suitable in reproducing the Hebrew deity; taking into consideration the dating of the Greek translation of the narrative.[88]

Term θεός and κύριος in the Esther narrative					
LXX^{Gött} (A-Text)	Term	Josephus	Term	L-Text	Term
2:20	τὸν θεόν [89]	Jewish Antiquities XI 203. 5-8	....	2:20	....
4:8	τὸν κύριον [90]	Jewish Antiquities XI 224	....	4:8	δευτερων
6:1	Ὁ δὲ κύριος	Jewish Antiquities XI 247	θεός	6:1	δυνατος
6:13	θεὸς ζῶν [91]	Jewish Antiquities XI 259	θεός	6:23	θεός

There are four occurrences of these explicit theological references, i.e. Esth 2:20; 4:8; 6:1 and 6:13. In Esth 2:20 the LXX^{Gött} reads τὸν θεόν, while the reading of *Aquila* and one Latin source testifies to τὸν κύριον (and the Latin equivalent).[92] Esth 4:8 reads τὸν κύριον with the text critical apparatus noting that the Aramaic equivalence for τὸν θεόν was 'added'. In Esth 6:1 Ὁ κύριος is used, while Esth 6:13, in turn, attests to θεὸς ζῶν. Josephus also accounts for the Esther narrative. He, on the other hand, makes no reference to either θεός or to κύριος in *Ant.* 9.203 (Esth 2:20) and *Ant.* 9.224 (Esth 4:8) respectively. He does, however, read θεός ch. 247 (Esth 6:1), where the LXX^{Gött} reads κύριος and θεός in *Ant.* 9.259 (Esth 6:13). Noteworthy is that the *Lucian* text also makes no reference to either terms in Esth 2:20; 4:8

---

[87] Tov, E., discussed this issue in an online published article dated 2008 on pp. 519-521, *Internet Source:* http://www.emanueltov.info/docs/varia/est.varia.pdf (date accessed: 21 February 2011).

[88] Kahana, Hanna. *Esther – Juxaposition of the Septuagint Translation with the Hebrew Text.* Leuven: Peeters, 2005 is of the opinion that the translation of the Hebrew Esther was completed by the beginning of the first century BCE, XXVII.

[89] a La^{-LK} τον κυριον.

[90] O⁻⁹³ A᾿ a om τον; O⁻⁹³ Aeth (cf. praef p 31) Arm + τον θεον; *deum* La^{Vpc} = L.

[91] 55 122 ο θεος ζωη; A ο θεος ζωη; 311 ο θεος; *dominus* Aeth; *dominus deus* Arm: cf L.

[92] τ. θεόν] τ. κυριον *a* La^{-LK}

and 6:1, except for 6:13 (L-Text 6.23) where it attests to the θεός term. The text witness P. Oxy. 4443[93] presents an uncontracted θεός term found in line 7 (addition 8:12^d of the Esther narrative). The term θεός is also used in four instances of this addition, which ranges from 8:12^a to 8:12^x. This might be an indication that the practise known as the *nomina sacra*, by which sacred names are contracted, especially names such as Ιησοῦς, χριστός, κύριος and θεός, had no influence in this particular text fragment. This could also have been true for other parts of the Esther narrative, especially those sections within the main body of the narrative where explicit reference has been made to θεός and κύριος. What could be deduced from the data is that the constructed LXX^{Gött} (A – *Alpha text)* does not draw a clear distinction between the term κύριος and θεός; both these terms were used with consistency. The *L-text*, however, opted for the term θεός, and appears to be shying away from the use of the term κύριος. Josephus agrees with this sentiment, by 'ignoring' the term κύριος (Esth 4:8), while 'replacing' the term κύριος with the θεός.

2.2.4   Preliminary Conclusions

The Hebrew text traditions (notably deduced from the 'Torah', Isaiah and Psalms in particular) appear, with regard to the reproduction of the terms אלהים, יהוה and אדני, intact for the most part. There are alternative readings suggested and some minor discrepancies compared to the DSS. Moreover, it does seem quite probable that the K^{e}tib and Q^{e}re traditions played a major part in 'forcing' the discrepancies within the Hebrew text tradition. It would thus be irresponsible to deny the integrity of the Hebrew text tradition; the data confirms such a claim. The evidence furthermore highlights the complexity in choosing a 'suitable' Greek equivalent for the Tetragram in particular. One should, however, be cautious not to over-emphasise the exceptions. The data is far too limited to come to a sound conclusion regarding the Greek rendering of the Hebrew deity. There existed no systematic approach, nor a general accepted method or rule, at least from the 3rd/2nd century BCE, for rendering the Hebrew deity in general, and the Tetragram in particular, with a 'most suitable' Greek equivalent. The multitude of variations within the confines of the limited data is a strong argument supporting such a premise. Second, it is plausible to infer – based on the literary evidence at hand – that the translation equivalent for the Hebrew deity in general and the Tetragram in particular, appears to be the term θεός. Finally, the scribes (*ad-hoc*) seem

---

[93] This text fragment is dated to between the first and second century CE.

uncomfortable with the term κύριος as a Greek rendering for the Tetragram, especially in the more 'Jewish' circles.[94] What lacks in this chapter is a systematic compilation, in table form, of all text critical variations regarding the terms in question of both the BHS and LXX[Gött] from where one could infer possible tendencies and text traditions and how they relate to another. Compiling such a table extends far beyond the parameters of this study, even though some tables have been included.

2.3 THE TRANSMISSION PROBLEM – *NT TEXT TRADITIONS*

2.3.1   Introduction

The secondary most important question for this particular research venture is how the use of the terms θεός and κύριος, and the concepts underlying them are reflected in the Christian era, especially in the first century Christian scriptures. It is noted that reflection of this nature demands independent research ventures. It would, however be beyond the scope of this study, not to even mention this chapter, to deal with all instances in the NT text where the terms κύριος and θεός were used including their variants. It is thus necessary to request for some leniency while reflecting on some[95] text-critical issues regarding the terms θεός and κύριος as reflected in the NT text. The primary objective would thus be, while observing the history of the text through a text critical lense,[96] to find possible tendencies, regarding the use of the terms θεός and κύριος. In other words: what alternatives were proposed and should this proposal be accepted. An exception will be made when dealing with the *deutero-Pauline* and *Pauline literature (non-citations)* for the sole purpose that the point of departure for this study is the explicit κύριος and θεός citations. Discussions on these literature categories will not only focus on the important text critical variants proposed, but consideration will also be given to the immediate literary context in determining a possible concept underlying these.

---

[94] This would be in agreement with De Troyers's 'General Conclusion' with regard to the pronunciation of the Names of God, " The Pronunciation," 163-164; the concluding remarks are also considered to be of immense value against which conclusions here could be compared and weighed. The insights inferred from the conclusions made would also prove to be of importance for 'controlling' purposes.

[95] Those text critical variations that is considered to be noteworthy in determining a possible tradition or practise that existed in the 1st century surrounding the use of the term κύριος and θεός.

[96] The standard text critical apparatus developed at the INTF (Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung; Münster, Germany) and presented by the Nestle-Aland 27th edition and, where available, the *Editio Critica Maior* (http://egora.uni-muenster.de/intf/veroef/ausgaben.shtml) will be used.

The reader's expectation should thus not be an extensive and an in-depth reflection on the term κύριος and θεός and all the text critical alternatives. The author intends to entertain an expectation that demands

a.) Reflecting on important text critical variations for the terms κύριος and θεός; and

b.) To also discuss these variations within its immediate literary context in determining a possible κύριος and θεός concept, when dealing with the *Deutero-*and*-Pauline literature*.

2.3.2   The Terms κύριος and θεός – *Reflecting on the Text Critical Variations*

2.3.2.1 *Synoptic Gospels*

As an alternative for αὐτοῦ (Mk 1:3) all the old Latin manuscripts' read του θεου ημων. The text reading is supported by ℵ A B[NT], while S A B[OT] supports the reading του θεου ημων.[97] In Lk 1:9 some witnesses (C* D Ψ 579. 1424. 2542) propose to read θεου as opposed to κυρίου.[98] With the second occurrence of the term κυρίου in Lk 2:9, text witnesses ℵ[2] Ξ Ψ 892 *pc* suggest reading θεου.[99] A strong group of text witnesses, ℵ A W Θ Ψ f^1, propose that Ιησουν be read as opposed to κύριος in Lk 7:13; while the text reading is supported by B L Ξ f^{13} 33 *pc*. The term Ιησου as an alternative reading for κύριος in Lk 10:41 does not hold controversial theological significance for the text; neither does a similar alternative in Lk 7:13. Jesus as the κύριος and Χριστός remains the theological concept underlying both the terms κύριος and ᾿Ιησοῦς. An alternative reading for αὐτοῦ in Lk 12:31 is proposed by the witnesses 𝔓[45] A D[1] Q W Θ that reads του θεου (𝔓[75] excludes the personal pronoun).[100] When this alternative is considered within the immediate literary context, it appears as referencing to the term θεός in Lk 12:28.[101] The text critical data presented by the synoptic

---

[97] See also text critical issues presented at Lk 1:9; 2:9; 7:13; 10:41 and 12:31; cf. Ehrman, Bart D. *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament – New Testament Tools and Studies 33.* Leiden: Brill, 2006, 148-149; Epp, Eldon J. "Textual Criticism in the Exegesis of the New Testament, originally... with an Excursus on Canon." Pages 461-496 in *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism – Supplements to Novum Testamentum 116.* Edited by M. M. Mitchell and D. P. Moessner. Leiden, Brill, 2005. Repr. from *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter; New Testament Tools and Studies 25; Leiden: Brill, 1997, 45-97. Epp offers a brief discussion on the "Son of God" text critical issue in Mk 1:1, 463. For a more in-depth investigation into this issue see Ehrman, *Studies in the Textual Criticism,* 149-154.

[98] The text reading is supported by ℵ A B.

[99] The text reading is supported by ℵ* A B.

[100] The text reading, however, is supported by ℵ B D* L Ψ 579. 892 *pc.*

[101] Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, second edition a companion volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament,* 4th revised ed. London: United Bible Societies, 1994, states that it is more likely that αὐτοῦ was replaced by του θεου than vice versa; one of the idiosyncrasies of 𝔓[75] is his

gospel manuscripts does not seem to attest to an 'authoritative' nor to a 'generally accepted' scribal tradition regarding the terms κύριος and θεός. All the noteworthy text critical discrepancies in this regard appear to be within the 'theological-conceptual' norm, i.e. that the terms χριστός and κύριος refer to the earthly Jesus, while the term θεός is predominantly used as a representation of the personal Hebrew deity.[102] Noteworthy in the Markan gospel is the infrequent use of the term κύριος in comparison with the other synoptic gospels, [103] as well as the overwhelming dominant and independent use of the term Ἰησοῦς. [104] The term θεός is used sporadically throughout the gospel. The Matthian gospel, testifies particularly to the irregular occurrence of both the term θεός (cf. Matt 22:29-33) and κύριος (cf. Matt 18:24-34; Matt 24:42-50). Moreover and striking is the clustered κύριος terms in Matt 24:42-50; 25:18-26.

Feature 1: κύριον τὸν θεόν σου

Matt 4:7 (Deut 6:16) - ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πάλιν γέγραπται· ⌜οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις⌝ **κύριον τὸν θεόν σου**.

Matt 4:8 (Deut 6:13) - τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ὕπαγε^⊤, σατανᾶ· γέγραπται γάρ· **κύριον τὸν θεόν** σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.

Matt 22:37 (Deut 6:5) - ⌜ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ⌝· ἀγαπήσεις **κύριον τὸν θεόν σου** ἐν ὅλῃ °τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ °¹τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ⌜διανοίᾳ σου·

And

---

tendency to omit personal pronouns, 136; contra Royse, James R. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri.* Leiden: Brill, 2008, whose critique is based on the general rule of *lectio brevior potior* (put forward by Metzger himself), 11-13. Royse is of the opinion that the reading of 𝔓^75 should be regarded as the original due to the fact that it is the oldest available witness, and the shortest reading.

[102] Matt 1:22-24 (among others), could be used as a contra argument; Matt 1:22 speaks of the prophets of κύριος that proclaimed that the virgin's child should be named Immanuel, which means "θεός with us", after which the angel of κύριος visited Joseph. These thoughts might suggest that the κύριος term cannot be referring to anyone else either than the personal Hebrew deity. The citation in Matt 3:3 (cf. Mk 1:3) reflecting Isa 40:3, however, suggests that conceptually the κύριος term for the author refers to Jesus (cf. Mk 5:19). The concept that κύριος denotes Jesus' authority is visible in Mk 2:28; 7:28 (the κύριος term is placed in the mouth of the *Syrophoenician* woman, which can only imply the 'profane' concept of the term).

[103] Cf. Mk 1:3; 2:28; 5:19; 7:28; 11:3; 11:9; 12:9, 11, 29, 36-37; 13:20, 35; 16:19, 20.

[104] Not associated with the term χριστός and κύριος as such.

Feature 2: κύριε κύριε

Matt 7:21-22 (cf. Matt 25:11) - κύριε κύριε,

The theological concept κύριον τὸν θεόν σου (Matt 4:7, and 22:27) is found only in the Matthian and Lukan gospels (cf. Lk 4:12; 10:27) – and in all the cases the content precedes the response of Jesus in the form of an answer, which in turn, is cited from Deuteronomy. It is thus plausible to infer that such a concept could be regarded as Jesus *logia* or it might also be a well established oral tradition, limited to the use of the Greek Deuteronomy. A second distinct characteristic is the use of κύριε κύριε attested once in Lk 6:46, apart from those occurrences in Matt 7:21, 22 and Matt 25:11. If one would interpret the two κύριος terms in Matt 7:21 and 7:22 through the lens of Matt 25:11, then the concept underlying the κύριος terms in Matt 7:21 and 7:22 is profane in nature with the theological potential to imply more, e.g. Jesus as the κύριος. The Lukan gospel attests to a fairly balanced frequency of the term κύριος and θεός, including the term Ἰησοῦς in comparison (with the exception of Lk 8:28-50 in terms of Jesus). What could be considered as 'out-of-the-ordinary' is the cluster of κύριος terms that are observable in Lk 12:36-47, used exclusively with the definite article. Another unique feature is the single occurrence of the term δέσποτα in Lk 2:29.[105]

2.3.2.2 *Acts of the Apostles*[106]

In Acts 5:9 an alternative reading (το αγιον) is suggested by $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$ (a 7th century papyrus) and minuscule 1838, while the text reading is supported by $\mathfrak{P}^8$ ℵ A B, among others. Some dynamics become apparent when the alternatives for both τὸν κύριον and τοῦ Ἰησοῦ in Acts 9:27 is considered. In the first instance $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$ suggests reading τὸν κύριον, with at least four possibilities, of which one is the text reading, presented as alternatives for τοῦ Ἰησοῦ:[107]

    a.) Κυριου - A *pc*

    b.) του κυριου Ιησου - (104). 326. 1241

    c.) του Ιησου Χριστου - Ψ *pc*

---

[105] The only other occurrence is attested in Acts 4:24.

[106] See Dunn, James D. G. "ΚΥΡΙΟΣ in Acts." Pages 363-378 in *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift: Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums.* Edited by Christof Landmesser; Hans Joachim and Hermann Lichtenberger, 1997.

[107] The text reading is supported by $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$ ℵ E 33. 1739 𝔐.

Two opposing alternatives are given against the reading of κύριος in Acts 12:11; the first is suggested by 36. 323. 453. 945. 1739 – reading ο θεος; the second is κυριος ο θεος proposed by 1241, whereas B Ψ 614 are sustaining the text reading. A third instance revolving around the same issue is found in Acts 14:24. In this instance, the text reads τὸν λόγον upheld by B D 1739 𝔐 co, while two alternatives are proposed. The first proposal is made by א A C Ψ 33. 81. 326. 614 *al* vg sy[p.h**] reading του κυριου after τὸν λόγον, while 𝔓[74] E gig bo[ms] suggests reading του θεου after τὸν λόγον. The alternative suggestions proposed above are not supported by strong manuscript witnesses to even consider altering the current text reading. The proposed alternative found in Acts 15:40, however, is supported by 𝔓[45] (Chester Beatty papyrus dated to the 3rd century CE), among others (C E Ψ 1739 𝔐 gig w vg[cl] sy bo), to read θεου as opposed to κυρίου. The question, however, is to what extent does 𝔓[45] weigh up to the large codices and other manuscripts (𝔓[74] א A B D(*) 33. 81 *pc* d vg[st] sa) which sustain the text reading.[108] Another proposed alternative with strong manuscript support is presented in Acts 20:28. The text reading θεοῦ is supported by by א B 614. 1175. 1505 is opposed by 𝔓[74] A C* D E Ψ 33. 36. 453. 945. 1739. 1891, suggest reading κυριου. This alternative could have been motivated by the fact that the scribe was either influenced by an OG manuscript or by Paul, both of which testify to the concept ἐκκλησία κυρίου. [109]

The only scribal 'tendency' deducible from the data presented by Acts is that codex Bezae (D[05]) appears more 'comfortable' with the term θεός as opposed to the term κύριος (see for example the text critical notes on Acts 2:17; 6:7 in NA[27]).[110] Other than the latter, although interesting discrepancies do exist, a scribal or text tradition regarding the term θεός or κύριος cannot be deduced with certainty. A final case in point is found in Acts 2:17-21 – a citation taken from Joël 2:28-32. The content cited is assigned to the words spoken by θεός while the term κύριος dominates the cited content; this in turn corresponds to its *Vorlage*. What appears to be obvious is that for the author (and/or sources) of Acts, in this particular case, the term κύριος is not regarded as a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram, but rather a term used to refer to Jesus as the κύριος. This would imply that a clear distinction is made between the referent of the term θεός and κύριος. A thorough investigation is needed,

---

[108] According to Omanson, R. L., & Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament: An adaptation of Bruce M. Metzger's Textual commentary for the needs of translators*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006, interprets this alternative as a scribal assimiliation to Acts 14:26, 389.

[109] Cf. Omanson & Metzger, *A Textual Guide,* 277; cf. Ehrman, *Studies in Textual Criticism,* 164-167.

[110] Cf. Weiss, Bernhard. *Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschicte Textkritische Untersuchung, TU 17.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897.

however, to determine if this is an isolated case, or if this is a well established theological concept of the author.

2.3.2.3 *Johannine gospel*

In John 4:1 an alternative reading for the term Ἰησοῦς is suggested by $\mathfrak{P}^{66c.75}$A B C L Wˢ Ψ, among others, namely the term κύριος. The text reading, in turn, is upheld by $\mathfrak{P}^{66*}$ ℵ D Θ 086 f^1 565. 1241. A dominating feature of the Johannine gospel is again the infrequent and very particular use of the term κύριος, while the almost complete absence of the term χριστός is striking. Yet again, as with the Markan gospel, the term Ἰησοῦς and θεός dominate as the theological significant acting agents.

2.3.2.4 *Pastoral letters*

2.3.2.4.1   1 and 2 Timothy

From the Pastoral Epistles, 1 Tim 5:5[111] requires some attention. An alternative for the term θεὸς is proposed by ℵ* D* 81 which reads τον κυριον, with ℵ* not testifying to the definite article. Those instances where the term κύριος is used in 1ˢᵗ Timothy are found within the technical phrase καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (1 Tim 1:2, 12; 6:3, 14). This also applies to the use of the term κύριος in 1 Tim 6:15, which refers back to 1 Tim 6:14, as well as to the term κύριος in 1 Tim 1:4, which in turn refers back to 1 Tim 1:12. The proposal to read the term κύριος in 1 Tim 5:5, as opposed to the term θεός, should thus be seriously considered as the more probable reading – if the thought structure of the letter is considered to be sufficient proof to alter the text. The text witnesses reading the term θεός are manuscripts dated to the 4ᵗʰ century CE (attesting to the θεός term together with the definite article), while other manuscripts are dated to the 9ᵗʰ century and later. The alternative reading, however, is supported, among others, by a 4ᵗʰ and a 5ᵗʰ century manuscript, both of which are 'first hand' testimonies.[112] The latter is also in support of the dominant literary κύριος context. These arguments could be sufficient to call for a serious consideration in altering the current text reading. There seems to be no evidence to suggest that any ground breaking 'new' concepts are introduced relating to the term θεός and κύριος. The latter remains a title assigned to Jesus as the χριστός, while the former would still hold the plausible potential to

---

[111] *txt* C F G P Ψ 048 *pc* (τον θ. ℵ² A D² 1739. 1881 𝔐) lat sy co.

[112] ℵ* D*.

refer to the Hebrew deity. The term κύριος is not used that frequently, and if it is, it is limited to the technical phrase τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ or variants thereof. What would be an interesting and necessary investigation is how the δεσπότης terms in 1 Tim 6:1 and 2 conceptually relate to the term θεός and κύριος respectively.[113]

2.3.2.5 *General letters*

2.3.2.5.1 James

In Jas 3:9, some witnesses (𝔐 vg[st.ww] sy[h] sa bo[pt]) propose θεός as reading as opposed to the term κύριος, which is supported by 𝔓[20] ℵ A B C P Ψ 33. 81. 945. 1241. 1739 *pc* ff t vg[st] sy[p] bo[pt]. Again an alternative reading is suggested for the term κύριος in Jas 4:10. Some text witnesses (945. 1241. 1739. 2298) propose reading του θεου, whilst others (𝔓[100] 𝔐) only suggest a definite article to be read before the term κύριος. The text reading is supported by ℵ A B K P Ψ 33. 81. 614. 630. 1505 *al*. The variations and the witnesses supporting an alternative reading in both Jas 3:9 and Jas 4:10 should not be regarded as sufficient enough to propose altering the current text reading. The term θεός appears to dominate the first section of James (cf. Jas 1 – 4:8), with the term κύριος in the leading position in the second and final section of the epistle (cf. Jas 4:10 –5:20).

2.3.2.5.2 1 and 2 Peter

The text critical discrepancy in 1 Pet 5:1 demands a closer investigation. The text reading Χριστοῦ is supported by ℵ A B, while 𝔓[72] opposes such a reading with the suggestion of θεου as a more suitable term.[114] The term θεός is the dominating acting agent in 1 Pet 3:14 – 1 Pet 5:14, in most cases used in combination with the term χριστός.[115] In 1 Pet 4:13 the concept of sharing in 'Christ's' suffering is introduced (ἀλλὰ καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε). This concept is taken further in 1 Pet 4:14 with the reproach of suffering in the name of 'Christ' (εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ). It is thus highly plausible that the term χριστός in 1 Pet 5:1 be read as is. What has been initiated in 1 Pet 4:13 is developed further in 1 Pet 5:1, where the elders and fellow-elders, martyrs with 'Christ' are called upon

---

[113] This would include the occurance of the term δεσπότης term in 2 Tim 2:19-21 and its conceptual correlation with the term κύριος, especially in its immediate dominate κύριος context; an opposing and contributing investigation into the δεσπότης use in 2 Tim 2:9 in correlation with its immediate dominate θεός context, would also hold valuable outcomes (cf. 1 Pet 2:18 and 2 Pet 2:1).

[114] Cf. Royse, *Scribal Habits,* 833.

[115] See 1 Pet 4:10-19; 3:16-22 as examples.

(Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων). The term θεός dominates the first epistle, while the term κύριος dictates the second epistle, especially from within the phrase τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ from where the term κύριος is further developed.[116] It would again be fascinating to establish the conceptual intent with the term δεσπότης in 1 Pet 2:18 and 2 Pet 2:1 and the impact of such on the θεός-κύριος concepts.

2.3.2.5.3 Jude

Jude does not attest to an array of text critical discrepancies, but it does account for an intriguing text critical note in Jude 4. The text reads ᵀ δεσπότην ᵀ καὶ κύριον ⸀ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι – with the text critical mark ᵀ indicating the insertion of the first person personal pronoun by $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$, while ᵀ marks an insertion of the term θεός suggested by sixth and ninth century manuscripts (P Ψ respectively). Even though the evidence is not in the least sufficient to consider changing the current text reading, the conceptual undertone and importance of the phrase is interesting, particularly with the use of the term δεσπότης in combination with the term κύριος relating to Jesus as the χριστός.

2.3.2.5.4 Johannine Epistles

A few manuscripts, including 1827, suggest αυτου as an alternative for θεοῦ in 1 John 2:17. Another such alternative is found in 1 John 4:15, in which the αυτω, supported by 614. 630 *pc* vg^mss and αυτω εστιν supported by $\mathfrak{P}^9$ are suggested alternatives for θεῷ in 1 John 4:15. These third person personal pronoun suggestions would not alter the theological-conceptual mindset and could be considered as noted, but irrelevant. A few alternatives are proposed for θεῷ in 1 John 5:10[117] and they have been listed below:

a.) τω υιω - A 81. 322. 323. 623. 1241. 1739*. 2464 *al* vg sy^hmg

b.) τω υιω του θεου - *pc* sa bo^pt

None of these suggested alternative readings is of any text critical value with regard to the integrity of the text, nor do they possess the necessary authority to consider altering the text. There seems to be little or no evidence that refutes the integrity of the Johannine epistles with regard to the terms under discussion here. The Johannine epistles appear to be theologically

---

[116] This is indeed an interesting observation; and observation that might support independent authorship of 1 and 2 Peter.

[117] The text reading is supported by *txt* ℵ B P Ψ 0296. 1739^mg 𝔐 l r sy bo^pt.

(with regard to the relevant terms under discussion) on a par; the term θεός dominates, with the term κύριος not used once.

2.3.2.5.5 Hebrews

There are no text critical discrepancies with regard to the term κύριος and/or θεός in Hebrews. The book of Hebrews, however, is regarded as significant for establishing a literary κύριος and θεός context in the first century CE. The term θεός dominates, appearing 67 times in 61 verses throughout the book. From the 67 occurrences, 10 instances form part of the cited content. The term κύριος, in turn, appears 15 times in 15 verses, of which 11 form part of citations. It is thus obvious that the evidence from the cited content presented by Hebrews is of great value and thus demands a thorough independent investigation. Some preliminary and introductory remarks should, however, suffice here for the purposes of this investigation.

The term θεός is clearly the theological significant term that is spear-heading Hebrews. This is emphasised by the introduction of a string of citations in Hebr 1:1-14 in which the term θεός, as acting agent, dominates (cf. Heb 1:6, 8 and 9). Importantly would be to determine how the term κύριος in Heb 1:10 conceptually relates with the term θεός in Hebr 1:6, 8 and 9) and if they share the Hebrew deity as referent.[118] Furthermore, it does appear as if the term Ἰησοῦς and χριστός are used with a strategic intent, with the term κύριος for the most part confined to cited content (cf. Heb 1:10; 8:8-10; 10:16, 30; 12:5, 6; 13:6). The introductory formula λέγει κύριος, captured in Hebr 8:8-10 in particular, would also prove to be of immense value, especially in assisting with determining the θεός-κύριος concept in Hebrews in relation to Jesus as the χριστός.

2.3.2.5.6 Revelation

Although text critical discrepancies are noted in Revelation, their significance regarding the terms θεός and κύριος in particular, does not require a detailed investigation. What is of interest and significant, is that it seems as if the author of Revelation decided on the κύριος ὁ θεός (and variants) concept when referring to the monotheistic Hebrew deity (cf. Rev 1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 15:3; 16:7; 18:8; 21:22; 22:5, 6). The χριστός, together with the term Ἰησοῦς does not figure at all, while the term κύριος is used on an *ad hoc* basis independent of the term θεός. Finally, the term δεσποτής in Rev 6:10 should be considered within the larger κύριος-

---

[118] Thematically it seems as if this is the case, but it cannot be determined as certain before an investigation into this matter is undertaken.

θεός concept. Based on the final two verses of Revelation, it does seem plausible to infer that the author shared the view that Jesus is the κύριος (cf. Rev 22:20, 21).

2.3.3 The terms κύριος and θεός – *Reflecting on the Text Critical Variations and Concepts (Deutero-Pauline)*

2.3.3.1 *Colossians*

The term χριστός dominates the first three chapters, with the term θεός used ever so often; the term κύριος, however, is clustered together in Col 3:18-25. Some manuscript witnesses, such as ℵ² C D¹ Ψ, insist on reading the term χριστός at Col 3:13, most probably due to the fact that Col 3:15 and 3:16 read the term χριστός in their *Vorlage*. The text reading, however, is supported by 𝔓⁴⁶ A B D* F G 1175 *pc* lat. Based on strong support for the text reading alone, it should suffice to accept the reading as it is. Nevertheless, it appears to be obvious that the concept that Jesus is the χριστός and κύριος is repeated here, while a close literary-conceptual link between the terms χριστός and θεός (cf. Col 1:24-2:2 and Col 2:16-3:12) could be inferred. Furthermore, the text critical issues attested in Col 2:2; [119] Col 3:15; [120] Col 3:16; [121] Col 3:22 and Col 4:3 requires some investigative reflection; the first of which is the text reading τοῦ θεοῦ, χριστοῦ in Col 2:2. The text reading is in no way certain as is evident from the possibilities listed below:

a.) του θεου D¹ H P 1881. 2464 *pc* sa^ms

b.) του Χριστου 81. 1241ˢ. (1739) *pc*.

c.) του θεου ο εστιν Χριστος D* ar vg^mss.

d.) του θεου του εν Χριστω 33.

e.) του θεου πατρος του (–ℵ* 048) Χριστου ℵ* A C 048^vid. 1175 *pc* (m vg^st.ww, sy^p) vg^mss sa^mss bo

f.) του θεου και πατρος (ˢ 075. 0208. 0278 *pc*) του Χριστου ℵ² Ψ 075. 0208. 0278. 365. 945. 1505 *pc* vg^ms (bo^ms)

g.) του θεου και πατρος και του Χριστου D² m (vg^cl) sy^h**

---

[119] *txt* 𝔓⁴⁶ ℵ* B 0208^vid. 6. 1241ˢ. 1739 *pc*; Cl.

[120] *txt* ℵ* A B C* D F G P 075. 81. 365. 629. 1175. 1241ˢ. 1505. 1739. 2464 *pc* lat sy co; Cl.

[121] *txt* 𝔓⁴⁶ ℵ² B C² D F G Ψ 075. 1739. 1881 𝔐 lat sy^(p) sa bo^ms; Ambst.

As mentioned before, it is evident that both the terms θεός and χριστός are dominantly used in Col 1 – 3:17 while conceptually they appear to be closely related.[122] None of the above proposed alternatives prove to suggest otherwise. What is obvious from the data, though, is that two readings appear to be dominant: (1) on the one hand it is the term θεός in relation to πάτηρ and (2) on the other hand it is the term θεός in correlation with the term χριστός. The literary inferred concept together with the strong textual witnesses supporting the current text readings seem to suggest that the latter would be the more plausible of the two possibilities. Another two independent alternatives for the term χριστός are proposed in Col 3:15, (a) θεός – as supported by א² C² D² Ψ and others,[123] while the term θεός in Col 3:16 is supported by A C* (among others); and (b) the term κύριος which is suggested by א* I 1175 (Col 3:16). The text reading, in the case of Col 3:15, is supported by $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ B 6. 1739. 1881 *pc* while the text reading for Col 3:16 is supported by $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ א B C* D* F G 1175. 1241ˢ. 1505. 1739 *pc* it vg^{st.ww} sy^h; Cl. The following is deductable from the text critical data presented by Col 3:

1.) $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ B and A represent the text reading for the most part, with the only exception of Col 3:16a where A proposed reading the term θεός against the term κύριος;

2.) Codex Sinaiticus (א) 'consistently' varies between the term χριστός, κύριος and θεός;[124]

3.) Codex Ephraemi (C) and Codex Claromontanus (D⁰⁶) do not show any consistency with variations between the terms χριστός, θεός and κύριος.

The evidence suggests that the text reading in Col 3:13, 15 and 16 should remain unchangeable due to a.) strong textual witnesses supporting the text readings in all these cases and b.) the theological concept inferred from the immediate literary context supporting the current text readings. In Col 3:22 one is again confronted with strong text witnesses suggesting an alternative against the κύριος reading. The term θεός is supported by $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ א² D² $\mathfrak{M}$ against manuscripts א* A B C D* F G L (among others). The later codices (dated between the 4th and 9th century) are a combination of both byzantine and western text traditions including the most authoritive of them all, B (codex vaticanus). On the other hand, the

---

[122] See for example Col 2:8-20; 3:1-4; 1:24-28.

[123] The text reading is supported by א* A B C* D* F G P 075. 81. 365. 629. 1175. 1241ˢ. 1505. 1739. 2464 *pc* lat sy co; Cl.

[124] In Col 3:13 the 'original' hand opted to read the term θεός while the 2nd hand proposed to read the term Χριστός. The opposite is true for Col 3:15: here the 'original' hand supports the Χριστός reading, whereas the 2nd hand suggests reading the term θεός. The 2nd hand also supports the text reading θεός in Col 3:16a, with א supporting the θεός reading in Col 3:16b.

proposed alternative is supported by papyrus manuscripts dated to the 2nd century CE, supported by redactors of both codex sinaiticus and claromontanus. Evident from the immediate literary context is that the term κύριος dominates as a theological significant acting agent. If the proposed alternative made by 𝔓⁴⁶ and others is to be regarded to such an extent as to adopt such a reading, it would then imply that the dominance of the κύριος term will be interrupted. The literary context, for example, reads χάριτι for τῷ θεῷ (Col 3:16) and the εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ θεῷ (Col 3:17) refers to the same entity, different from the one to whom Ὁ λόγος belongs to and in whose name everything is done (Col 3:16). The entity τοῦ Χριστοῦ to whom the word belongs to, should also be regarded as κυρίου Ἰησοῦ through whose name everything is done. The term κύριος used in Col 3:18 and Col 3:20 seems to be referring to the same entity ascribed to Jesus, who is the κύριος and or χριστός. It appears as if the term χριστός and κύριος were reserved, at least noticeable in these instances, when referring to the theological significance and meaning of Jesus' work. A varied use of the term κύριος is found in Col 3:22, where κυρίοις refers to the 'Masters' in the secular sense of the word. The κυρίοις in Col 3:22 is referred to in opposition to the κύριον term in the same verse (Col 3:22). The alternative reading θεον proposed by authoritative text witnesses makes this extremely intriguing. Why would the scribes of 𝔓⁴⁶ and others regard the term θεός to be more suitable than the term κύριος in this particular case? Was the logic behind such a proposal to make a clear distinction between the terms κυρίοις and κύριος, the latter which appears to be generally understood as referring to a 'master' or one with authority over another? The scribes of 𝔓⁴⁶ might have been of the opinion that a distinction is required between the work done that will be visible for people in general (Col 3:23). This work will also be visible to 'a master' in particular.

If one accepts the proposal, it would entail that the scribes of 𝔓⁴⁶ did not consider the term κύριος, at least deductable from this occurrence, as a suitable term when referring to the Hebrew deity–if of course the Hebrew deity is implied with the term κύριος in Col 3:22. One could also interpret the alternative reading proposed by the scribes of 𝔓⁴⁶, that the scribes considered the term κύριος as referring to Jesus as the κύριος and the Christ, 'lord' above all; the one being equal with the Hebrew deity and that they therefore opted for the term θεός. Although the suggested θεός reading is appealing, both the manuscript and contextual evidence weighs in on the current text reading.

2.3.3.2 *Ephesians*

If the premise is accepted that the letter to the Colossians is a forerunner of the Ephesian epistle, and if such a premise is based on the fact that these two epistles share a common theological undertone, then it is indeed plausible that one would expect the theological concepts supporting that the terms κύριος and θεός in particular, to be on par.[125] As in Colossians, the term χριστός is predominately used in correlation with Jesus, especially in Eph 2:6, 11, 13; 3:6, 11. As with Col 3:18-25, a cluster of κύριος terms is also observable in Eph 6:1-10 with a high frequency of use elsewhere while closely associated with the term χριστός. The text critical issues surrounding the relevant terms, Eph 2:22; 5:10; 5:17; [126] 5:21[127] and 5:29[128], requires some reflection.

The θεός reading in Eph 2:22 is supported by 𝔓[46] ℵ A, while the term χριστός is suggested as an alternative by codex vaticanus. There is no obvious reason to alter the current text reading, even though the suggestion by B is intriguing. Another alternative is suggested in Eph 5:10, where D* F G 81* propose the θεω reading as opposed to κυρίῳ. The text reading is supported by strong textual witnesses, 𝔓[46] 𝔓[49] ℵ A B. Based on the textual evidence alone, the text reading should remain as is. Furthermore, two alternatives are proposed for the κυρίου reading in Eph 5:17: the first is θεου supported by A 81. 365, among others, the second 𝔓[46] proposing Χριστου as alternative. The text reading is supported by ℵ and B. The manuscript support appears to be swaying towards 𝔓[46] due its early date or towards ℵ and B, due to the authoritive nature of these codices. The difficulty is that 𝔓[46] ℵ B all form part of category I, the latter which is the most likely to portray the 'original' text. Due to the fact that both ℵ B support the text reading and such reading would fit seamlessly into the immediate literary context, the text reading should be accepted as the closest to the original.

A further discrepancy is found in Eph 5:29 relating to the term χριστὸς. Text witnesses D[2] 𝔐 propose κυριος in this instance, while such a reading is opposed by numerous witnesses, 𝔓[46] ℵ A B D* F G P Ψ (to mention only a few) in support of the text

---

[125] See Schnelle, Udo. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007, 345 and 350-351 in terms of Ephesians reliance on Colossians in particular; cf. Schnelle, Udo. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007, 521.

[126] *txt* 𝔓[46] ℵ A B P 0278. 6. 33. 81. 365. 1241[s]. 1739 *pc*; Hier Aug.

[127] *txt* ℵ A B D[1] Ψ 0278. 33. 1739. 1881 𝔐 f vg sy[(p)] bo[pt]; Hier.

[128] *txt* 𝔓[46] ℵ A B D* F G P Ψ 048. 0278. 0285. 33. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1241[s]. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464 *al* latt sy co.

reading. The decision should be apparent, the text reading remains intact. One text critical variation, found in Eph 5:17 requires however, further attention. An alternative for κυρίου, supported by ℵ and B, is proposed by 𝔓⁴⁶ reading Χριστου. Even though all three these witnesses testify to the *nomina sacra* form of the terms under discussion, 𝔓⁴⁶ supports the oldest available reading in this case. Deduced from the immediate literary context there is no apparent reason why the text should be altered. If the scribe/s of 𝔓⁴⁶ was influenced by the phrase ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός (Eph 5:14), this might have had an impact to read the Χριστός term in Eph 5:17 (ἀλλὰ συνίετε τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου). The latter would imply that the same entity, namely the exalted Jesus, will not only shine upon someone as the 'Christ' (Eph 5:14), but the latter is also imperative to understand his will (Eph 5:17). A similar concept of praising κύριος from the heart (Eph 5:19) is found in Col 3:16 (χάριτι ᾄδοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν τῷ θεῷ) with the difference that in Col 3:16 praises are to be directed to θεός, although other text witnesses suggested the term κύριος. Thus, there appears to be at least three distinct terms used by the school of authors responsible for the Colossian and Ephesians correspondence when referring to the one to whom praises are to be directed, κύριος, θεός and χριστός. It would therefore make no significant theological or Christological impact to use either the κύριος or χριστός term in Eph 5:17.

2.3.3.3 *2 Thessalonians*

The second Thessalonian epistle does not offer any text critical data with regard to the relevant terms under discussion. Moreover, the epistle does not introduce any ground-breaking, nor creatively new theological concepts that demand consideration. What could be noted is that the term κύριος is dominantly used in association with Jesus as the χριστός, while the term θεός is utilised as expected, to function independently from the term κύριος and/or χριστός.

2.4 THE TERMS ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ IN THE *Pauline letters (non-citations)*

2.4.1 1 Thessalonians

The use of the term θεός and κύριος in the NT, in general in relation to one another and in association with Jesus as the χριστός, appears to be in line with the Pauline thought; or rather

that which can be inferred from the Romans and Corinthian, and the other 'genuine' Pauline letters. The term θεός is used when referring to the one that has raised Jesus from the dead (cf. 1 Thess 1:10).[129] There are no new κύριος or θεός concepts deducible from this epistle in comparison to the ones already discussed, except for τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ which only occurs in Mk 1:14 and Rm 15:15, apart from its frequent occurrence in 1st Thessalonians. Another interesting concept introduced is τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. 1 Cor 1:2; 1 Cor 10:32; 1 Cor 11:16, 22; 1 Cor 15:9; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:13) a concept that one can consider, with a reasonable amount of certainty, as belonging to the thought factory of Paul. There are only four references to the τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ concept in the New Testament text, separate from the *Pauline literature* (cf. Eph 3:10; 2 Thess 1:4; 1 Ti 3:15); all of which are found in the *deutero-Pauline literature,* except for the occurrence in Acts 20:28.

The term κύριος is being implemented, for the most part, in association with Jesus (cf. 1 Thess 1:1, 3; 1 Thess 2:15; 1 Thess 2:19; 1 Thess 3:11, 13; 1 Thess 4:1, 2; 1 Thess 5:9, 18, 23 and 28). The exceptions focus primarily on the παρουσία of κύριος and related concepts (1 Thess 3:13; 1 Thess 4:15, 17; 1 Thess 5:2; 1 Thess 5:23). A final exception is that κύριος will punish wrong deeds (1 Thess 4:6). There are thus no new or innovative θεός and/or κύριος concepts introduced in this epistle, other than what will be discussed in chapters three (Romans) and four (1st and 2nd Corinthians). Generally speaking, the integrity of the text seems to be intact. The variant reading του Χριστου as opposed to τοῦ θεοῦ in 1 Thess 2:8 should not be regarded as an 'authorative' alternative, for obvious reasons.[130] Clearly, some scribes, including church fathers Eusebius and Jerome, were of the opinion that τὸ εὐαγγέλιον should not be regarded as 'belonging' to, so to speak, nor should it be regarded as the source of θεός; but it should rather be ascribed to χριστός. The alternative reading suggested in 1 Thess 3:9, is noteworthy and should be given due consideration. This verse reads: τίνα γὰρ εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι περὶ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ ᾗ χαίρομεν δι' ὑμᾶς ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. In both instances where the term θεός has been used, the 'original' hand of codex Sinaiticus, together with other manuscripts, propose to read the term κύριος. It appears as if such scribes intended to 'hold on to' the term κύριος used in 1 Thess 3:8, in which 'they' (most probably referring to the congregation) stand ἐν κυρίῳ. For them it made sense to rather read δυνάμεθα κυριω than δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ as well as ἔμπροσθεν κυριου rather than ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ. It seems as if they wanted to remain literary-

---

[129] In both instances where θεός is read in 1 Thess 3:9 codex ℵ* D* suggest κύριος (1st instance), while only ℵ* suggest reading the term κύριος in the 2nd instance.
[130] Only a few manuscripts, and with that non authority ones, propose reading the term χριστός.

conceptual consistent by applying the term κύριος in both these instances. They might have been of the opinion that conceptually to 'stand in the lord', and anyone who shares 'in the power of the lord' should be rejoicing 'before the lord'. If the term κύριος in 1 Thess 3:9 refers to the same referent as would the term κύριος in 1 Thess 3:11 (ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς) and 1 Thess 3:13 (τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ), which is related to Jesus, then it becomes evident why the second hand of codex Sinaiticus, in collaboration with codex A and B, suggest reading the term θεός.

2.4.2 Galatians

The terms θεός and χριστός in the Galatian epistle are the dominating theological significant acting agents. Established concepts associated with the term θεός are: the will of θεός (Gal 1:4, cf. Gal 1:20; Gal 2:6), the congregation of θεός (Gal 1:13). The suggestion that θεός is pleased (Gal 1:15), while being the one that is glorified (Gal 1:24). The referent of the term θεός remains the one that shows mercy (Gal 2:21; Gal 3:18), the one in whom one believes (Gal 3:6), while declaring those that believe righteous (Gal 3:8, 11). The term θεός refers to the monotheistic Hebrew deity (Gal 3:20), the one to whom the kingdom belongs (Gal 5:21), the θεός of the true Israelites (Gal 6:16). Chapter four testifies to a cluster of θεός terms that would require a more detailed discussion. Two primary concepts accompany the term θεός in this chapter; the first is the one that sends (Gal 4:4, 6); the second is the knowledge about θεός (Gal 4:8, 9). What is also found in chapter four is that the angel of θεός is considered to be on a par with Jesus as the χριστός (Gal 4:14). The term κύριος is used in the well known and established phrase καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Gal 1:2; Gal 6:14, 18); with one reference made to James as the brother of κύριος (Gal 1:19). One other reference is made to the term κύριος with regard to being a slave. The latter most probably suggests a profane use of the term κύριος (Gal 4:1). There seems to be no obvious or explicit literary and conceptual link between the terms θεός and κύριος; nor are there any apparent associations between the terms κύριος and χριστός other than what is presented in the phrase κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. A close literary relation between Jesus and the term χριστός is deducible from a number of verses (cf. Gal 1:1, 12; Gal 2:4, 16; Gal 3:1, 14, 22, 26 and 28; Gal 4:14; Gal 5:6, 24; Gal 6:14, 18). Some further remarks are necessary on the literary connection between the terms θεός and χριστός.

In chapter one there is no apparent literary correlation between the θεός and χριστός term; a conceptual association is deducible if one considers Gal 1:13 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ and Gal 1:22 ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ regarding the 'possessor' idea of the congregation.[131] Undisputed is the fact that for Paul θεός is the πατρὸς who raised Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός from the dead, particularly inferred from the introduction to his epistles. Two separate entities can also be assumed from Gal 2:19 - underlined by the concept that one (in this case Paul) is dead for the law, but alive in θεός; while crucified in χριστός.[132] Paul would consider the latter as the law of χριστός (cf. Gal 6:2). In Gal 2:20 the text reads τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ supported by ℵ A C D, while 𝔓[46] B D* F G (b) suggest an alternative of τη του θ̄υ και χ̄ρ̄υ. Although the alternative reading presents strong manuscript support, the theological concept "faith in...θεός" is alien to Pauline thought.[133] The suggested 'insertion' of εις Χριστον in Gal 3:17 proposed by D F G I 0176. 0278, although noted, the text reading should remain due to the overwhelming manuscript support.[134] Another χριστός induced variant is found in Gal 3:21, where mss. 104 suggests reading του Χριστου as opposed to του θεου.[135] Various possible readings are suggested for διὰ θεοῦ in Gal 4:7:

- δια θεον - F G 1881 *pc*
- δια Χριστου - 81. 630 *pc*
- δια Ιησου Χρ. - 1739[c]
- θεου δια (+ Ιησου P 6. 326. 1505 *pc* sy) Χρ. - ℵ[2] C[3] D 0278

Apart from the altered accusative reading against the genitive of θεός in Gal 4:7, alternatives read δια Χριστου or δια Ιησου.[136] It is clear that the term κύριος and θεός operate independently, both literary and conceptually speaking. The same could be said for the term χριστός and θεός, even though there might be sporadic tendencies to relate these terms most

---

[131] This concept (that of congregation or assembly 'belonging' to θεός) is a familiar concept for Pauline thought (cf. 1 Cor 1:2; 1 Cor 10:32; 1 Cor 11:16, 22; 1 Cor 15:9; 2 Cor 1:1; 1 Thess 2:14; 2 Thess 1:1, 4); while this concept, in association with the term χριστός, is only used in Rom 16:16; Eph 1:21; Eph 5:24, apart from Gal 1:22, in the whole of the New Testament.

[132] Cf. the concept of descendants of Abraham in Gal 3:15-18, in which θεός is the one making the promise to Abraham, while the promise is being fulfilled through χριστός; a similar concept which is presented in Gal 3:26.

[133] Metzger, *Textual Commentary,* 524.

[134] 𝔓[46] ℵ A B C P Ψ; cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary,* 525.

[135] The text witnesses supporting the reading in the text are supported by ℵ A C D (F G) Ψ 0278. 33. 1739. 1881.

[136] The text reading is supported by 𝔓[46] ℵ* A B C* 33. 1739.

probably due to the conceptual overlapping of themes and topics addressed. The correlation between the terms κύριος and χριστός is centred upon the Jesus figure, as expected.

2.4.3 Philippians and Philemon

The introductory phrases on the subject of the terms θεός and κύριος in relation to Jesus as the χριστός suggest a certain consistency on the part of Paul. The striking aspect of the Philippians' epistle is the overwhelming and dominant use of the term χριστός. In no other Pauline text had the term χριστός been used with such emphasis as in this epistle. It is by far the most dominant term used in most of the cases in association with Jesus. The terms Ἰησοῦς, κύριος and θεός are used with almost the same frequency, with the term Ἰησοῦς in most of the cases associated with the term χριστός, apart from its relational use with the term κύριος which is limited to the technical phrase κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Phil 1:1; Phil 2:11; Phil 3:8; Phil 4:23). The only exception observable is found in Phil 2:19, where the term Ἰησοῦς is used in association only with the term κύριος. Some manuscripts[137] would argue, however, for a χριστός reading, possibly due to the dominant correlation between the term Ἰησοῦς and χριστός, particularly in the Philippians epistle.[138]

Irrespective of the 'frequency' statistics, the term θεός remains the referent towards whom one should direct thanks and praise, together with glory (Phil 1:3, 11; cf. Rom 1:8; 1 Cor 1:4, 14; 1 Cor 14:18 and Philem 4 in terms of thankfulness). One of the most significant literary and conceptual associations between Jesus as the χριστός and/or κύριος and θεός is found in the all well and frequently debated *Philippus Hymnus* (Phil 2:5-11); the latter which demands an in-depth reflection. A first and necessary approach towards interpreting Phil 2:5-11 with regard to the relationship between Jesus as the κύριος and Χριστός and θεός, is to understand the phrase Τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in Phil 2:5. The potential meaning of φρονέω is to 'have attitude', 'ponder', 'hold a view' and 'honour' which includes the semantic possibilities of 'to think thoroughly', 'to plan'; to have an attitude characterised by wisdom, well thought through ideas.[139] The second thought introduced by means of a relative pronoun is ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων – he who exist / is present in the

---

[137] C D* F G 630. 1739. 1881.

[138] An alternative reading for the phrase Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου is suggested by text witnesses, D* F G b reading: εγω μεν ευχαριστω τω κυριω ημων. Furthermore, the phrase καὶ ἔπαινον θεοῦ in 1:11 is opposed by three independent alternatives (και επαινον Χριστου - D*, και επαινον μοι - F G, θεου και επαινον εμοι - P[46] (g)).

[139] Cf. Louw, J. P. & Nida, E. A. "φρονέω." *Greek-English Lexicon Based on Semantic Domain 1*, 259 and

'form' of θεός (Phil 2:6). An understanding of the μορφή concept is thus crucial to the whole debate.[140]

In Homer, Greek Old Testament inscriptions, Philo and Josephus the meaning of μορφή would be something in the line of 'form', 'outward appearance' or 'shape.'[141] Plato and Philo, among others, employed the μορφή concept in association with θεός.[142] The pivotal question is what was meant with the concept ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ? Was the intent morally-ethical, socio-political or philosophical-existential, or a combination of these concepts? The Greek Old Testament's employment of μορφή is never done in association with the term θεός (cf. Jdg 8:18; Tob 1:13; 4 Mac 15:4; Job 4:16; Wis 18:1; Isa 44:13 and Da 3:19), while the εἰκών term (which bears the potential meaning 'image', 'likeness', 'form', 'appearance') is frequently used in relation to the term θεός (cf. Gen 1:26; Gen 5:1; Gen 9:6; 2 Ch 33:7) with a similar underlying concept as with the case in Phil 2:6. The same term will also be used when referring to the emperor's head on a coin. The μορφή term together with the ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ concept should therefore be considered as a 'visually reasonable and acceptable' representation of the 'genuine'. The 'form' describes the essence of an entity or person that is reproduced in a 'different form' so to speak.

What Jesus as the χριστός did not do, is to consider the ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ as a prize or booty to be ἴσος – equal to θεός. The latter phrase or thought could primarily be interpreted in two ways; the first possibility would be to consider the reason for the phrase οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν᾿ ἡγήσατο (Phil 2:6a) in relation to τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ (Phil 2:6c), which implies that even though Jesus is regarded ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, he did not misuse it to consider himself to be on a par with θεός. The second possibility would be to interpret the two concepts ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων and τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ as 'parallel' concepts, namely the 'godly' nature of Jesus. This would suggest interpreting οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν᾿ ἡγήσατο as a thought that merely connects or facilitates the 'parallel' concepts: a.) Jesus being in the form of θεός and b.) Jesus existing like θεός. The latter proposal is indeed plausible and is considered here as the most 'obvious' choice. The former however, requires more explanation; this interpretive possibility pivots on how the infinitive functions in Phil 2:6c on the one hand, and how the middle voice is perceived on the other hand (Phil 2:6b).

---

[140] Cf. Bauckham, Richard. "Paul's Christology of Divine Identity." Pages 1-26. Cited 2nd February 2012. Online: http://www.forananswer.org/Top_JW/Richard_Bauckham.pdf, 12-15; Schnelle, *Leben und Denke,* 414-418.
[141] Arndt, William F. and Gingrich, Wilbur F. "μορφή." *BAGD* 2, 528.
[142] Cf. Plato. *Resp.* 380D, 381B and 381C.

It is reasonable, in the case of Phil 2:6c, to regard the infinitive as the subject of the verb,[143] implying that the clause τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ introduces a 'new' subject matter and not an infinitive of cause or purpose. The implication of such is that the act of 'considering' (ἡγήσατο) refers back to ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (Phil 2:6a). The middle voice, in turn, is a much more complicated grammatical aspect to define and describe. Porter defines it as *the Greek middle voice expresses more direct participation, specific involvement, or even some form of benefit of the subject doing the action*.[144] If one considers Porter's statement as a working definition, then the act of 'thinking' or 'considering' ἁρπαγμὸν – a prize (or rather 'not' considering), has to refer to ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (Phil 2:6a) if the phrase to follow is indeed an infinitive of subject (Phil 2:6c). The plausibility of the former suggested interpretive option is strengthened by the fact that the concept underlying ὑπάρχων (Phil 2:6a) and τὸ εἶναι (Phil 2:6c) revolves around 'to be', 'existence', 'existentialism', or does it?

The thought-structural context of Phil 2:5-6 could be structured as follows:

a.) Imperative clause v. 5a (the concept of thinking, considering)

- Τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν

b.) Relative clause v. 5b (relative to the concept of thinking)

- ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

c.) Relative clause v. 6a (relative to Jesus as the Χριστός – v. 5b)

- ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ

d.) Relative clause v. 6b (relative to Jesus as the Χριστός, while relating to v. 6a)

- ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο

e.) Subject clause v. 6c (open relating possibilities)

- τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ

Based on the above proposed thought-structure, governed by the relative clauses, the participle (ὑπάρχων) in combination with the middle voice (ἡγήσατο) not only ensures that what is stated is related to the content of v. 6a and relative to Jesus as the χριστός, but it also opens the possibility, with the assistance of the infinitive as the subject of the verb to either regard τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ as the subject matter of ἡγήσατο and to consider the concept ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ being parallel with τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ. This being said, the probability that ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο as a subject clause relating to τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ as a purpose

---

[143] Porter, S. E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999,195.

[144] Porter, *Idioms,* 67.

clause should in no way be ruled out. The latter, which would imply that ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ is considered by Jesus as the χριστός not to be a prize that would 'initiate' him, or that he would be led by such an idea that he is equal to θεός. The 'comprehension' of Jesus as the χριστός (Phil 2:5), he who was ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ (Phil 2:6a) did not 'mislead' him to think (Phil 2:6b) that he is equal to θεός (Phil 2:6c), but he considered himself humble and adopted the role as a slave (Phil 2:7). Moreover, due to the reason that Jesus as the χριστός did not consider his ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ as a 'pass' to be understood as being equal to θεός, he was exalted by θεός (Phil 2:9a) and given the name that is above all (Phil 2:9b).

The 'name' concept is taken further in Phil 2:10 in that (or therefore, related to Phil 2:9) every knee shall bow 'in the name of Jesus' and every tongue will confess that:

a.) Jesus is the χριστός and κύριος;
b.) Through whom θεός will be glorified.

In summary, Jesus remains the κύριος and χριστός in the *Philippus Hymnus*; the one that did not consider his ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ as being equal to θεός, but which made him humble enough to adopt the role of a slave. Therefore, every knee will bow and every tongue confess that Jesus is the κύριος and χριστός through whom θεός is glorified. Irrespective thus if the *Hymnus* proves to be 'early Christian' in origin and not a Pauline creation as such, the κύριος-θεός-χριστός concept would suit Paul's theo-Christ and kyrio-*logie* perfectly.

The Philemon letter offers no new or alternative concepts with regard to the κύριος, θεός and χριστός terms. The term χριστός is again used in close relation with Jesus (see Phlm 3, 9, 23, 25). The same could be said for the term κύριος (cf. Phlm 3, 5, 24); also used in Phlm 16 and 20 as reference to being brothers in κύριος.[145]

This chapter would be considered incomplete if the the works of Philo and Josephus, as representatives of a more Hellenised and 'conservative' Jewish thought respectively, are not included. These works might confirm or deny the claims made regarding the use of the terms θεός and κύριος. What the investigation into the use of the term θεός and κύριος in the works of Philo and Josephus would be able to achieve, is to point one to a reasonable general sentiment regarding the use of the terms θεός and κύριος in the first century CE, as well as the concepts that supported such terms.

---

[145] Codex D* 'inserted' εν κυριω (Phlm 19) at the end of the verse, while in Phlm 20 an alternative reading κυριω is proposed by D² over and against Χριστω.

2.5 THE WORKS OF PHILO[146]

2.5.1 Introduction

The reconstructed literary works of Philo is significant for the understanding of first century BCE Hellenistic Judaism. Philo and his works and the ultimate understanding of this literature are essential in grasping the Jewish thought within in the Second Temple period of ancient Judaism. He is critical for understanding many of the currents, themes, and interpretative traditions which existed in Diaspora and Hellenistic Judaism.[147] Philo is also noteworthy for understanding the early church and the writings of the New Testament, especially those of Paul, John, and Hebrews.[148] He is also considered to be significant for lexical and conceptual terms that are reflected in the language of the New Testament.[149] According to a computer generated concordance search, the term θεός occurs 2397 times in 1791 sections of text or paragraphs in the works of Philo of Alexandria, followed by κύριος with 479 occurrences in 409 sections and finally δεσπότης occurring 218 times in 199 sections. Some of these instances will be discussed in more detail below. Significant however for this study is how Philo related these terms with one another, and what theological concepts he formed when he used these terms.[150] Even though the explicit citations in the works of Philo are necessary and would have produced interesting and valuable results, such an endeavour justifies an independent study. However, if and where Old Testament texts are cited which correspond to the explicit citations in the Pauline literature, due attention will be given. The focus here would thus be on those texts from the Philo corpus which conceptually deals particularly with the terms κύριος and θεός as reference to the Hebrew deity. The intention is not to deal with all the instances where the terms κύριος and θεός appear, but to focus on those instances where one could deduce with certainty, conceptual processes on the part of Philo.

---

[146] For the Greek text of Philo's work, the online version of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG) was consulted (http://www.tlg.uci.edu/). The translations are my own, with assistance from links to online translations offered by TLG as well as the work of Yonge.

[147] Yonge, C. D. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996, 'Foreword.'

[148] Ibid.

[149] Ibid.; Niehoff, Maren R. "Questions and Answers in Philo Genesis Rabbah." *JSJ* 39, (2008), 337-366, suggests that Paul considered both the Hebrew Bible as well as its Greek translation as 'Holy Scripture,' 339. Niehoff, while referring to the works of Adam Kamesar, also states that Phile adopted certain methods of Homeric scholarship. These suggestions and remarks would confirm the fact that Philonian thought is a valuable conceptual commodity for Hellenistic Judaism in the first century CE.

[150] The two names of the Hebrew deity, θεός and κύριος, according to Mamorstein, A. *Philo and the Names of God JQR* 3, (1932), 295-306, is one of Philo's chief doctrines, 295; cf. Dahl, N. A. and Segal, Alan F. "Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God." *JSJ* 9.2, (1978), 1-28.

2.5.2 *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*

In this book Philo's objective was to write about who is the heir of the divine things (θεῖος). The backdrop against which *Her.* 22 is to be understood is the oracle initiated by Abram introduced in ch. 1, where Philo quotes from Gen 15:1, which reads: ὁ μισθός σου πολὺς ἔσται σφόδρα and Gen 15:2 reading δέσποτα, τί μοι δώσεις. The freedom of speech towards one's master (*Her.* 6) is based on love for his 'master', a yearning for knowledge. The opposite is to be silenced, where Moses and the Israelites are considered to be exemplars of the ignorant. As support for Philo's criticism against the Israelites, he quotes from Exod 14:4-5 (*Her.* 4). Philo's critical stance against the Israelites is emphasised in *Her.* 19, with Philo again quoting from scripture (Exod 20:19). Philo repeats the citation taken from Gen 15:2 (*Her.* 22), through which he poses the question: "what shall you give me?" This for Philo shows confidence, but the addition "O Master" (δεσπότης), speaks of prudent confidence (Gen 15:2).[151] He goes further by saying that a habit exists to use two appellations when referring to the cause of the created things (εἰωθὼς δὲ χρῆσθαι μάλιστα διτταῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰτίου προσρήσεσι, τῇ θεὸς καὶ τῇ κύριος), namely: θεός and κύριος. He then says that he (the person, Abram, who uttered δεσπότης) used neither of the terms (οὐδετέραν νῦν παρείληφεν); although it is meant that the person calls them by the name of δεσπότης and thereby speaking with caution and reservation. Philo continues saying that it is said that the δεσπότης and κύριος is regarded as synonymous, on which Philo reacts by writing in *Her.* 23, that although the two terms are one and the same thing, they differ due to the meaning assigned to them, after which he explains the origin of both words.

For Philo, κύριος and δεσπότης are referring to 'the same' (εἶναι λέγεται); but underlying these terms are different thought concepts (εἰ καὶ τὸ ὑποκείμενον ἓν καὶ ταὐτόν ἐστιν, ἐπινοίαις αἱ κλήσεις διαφέρουσι·). Philo explains that the term κύριος derives from κῦρος (that which is firm), while δεσπότης, in turn, comes from the word δεσμόν (fear). So when one calls 'Master' (δεσπότης) it implies that such a person respects the sovereignty of such entity (*Her.* 24). Critique from a semantic or linguistic-conceptual point of view against such an interpretation of the terms κύριος and δεσποτής is thus deemed irrelevant. For Philo knowing the meaning of the 'root' Greek word is imperative for the understanding of the terms κύριος and δεσποτής. It was clearly not necessary for him to explain what is meant or

---

[151] Which could be considered as significant is the fact that the term δεσποτής in Gen 15:2 and Gen 15:8, apart from the occurrence in Josh 5:14, are the only three occurances of the δεσποτής term in the entire constructed Greek Old Testament text offered by LXX^Gött; the latter is thus a strong argument a.) that they might have been influenced by the same Greek *Vorlage*; b.) or that the Greek reading might be an indiction of inter dependence.

how one should understand the term θεός, presumably because the risk for misunderstanding or interpretation was far less, in comparison to the terms κύριος and δεσποτής.

Philo's discussion on the matter of Abram's oracle, the freedom of speech, suggests that conceptually for him both the terms θεός and κύριος refer to the creator and that if one calls upon such entity using δεσπότης, the latter term would imply everything the terms θεός and κύριος stand for. Philo even went as far as to say that the term δεσπότης does not refer to any other being, than the created one, the 'Master' of the universe (τὸ κράτος ἀνημμένον ἀπάντων). Δεσπότης is also κύριος (ὥστε τὸν δεσπότην κύριον εἶναι), *Her.* 24. Philo thus clearly differentiates in this case at least, between the referent (the entity itself), the terms used when referring to such an entity and the concepts that are being called to mind when these terms were used. Thus, the term θεός would be the literary term that was used when referring to the entity 'proper', the Hebrew deity. The terms κύριος and δεσπότης, in turn, are used to refer to the same entity without embodying the essence of the Hebrew deity, while transmitting a particular characteristic or aspect of the Hebrew deity.

2.5.3 *Legum Allegoriae*

Philo offers his own interpretation of the events as captured in Genesis 2. In *Leg.* 1, 88 Philo wrote that 'Adam' was commanded to name all the living things, but that he did not name himself. He explains this by saying that he (Adam) was ignorant of himself and his own nature (*Leg.* 1, 92). He continues his explanation by saying that command, prohibition and recommendation are different; command is for the intermediate character, neither good nor bad (*Leg.* 1, 93). Prohibition is directed to bad men while recommendation is aimed at the good person to prevent evil and to pursue that which is good (*Leg.* 1, 93-94). In *Leg.* 1, 95 it is continued that with good reason the earthly mind is neither evil nor good, but in the middle (*Leg.* 1, 95.1-2). Advice is therefore made possible by calling on two names: κύριος and θεός (*Leg.* 1, 95.3-4). Philo goes further by stating that κύριος ὁ θεός commanded that whoever pays serious attention to his advice could consider himself worthy of the blessing bestowed upon him by θεός (*Lev.* 1, 95.5). The one that rejects his advice will be dismissed by κύριος, who is his δεσπότης and who has authority over him (*Leg.* 1, 95.6).

Philo continues in *Leg.* 1, 96.1-3 by quoting from Gen 3:23 (καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν αὐτὸν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς ἐργάζεσθαι τὴν γῆν, ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθη–The Lord God drove him out of the paradise of happiness to work the earth), after which Philo interprets this citation by saying that κύριος as δεσπότης (Master) and ὁ θεός as εὐεργέτης (Benefactor) will

both punish the one that disobeyed his command (*Leg.* 96.5-6). To understand Philo's concept underlying the terms θεός and κύριος, one has to grasp what Philo meant with πάλιν ὡς ἀμφότερα – again like one or the other. For Philo it does not matter which term is used when referring to the one that will punish the subject that disobeyed; because for Philo both κύριος as δεσπότης (Master) and ὁ θεός as εὐεργέτης (Benefactor) refer to the same entity responsible to hand down punishment. It would thus be save to infer that for Philo the term θεός refers to the Hebrew deity 'proper', while the terms κύριος and δεσποτής refers to epithets in an attempt to discern how θεός is involved in human reality.

2.5.4   *De Sobrietate*

Philo attempts to explain the 'curses' caused by sin in *Sobr.* 51. As an introduction to this discussion, he cites Gen 9:25-26, of which v. 26 is of special importance: εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς Σήμ, καὶ ἔσται Χαναὰν δοῦλος αὐτοῖς (blessed be the κύριος, θεός of Shem and Kanaan will be a servant to them). He then goes further asking the question about what a good man thinks of prayer, a man such as Shem (bearing the same name as good), saying that: τὸν γὰρ κύριον καὶ θεὸν τοῦ τε κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ πάντων ἰδίᾳ θεὸν κατ' ἐξαίρετον χάριν τοῦ Σὴμ ἀνακαλεῖ (he calls upon κύριος and θεός of the cosmos and all things in it, uniquely according to the private thanks to the θεός of Shem). Philo continues by exploiting the meaning of Shem's name in terms of the created cosmos (*Sobr.* 52-55), followed by a rhetorical question. In *Sobr.* 55 Philo makes a distinction between the δεσπότης (Master) and εὐεργέτης (Benefactor) of this world who is called by these two appellations: κύριος and θεός, and the 'good' (most probably referring to Shem) is merely called the σωτὴρ and εὐεργέτης, neither δεσπότης nor κύριος. The referent of the κύριος and θεός terms, in the mind of Philo, differs from the referent of the σωτὴρ and εὐεργέτης terms. The latter refers to those doing 'good', appreciated for their intellect; while the former, κύριος and θεός terms, including δεσπότης, refer to the benefactor of the world. The functional distinction between the terms κύριος and θεός is portrayed by the terms δεσπότης (Master) and εὐεργέτης (Benefactor), but not limited to these terms.

The terms δεσπότης (Master) and εὐεργέτης (Benefactor) are epithets of the Hebrew deity, 'named' using the terms κύριος and θεός. Philo draws a clear distinction that although the epithet εὐεργέτης could be ascribed to a mortal 'good' person, the latter should and would not be called κύριος and θεός. This is a clear indication, at least deductible from this instance, which Philo considered both the terms κύριος and θεός as suitable terms used to refer to the

Hebrew deity. This is not to infer that Philo shared the same concept when he used the terms κύριος and θεός when referring to the Hebrew deity. Philo makes it clear that both the terms κύριος and θεός are appellations (name, title or designation), the latter which does not necessitate encapsulating the entire essence of the Hebrew deity; even though the term θεός seems to have been the term opted for when referring to the 'overall' essence of such a deity, is meant.

2.5.5   *De Mutatione Nominum*

Interestingly for Philo is that the true and living θεός could not be assigned a name κύριος (*Mut.* 11.1-2). He supports this statement by citing Ex 3:14 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν. According to Philo, the nature of θεός, cannot be named (*Mut.* 11.4). Philo goes further by stating that θεός allows one to use the term κυρίος as a name (*Mut.* 12.3-4). This being is the κύριος ὁ θεός of three natures: a.) instruction, b.) holiness, and c.) practice of virtue. According to Philo the best possible term to refer to such an entity, because his 'proper name' was not revealed (Philo confirms by citing Exod 6:3) and based on his logic, is then κύριος (ch. 13). In section 15 Philo explains how one should understand Gen 17:1 which reads ὤφθη κύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ. The latter is not to say that Abraham saw the cause of all created things, but he was surrounded by kingly power, because the appellation κύριος belongs to authority and sovereignty (*Mut.* 15.6-8). Thus, θεός can be called κύριος and δεσποτής of bad men, but θεός for those in a state of advancement and development (*Mut.* 19). For those who are deemed to be most perfect, is θεός at once θεός and κύριος (*Mut.* 19.3-5). The distinction Philo is drawing appears to be based on virtue or stated differently, positivistic existentialism. The referent becomes a κύριος or δεσποτής and a θεός.

Philo continues with his line of thought by quoting from various Old Testament texts, τάδε λέγει κύριος (Exod 7:17), ἐλάλησε κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν λέγων· ἐγὼ κύριος, λάλησον Φαραὼ βασιλεῖ Αἰγύπτου, ὅσα ἐγὼ λαλῶ πρὸς σε (Exod 6:29), through which he emphasises the dominance of the rule of κύριος in ch. 20. Philo then states that the term κύριος used to address such a being is not spoken of commonly, but it is to affirm that κύριος is the δεσποτής of all things.[152] In *Mut.* 22 Philo states that there is no created κύριος, only an uncreated θεός, the real governor; for the one who despises θεός is therefore the κύριος of the foolish. But for those who *improve*, he is θεός, a statement confirmed with a citation taken from Gen 17:1 and Gen 35:11 - ἐγώ εἰμι θεὸς σός ἐγὼ <ὁ> θεός σου, αὐξάνου καὶ πληθύνου;

---

[152] Philo cites a few texts to strengthen his argument (Gen 7:1; 17:1; Exod 7:17; 6:29; 9:29; 20:2; Deut 4:1).

but for those who are *perfect,* θεός is for those both κύριος and θεός. Philo then confirms the latter by citing from the Decalogue ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός σου (Exod 20:2) and κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν (Deut 4:1). It could thus be inferred from the above extract that the term θεός for Philo refers to the one and only living entity, the Hebrew deity; whereas the term κύριος could be used either negatively or positively, depending on the one using such a term. For the immoral man, the foolish, those yet to comprehend θεός, θεός could be κύριος and δεσποτής, in the generic sense of the word, due to the fact that θεός rules and is master over all. If one is thus in a 'perfect' state, θεός becomes κύριος and θεός at once. Finally, the term κύριος is not the proper name of θεός, but it is the generally accepted term used to 'name' θεός.

2.5.6   Summary

It would be premature to make absolute or final concluding remarks on how Philo conceptualised both the term θεός and κύριος. Philo's conceptualisation process with regard to these terms is neither static nor fully developed. It is clear that his concept is developing and adapting to the themes and issues addressed. What could be inferred with a reasonable amount of certainty is that the term θεός, in the mind of Philo, refers to the one created being, the monotheistic Hebrew deity 'proper'. The term θεός would be the most suitable term for Philo when he intends to call the creator and all encompassing Hebrew deity into mind. The term κύριος on the other hand would be a term not synonymous with the term θεός, in the existential-conceptual sense of the word. Philo would, however, consider the term κύριος to be a suitable term when 'referring' the Hebrew deity as the θεός; but Philo would be opposed to the fact that the κύριος term is a 'name' for the Hebrew deity, while taking into consideration that the potential 'meaning' such a term holds might overlap with the semantic possibilities that the term δεσποτής embraces.

Another significant Jewish thinker would be Josephus, who did not conceptualise as much in comparison to Philo, but the lack thereof will prove to be of importance.

2.6 THE WORKS OF FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS[153]

2.6.1 Introduction

Flavius Josephus (A.D. 37–c.100) was a 1st century Roman-Jewish historian who recorded Jewish history in the Greek language, with special emphasis on the first Jewish war. His work became for Christianity perhaps the most significant extra-biblical writings of the first century. They are the principal sources for the history of the Jews from the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (BCE 17–63) to the fall of Masada in CE 73, and therefore, are of incomparable value for determining the setting of late inter-testamental and New Testament times.[154] Together herewith is the importance and value of Josephus' conceptual interpretation and understanding of terms such as κύριος, θεός and δεσποτής. A computer generated search reveals that the term κύριος appears in eight instances used in seven distinct sections (sections in this case should be regarded as a synonym for chapters). The term θεός, on the other hand, is found in 223 sections occurring 291 times, followed by the term δεσποτής used in 17 instances within 16 distinct sections. The intent with this section of the study is to determine which terms Josephus utilised in reproducing the Hebrew deity, what concepts underlie these terms and how commonly used and accepted were these terms and underlying concepts. The attention will primarily be focused on those sections of texts not only containing the relevant terms, but which were used in a literary-thought context from where one could sufficiently deduce an underlying concept. The first of which is *Antiquitates Judaicae*.

2.6.2 *Antiquitates Judaicae*

In his preface on the Antiquities of the Jews, Josephus states that while teaching others, having Moses in mind, one should first teach that θεός is father and δεσποτής of all things.[155] This concept that θεός is the δεσποτής over all, is confirmed in *Ant.* 1, 2.72,[156] with the phrase: θεὸν ἡγούμενοι δεσπότην εἶναι τῶν ὅλων; while the δεσποτής term is used in *Ant.* 1, 3.102 for mortal men having authority over all living creatures.[157] In *Ant.* 4, 8.202 Josephus

---

[153] For the Greek text of Josephus' work, the online version of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG) was consulted (http://www.tlg.uci.edu/). The translations are my own, with assistance from links to online translations offered by TLG as well as the work of Whiston.

[154] Whiston, W. *The works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.

[155] Philo would share Josephus' concept in this regard.

[156] *Ant.* 2, 270.2 testifies to the term δεσποτής used in a similar as in *Ant.* 1, 2.72.

[157] Cf. *Ant.* 1, 10.189, 190; *Ant.* 2, 11.7, 41.1; 128.2, confirming the 'profane' use of the term δεσποτής.

states that if one blasphemes ὁ θεός, such a person should be stoned to death. Josephus goes further stating that ὁ θεῖος (the deity)[158] - which probably refers to ὁ θεός in its dative case (*Ant.* 4, 8.206) – will not be pleased with an improper sacrifice (*Ant.* 4, 8.206). Interesting is that Josephus also forbids anyone to blaspheme any other θεός, neither should one take away a gift offered to any θεός (*Ant.* 4, 8.207). Regarded the first fruits not being produced during a seasonable time, such fruit is not suitable for θεός nor for the δεσποτής, the latter referring to the owner (ch. 8.226). These fruits however, after the fifth year, belong to κύριος, the latter which also refers to the owner, who may do with the fruit as he pleases (*Ant.* 4, 8.227). Both the κύριος and δεσποτής terms are used interchangeably in *Ant.* 4, 8.281-282 when referring to the owner.[159]

Significant is *Ant.* 5, 121, in which Josephus states that τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Ζεβεκηνῶν Ἀδωνιζεβέκῳ (Andonibezek) τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐπιτρέψαντες· τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τοῦτο σημαίνει Ζεβεκηνῶν κύριος (whose name denotes 'Lord' Bezek) for ἀδωνὶ (Adoni) γὰρ τῇ Ἑβραίων διαλέκτῳ κύριος γίνεται (signifies 'Lord' in the Hebrew dialect). The latter would appear to affirm that אדוני transcribed as ἀδωνὶ would carry the meaning κύριος (that could be translated with 'master', 'lord', 'ruler' or 'owner').[160] The nominative plural form of the term κύριος is used in *Ant.* 8, 8.216 to imply those who can judge – which might be an indication of a ruler concept. In *Ant.* 9, 202 it is said that Joash overthrew the wall of Jerusalem and stole the treasures of θεός becoming κύριος (master) of Jerusalem.[161] Valuable is the cited text taken from Isa 19:19 in *Ant.* 13, 68:

> καὶ γὰρ Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης τοῦτο προεῖπεν· ἔσται θυσιαστήριον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ·

> "because the prophet Isaiah foretold these things: 'there should be an altar
> in Egypt for the κύριος θεός'"

This is the only instance, in the literature assigned to Josephus, where the term κύριος indirectly represents the Tetragram; the MT only reads יהוה translated and represented with

---

[158] Cf. *C. Ap.* 1, 30.2, where the θεός term is used in relation to 'divine' worship. Cf. Fischer's, *ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ,* 135-136, examples as an indication how stringently Josephus avoided the use of the Tetragram.
[159] See Fischer's, *ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ,* valid critique against Brüne B., who was of the opinion that Josephus used the δεσποτής term intentionally as a counter messure against 'God as father' so often used by the Christians, 133-134.
[160] Wutz, Frans. *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus.* Stuttgart: TUVMG, 1933, represent the Hexapla rendition, which transcribes the Tetragram, in many cases, using αδωναι, 146.
[161] Cf. *Ant.* 1, 18.265, for a similar use of the term κύριος, one who has dominion and authority.

κύριος in LXX^{Gött}.[162] It is thus plausible to deduce that Josephus 'added' τῷ θεῷ. It is just as possible to consider a *Vorlage* that read κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ. One could argue, based on Josephus' use of the term θεός that he did not consider the term κύριος in this phrase as an equivalent Greek term representing the Tetragram. The term κύριος should thus rather be considered as the 'inclusion' while the dative use of the term θεός would be the equivalent term for the Tetragram.[163] Another interesting case is found in *Ant.* 20, 75-96 – the crisis of Izates and how θεός delivered him, is narrated here. In *Ant.* 20, 89 it is written that he (Izates) supplicated to θεός (ἔλεγεν κρείσσω τὸν θεόν) and called upon θεός (ἐνήστευεν ἀνακαλῶν τὸν θεὸν) saying:

> εἰ μὴ μάτην, ὦ δέσποτα κύριε, τῆς σῆς ἐγενόμην χρηστότητος, τῶν πάντων δὲ δικαίως μόνον καὶ πρῶτον ἤγημαι κύριον

> "Ὁ κύριος (and) δέσποτα, if I have not committed to your goodness, but only determined that you are the principal and κύριος..."

One could infer from the supplication to θεός and how θεός is addressed, that the concept underlying the θεός term is the monotheistic deity of the Hebrew people, while κύριος and δεσπότης refer to the same entity but with the concept of 'ruler', 'master' and 'lord' in mind.[164]

2.6.3 *De belle Judaico*

Again the term θεός is used when referring to the monotheistic Hebrew deity (*B.J.* 1, 84.1).[165] In *B.J.* 5, 248.3 it is stated that ἐφ᾽ οἷς οὗτος κύριος τῶν ὅλων of which the 1st person personal pronoun οὗτος, together with κύριος, refer to Simon. A similar underlying concept is found with the term κύριος in *B.J.* 11, 134.6 which refers to Καῖσαρ.[166] In *B.J.* 2, 2.7 the term δεσπότης is used to refer to the emperor, who is king and has authority.[167] The term δεσπότης is in turn used in *B.J.* 2, 285.3 when referring to the owner of a piece of land. Moreover and interesting is the use of the δεσπότης term in *B.J.* 1, 207.2. This term is used in relation to an 'absolute' lord, who refers to Antipater.[168] In *B.J.* 11, 350.3 the term δεσπότης

---

[162] 1QIsa^a (column XV) as well as 4QIsa^b (frgs. 10-13) confirms the יהוה reading.

[163] See also the use of the term θεός in *Vita* 1.15; the one that has foresight into the future.

[164] See *Ant.* 1, 272.2; *Ant.* 2, 263.2; *Ant.* 11, 63.7; 228.3; *Ant.* 12, 331.2; 390.7; *Ant.* 14, 162.3; *Ant.* 28, 213.5 for similar meanings assigned to the term δεσπότης, as well as *Ant.* 2, 174.4; 190.3; 193.1; *Ant.* 9, 201.1 for the term κύριος; contra Fischer, *ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ*, 135-136, who is of the opinion, deduced from the works of Josephus, that man should use δεσπότης in the dative case when addressing God.

[165] Cf. *B.J.* 1, 148.6.

[166] Cf. *B.J.* 2, 69.3.

[167] Cf. *B.J.* 1, 202.3; *B.J.* 3, 402.1.

[168] See also *C. Ap.* 2, 209.5 and *C. Ap.* 2, 367.1.

designates a household master. Finally, the term δεσποτής is employed as an epithet of θεός, he who is the true 'lord' of all humankind.

2.6.4   *Contra Apionem*

The term θεός and its underlying concept, appears not to be different in this document, compared to the others. In *C. Ap.* 1, for example, the term θεός is used to refer to both the Hebrew deity (*C. Ap.* 1, 75.2) and to deities in general (*C. Ap.* 1, 76.2).[169] The same could be said for the term κύριος, signifying kingship, being a ruler with authority and dominion (book I 146.3). Josephus furthermore, calls the Romans the κυριοί of the habitable world (*C. Ap.* 2, 41.6). This document also attests to the profane use of the term δεσποτής term in *C. Ap.* 2, 210.4.[170]

2.6.5   **Summary**

Josephus went to great lengths to avoid the use of the term κύριος, probably due to its literary connection with the Tetragram that was made possible by the Greek OT texts.[171] He chose the term θεός if and when he wanted to refer to the monotheistic Hebrew deity. Evident from his avoidance of the term κύριος, it might suggest that such a term, within the Jewish-Hellenistic frame of reference, was a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. Even though, if and when Josephus used the term κύριος, it appears as if he adopted the 'generally accepted' denotation that such a term implies, authority, rule, kingship, being a master; Josephus opted for the term δεσποτής in the majority of cases. The following chapter would also address the literary problem, but from a New Testament text critical perspective. The extent and complexity of the larger literary problem against which the explicit κύριος and θεός citations will be discussed will not be complete without reflecting on the significant text critical variants with regard to the term κύριος and θεός. Attention has been given to the suggested 'transmission' or 'reproduction' problem regarding the terms יהוה, אדני as well as אלהים. Consideration was also given to the so-called 'translation' or 'rendering' problem; the complexity in deciding on the best possible Greek equivalent for these Hebrew terms, especially יהוה and אדני. These literary problems will again come to the fore when the explicit κύριος and θεός citations are dealt with in-depth in chapters 3 and 4.

---

[169] Cf. *C. Ap.* 1, 167.5; 225-227; 237.3. The term θεός is also used when referring to the Egyptian gods (*C. Ap.* 2, 48.4).
[170] Cf. *C. Ap.* 2, 174.4; 241.2.
[171] Cf. Fischer, *ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ,* 138.

CHAPTER 3: EXPLICIT ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ CITATIONS IN THE LITERARY CONCEPTUAL CONTEXT OF ROMANS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The explicit κύριος and θεός citations in the Romans epistle account for eighteen of the twenty-six citations found in the Pauline literature. The primary objective in this chapter will be to determine to what extent the explicit κύριος and θεός citations influenced the immediate literary concept of Paul and *vice versa*. Attention will thus be given to the intertextual influence with regard to conceptual meaning underlying the κύριος and θεός terms, as well as the intratextual impact. The intertextual influence will not be the primary focus, since chapter II was devoted to determining the influence of such. The evidence from the latter as well as the underlying arguments will therefore be referred to, while special attention will be given to the intratextual impact. The first necessary introductory steps would be a.) to relate the Romans epistle to the literary problem formulated in chapter 2, and b.) to establish explicit citations.

3.1.1 Relating Romans to the Literary Problem

How does data discussed in chapter 2 relate and influence the explicit κύριος and θεός citations in the Romans epistle? Eighteen of the twenty-six indentified explicit citations are found in Romans, all sourced from Isaiah, Psalms and the Pentateuch with the exception of three citations; Rom 9:26 is citing content taken from Hos 2:1c-3, Rom 10:13 [Joel 3:5a] and Rom 11:2c-3 [3 Kgdms 19:10]. In answering the question how influential the literary problem would be for the explicit κύριος and θεός citations, one should at least summarise the extent of the problem attested in each source. The tabled summary would form the outline and frame of reference in determining the extent of the sourced influence.

Tabled summary: Literary problem

Isaiah		Psalms		Pentateuch	
Hebrew	**Greek**	**Hebrew**	**Greek**	**Hebrew**	**Greek**
1QIsa[a] אדני / יהוה	LXX[Gött] not = MT	11QPs[a] 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	No manuscript evidence	4QGen-Exod[a] / 4QExod[b] יהוה	P.Ryl 458 Lacuna (either κύριος or יהוה)
4QIsa[c] 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄		11QPs[c] יהוה		4QExod[j] / 2QExod[b] 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	P.Fouad 266 blank space / יהוה
Not = MT		= MT		4QExod-Lev[f] 11QLev[a] 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	4QLXXLev[a] probably κύριος
				4QDeut[k2] 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	4QpapLXXLev[b] ΙΑΩ
					P.Oxy 3522 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄

At first glance the evidence put forward in the table above portrays a somewhat grim picture; three crucial aspects come to the fore. The first is the obvious limited evidence in terms of the Greek OT manuscripts. Even though one could make some preliminary suggestions, any attempt to make a conclusive assumption based on the limited and scattered evidence would prove to be futile. The Greek manuscripts investigated are the only available Greek manuscripts which do not seem to show Christian contamination. Secondly, the translation of the Greek OT is not, to say the least, rooted in a unified and standardised Hebrew text, especially with regard to the Tetragram and the 'naming' of the Hebrew deity. Although square Hebrew characters were used, for the most part, as a reproduction of the Tetragram, the evidence shows numerous variations and alternatives–especially when one includes the so-called non-biblical manuscripts. Therefore, making unqualified claims that the term κύριος was considered to be the suitable Greek equivalent for the Tetragram, or that the term θεός was regarded as the most suitable Greek term for אלהים would be irresponsible. Finally, the MT (as represented by the BHS) and the Greek OT text (best represented by the critical Göttingen edition) in comparison does show several discrepancies and deviations from the so-called 'rule of thumb.' The explicit κύριος and θεός citations are thus rooted in a complex literary environment demonstrating multifaceted problems with no immediate solutions on the horizon. The ultimate effect on the explicit κύριος and θεός citations due to the limited

availability of Greek manuscripts, is that one is forced, for the most part, to rely on critical eclectic text editions, such as the LXX[Gött] constructed from manuscripts and codices that originated from within the Christian tradition.[1] The latter is evident from the contracted or abbreviated forms of the terms κύριος and θεός, among many others, signifying its sacred character.[2] The most responsible manner in which one should deal with these citations is, a.) to establish each explicit citation with a reasonable amount of certainty, while b.) determining the most plausible text reading of the citations within, c.) its immediate literary context or literary conceptual context. This would at least ensure a plausible setting from where one could determine with a credible amount of certainty to what extent these citations influenced the underlying concept of the Greek equivalents for the Hebrew deity in the mind of Paul. The first necessary step would thus be to establish the explicit citations.

3.2 ESTABLISHING THE EXPLICIT CITATIONS

3.2.1   Citations with Introductory Formulae

There are citation markers, so to speak, assisting one in determining if a certain text can be classified as a citation. One such marker is the so-called introductory formula,[3] which is a phrase or word within a text that clearly distinguishes the content it introduces as a citation. Below is a list of such formulae present in the Pauline literature in which the citation under discussion here has been grouped.[4]

καθὼς γέγραπται	γέγραπται γάρ	ἡ γραφη λεγει	γέγραπται γάρ / ὅτι λέγει κύριος
Rom 2:24	Rom 14:11a	Rom 4:3	Rom 12:19
Rom 3:11,18	Rom 14:11b	Rom 10:13	1 Cor 14:21
Rom 11:8	1 Cor 3:20		
Rom 15:9, 11			

---

[1] The key argument in considering the available Greek OT text witnesses as being Christian in origin is the practise referred to as the *nomica sacra,* cf. Hurtado, L. "The Origin of the Nomina Sacra: A Proposal." *JBL* 117.4 ,(1998), 655-673, 658.

[2] Cf. Hurtado, "The Origin," 655.

[3] Koch, *Schift,* 13-20, lists six other markers that are of importance and value if and when content are to be qualified as an explicit citation.

[4] Cf. Koch's, *Schrift,* 25-32, discussion on the introductory formulae.

	1 Cor 1:31				
	1 Cor 2:9				
Δαυὶδ λέγει	ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει	Ἠσαΐας δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ	καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἠσαΐας	Ἠσαΐας γὰρ λέγει	ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή
Rom 4:8	Rom 9:26	Rom 9:28	Rom 9:29	Rom 10:16	Rom 11:3

A concordance search indicates twenty six instances in the New Testament (NT) where the introductory formula καθὼς γέγραπται has been used, nineteen of these appear in the Pauline literature. The introductory formulae γέγραπται γάρ, or γέγραπται without the conjunction, is also a popular formula utilised by Paul. Peculiar is the formula λέγει κύριος that trails the cited content in combination with γέγραπται γάρ as an introduction formula in Rom 12:19 as well as in 1 Cor 14:21. The phrase ἡ γραφὴ λέγει is not used that often – of the nine occurrences and variations thereof in the NT, five can be assigned to the Pauline literature. The remaining introductory formulae, especially those in Rom 9:26-29, are uniquely Pauline. The five citations (Rom 11:34, 1 Cor 2:16, 1 Cor 10:26 and 2 Cor 3:16), identified as explicit in nature, are not introduced with a formula defining it as such. Thus, some remarks regarding these are necessary.

3.3 EXPLICIT CITATIONS *WITHOUT* INTRODUCTORY FORMULAE

3.3.1   Romans 11:34 and 1 Corinthians 2:16

Rom 11:34	1 Cor 2:16	Is 40:13
τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου;	τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου,	τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου,
ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ	ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;	καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος
ἐγένετο;	ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν.	ἐγένετο, ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν;

The reason why the content of these two references (Rom 11:34 and 1 Cor 2:16) have been grouped as part of the explicit citations, is because the content-match-ratio is more than 80%[5] and secondly, there are two dissimilar references to the content from the same corpus, emphasising the fact that a definite Greek *Vorlage* could be assumed, even though they might have varied from one another. Finally, these phrases do not appear in any other Greek constructed Old Testament text, which strengthens the assumption that the content was not just taken from memory based on a random text. It is plausible to assume that Rom 11:34 and 1 Cor 2:16 reflect a certain wording that resembles Isa 40:13[LXX]. Koch is of the opinion that if the word order under question deviates noticeably from the stylistic content within its immediate literary context, one could regard such a phrase as an explicit citation.[6] He referred to Rom 11:34 and 1 Cor 10:26 in this particular case, but it is suggested that 1 Cor 2:16 be included here.

3.3.2 1 Corinthians 10:26

In 1 Cor 10:25 reads: Πᾶν τὸ ἐν μακέλλῳ πωλούμενον ἐσθίετε μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν· ending with a semi-colon. The phrase to follow: τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς (1 Cor 10:26) is a genitive clause of origin and relationship,[7] which appears to be logically cohering with the preceding phrase, although the stylistic nature of the phrase deviates from the remaining sections of the text. This genitive clause seems to interlace seamlessly with the content of 1 Cor 10:25, making it extremely difficult to determine for both reader and or hearer whether the content to follow is indeed a quoted content or not. However, one could say with a comfortable amount of certainty that the phrase in 1 Cor 10:26 taken from Ps 23:1a, would have been noticed and regarded as nothing other than cited content, even with its seamless integration into a literary context.

3.3.3 2 Corinthians 3:16

The text reads (2 Cor 3:15) ἀλλ᾽ ἕως σήμερον (but until today), ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωϋσῆς (whenever Moses reads), κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται· (a veil covers their hearts). After which the author interprets the latter by citing content from Exod 34.34a: ἡνίκα δὲ ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα. The connecting words ἡνίκα,

---

[5] See also Koch, *Schrift,* who makes it clear that a cited text without a clearly defined introductory formula could be regarded as a citation if the text is syntactically not in accordance with the broader context and the reader is able to realise that the text does not form part of the actual context, 13.

[6] Koch, *Schrift,* present Rom 11:34 as an example, 14.

[7] Blass, F., Debrunner, A., & Funk, R. W. "(A) The Adnominal Genitive – 162. Genitive of Origin and Relationship." *BDF*, 89-90.

τὸ κάλυμμα and περιαιρεῖται (the opposite of κεῖται) ensures the effectiveness in recognising the cited content.[8] For the interim, the identified explicit κύριος and θεός citations have been established and confirmed. With the explicit citations established and confirmed, the focus will now shift to each explicit citation.

3.4 ESTABLISHING THE ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ TEXT IN ROMANS

3.4.1 Romans 1

The introduction to this letter is characterised by the typical formulae and phrases expected with the opening of an epistle.[9] The phrase εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ (Rom 1:1), which forms part of the introduction of the epistle, is not typically used within the opening phrases. [10] This grammatical phrase appears only twice in the New Testament text and does not form part of the Pauline literature. The first is found in Mk 1:14 where Jesus, after arriving in Galilee, proclaimed the 'good news' of θεός. The second instance is found in 1 Pet 4:17, which revolves around the judgement of the house of θεός and the implications when the 'good news' of θεός is not adhered to.[11] Another interesting introductory phrase is περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, of which similar phrases are present in Jh 7:42 and 2 Tim 2:8. For the author of the Johannine gospel the scriptures foretold that χριστός will be a descendant from David, being born in the village Bethlehem. Paul would be in agreement with this when he states that the holy scriptures foretold, through the prophets, that the son of αὐτοῦ (which would be referring to the term θεός in Rm 1:1) will be born as descended from David, according to the flesh (Rom 1:2-3). What the scriptures prognosticated, for Paul, is the εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ. In comparison to the Timothy account, the fact that Jesus Christ is a descendant from David is not rooted in the scriptures *per se*, but it is considered as κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου; the first person pronoun which, in this instance, implies Paul. The idea that the proclamation about Jesus as the χριστός, as being the good

---

[8] Koch, *Schrift,* argues that the interpretation that follows in 1 Cor 3:17 indicates that 2 Cor 3:16 might present a cited text, 13.

[9] Schlier, H. *Der Römerbrief.* HThK 6/3; Freiburg: Herder, 1987, 17.

[10] Cf. Dunn, James D. G. *Romans 1-8.* WBC vol. 38a; Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 11.

[11] Wilckens, U. *Der Brief an der Römer.* EKK 6/1; Zürich: Benziger and Neukirchener Verlag, 1973 suggests that εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ is employed in two ways: 1.) through the relative clause in Rm 1:2, and b.) by the content of the v. 3f that does not belong to v. 2, 56; Käsemann, E. *Commentary on Romans.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: SCM Press Ltd, 1980 refers to the Calendar inscription from Priene (dated to circa 9 BCE). This inscription, according to Käsemann, does not sufficiently explain the absolute and technical use of εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ in the NT, 7.

news Paul is decreeing, is not foreign to Paul.[12] What would be foreign, is ὑπακούειν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ,[13] in that τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ is implied with τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ. There should be little doubt that for Paul the declaration that Jesus as κύριος and χριστός has been raised from the dead, is the εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ.[14] Jesus would thus be, according to Paul, the predetermined son of θεός (Rom 1:4). The latter concept is therefore associated to both the phrase in Rom 1:4c (ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν), as well as Rom 1:3 (περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα).[15]

The standard technical phrase χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is undisputed of course. This particular phrase confirms the fact that Paul conceptually regarded the term θεός as referring to an entity separate from Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος. The mediating character of Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος is also introduced in, but not limited to, Rom 1:8;[16] the concept of directing thanks towards θεός is, furthermore, not something new to Paul.[17] The remaining part of ch. 1 is entirely dominated by the term θεός as the primary acting agent, through whom Paul initiates concepts such as the will of θεός (Rom 1:10); the anger of θεός (Rom 1:18); the truth of θεός (Rom 1:25) and θεός as the one that provides or delivers (Rom 1:26-27).

3.4.2   Romans 2

3.4.2.1   *Romans 2:24*

There seems to be no obvious text critical issue attested in Rom 2:24. However, if the text is closely scrutinised with a comparison between the immediate thought-structures of both the source[18] (Isa 52:5c) and target texts (Rom 2:24) such a view rapidly changes. It becomes apparent that the former clearly shows that the 2nd person personal pronoun μου in the phrase δι᾿ ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν refers to κύριος (τάδε λέγει

---

[12] Cf. Rom 2:16; Rom 16:25 for the use of εὐαγγέλιόν μου and 2 Cor 4:3; 1 Thess 1:5 for the use of εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν.

[13] Cf. 2 Thess 1:8.

[14] Cf. Rom 15:16; 2 Cor 11:7; 1 Thess 2:2; 1 Thess 2:8; 1 Thess 2:9.

[15] Cf. Michel, O. *Römerbrief.* KEK 4/14; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, 70. See also the excursion on Apostleship and the gospel, 70-72. The association of the concept in Rm 1:4 with Rm 1:2 and Rm 1:3 remains valid, even though Rm 1:3ff is considered pre-Pauline material, Michel, *Römerbrief,* 72-73; see also Schlier, *Der Römerbrief,* 23-27.

[16] Cf. Rom 5:21; Rom 7:25; Rom 6:27; Gal 1:1; Phil 1:11; 1 Thess 4:14

[17] Cf. Rom 14:6; 1 Cor 1:4; 1 Cor 1:14; 1 Cor 14:18; Phil 1:3-6; 1 Th 1:2-4; 1 Th 2:3; Phlm 4-5.

[18] With source text is meant any Greek version of the Old Testament Hebrew text. This study utilised both the Ralhfs and Göttingen eclectic texts (also referred to as the LXX), together with other Greek manuscripts reflecting content from the Old Testament.

κύριος), associating βλασφημεῖται indirectly with κύριος; while in the latter text (Rom 2:24) βλασφημεῖται is associated with θεός (ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ). The term κύριος in Isa 52:5c, in turn, correlates with its Hebrew counterpart[19]-if the general consensus that the latter term is the Greek equivalent for the Tetragram is accepted.

Literary comparison (Rom 2:24 and Isa 52:5c)		
NA 27 (Rom 2:24)	LXX[Gött] (Isa 52:5c)	MT[BHS] (Isa 52:5c)
	τάδε λέγει **κύριος**.[20]	נְאֻם־יְהֹוָה
τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ **θεοῦ**	δἰ ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς	
δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται	τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται	שְׁמִי מִנֹּאָץ
ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,	ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι	וְתָמִיד כָּל־הַיּוֹם
καθὼς γέγραπται.		

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES				HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES			
NT		OT		OT			
𝔓[46]	ℵ, A, B	A B Q S V	'a	1QIsa[a]	4QIsa[c21]	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
-	θυ	μου (κς)	ΠΙΠΙ	יהוה	דוﬡד	יהוה	יהוה

The textual evidence seems to be suggesting that the earliest Jewish text witnesses attest to the Tetragram (יהוה), whereas κύριος and θεός, or rather the *nomina sacra* of these terms, are represented in the Christian tradition. The Greek OT text witnesses appear to be in agreement on this matter. Traces of a possible separate Jewish-Hellenistic tradition can be found in the *Anonymous dialogues cum Judaeis* [Scripta Anonyma Adversus Judaeos], (ch. 13.68-69) which reads the term δέσποτής in this instance, which is also characteristic of Josephus' work as opposed to implementing the term κύριος.[22] The evidence thus suggests that the underlying

---

[19] The enigma and complexity surrounding the Tetragram and the 'naming' of the Hebrew God cannot be avoided when dealing with the issue at hand.

[20] The Aquila recension offers an alternative reading ΠΙΠΙ within the phrase και νυν το μοι ωδε φησι πιπι presented by codex Marchalianus. This is a clear indication of the intent to follow the Hebrew, without the proper background knowledge to do so.

[21] This manuscript only accounts for Isa 52:10 - Isa 53:3. The manuscript dominately applied דוﬡד for the Tetragram, from where one could infer that it would have been the case with Isa 52:5.

[22] See for example Josephus, *Ant* 1 ch. 20 line 4 (δέσποτής ὁ θεὸς); *B.J. Book* II section 3 line 1 (διαθήκας τῶν ὅλων δεσπότης); *Vita* section 346 line 5 (πρὸς τοὺς δεσπότας), to mention only three.

theological issue pivots on an ancient theological significant problem, namely the blasphemy of the Hebrew deities' 'name', the Tetragram. If then the issue of blasphemy revolves around the Tetragram,[23] and the term θεός is regarded as the commonly accepted Greek representation of אלהים, then the phrase τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ in Rom 2:24 would not, from a Jewish-religious point of view, make sense. How should one then comprehend the implementation of τοῦ θεοῦ in terms of blasphemy in Rom 2:24? It is possible that both the term θεός and κύριος, at the time of Paul, were accepted, used and thus conceptualised as suitable terms in 'naming' the Hebrew deity; the latter would weaken the thrust of the literary-theological problem. If both these terms were accepted suitable Greek equivalents for 'naming' the Hebrew deity, then it would not have been a problem using them interchangeably.[24] One would still have to account for the fact that the Hebrew concept of blaspheming the 'name' of their deity related to the Tetragram, the latter of which, among scholarship in general, is not well represented in the Greek text with the utilisation of the term θεός. This evidently makes Paul's use of the term θεός problematic. It is thus necessary to determine whether this was a theological conceptual shift in the minds of early Christian thinkers, an alternative text tradition, or merely a concept coined by Paul.[25]

Although no text-critical evidence exists to suggest a different text *Vorlage*, this possibility should not be ruled out. Howard would argue that the use of the term θεός had to be due to the practise of replacing the Tetragram in the Greek Old Testament with terms such as κύριος and θεός, which in turn, spilled over into the New Testament.[26] Howard could be correct in stating that both the κύριος and θεός terms were used as substitutes for the Tetragram.[27] The core issue is to establish practically how Paul dealt with the Isaiah scroll which was at his disposal. Did he quote the content of Isa 52:5c from memory or did he use a physical Isaiah scroll as a reference? Was he reminded by a phrase, thought, or concept after which he consulted his text and reworked it on a 'wax note pad', altering the Greek text while ignoring the Hebrew counterpart, which he might have known well, at least the topic

---

[23] Cf. Exod 20:7 using יהוה with regard to blasphemy, who is אלהים.

[24] Cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 87, suggests that Paul was conscious of the fact that whenever he explicitly cited an Old Testament text containing the κύριος term, the יהוה and therefore the Hebrew deity (Koch uses "Gott").

[25] Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* 85-86, assigns this change to a Pauline adaptation.

[26] Howard, G. "The Tetragram and the New Testament." *JBL* 96.1, (1978), 63-83, 77; cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 143, who suggests that Paul opted for the 2nd person personal pronoun, the latter which implies θεός, ensuring a literary link with Rom 2:23, 143; cf. Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* 86; cf. Wilk, *Die Bedeutung,* 391, interprets the citation as Paul's attempt to indicate the universal character of sin, the latter which includes the Jews. Shum, *Paul's use,* 178, suggests that the implementation of the 2nd person personal pronoun is due to the fact that the κύριος term is almost exclusively used for Jesus as the χριστός.

[27] Howard, "Tetragram," 77.

surrounding the blasphemy of the name of the Hebrew deity. More likely however, is the possibility that the cited phrase was reworked to suit Paul's theological paradigm.[28]

The Hebrew as well as the Greek text tradition of text reference Isa 52:5c reads יהוה and κς respectively (with the exception of ΠΙΠΙ), while the Greek text tradition of the text reference Rom 2:24 reads θυ. There are thus four distinct terms, if one includes δέσποτής, implemented as reference to the 'one' who's name is blasphemed.

~ A translation and theological conceptual problem ~

The evidence appears to be relatively clear: Paul deviates from Isa 52:5c.[29] He seems not to be interested in the immediate literary context of his source text (Isa 52-53), nor does he appear to be interested in the theme addressed in Isaiah 52-53.[30] What is of value to Paul is that the Jews are dishonouring θεός by boasting in the law (Rom 2:23). He then used Isα 52:5c as support for his argument, well aware of the literary context it was taken from; an eminent 'positive' and 'uplifting' approach towards the Jews in captivity. Paul then interpreted the blasphemy of κύριος (Isa 52:5c) in such a way that they, the Jews, are portrayed as the ones causing the blasphemy.[31] The question still remains, why did Paul conceptually deal with the blasphemy theme in relation to θεός and not κύριος, if κύριος was

---

[28] Lindörer, M. "Das Schriftgemässe Evangelium des Paulus nach dem Zeugnis des Römerbrief – Funktionalität und Legitimität des Römerbriefes." Ph.D. diss., University of South Africa, 2006, would concur that the change from the personal pronoun μου to τοῦ θεοῦ should be assigned to Paul, 239.

[29] Cf. Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* 85-86; Wilk, *Die Bedeutung,* 18; 49.

[30] Contra Wagner, *Herhalds of the Good News,* 176-178. Wagner is of the opinion that Paul is not only aware of the literary context underlying Isa 52:1-10, but he (Paul) appears to be influenced by the 'original' setting of both Isa 52:5c as well as Isa 52:7; cf. Moyise, S. "Quotations." Pages 15-28 in *As it is Written – Studying Pauls use of Scripture.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008. Moyise concurs with Hays' opinion that Paul had indeed respected the context of Is 52 and the implementation of such a text, in this case Isa 52:5. The citation and its source context could only be understood from multiple readings of the text, 23. Fisk, Bruce N. "Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge among the Christians of Rome." Pages 157-185 in *As it is Written – Studying Pauls use of Scripture.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008, on the other hand affirms that Paul diverges to a great extent from the context of Isaiah 52, forcing one not to assume that he was engaging his audience on the level of biblical exegesis, 158.

[31] Cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 105, who indicates that Paul connects the citation taken from Isa 52:5c with Rom 2:23 to such an extent, that he (Paul) even postponed the introductory formula to be read at the end of the verse. Koch furthermore suggests that by introducing the verse with τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ Paul has successfully increased the importance of the content that follows, 105; see also Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* 85 and Wilk, *Die Bedeutung,* 231. It is generally accepted by scholars that Paul interprets the blasphemy of 'God' by the Jews as disobeying the law (Rom 2:23), cf. Schlier, *Der Romerbrief,* 87; Wilckens, *Der Brief,* 150 and Lohse, E. *Der Brief an die Römer.* KEK 4/15; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003, 112. Malina, B. J and Pilch, J. J. *Letters of Paul – Social-Scientific Commentary.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006, formulates it as follows: "That non-Iraelites dishonour the person of the God of Israel is due to Israelites living among non-Israelites. It is those Israelites living among non-Israelities who have been Paul's target audience of the innovation he proclaimed, 235.

the 'accepted' Greek equivalent for the Tetragram? The crux of Paul's intent with the cited content in particular, but not limited to, is found in Rom 2:9-11 and Rom 3:27-31.[32]

Chapter 2

9 θλῖψις καὶ στενοχωρία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνος·	Hope and distress is upon every living human to achieve evil, first the Jews and then the Greek;
10 δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι·	Glory and Honour and Peace is the outcome for whom does good, first the Jews and then the Greeks:
11 οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωπολημψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.	Because favouritism is not found with *Theos*

Chapter 3

27 Ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις; ἐξεκλείσθη. διὰ ποίου νόμου; τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί, ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως.	How then should one boast? By excluding through what type of law? Through works? No, rather through the law of faith.
28 λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου.	A man who believes is considered righteous separately from the works of the law
29 ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν,	Is *Theos* only for the Jews? And not for the Gentiles? Indeed also for the Gentiles
30 εἴπερ εἷς ὁ θεὸς ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως.	If indeed firstly *Theos*, does show justice for circumcision out of faith and uncircumcised through faith
31 νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ νόμον ἱστάνομεν.	Thus, do we regard the law of no value through faith? Although we stand by the law.

This is the literary platform from where Paul is constructing his argument, the fact that both Jew and Greek are viewed by θεός as being equal. Paul considers θεός to be the righteous, tolerant, powerful, glorified Judge; the beholder of truth, who delivers his verdict; both Jew

---

[32] Vegge, T. *Paulus und das antike schulwesen – Schule und Bildung des Paulus.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006, suggests that Paul relied on his early Pharisaic training when he utilised the model for a fictional dialogue character in Rom 2:17-29, 491.

and Greek are equal. Boasting in the law, according to Paul, excludes people.[33] Ironically Paul is using the very scripture the Jews boast about knowing so well, hence through which they perceived themselves as not being equal with others, against them.[34] The law for Paul appears to be a dividing factor, rather than a uniting subject. Faith, on the other hand is the unifying element planned by θεός (Rom 3:30). Even though the nature of the source context for the Isaiah text appears to be positive and optimistic, the opposite is being reflected in the cited content. Clearly Paul is not allowing his *Vorlage* to dictate to him; he does however implement scripture to serve the purpose of his argument. Moreover, Paul intentionally employed the term θεός to emphasise the cosmic, general (in the sense of accessibility and dominion) and universal character of θεός.[35] The term κύριος would not have had the same impact, presumably due to its possible profane use or that it was indeed an accepted and conscious Greek equivalent for the Tetragram, which might have had an 'exclusive' Jewish resonance to it. Paul required a term that would call a deity into being that both Jew and Greek could relate to, while attaching a more universal character to the monotheistic Hebrew deity. The term θεός, in both Ps 13:2c and Ps 35:2b (cited in Rom 3:11 and 3:18 respectively), suited Paul's objective well, while the term κύριος in Isa 52:5c, for Paul, would have had a reverse impact on his argumentation.

It appears as if Paul's argument gained more than it lost with the conceptual shift from κύριος towards θεός. He disregarded the fact that the concept of blasphemy is to a great extent connected to the Tetragram, while the term κύριος transferred the blasphemy concept better than the term θεός. It seems as if Paul got away with this by ignoring the blasphemy as a dominant theme on the one hand, and by primarily using the term θεός, in the literary conceptual context, on the other hand. It would be premature at this point to say with certainty, but θεός might have been the more 'accepted' Greek term for the 'personal' Hebrew deity in which the essence of אלהים and יהוה culminated. Nevertheless, it is the opinion held here, that Paul's *Vorlage* (Isa 52:5c) did read the term κύριος. He intentionally altered the term to read θεός, the latter which suited his objective best. Based on the evidence at hand one could with a reasonable amount of certainty assert that in this case,[36] the cited

---

[33] Rom 3:27 speaks boasting as excluded.

[34] Michel, *Römerbrief*, 131-132 confirms Paul's reworking of the citation, has the effect of increasing the theological weight of the content; while καθως γεγραπται emphasises the authority of the content of the citation; cf. Ridderbos, H. *Aan de Romeinen*. Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament; Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959, 66, with regard to Paul's reversed deployment of Isa 52:5c. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief*, 87; Wilckens, *Die Römer,* 150. Schmithals, W. *Der Römerbrief - Ein Kommentar*. Gütersloh, 1988, comments that Rom 2:24 is the climax and third section of his Synogogue sermon (Rom 2:17-24), 98.

[35] Cf. Wilk, *Die Bedeutung,* 391.

[36] Which is most likely also true for the cited text in Rom 3:11 (Ps 13:2c) and Rom 3:18 (Ps 35:2b).

content was integrated into the target context with the primary objective to support Paul's concept of θεός as the Hebrew deity, accessible not only to Jews but also to Greeks.

3.4.3 ROMANS 3

3.4.3.1 *Romans 3:11 and Romans 3:18*

Both these verses contain explicit citations reflecting content from Ps 13:2b and Ps 35:2 respectively. Rom 3:11 reflects, among others, content from Ps 13:2b reading ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν with its Hebrew counterpart reading דֹּרֵשׁ אֶת־אֱלֹהִים. Rom 3:18, in turn, mirrors content from Ps 35:2b, which reads οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ, assumable with אֵין־פַּחַד אֱלֹהִים as its Hebrew counterpart.[37] This clearly shows that the 'traditional' and generally accepted view that the term θεός is the Greek counterpart for אלהים appears to be intact. The term θεός in Rom 3:11 and Rm 3:18 also slots in well within the target context in which the term θεός is the dominating acting agent; seemingly utilised without any immediate theological-relatedness, other than the appearance of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Rom 3:22 and Rm 3:24. In both these cases, justification by θεός is through faith and redemption in Jesus as the Χριστός respectively.

Literary comparison (Rom 3:11 and Ps 13:2/14:2)		
NA[27] (Rom 3:11)	LXX[Gött] (Ps 13:2b)	MT[BHS] (Ps 14:2)
	κύριος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ διέκυψεν	**יְהוָה** מִשָּׁמַיִם הִשְׁקִיף
	ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦ ἰδεῖν	עַל־בְּנֵי־אָדָם לִרְאוֹת
		הֲיֵשׁ מַשְׂכִּיל דֹּרֵשׁ **אֶת־אֱלֹהִים**:
οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν **τὸν θεόν**	εἰ ἔστιν συνίων ἢ ἐκζητῶν **τὸν θεόν**	

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		OT	OT	
𝔓[46]	ℵ, A, B	A B S[OT]	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
	θν	θν	אלהים	אלהים

---

[37] Koch, *Schrift,* 182, is of the opinion that a *Florilegium* (a compilation of excerpts from other writings) in Rm 3:10-18 is not plausible, neither does the passage, and changes thereof, indicate that Paul is following a transmitted *Überlieferung*. For him this distinct passage should not be considered as coincidence, but rather a well planned and structured portion of litetature, 183; Lindörfer, "Das Schriftgemässe," presents the arguments for and against a pre-Pauline composition, 242-243; see also Schlier, *Der Romerbrief,* 99. For Lohse, *Der Brief,* the citation is reproduced freely and in a shorter form, 123.

Literary comparison (Rom 3:18 and Ps 35:2/36:2)

NA^{27th} (Rom 3:18)	LXX^{Gött} (Ps 35:2b)	MT^{BHS} (Ps 36:2)
	Φησὶν ὁ παράνομος τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ,	נְאֻם־פֶּשַׁע לָרָשָׁע בְּקֶרֶב לִבֵּי
οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος **θεοῦ**	οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος **θεοῦ**	אֵין־פַּחַד **אֱלֹהִים**
ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.	ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ·	לְנֶגֶד עֵינָיו:

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES				HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		OT		OT	
$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	א, A, B	A B S	55	Cod^{Len}	Cod^{Alep}
-	θυ	θυ	κυ	אלהים	אלהים

The text critical notes presented by the NA^{27} do not provide any evidence beneficial to this particular discussion. The LXX^{Gött} does not present that much either, only that a Coptic papyrus (U) dated to the 7th century, assigned a definite article preceding the term κύριος. This is true for all the papyri excluding minuscule 1221. The MT, in turn, points out that Ps 53:5 (a replica of 14:2) implemented אלהים in comparison to the יהוה in Ps 14:2a, while Ps 52:3^{LXX} reads the 'expected' term θεός. The implementation of the different terms when both the Greek and Hebrew versions of Ps 13:2^{LXX} (Ps 14:2^{MT}) and Ps 52:3^{LXX} (Ps 53:3^{MT}) are compared, indicates that אלהים and יהוה were interchangeable, at least in this instance. The dissimilarity between the content of Rom 3:11 and Ps 13:2b requires some reflection; Rm 3:10a assigns what is to follow to scripture, with Rom 3:10b reading οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς (he is not righteous, no one is) followed by Rom 3:11a οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων (the one comprehending, does not exist) as well as οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν (the one seeking *Theos*, does not exist). Psalm 13:2a suggests that κύριος broke through heaven upon sons of man, to see if he comprehends (τοῦ ἰδεῖν εἰ ἔστιν συνίων) and if he seeks θεός (ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν). The author of the Psalms ensured that the emphasis is centred on Ps 13:3; while Paul distributed the emphasis equally between both δίκαιος, ὁ συνίων and ὁ ἐκζητῶν, made possible by οὐκ ἔστιν.[38] Apart from the shift in emphasis, it seems as if both the Greek and

---

[38] See Metzger's *A Textual Commentary,* note on οὐκ ἔστιν (Rom 3:12), 448-449. Schlier, *Römerbrief,* states that Rom 3:10 has not originated with Paul, while referring to 1QH IX 14f as well as 1QH IV 29f; 1QH VII 17;

Hebrew eclectic texts traditions are intact, with the exception of one OT minuscule[39] reading κυ (Ps 35:2). There are thus, with regard to the term θεός, no immanent literary problems or issues that present itself.

Both these citations, which attest to the term θεός, would blend in well with its immediate literary context, leaving not much room for theological or Christological scrutiny. These citations would play a vital role when terms such as χριστός and Ἰησοῦς are considered within a dominate θεός literary conceptual context.

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

The use of the term θεός in Rom 3:11 and Rom 3:18 suited Paul's implementation of the more controversial term θεός in Rom 2:24 well. This chapter (Rom 3) is introduced with the concept ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ (they believed in the oracles of θεός – Rom 3:2), followed by τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ (faith in θεός – Rom 3:3). The term θεός also refers to the one who is truthful, with the unrighteous associated with θεός as being righteous (Rom 3:5). The rhetorical question, μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν (isn't θεός unjust if he who is angry about 'our' nature?). The answer to the rhetorical question is given, while stating that it is θεός that will judge the world (Rom 3:6); moreover, the concept of θεός' truth is mentioned in Rom 3:7. This literary conceptual context leads up to the cited content in Rm 3:11 and Rom 3:18; both of which seamlessly integrate with the θεός concepts already introduced. Most of these concepts are repeated in Rom 3:19, 21, 26 and 30. The concept that

---

1QH XII 311f, 99. For Schlier, righteousness is not only a focal issue Paul deals with there, but is for Paul the sum of everything; cf. Michel, *Römerbrief,* 142-143. Hays, *Echoes,* regards the quotations in Rom 3:10-18 as a powerful rhetorical warrant, 50; cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 179, with regard to the rhetorical value of οὐκ ἔστιν and Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* 91. For a detailed investigation on the possibility of a *vorpaulinsche Herkunft*, see Koch, *Schrift,* 180-184. Koch states that Rom 3:10-18 is, if not anything else, a planned composition, composed by Paul which, considered within Romans as a whole, does not appear to be that out of the ordinary, 185-186; cf. Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* 88-89 and Watson, F. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith.* Londen: T & T Clark, 2004, 58. Contra Dunn, *Romans 1-8,* who suggests that the catena of scriptural passages attested in Rom 3:10-18 can be compared to contemporary parallels such as CD 5:13-17 and 4 Ezra 7:22-24, 145; see Woyke's, *Götter,* response to Scott's conclusion in this regard, 291-292. According to Keener, C. S. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament.* Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1993, Rom 3:9-19 (Proof of Scripture), indicates that the proof texts in Rom 3:10-18 are similar to the rabbinic principles of *gezerah shavah* (rules of Jewish hermeneutcis), 420. For Porter, S. E., "Paul and his Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel." Pages 97-124 in *As it is Written – Studying Pauls use of Scripture.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008, it is clear that Paul had to have a Psalm scroll at his disposal when he composed Rom 3:10-18, 123. Michel, *Römerbrief,* states that Codex B[LXX] adopted the Pauline text, Ps 14:1-3 (Rom 3:12) ουκ εστιν δικαιος ουδε εις and ουκ εστιν φοβος θεου… (Rom 3:18) so that they function respectively as *Uberschrift* and *Resultat*, 143.
[39] Mss. 55.

θεός is not limited to Jewish people (Rom 3:29), hence everyone should be punished by him (Rom 3:19), are central theological themes.[40]

The cited content, reflecting Ps 32:2b and Ps 35:2b, continues on the same line of thought, which is a plausible indication that Paul dealt with these texts extensively. It is no coincidence that the cited content reads that no one seeks (Rom 3:11) and fears θεός (Rom 3:18). These passages have been hand-picked by Paul, while ignoring Ps 13:2a κύριος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ διέκυψεν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,[41] in support for his justification-righteous argument as well as his theological concept that θεός is the only one capable of considering one righteous. In addition to the latter, this is made possible through Jesus as the χριστός (Rom 3:22 and Rom 3:24).[42] The affiliation between θεός and Jesus as the χριστός is one of righteous θεός mediating through faith in Jesus as χριστός. The conceptual context in chapter three thus confirms why it was of utmost importance for Paul to employ the term θεός in Rm 2:24. The well thought-through Rom 3:10-18 composition, with its admirable rhetorical thrust, especially visible in Rom 3:10-11 and Rom 3:18, suits Paul's *theo*-logie extremely well. The literary conceptual context attested in Rom 1:1 – 3:31 demanded a 'universal' deity; a deity accessible for both Jew and Gentile, one whom the term θεός calls to mind.

3.4.4   ROMANS 4

3.4.4.1   *Romans 4:3*

The text witnesses for both the NT as well as the Greek OT, including Philo who also quotes content that resembles Gen 15:6[LXX], all read Τω θω with an overwhelming amount of manuscripts supporting such reading.[43] The parallel NT references Gal 3:6 and Jas 2:23, both read τῷ θεῷ with their respective manuscript support intact. The Hebrew equivalent reads יהוה with no text critical data to prove otherwise. The text critical evidence for and against various readings is presented in table below.

---

[40] Klumbies, Paul-Gerhard's remark in "Der Eine Gott des Paulus - Röm 3,21-31 als Brennpunkt paulinischer Theo-logie." *ZNW* 85 3/4 (1994), 192-206, that the 'one' God concept forms the Continuum between the Old and New Testament; would suit this literary context well, even though his investigation focused on Rom 3:21-31, 192; see also the discussion on Rom 3:10-20 in Keesmaat, Sylvia C. "The Psalms in Romans and Galatians." Pages 139-162 in *The Psalms in the New Testament.* Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

[41] The term κύριος in Ps 13:2a would not have suited Paul's *theo*-logie; the latter which required, it seems, a 'universal' deity accessible to both Jew and Greek.

[42] Cf. Käsemann, *Romans,* 86, confirming the fact that the cited content attested in Rom 3:11-18 could not have been sourced from Paul's memory.

[43] See Koch's, *Schrift,* 48-88, presentation of the *Textgrundlage* of the Pauline citations; cf. Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* in the case of Rom 4:3, 100.

Literary comparison (Rom 4:3 and Gen 15:6)		
NA[27] (Rom 4:3)	LXX[Gött] (Gen 15:6)	MT[BHS] (Gen 15:6)
τί γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει;		
ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ **τῷ θεῷ**	καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Αβραμ **τῷ θεῷ**,	וְהֶאֱמִ֖ן **בַּֽיהוָ֑ה**
καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.	καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.	וַיַּחְשְׁבֶ֥הָ לּ֖וֹ צְדָקָֽה׃

	GREEK TEXT WITNESSES		HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES
NT	**OT**	**OTHER**	**OT**
𝔓[46] 𝔓[20] 𝔓[40] ℵ A B	A L 905 911 961 O[-58 376] C'' bdf[-56] nstyz al verss (Ach) Sa Syh[OT]	Philo (Quis rerum divinarum heres sit) 90.6; (De migratione Abrahami) 40.5	Cod[Len]
Τω θω			בַּֽיהוָ֑ה

The imminent problem in this particular case seems to be more related to the process of transmission of the Hebrew text and the translation thereof. Rösel would argue that the variation, with regard to the terms κύριος and θεός, is due to the fact that the Greek translators avoided the use of the term κύριος if and when the text speaks of righteousness and judgement.[44] The topic under discussion in Gen 15:6, however, does not seem to focus on the suspected themes underlying Rösel's proposal; attention is rather given to the faith of Abraham in θεός (ἐπίστευσεν Αβραμ τῷ θεῷ) and how θεός considered Abraham as living in righteousness (καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην). The author continues in Gen 15:7 by introducing θεός again in the 1st person, speaking to Abraham and how he (θεός) delivered him from the region of the Chaldeans.

As mentioned above, in both these cases the MT reads יהוה.[45] If the 'rule of thumb' is accepted, then it is possible that a Greek OT manuscript, not in extant today, existed which testified to a Hebrew *Vorlage* reading אלהים were available to the Greek translators. It is also plausible that the Greek translators theologically reworked their Hebrew *Vorlage* opposing the 'rule of thumb' that the κύριος term is the most suitable Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. As it was stated earlier on in this study, there appeared to be no evidence

---

[44] Rösel, "Reading and Translating," 414.
[45] In Achim's B., investigation "Gen 15,6 und das Vorverständnis des Paulus." *ZNW* 109.3, (1997), 329-332), he consistantly refers to *Jahweh* even though the Greek text witnesses reads θεός, 329 -332; cf.

suggesting that an officially-structured rule existed implying that the term κύριος is the 'accepted' Greek equivalent reproducing the Tetragram. Plausible however, is that the term θεός was opted for at the beginning of the first century CE, if not earlier? It is, therefore, recommended that the literary problem should not be interpreted as a transmission or source-target text issue between Rm 4:3 (target text) and Gen 15:6 (source text), but rather a translation-conceptualisation issue involving the Hebrew and Greek OT texts.[46] Nevertheless, this might have had an indirect impact on the theological concept formed by the NT thinkers, and for Paul in particular.[47]

The LXX[Gött] reads θεός in Gen 15:6 where one would expect κύριος, if the rule of thumb is upheld that the latter term is the generally accepted Greek equivalent for יהוה. This poses an indirect theological problem concerning the conceptualisation of the Hebrew deity.

~ A translation or rendition problem ~

Paul continues with his line of thought initiated in the first three chapters, by addressing the issue of λογίζομαι (reckon, consider, think), relating the latter concept with righteousness (Rom 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11). In Rom 4:3 θεός is the acting subject responsible for λογίζομαι in terms of righteousness, the latter of which is confirmed in Rom 4:6. These concepts associated with θεός blend in well with the immediate literary context. According to Paul it could only have been θεός who has the ability and wisdom to consider one righteous.[48] Rotzoll, referred to by Achim, is of the opinion that *"Paulus tue Gen 15,6 u.a. »gemessen an zeitgenössischen jüdische Verständnis dieses Verses« Gewalt an."*[49] In Rom 4:8 however, it is

---

[46] Cf. Achim, "Vorverständnis," refers to Oemings'exegetical conclusion, who is in turn concerned about the interchangeable subject, Abraham, being both believer and 'regarder' of righteousness, 330. For Achim, the subject of both Gen 15:6 and Gen 15:7 is *Jaweh,* 331.

[47] Ironically enough, for Achim and others like Oemings and Rotzoll, the issue revolving around Paul's *Vorverständnis* is not so much the altered term used to refer to the Hebrew deity as subject; but rather Abraham as the subject of both the one acting out faith and the one to regard himself as righteous, 329 – 334.

[48] Cf. Käsemann, *Romans,* 112-113. For Schlier, *Römerbrief,* Paul did not understand faith as the opposite of accomplishment, 124; in fact he penetrates such Judaistic understanding (cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 133) and thus returns to the OT understanding that faith is neither to be understood as psychological nor as a fulfilment of a covenant promise. Dunn, *Romans 1-8,* indicates that the same appeal is found in 1 Macc 2:52 and Jas 2:23 does show that Paul is not idiosyncratic, 202.

[49] Achim, "Vorverständnis,, 335; Contra Holst, R. "The Meaning 'Abraham believed God' in Romans 4:3." *WTJ* 59, (1997), 319-326. Holst does not openly critique Paul's use of Gen 15:6 as such, for him the citation indicates that Paul showed that he understood the difference between "believing God" and "believing in God", between subjective faith and its objective content, 319. From the moment God spoke to Abraham, specifically in this context, God was no longer ἄγνωστος θεός and Abraham no longer ἀσεβής, 320. Aletti, "Romans 4 et Genese," proposes the context of Gen 17 as a possible solution to the problem posed in Rm 4; the solution of faith of which Abraham is considered to be normative, 325. Such a background demanded that Aletti had to

κύριος who does not consider one's sin, making a person blessed. For the translator of Ps 31:2[LXX] it is also κύριος who is the acting agent, and for the MT it is the generally expected יהוה.

3.4.4.2   *Romans 4:8*

Literary comparison (Rom 4:8 and Ps 31:2)		
NA[27] (Rom 4:8)	LXX[Gött] (Ps 31:2)	MT[BHS] (Ps 31:2)
μακάριος ἀνὴρ	μακάριος ἀνήρ,	אַשְׁרֵי אָדָם
οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται **κύριος** ἁμαρτίαν.	οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται **κύριος** ἁμαρτίαν,	לֹא יַחְשֹׁב **יְהוָה** לֹו עָוֹן
	οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος.	וְאֵין בְּרוּחֹו[b] רְמִיָּה[a]:

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		**OT**	**OT**	
𝔓[46]	ℵ, A, B	S B U R A σ′	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
-	κς	κς	יהוה	

If one considers Rom 4:3 and the citation taken from Gen 15:6 in combination with Rom 4:8 (Ps 31:2) within its immediate literary context, the problem becomes noticeable.

Agent responsible for the act of reckoning

NA[27]	LXX[Gött]	MT[BHS5th]
Rom 4:3 θεός (citation)	Gen 15:6 θεός	Gen 15:6 יהוה
Rom 4:6 θεός		
Rom 4:8 κύριος (citation)	Ps 31:2 κύριος	Ps 32:2 יהוה

---

account for the explicitness found in Rom 4:3 (Gen 15:6) and Rom 4:7-8 (Ps 31:1-2) and how they correlate to form part of the proposed solution of faith against the backdrop of Gen 17; Michel, *Römerbrief,* formulates the 'Abraham background' as follows: "Es kommt Paulus also nicht so sehr auf ein logisches Schema an, aks vielmehr auf die Herausarbeitung des Glaubensbegriffes," 162; see Lohse's, *Der Brief,* discussion on πίστις / πιστεύειν, 156-158 as well as Woyke, *Götter,* "Der Glaube and Gott – die Abrahamstradition," 122-127. For Woyke it is important to note that the content of both Rom 4:3 and Rom 4:11 calls Philo in mind and that Paul connects the idea of Abraham, being the father of all the believers, with 1 Thess 1:8, 123-127; "für Paulus kommt nun noch hinzu, das ser seine Rede von Heil und Rettung christologisch füllt – in 1 Thess 1:8 korreliert der Glaube an Gott mit dem λόγος τοῦ κυρίου," 127.

The dominating, theological significant, acting subject remains θεός, the term referencing to the one Abraham believes in, the latter through which he will be considered righteous. In Rom 4:6 David is the one proclaiming that the one is blessed whom θεός declares righteous,[50] while in Rom 4:8 the man is blessed whom κύριος declares free from sin. The Greek text tradition, supported by both the NT and OT manuscripts, the θεός (Rom 4:3) and κύριος (Rom 4:8) terms appear to be equally suitable when dealing with the act of reckoning. The latter is true for both the OT source context (Gen 15:6 and Ps 31:2) as well as the NT target context (Rom 4:3 and Rom 4:8). The Hebrew tradition attests only to the יהוה as the primary acting subject with regard to the act of reckoning.

The Hebrew text tradition regard יהוה as the primary agent responsible for the act of reckoning, while for the Greek text tradition both the θεός and κύριος terms refer to a deity who could act-out reckoning.

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

Paul capitalises on the concept of boasting introduced in Rom 2:17 and developed further in Rom 2:23. In Rom 4:1 the concepts boasting, righteousness and faith culminate in the person of Abraham. Paul thus laid a solid foundation in ch. 1-3, from where he intended, it seems, to build his argument that a man is considered righteous based on faith in θεός, a concept previously introduced in Rom 3:28. For Paul's argument to be effective he required more than mere critique of what the Jews considered to be righteous and what they boasted of, namely the law. It was necessary for Paul to first present an alternative, which he has done in Rom 3:28, but the concept of righteousness through faith further necessitated an authentic example, Abraham.[51]

Again the dominating acting agent inferred from the immediate literary context is θεός. The cited text (Gen 15:6) thus suited Paul's *theos*-concept well. The problem is that the

---

[50] Käsemann, *Romans*, states the quotation in Rom 4:6ff does interrupt the argument from the example of Abraham, but it does not end it, 113. According to him, the Gen 15:6 and Ps 31:1f citations, which are taken further in Rom 4:9, is an indication that Paul is proceeding according to the *gezera sawa*, the second rule of Hillel's seven criteria of exposition, 113; cf. Koch, *Schrift,* adds that "Im Röm 4 liegt eine der wenigen umfangreicheren Exegesen eines einzelnen Schrifttextes bei Paulus vor." Koch continues by stating that the string of citations *Law – Prophet – Text of venerated persons* (such as David in the Psalms) is not limited to Rabbinic literature (cf. Keener, *IVP – Background,* S.d. Rom 4:3), but it is also attested in the Jewish-Hellenistic *Homilie,* 221-223; see also Koch's discussion on the structure of a *Homilie* and *Midrash* in Pauline text analises, 224-227.

[51] Wilckens, *Der Brief*, notes that Gen 15:6 is self-evidently understood in Judaism that Abraham's faith in God is safeguarded despite onslaughts; in other words, he is considered righteous through his works, 262. Wilckens, also points out that such an understanding would correlate with a Rabbinic understanding of crediting righteousness, 262; cf. Käsemann, *Romans,* 112 and Koch, *Schrift,* 221.

MT reads בַּיהֹוָה and not the expected אלהים. If Paul knew this, which is in doubt, it would have had an impact on his use of Gen 15:6. What is of interest is that the immediate literary context of the MT is dominated by יהוה, while the LXX^{Gött} varies between the term κύριος and θεός. It does appear as if the Greek translators opted for the term θεός when the Hebrew deity as the 'most high' (τοῦ ὑψίστου) was referred to as is evident from Gen 14:18-20 and 22. The Hebrew counterpart reads, in all cases, אל. The implication is that the term θεός in Gen 15:6 is the Greek equivalent which reproduces the Tetragram, while the term θεός in Gen 14:18-20 and 22 specifically refers to the Hebrew deity as the 'most high'. One could thus assert, with a reasonable amount of certainty, that Abraham had faith in θεός, the 'most high' the personal Hebrew deity יהוה.

Paul interrupts this seemingly perfect *theos*-concept supported by four citations thus far (Isa 52:5 [Rom 2:24]; Ps 13:2 [Rom 3:11], Ps 35:2 [Rom 3:18]; Gen 15:6 [Rom 4:3]). He does this with the citation taken from Ps 31:2 which reads the term κύριος. There is ample proof that the θεός concept dominates at least the first eleven chapters of Paul's epistle. It is therefore palpable that θεός is the term Paul applies when referring to the Hebrew deity, the latter is confirmed by the cited texts dealt with thus far. Why then would Paul cite a text, which supposedly read κύριος, as support for his dominating θεός concept argument? For one, this could be regarded as obvious proof that Paul followed his *Vorlage*, due to the fact that he had a good enough reason to alter his *Vorlage* to be more 'in tune' with his *theos*-concept.

The question thus is, how does the term κύριος in Rom 4:8 relate to the term κύριος in Rom 4:24; 5:1 – including Rom 4:3? Furthermore, how does this term relate to the term θεός? Conceptually speaking, based on the *theos*-concept in the immediate literary context of Romans 4, the term θεός appears to be referring to the personal Hebrew deity. Secondly, the term κύριος in Rom 4:8 does indirectly represent the Tetragram (cf. Ps 32:2^{MT}). Conceptually however, it seems as if Paul did not share the view of the LXX in this particular case, that the term κύριος is a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. In other words the concept underlying the term κύριος in Ps 31:2 was not adopted by Paul. It is highly unlikely that the cited text (Ps 31:2a) coincidentally dealt with λογίσηται and ἁμαρτίαν. Paul hand-picked this citation, together with Ps 31:1 as words spoken by David regarding the act of reckoning; what could be considered to be coincidence is that Ps 31:2 read the term κύριος.[52] The latter term suited

[52] According to Michel, *die Römer*, the two citations in Rom 4:3 (Gen 15:6) and Gen 4:7 (Ps 31:1) determines, so to speak, the first section of Rom 4:1-8, 160. In Michel's own words: *Nach Rabbinsche Methode wird das Torawort durch das Psalmwort bekräftigt*, 160.

Paul's literary conceptual context of faith in θεός who is responsible for the act of reckoning and making one righteous with faith in the resurrection of Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, through whom they (the believers) will be considered righteous (cf. Rom 4:23-24). Thus, the term κύριος in Rom 4:8 does not conceptually imply anyone else other than Jesus as the κύριος in Rom 4:24.

Third, the term θεός refers to the one that is the giver of peace through Jesus Christ the κύριος. Jesus as the κύριος is thus the direct object of the actions of θεός (Rom 4:24) and the mediator through whom θεός acts. It seems as if Paul, literary-conceptually speaking, did not make a distinction between the κύριος as a term that indirectly reproduces the Tetragram (Rm 4:8) and the term κύριος as title for Jesus as the χριστός (Rom 4:24). Paul's distinction between the term κύριος representing the Tetragram in particular and Jesus in general, and the term θεός referring to the personal Hebrew deity, is not yet clear.[53]

3.4.5   Romans 5

The first phrase of Romans 5 confirms the fact that the term θεός refers to the one that gives, with Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος through whom θεός mediates (Rom 5:1). The mediating quality is again qualified in Rom 5:11 where the phrase διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is used in correlation with the idea of boasting in θεός through Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος.[54] The boasting concept is again present, occurring in association with the hope and glory of θεός (Rom 5:2). Two other concepts related to the term θεός are also introduced; the one being the love of θεός in Rom 5:5 and second the grace of θεός in Rom 5:15. The term χριστός is brought into play as the one mediating between mortal beings and θεός (cf. Rom 5:6 and Rom 5:8), which would have the effect of reconciliation with θεός (Rom 5:10). The righteousness and grace of θεός is visible in and through one 'mortal' being Jesus as the χριστός (Rom 5:15 and Rom 5:17). It would thus be safe to assume on the one hand that the mediating eminence of Jesus as the χριστός is confirmed here; and on the other hand that the term θεός is referring to the one who is governing, overseeing and facilitating such mediation.

---

[53] Interestingly though, is that Michel, *die Römer,* does not make a distinction between the κύριος and θεός term when he deals with Rom 4:6-8; he merely refers to *Gott* as the acting subject, 165. The latter is true for most commentators.

[54] Cf. Rom 5:21 with regard to the mediating quality of Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος.

3.4.6 Romans 6

The concept underlying Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, being the mediator, is slightly varied in Romans 6. The deviation is made possible by the implementation of the dative case proper as well as with the prepositional phrase led by the preposition ἐν. It is almost as if the conceptual-substantive 'distance' between mortal subjects and Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, who mediates between human beings as the referent of the term θεός, is 'shortened'. The gift of eternal life comes from θεός and is embodied in Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος (Rom 6:23). One is therefore enslaved to θεός, to whom gratitude should be directed (Rom 6:17), to whom righteousness belongs (Rom 6:13). For Paul one who is dead for sin is living for θεός (Rom 6:10), dead for sin but alive for θεός in Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος (Rom 6:11). The mediating functionality is no longer being a mortal being boasting through Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, but the mediating subjective substance has been united with such mortal beings who then receive the ability to live with θεός.

The mortal subject is being baptised into the death and resurrection of Jesus as the χριστός; the latter which results in the glorification of the πατρός (Rom 6:3-5). The concept is that the mortal being becomes one with the risen χριστός, over whom death has no power. The 'internalisation' of Jesus as the χριστός is introduced with the ultimate effect of living in or for θεός. By initiating the internalisation concept, Paul achieved moving Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, and ultimately also the mortal subject, closer to the living θεός. The introduction and development of Paul's concept of death, being a mortal reality, and life in its eternal form, assists Paul in connecting χριστός as referent for Jesus and θεός, who is in turn the referent for the monotheistic living deity of the Jews.

3.4.7 Romans 7

The initiated and developed concept through the mediating function of χριστός and the internalisation of such a concept is carried over into Romans 7. Paul states that the mortal being is also dead for the law, due to the death of χριστός which has the effect that one will bear fruit for θεός (Rom 7:4). The delight of the law is thus internalised (Rom 7:22). Again the gratitude is towards θεός through Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, because conceptually for Paul he is a slave of the law of θεός, but in flesh he is a slave to sin (Rom 7:25).

3.4.8 Romans 8

The first two verses of this chapter follow through the concepts already introduced by Paul; those in Jesus as χριστός will not be condemned, because one is set free through the spirit of the law of the living in Jesus as the χριστός (Rom 8:1-2). The solution according to Paul was for θεός to send his own son as a mortal being to do what the law could not do (Rom 8:3). As mortal beings, humans are slaves of the law, impossible to please θεός because the mind is focused on the flesh, causing hostility towards θεός (Rom 8:7-8). The concept Paul is thus propagating is that if one follows the law, one's mind is then automatically fixated on the flesh which ultimately causes hostility towards θεός. The solution thus for Paul is that a 'representative' of θεός should become 'flesh' to give spiritual substance to those enslaved by the law. Therefore those living in Jesus as the χριστός are not considered to be of the flesh, but of the spirit. The concept is that the spirit of θεός dwells within them and if they do not have the spirit of χριστός in them, they do not belong to him (Rom 8:9). The latter would also imply that the body is dead for sin, but the spirit is alive due to the righteousness of the spirit.

It does appear as if Paul conceptualised the spirit of θεός and χριστός to be of the same substance, from where one could infer that the referents of both the θεός and χριστός terms are the same. One should, however, have to make a distinction between πνεῦμα θεοῦ as a genitive of origin and relationship and πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ as a genitive of object (Rom 8:9).[55] The term χριστός refers to the one that constitutes the substance of the spirit as the living spirit of the law (Rom 8:2). This spirit is the object sent by θεός as His son (Rom 8:3). The term χριστός in πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ thus, does not refer to the originator of the spirit, but it rather presents the objective genitive.[56] The concept introduced in Rom 8:11 that the spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells within a mortal body, together with the genitive of quality[57] used in relation to the spirit confirms that the origin of the spirit should be traced back to θεός and that Jesus as the χριστός is both the object of the workings of the spirit of θεός, while becoming the subject. The spirit of θεός is thus qualified by χριστός to such an extent that if one is led by the spirit of θεός, which is χριστός, one could be called a child of θεός (Rom 8:14). Moreover, as a child of θεός one is also an heir of θεός and co-heir of χριστός (Rom 8:17).[58]

---

[55] A suggested translation for the genitive of object in terms of πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ would be 'spirit about Christ'.
[56] Arndt, *BAGD,* 163.
[57] Arndt, *BAGD,* 165.
[58] The concept of being children of θεός is further developed in Rom 8:19 and 21.

3.4.9   Romans 9[59]

This chapter is characterised by a multitude of citations.[60] The focus though, would only be directed to those explicit citations attesting to either the term κύριος or θεός. The first of which is Rom 9:26 reflecting content resembling Hos 2:1b-c[LXX]. The readings of both the NA[27] and LXX[Gött] seem to be intact, both implementing the term θεός. The dynamics of this verse and its cited content comes into play once it is considered within the immediate literary conceptual context; the latter would include the explicit citation taken up in Rom 9:28 and Rom 9:29 both of which account for the term κύριος.

3.4.9.1   *Romans 9:26*

Literary comparison (Rom 9:26 and Hos 2:1b-c)		
NA 27 (Rom 9:26)	LXX[Gött] (Hos 2:1b-c)	MT[BHS] (Hos 2:1b-c)
καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς·	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς	וְהָיָה בִּמְקֹום אֲשֶׁר־יֵאָמֵר לָהֶם֙
οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς,	Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς,	לֹא־עַמִּי אַתֶּ֔ם
ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται **υἱοὶ θεοῦ** ζῶντος.	ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται **υἱοὶ θεοῦ** ζῶντος.	יֵאָמֵר לָהֶם בְּנֵי אֵל־חָי׃

---

[59] For a detailed analysis of the problem and objective related to Romans 9-11 and how Rom 9:6-29 is viewed as a key element in the understanding the divine promise in Romans 9, see Brandenburger, E. "Paulinische Schrifauslegung in der Kontroverse um das Verheißungswort Gottes (Röm 9)." *ZTK* 82.1, (1985), 1-47.Brandenburger, did not adequately account for the catena of citations, particularly in Rom 9:26-30 in addressing the issue of divine promise. Quesnel, M. "La figure des Moïse en Romains 9-11." *NTS* 49.3, (2003), 321-335. Quesnel, did not focus on the citations in question, but investigated those passages where the figure of Moses was presented (e.g. Rom 10:5, 328).

[60] Michel, *Römerbrief,* suggests that the citations used in Rom 9:25-29 had to have a commen denominator. For him Paul intentionally structured the citation as a proclamation composition, the latter which did not only play a significant role in the communication of the message, but in the liturgy as well, 317. Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Epistle to the Romans*. ICC 1, Romans I-VIII; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975, comments that the alternating reading for ἐρῶ (Hos 2:25), καλέσω (Rom 9:25) ensured that a link with Rom 9:24 as well as with Rom 9:26, 499; cf. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief,* 303; Moo, Dougles J. *The Epistle to the Romans.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1996, calls this a 'chiastical' link, 611. There appears to be a general consensus among commentators that the Hosea citations, re-conceptualised by Paul, refers to the Gentiles, while the citation taken for Isaiah had the 'remnant' of the Israelites in mind, cf. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief,* 303-304; Michel, *Römerbrief,* 316; Cranfield, *Romans,* 499; Fitzmeyr, Joseph A. *Romans – A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993; van Bruggen, J. *Romeinen – Christenen tussen stad en synagogue.* Commentar op het Nieuwe Testament 3; Kampen: J. H. Kok, 2006, 143. Moo, *Romans,* suggests that Paul not only structured the catena of citations in Rom 9:25-29, but that he also systematically moved through the 'canon': partriarchal narratives (Rom 9:7-13), events of the Exodus (Rom 9:14-18) followed by the prophets (Rom 9:24-29), 610. Wilk, *Bedeutung,* notes that the citation in Rom 9:25-27f draws from Rom 9:24, which draws from Rom 9:23, 130. Paul's use of Isa 1:9 is supported by his thoughts introduced in Rom 9:23, which is also a logical justification for Rom 9:22. Longenecker, *Biblcal Exegsis,* calls the catena of citations in Romans 9 a "pearl stringing" one example of Paul's Pharisaic background and midrashic heritage, 99.

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		**OT**	**OT**	
$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	א A B	A B Q S	Cod^{Len}	Cod^{Alep}
θυ	θυ	θυ	אֵל	אֵל

In this case the term θεός is used as the Greek representative for אל and not the masculine plural form of the term, as the general assumption goes. The Hebrew text tradition together with the text transmission appears to be intact, if one compares e.g. Hos 1:7ff with 4QXII^d (Hos 1:7) and 4QXII^g (Hos 2:24) with the MT including the LXX^{Gött} resulting that in almost all instances where the discussed and related terms are present, they correspond.[61] There is no textual evidence to suggest an alternative reading for what is currently presented by the LXX^{Gött}.

<div align="center">

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

</div>

3.4.9.2   *Romans 9:28*

The cited content taken up in these verses is complex to say the least. The phrase ἐὰν ᾖ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ ὑπόλειμμα σωθήσεται· (Rom 9:27b-c) seems to be reflecting content from Hos 2:1a^{LXX}, which in turn, reads Καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης. It could also reflect content resembling Isa 10:22^{LXX} reading ἐὰν γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ισραηλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν σωθήσεται. One can argue that it is highly probable that Paul cited Hos 2:1a due to the fact that he was working from Hos 2:1b-c in Rom 9:26. The critique against such an argument is the introductory formula through which the content is assigned to Isaiah. Although Hos 2:1a as source used in Rom 9:27 and Rom 9:28 cannot and should not be ruled out. The author opts for Isa 10:22ff as it is set out in the table on the next page.[62]

---

[61] See also the text critical comments on Rom 9:26 in Koch, *Schrift,* 54 (refer to footnote 33).

[62] Cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 167-168; Wilk, *Die Bedeutung,* 225 as well as Shum, *Paul's use,* 210. Seitz, E. "λόγον συντέμνων – eine Gerichtsankündigung? (Zu Römer 9,27/28)." *BN* 109, (2001), 56-82. Seitz offers a comparison between Isa 10:22, Hos 2:1 and Rom 9:27, 58 as well as between Rom 9:28 and Isa 10:23, 61-62.

Literary comparison (Rom 9:27, 28 and Isa 10:22, 23)

NA[27] (Rom 9:27, 28)	LXX[Gött] (Isa 10:22, 23)	MT[BHS] (Isa 10:22, 23)
27 Ἠσαΐας δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ·		
ἐὰν ᾖ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ	**22** καὶ ἐὰν γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ισραηλ	22 כִּי אִם־יִהְיֶ֨ה עַמְּךָ֤ יִשְׂרָאֵל֙
ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ ὑπόλειμμα σωθήσεται·	ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν σωθήσεται·	כְּח֣וֹל הַיָּ֔ם שְׁאָ֖ר יָשׁ֣וּב בּ֑וֹ כִּלָּי֥וֹן חָר֖וּץ שׁוֹטֵ֥ף צְדָקָֽה׃
	λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ,	
28 λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων[63]	**23** ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον	23 כִּי כָלָ֣ה וְנֶחֱרָצָ֑ה
ποιήσει **κύριος**	ποιήσει **ὁ θεὸς**	**אֲדֹנָ֤י יְהוִה֙ צְבָא֔וֹת** עֹשֶׂ֕ה
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.	ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ.[64]	בְּקֶ֖רֶב כָּל־הָאָֽרֶץ׃ ס

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES					HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT		OT			OT		
𝔓[46]	א A B	S A Q	C	B V	1QIsa[a]	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
κς	κς	ο θς	κς κς	κς	אדוני יהוה צְבָא֔וֹת	יהוה צְבָא֔וֹת אדוני	יהוה צְבָא֔וֹת אדוני

According to the Hebrew text critical data, the phrase יְהוִה֙ צְבָא֔וֹת was deleted by two LXX manuscripts, which most probably refers to codex B and V.[65] The latter also implies that B and V considered the term κύριος as a suitable representation for the Hebrew term אדוני.

This would imply that the Greek text tradition regarded the following as suitable representatives, in this instance, for its Hebrew counterparts:

---

[63] Schlier. *Der Römerbrief,* notes that συντελῶν and συντέμνων are also closely related in Dan 5:27 and Dan 9:24, 304; cf. Cranfield, *Romans,* 502 footnote 1.

[64] For an explanation on the variation between ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ see Koch, *Schrift,* 245-146.

[65] The BHS text critical apparatus note that יְהוִה֙ צְבָא֔וֹת has probable been deleted (2 Mss 𝕲, prb dl). See also Metzger's response to the συντέμνων term in, *A Textual Commentary*, 462.

κς	אדוני
κς	יהוה צבאות
ο θς	אדוני יהוה צבאות
κς	אדוני יהוה צבאות

An underlying, and with that a significant issue is that יהוה was vocalised when used in combination with אדוני, to read (*Q^e re*-tradition) *Elohim,* and when presented alone, it was vocalised to read *Adonaj*.[66] The evidence at hand appears to suggest that two text traditions developed within the transmission of the יהוה and related terms. The first opted for θεός with the definite article, while the second decided on κύριος. A third could also be distinguished presenting two κύριος terms for both אדוני and יהוה. The NT text witnesses give the impression that they chose only the term κύριος as representation of אדוני together with the יהוה. The Hebrew text tradition appears to be intact, while the Greek text tradition struggled, evident from the inconsistency, to render the Hebrew terms under discussion.

The culminating problem is the literary missing link between יהוה-אדוני, (between *ADONAJ* and *JHWH*) and the OT Greek represented terms. Finding the 'missing link' would be important to establish a theological-conceptual link between the Jewish concept of the Hebrew deity and early Christian Christology.

~ A translation and Greek transmission problem ~

3.4.9.3   *Romans 9:29*

This verse, for the most part, appears to be intact. The textual integrity is undisputed, although internally the cited text taken from Isa 1:9 might pose some challenges.

Literary comparison (Rom 9:29 and Isa 1:9)		
NA[27] (Rom 9:29)	LXX[Gött] (Isa 1:9)	MT[BHS] (Isa 1:9)
καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἠσαΐας·		
εἰ μὴ **κύριος** σαβαὼθ	καὶ εἰ μὴ **κύριος** σαβαωθ	לוּלֵי֙ **יְהוָ֣ה** צְבָא֔וֹת
ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα,	ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα,	הוֹתִ֥יר לָ֛נוּ שָׂרִ֖יד
ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ	ὡς Σοδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ	כִּמְעָ֑ט

---

[66] Cf. Rösel, *Adonaj.*

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES			
NT		OT	OT			
$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	א A B	S A B	1QIsa[a]	4QIsa[f]	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
κς	κς	κς	יהוה	יהוה	יהוה	יהוה

Deduced from the evidence it is apparent that the text transmission and translation appears intact. The 'general accepted' Greek equivalent terms were used reproducing the Tetragram. The cited text in Rom 9:29 (Isa 1:9), together with Isa 10:23 in Rom 9:28 would nonetheless ensure conceptual dynamics once the impact of these cited texts are considered within their immediate literary context.

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

The term χριστός introduces this section of text, with θεός as the primary acting agent, while the term κύριος dominates the cited content. The first four verses of chapter nine are dominated by the term χριστός.[67] Paul declares speaking the truth in Christ (Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ) [Rom 9:1], while longing to be cursed himself, one without Christ for the sake of his brothers (ηὐχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου) [Rom 9:3]. This introduction is followed by the intensely debated and highly intriguing Rom 9:5.[68] The latter verse provides the literary context in which the intriguing trust of the inter-relatedness of the χριστός and θεός are put to the fore. This verse thus demands special consideration.

Romans 9:5 can be divided into three parts:

5a   ὧν οἱ πατέρες

5b   καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ **Χριστὸς** τὸ κατὰ σάρκα

---

[67] Cf. Rom 9:1, 3 and Rom 9:5.
[68] See Kammler, Hans-Christiaan. "Die Prädikation Jesu Christi als »Gott« und die paulinische Christologie." *ZNW* 94.3/4, (2003), 164-180. Kammler presents a list of sources against and for a Christ reading of Rom 9:5, 164-166.

5c   ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων **θεὸς** εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν

The grammatical-syntactical framework of this verse is introduced in Rom 9:4.[69] The phrase ὧν οἱ πατέρες (Rom 9:5a) would function on the same grammatical level as ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία (Rom 9:4b), which refers back to οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται (Rom 9:4a) and καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθῆκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι (Rom 9:4c) respectively.[70] The relative pronoun in its genitive case ὧν does allow scope to relate what precedes it with what follows using both the impersonal 'which' as well as the personal 'who' pronouns. Thus, ὧν οἱ πατέρες (Rom 9:5a) is not merely saying something about the subject, but it also defines the object (Rom 9:4c).[71] The relative pronoun in Rom 9:5b καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα does not refer to 'something' or 'someone' other than what has been presented in Rm 9:4c (object) and those introduced in Rom 9:5a (subject).[72] What it does allow is for a secondary subject to be introduced, ὁ Χριστὸς, without misplacing sight from the immediate literary context. The phrase in Rom 9:5c (ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν) deviates from the ὧν phrase pattern, while Paul ingeniously uses the participle of εἰμί, which appears very similar to the relative pronoun ὧν. By doing so, Paul intelligently remains within the literary conceptual context, while introducing on the one hand, what would have been highly controversial, χριστός being θεός; and on the other hand accomplishing with this, an open-endedness of this concept.[73] The nominative participle ὢν could therefore either refer to ὁ Χριστός (Rom 9:5b),[74] or one should regard it as an independent clause which will imply that ὢν refers to ὁ ... ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς (Rom 9:5c).[75] Paul's intent was not to conceptually regard χριστός *to be* or *to become* ὁ θεός; neither was his aim to address this issue for it to be an open and closed case. Paul's objective, which he accomplished up until this very day, is for this theological concept to be open-ended; a literary 'peak' into the mind of Paul.

---

[69] Cf. Michel, *Römerbrief,* is of the opinion that Paul reworked old Jewish-Hellenistic material, 296.
[70] Cf. Cranfield, *Romans,* 465-466.
[71] See also Schlier's, *Der Römerbrief,* summary of interpretations by scholars on the 'whom' the doxology relates to, 288; cf. Michel, *Römerbrief,* 296-297.
[72] A significant aspect with regard to Rom 9:5a is whether one opts for a comma or full stop or semi-colon after τὸ κατὰ σάρκα; cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary,* 460.
[73] Cf. Kammler, "Die Prädikation," 166.
[74] See Kammler's, "Die Prädikation," summary of the main arguments for such a view, 166-169.
[75] Ibid.,171-172.

What is of importance is that the term χριστός in Rom 9:5 should not be considered isolated from the term χριστός in Rom 9:1 and Rom 9:3.[76] The same should be said for the term θεός, which has to be dealt with in the context of the other θεός terms implemented in chapter 9.[77] In Rom 9:6 for example, Paul says that the word of θεός should not alone be regarded as invalid, because not all coming from Israel are Israelites, and not all descendents from Abraham are his children (Rom 9:7); neither are these children from the flesh to be considered as children of θεός, but the children promised by θεός are Abraham's offspring (Rom 9:8). In Rom 9:11 the concept of predestination is brought into play by means of a subordinate clause introduced by the conjunction ἵνα. Furthermore, in Rom 9:14 Paul poses a rhetorical question, through which he intends to disregard and nullify the fact that θεός can be considered unjust. By doing so Paul sets the backdrop against which he wanted to show that θεός is merciful (Rom 9:16). In Rom 9:20 Paul emphasises through yet another rhetorical question the ignorance of man to argue with θεός. Finally it is θεός who desires to demonstrate his anger in Rom 9:22.

This sets the immediate *theos-kyrios* conceptual context in relation to Jesus, or Jesus as the χριστός, if present. The remaining *theos-kyrios* literary conceptual context is made possible by the three cited texts: Rom 9:26, 28 and 29.[78] The literary integrity of Rom 9:26 is shown to be secure. There is no reason to interpret the explicit θεός citation and with that the term θεός as referring to any other than the Hebrew deity. The continuity of the descent and offspring theme related to Abraham and to θεός, is accomplished by the implementation of Hos 2:1b-c.[79] This verse clearly states that θεός, the living one, called them (his people Rom 9:25) not his sons. The fact that the term θεός in Hos 2:1b-c (Rom 9:26) is the Greek equivalent for אל confirms the premise that the term θεός refers to the Hebrew deity. One would not have expected any other term than θεός, because θεός is the one whose words are commented on in Rom 9:6. The question of offspring in relation to θεός is brought to the fore in Rom 9:8; and it is the plan of θεός that is introduced in Rom 9:11. There should thus be

---

[76] Cf. Käsemann's statement that which is addressed in Rom 9:5 should not be isolated from what precedes it, *Romans,* 259; cf. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief,* 288; cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary,* 461.

[77] See Rom 9:6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 20, 22 and 26.

[78] According to Schlier, *Der Römerbrief,* Paul wants to appeal that the Gentiles belong to the people of God with the Hos 2:1 citation, 303; the Isa 10:22-23 confirms the true Israel as the Ekklesia. These citations also confirm the sovereign action of God, 304. For Schlier, it is also evident that ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος (Rom 9:26) indicates Paul's opposing stance over and against the Jewish-Apocalyptic and Rabbinic position, 304. Koch, *Schrift,* mentions that the suggested redaction of the Israelites in Isa 10:22 is a portrait of a legal act of *Yahweh.* 146.

[79] Cf. Käsemann, *Romans,* notes that the cited content taken from Hos 2:1 does not denote Palestine as the place where Gentiles will gather eschatologically. What Paul does is to take the promise made to Israel and relate it to the Gentile – Christians, 274.

little doubt that the concept underlying the term θεός in Romans 9 is the monotheistic Hebrew deity.[80]

The same cannot be said though for Isa 10:22c-23 in Rom 9:27-28.[81] A variety of possibilities are presented by the Greek text witnesses for both OT and NT texts. All the NT text witnesses read κύριος, while the OT text witnesses vary between ὁ θεός, κύριος κύριος and κύριος. The attention towards the descent of Israel theme is kept with the citation from Is 10:22c-23. Important is to first consider the concept/s underlying the phrase אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת presented in the MT. Three distinct, yet intertwining concepts can be deduced from the Hebrew phrase. The first concept is represented by the term אֲדֹנָי (*Adonaj*),[82] in the words of Rösel:

> Als zusammenfassung dieses Überblicks ist festzuhalten, daß אדון offenbar dann für Menschen verwendet wurde, wenn es um die Beschreibung eines Verhältnisses zwischen Partnern unterschiedlichen Ranges geht...Damit wird verständlich, daß אדון zur meistgebrauchten Form der höflichen Anrede innerhalb der biblischen Literatur wurde... Festzustellen ist zudem, daß bei der Anredeform אדני 'mein Herr' gelegentlich eine Erstarung der Bedeutung des Suffixes (Gen 44,7) zu notieren ist. Diese Beobachtung ist für die Erklärung des אֲדֹנָי als Titels JHWHs von Bedeutung[83]

It thus seems plausible that the concept underlying the term אֲדֹנָי should be understood as a term used when referring to יהוה with the utmost respect and admiration on the one hand, and courteous and respectful designation of a person belonging to a higher social rank on the other hand. The second concept is presented by יהוה vocalised to read either *Elohim*[84] or *Shema*[85] both of which would support the concept as the personal

---

[80] Koch, *Schrift*, rightly suggests that the objective in the literary conceptual context of Romans 9 is the freedom of God to choose and to deny as he pleases. Israel, as a group of people, (Rom 9:25-27) is made out to be an insignificant remnant, 303; the latter would be in line with the mainstream commentators such as Schlier, Wilkcens, Michel, Käsemann, Dunn, Cranfield to mention only a few.

[81] Käsemann, *Romans,* suggests that the citation taken from Isa 10:22ff (Rom 9:27-28) if the association forms the transition from Hos 2:1 (Rom 9:26), inferred from the content, it offers an antithesis, 275. Moreover, Käsemann confirms that συντελεῖν and συντέμνειν became an apocalyptic formula from the time of Dan 5:27[LXX], 275; cf. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief,* 304; cf. Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 575. Heil, John P. "From Remnant to Seed of Hope for Israel: Romans 9:27-29." *CBQ* 26.4, (2002), 703-720; see also the historical-theological development of Isa 10:22c-23 as it culminates in Rom 9:27-28 in Koch, *Schrift,* 146-149.

[82] See Rösel's, *Adonaj,* brief description of the proposals made for the epistemological understanding of אדני after which he deals extensively with the possible background of the Hebrew form and the uses of such, 19-31.

[83] Rösel, *Adonaj,* 31.

[84] Cf. Rösel, "Reading and Translating," 412-413.

monotheistic deity of Israel, which is followed by the epithet צְבָאוֹת. The term יהוה would be considered to be the 'proper noun' used when referring to the 'God' of the Israelites and Judeans,[86] while אלהים in relations to אל, are Hebrew terms used to express the concept of a wise, creator deity with a variety of meanings, including the potential of being a proper name.[87] The most 'suitable' Greek equivalents for these terms, inferred from the 'general rule of thumb' would have been either δεσπότης κύριος σαβαώθ or δεσπότης θεός σαβαώθ. Deduced from the textual evidence it seems to be clear that the צְבָאוֹת term was 'ignored' from a very early stage of transmission, or either by the Greek translators. In combination thus, text witnesses S A Q produce the best possible equivalent available, although with the reading ο θς the personal-courteous nature of the phrase is lost. Paul's inconsistent reference to the Hebrew deity can only be attributed to the fact that he stringently followed his *Vorlage*, or that he intentionally wanted to deviate from the θεός concept and chose those Greek text readings at his disposal (Isa 10:23) and (Isa 1:9) that read the term κύριος. The latter would almost be impossible to prove, while the former seems as if this is the more plausible of the two possibilities. This would imply that conceptually Paul did not differentiate between who is referenced to when the term θεός or κύριος is used; for Paul both these terms appear to be referring to the Hebrew deity or does it?

In support of the proposed premise a thematical comparison between Rm 9:8 and Rom 9:29 is helpful. The former speaks of τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ (the children of flesh not necessarily being children of *Theos*, see also Rm 9:7), while the latter confirms that εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα (if *Kyrios, lord of hosts,* did not leave a remnant behind). Both κύριος (Rom 9:29) and θεός (Rom 9:8) reserve the right to decide which nation or clan to accept or deny; to include or to exclude. Moreover, a thematical comparison between Paul's commandment that ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 9:6) should not be considered invalid and the statement that it will come to fulfilment once and for all on earth (λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) [Rom 9:28] strengthens the hypothesis that Paul might have conceptualised both the terms κύριος and θεός as the Hebrew deity, or at least the term κύριος in Rom 9:28 and Rom 9:29. Finally, the fact that the term κύριος does not appear in Romans 9, nor is there a conceptual link between the term κύριος in Rom 9:28 and

---

[85] Cf. De Troyer. "The Pronunciation," 144-146..
[86] Cf. RGG. "JHWH," 504; cf. DDD. "Yahweh," 1711.
[87] Cf. DDD. "God," 352-353.

Rom 9:29 and the term χριστός in Rom 9:1, 3 and 5. One could also argue that Paul's *Vorlage* gave him ample scope to 'alter' the citation to read θεός, but Paul allowed his *Vorlage* to dictate to him, amidst the dominant *theos*-concept in Romans 9, because he wanted to call Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος into mind. This line of argument can only hold water if the premise that Paul's *Vorlage* read the term κύριος is upheld.

A pertinent question therefore comes to mind: *how do the considered quotations and the conclusions drawn from their impact reflect on the interpretation and understanding of Rom 9:5?* The term χριστός in Rom 9:5 should first and foremost be understood in relation to the χριστός terms in Rom 9:1 and Rom 9:3. In both these instances the term χριστός is presented within a prepositional clause: Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ and ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ respectively. It should further be noted that in both cases the first person singular pronoun, which refers to Paul, is used. With this in mind, the conceptual meaning of the term χριστός in Rom 9:5 appears to be meditative in nature. This is emphasised by the prepositional phrase ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. In Rom 9:1 Paul's truth is considered to be justified ἐν Christ (Rom 9:1), while ἀπό again infers a secondary position over and against someone that is ἐν Christ (Rom 9:3).[88] The preposition ἐξ in Rom 9:5 would consequently also imply that Christ holds a mediating function and role. One could thus, with a reasonable amount of certainty, conclude that the concept underlying the term χριστός in these verses is one of Christ being a mediator. On the other hand however, it would be difficult to deny that through this mediating role, χριστός, in the mind of Paul, should be praised as θεός, who is θεός over all.[89] This concept is strengthened when one considers the idea that ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα seamlessly fits into the concept of θεός' free will to make or regard nations, clans or any group as 'his sons' or 'his children' as is evidently assigned to both θεός and κύριος in chapter nine. Deduced from this, not only is the term θεός and κύριος used in conceptually referring to the Hebrew deity, but in this case the term χριστός also belongs to such a concept.

---

[88] Cf. Käsemann, *Romans,* 259.

[89] To quote Kammler, "Die Prädikation:" „Der Begriff θεός wäre dabei nicht im Sinne eines *Nomen proprium* verwendet, sondern als *Wesensbezeichnung*, " 171.

3.4.10 Romans 10[90]

3.4.10.1 *Romans 10:13*

The cited text visible in this verse bears a resemblance to content wording/phrasing of Joel 3:5a. Text critically speaking, no explicit issues are noted by the various eclectic texts, nor are there any other text witnesses that would argue for a variant reading. Both the Greek and Hebrew text traditions appear to be undisputedly in agreement. It seems clear that θεός (Rom 10:9) and κύριος (Rom 10:13, 16) are terms referred to the acting entity who raised κύριον Ἰησοῦν from the dead (Rom 10:9 - θεός), who is κύριος over all (Rom 10:12) to whom everyone calls for salvation (Rom 10:13).[91]

Literary comparison (Rom 10:13 and Joel 3:5a)		
NA[27] (Rom 10:13)	LXX[Gött] (Joel 3:5a)	MT[BHS] (Joel 3:5a)
πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται	καὶ ἔσται πᾶς, ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται	וְהָיָ֗ה כֹּ֤ל אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָ֖א
τὸ ὄνομα **κυρίου** σωθήσεται.	τὸ ὄνομα **κυρίου**, σωθήσεται·	בְּשֵׁ֥ם **יְהוָ֖ה** יִמָּלֵ֑ט

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT		OT	OT		
𝔓[46]	ℵ A B	S A B	Mur 88 Col. II:15	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
κυ	κυ	κυ	יהוה	יהוה	יהוה

Based on the evidence at hand, it seems clear that both the Hebrew and Greek text traditions are intact, moreover that the rendering from Hebrew into Greek with regard to the term κύριος appears faultless.

The underlying issue would come to the fore once this citation is considered within its immediate thought-structural context through which the inter-relatedness of the κύριος term with the θεός term as well as with Jesus of Nazareth and the Christ term.

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

---

[90] Dewey, Arthur J. "A Re-Hearing of Romans 10:1-15." *Semeia* 65, (1994), 109-126. Dewey considers how the 'written' text such for example Deut 30:12-14, among others, functioned in the 'oral' text (e.g. Rom 10:6-8).
[91] The 'ruler' or the one with the appropriate 'authority' over Jew and Gentile is κύριος; the latter which is a strong indication of a literary situation, according to Schlier, *Der Römer,* 314-315.

3.4.10.2 *Romans 10:16*

The cited content resembles Isa 53:1a[LXX], the LXX reading does not agree with its Hebrew counterpart reading יהוה or any other related term. The Greek text tradition appears to agree on the use of the term κύριος in its vocative case, while the Hebrew text does not make any reference to the יהוה or any other term which might refer to the Hebrew deity in this particular case.

Literary comparison (Rom 10:16 and Isa 53:1)		
NA[27] (Rom 10:16)	LXX[Gött] (Isa 53:1)	MT[BHS] (Isa 53:1)
Ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει· **κύριε**, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;	**κύριε**, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίων **κυρίου** τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη;	מִי הֶאֱמִין לִשְׁמֻעָתֵנוּ וּזְרוֹעַ **יְהוָה** עַל־מִי נִגְלָתָה׃

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		**OT**	**OT**	
$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	ℵ A B	S A B	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
κε	κε	κε	-	-

The vocative case of the term κύριος is not attested in the MT, in any way or form. The use of the term κύριος in Isa 53:1b is represented in the MT with the 'expected' יהוה. Conceptually speaking, it does seem as if the Greek OT text shares, taking into consideration that the term κύριος is considered as the most suitable Greek equivalent for reproducing the Tetragram, the same theological undertone, that the personal Hebrew deity is the primary theological significant acting agent; represented by the יהוה and κύριος terms respectively.[92] The extent of the impact, of this seemingly insignificant discrepancy, will become evident when Rom 10:16 is considered within the immediate-thought structure which includes the cited text in Rom 10:13.

---

[92] Isa 53:4[MT] reads the אלהים term with no equivalent attested in the Greek counterpart.

The deductible problem in this instance is two-fold: first, the 'absence' of the יהוה or any other related term, thus a translation or transmission problem. The second problem would be the literary-conceptual integration of the cited text, particularly the term κύριος, in its inter-relatedness with the term θεός and with Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος.

~ A problem of rendition as well as theological-conceptual ~

Three theological significant terms equally dominate chapter ten–all of which are attested to in four verses each; the first is the term θεός used Rom 10:1, 2, 3, 9, with the term κύριος implemented in Rom 10:9, 12, 13, 16, two of which form part of cited texts. Finally, the term χριστός is deployed in Rom 10:4, 6, 7 and 17. The cited texts (Joel 3:5a and Isa 53:1) will thus be evaluated within a dynamic literary conceptual context, in an attempt to establish to what extent these terms are inter-related with one another and how they impact the theological fibre of Romans 10.

The term θεός is the referent to whom prayer is directed (Rom 10:1). It is pointed out that the Israelites had a desire for θεός (Rom 10:2), but they were ignorant of his righteousness (Rom 10:3). These concepts are introduced while the concept of θεός being the agent responsible for resurrecting κύριον Ἰησοῦν from the dead is confirmed in Rm 10:9. The term χριστός, on the other hand, is regarded as the fulfilment of the law in righteousness through faith. The concept of faith and righteousness in relation to the term χριστός is further developed in Rom 10:6 and Rom 10:7, through which χριστός (Rom 10:4) is brought into close proximity with the cited text in Rom 10:6 and 7. The mediator role appears to be the primary function assigned to χριστός, who was the one who descended from heaven and the one ascending from the depths; the one who was raised from the dead. The use of the term χριστός in Rom 10:17 is more complicated than meets the eye. A significant text critical issue is found at Rom 10:17 where the text witnesses supporting the χριστοῦ reading are $\mathfrak{P}^{46vid}$ ℵ* B C D* 6. 81. 629. 1506, while an alternative reading θεου is supported by ℵ[1] A D[1] Ψ 33. 1881 𝔐. The papyri witnesses cannot be determined with absolute certainty, but the Uncials, such as codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Ephraimi and Claromontanus are of course strong text witnesses supporting the χριστοῦ reading. This raises the question why some scribes deemed it necessary to read θεοῦ and not χριστοῦ? In an attempt to answer the latter question, one should first account for the term κύριος in Rom 10:13 Rom 10:16; secondly it would be necessary to understand the issue dealt with in both Rom 10:16 and Rom 10:17.

The one who speaks in both Isa 53:1 as well as in Rom 10:13 is κύριος there should be little doubt that the term κύριος Isa 53:1 was intended to reproduce the Tetragram. The fact that the term κύριος is predominantly used in the source context (Isaiah 53), correlating with its Hebrew counterpart in all instances (except for Isa 54:4), is a strong testimony supporting such an argument. The latter does not necessarily imply that the conceptual undertone supporting the term κύριος in Rom 10:13 and Rom 10:16 was adopted by Paul, although literary speaking it appears to be the obvious assumption. In other words, based on the literary evidence at one's disposal, the history of the text – both in its translation and transmission phases–proposes that the term κύριος in Rom 10:13 is the Greek equivalent for the Tetragram.[93] Even though this is the case, one cannot assume that Paul *intended* the term κύριος to call the Tetragram into mind. It does appear, however, as if one could argue for the opposite if compared with Rm 10:9 and Rom 10:12. If Rom 10:13 is read in relation to Rom 10:12, given the fact that the term κύριος, text historically speaking, reproduces the Tetragram, that the only logical conclusion is that Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός is called to mind in this instance.[94] Could the same be said for Rom 10:16?

The concept of 'hearing' continues in Rom 10:17, while faith is possible through hearing the message, and what is heard is the message about χριστοῦ. The role and nature reflected by the term χριστός is once more one of mediation. If one interprets the cited content in Rom 10:18-21 as reflecting 'words' of θεός, then it is plausible to read the term θεός and not χριστοῦ in Rom 10:17. This might have been the way in which the scribes or redactors of א[1] A D[1] Ψ understood the text. It does appear to be plausible that these scribes interpreted the κύριος who Isaiah is addressing (Isa 53:1) as the Tetragram and therefore wanted to 'alter' the manuscript reading from χριστός to θεός. One should, however, make a clear distinction between 'the message' which in this case is that of χριστός (Rom 10:17) and the one addressed, namely κύριος, about proclaiming the message (Rom 10:16). If such a distinction is valid and if the term κύριος in Rom 10:16 represents the Tetragram, text historically speaking, then it is most likely that Paul conceptualised the Tetragram when he used the term κύριος. If his readers, especially those from a Greek background, would share such a concept, remains uncertain. If one argues that the term κύριος in Rom 10:16 refers to the same entity as the term χριστός in Rom 10:17, then it seems literary plausible and

---

[93] Rowe, "Name of the Lord," 135, considers the term κύριος in Rom 10:13 as 'proof' that Paul relates God of the Old Testament with Jesus and that this holds profound implications for the understandingof the identity of the God of the Old Testament.

[94] Metzger, *Textual Commentary,* ascribes the 'omission' of χριστοῦ in several Western witnesses as carelessness, 463-464.

cognitively logical that the term κύριος in Rom 10:16 conceptually refers to the same entity as in Rom 10:17; a conceptual model that will fit well into the Pauline *christo*-logie.

The literary inferred concept underlying this cited text (Joel 3:5a) is that everyone who calls upon κύριος will be saved.[95] This idea is confirmed in Rom 10:12 whereby κύριος is made to be the κύριος of both Jew and Gentile. The concept of faith was introduced in Rm 10:9; when one confesses with the mouth that Jesus is κύριος and believes that θεός raised him from the dead, and then one would be saved. The κύριον Ἰησοῦν of Rom 10:9 and the χριστός in Rom 10:8, in particular, can thus be regarded as terms referring to the same being, namely Jesus as both the κύριος and the χριστός. Structuring Paul's conceptual thought regarding the θεός and κύριος would consequently present something as follows:

θεός
recipient of prayers (v. 1);
longed for by the Israelites (v. 2);
ignorance of theos' judgment (v. 3);
raised Kyrios-Jesus from the dead (v. 9).

χριστός
The fulfilment of the law (v. 4);
Mediator (v. 6 and 7);
Faith through Christ's message (v. 17).

κύριος
used as a title for Jesus (v. 9);
over Jew and Gentile (v. 12);
salvation through calling on κύριος (v. 13, Joel 3:5a);
addressee of the prophet Isaiah (v. 16, Is 53:1).

Inferred from Paul's literary conceptual context it seems probable to suggest that the term θεός is used when referring to the Hebrew deity as the righteous monotheistic deity of ancient Israel; the only entity capable of raising a mortal from the dead. The term χριστός can

---

[95] Interesting, though, is that Joel 3:1-5 is cited in Acts 2:17-21, and this citation is ascribed to what is said by θεός (Acts 2:17), with the term κύριος suggested by codex Bezae, among others. In Acts we thus have the concept that the citation content is the 'words' spoken by θεός and that these words also mentions that everyone calling on the name κύριος will be saved (cf. Acts 2:21; Joel 3:5a).

primarily be regarded as mediator, while the term κύριος in Rom 10:9 in particular is used to conceptually refer to a single entity, Jesus as the κύριος (cf. Rom 10:9 and 12). Calling on the 'name' κύριος in Rom 10:13 could either imply Jesus as the κύριος or the name of the Hebrew deity, the Tetragram. [96] The term κύριος in Rom 10:16 should however, be considered as referring to the personal Hebrew deity. There appears to be more to the term κύριος than merely an epithet or title for Jesus as the χριστός. The conceptual relatedness in the mind of Paul remains for now enigmatic. Any concluding judgment in this regard would be pre-mature and irresponsible. The two cited texts, Joel 3:5a and Isa 53:1, do introduce a κύριος concept which is not that obvious to determine, making the text critical proposal to read the term θεός in Rom 10:17 even more intriguing.

Paul succeeded in conceptually relating the terms θεός, κύριος and χριστός by deploying two common denominators and governing topics a.) σωτηρία and b.) πιστεύω. The theological concept underlying σωτηρία and πιστεύω is that θεός is the initiator and therefore acting agent (cf. Rm 10:3), while the resurrection of χριστός is the object or subject matter through which θεός wanted to save humanity (cf. Rom 10:4-7). An addition to the latter, those who claim that Jesus is κύριος, raised from the dead, will be saved. Paul achieved a somewhat confusing conceptual coherence by his subtle juxtaposition of the θεός, κύριος and χριστός; such an assumed confusing conceptual coherence, especially with regard to the relatedness of the term κύριος attested in the citations (Rom 10:13 and 16) and the term κύριος in Rom 10:9 and 12.

3.4.11 Romans 11

3.4.11.1 *Romans 11:3*

Another interesting cited content variation and implementation is found in Rom 11:2b-3.[97] This verse resembles content from 3 Kgdms 19:10[LXX] and 1 Kgs 19:10 (1 Kgs 19:10)[MT].[98]

---

[96] Cf.Rowe. "Name of the Lord," 149-151.

[97] Cf. Bruggen, *Romeinen*, 157; Wilckens, *Die Brief,* 237. Cranfield, *Romans,* points to the fact that there are many examples from the Rabbinic literature of reference to sections of Scriptures by means of titles derived from their subject matter, 545-546; cf. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief,* 322.

[98] See Stanley, Christopher D. "The significance of Romans 11:3-4 for the Text History of the LXX Book of Kingdoms." *JBL* 112.1, (1993), 43-54. Stanley presents the nature of the problem in terms of the History of LXX Book of Kingdoms, 43-46. He also offers a comparison between the LXX, LXX_L, MT and Rom 11:3 and Rom 11:4, 47-48.

Literary comparison (Rom 11:2b-3 and 3 Kgdms 19:10)

NA²⁷ (Rom 11:2b-3)	LXX^Gött (3 Kgdms 19:10)	MT^BHS (1 Kgs 19:10)
2b ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή,	καὶ ἰδοὺ ῥῆμα **κυρίου** πρὸς αὐτὸν	
	καὶ εἶπεν Τί σὺ ἐνταῦθα, Ηλιου	
[ὡς ἐντυγχάνει]		
[τῷ θεῷ]		
[κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ];		
	10 καὶ εἶπεν Ηλιου Ζηλῶν ἐζήλωκα	וַיֹּ֩אמֶר֩ קַנֹּ֨א קִנֵּ֜אתִי
3 κύριε,[τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν]	τῷ **κυρίῳ** παντοκράτορι,	**לַיהוָ֣ה׀ אֱלֹהֵ֣י צְבָא֗וֹת**
ὡς ἐντυγχάνει κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ	ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπόν σε οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ·	כִּֽי־עָזְב֤וּ בְרִֽיתְךָ֙ בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל
τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν,	τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν	אֶת־מִזְבְּחֹתֶ֖יךָ הָרָ֑סוּ
τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν,	καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν	וְאֶת־נְבִיאֶ֖יךָ הָרְג֣וּ בֶחָ֑רֶב
κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος καὶ ζητοῦσιν	ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος	וָאִוָּתֵ֤ר אֲנִי֙ לְבַדִּ֔י וַיְבַקְשׁ֥וּ אֶת־נַפְשִׁ֖י לְקַחְתָּֽהּ

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		**OT**	**OT**	
𝔓⁴⁶	ℵ A B	A B	Cod^Len	Cod^Alep
-	θω	κω	-	-
-	κε	-		

To determine the rendition in Rom 11:2b-3 of content that resembles 3 Kgdms 19:10 is complex. The tables above are an attempt to construct such a rendition. It is reasonable to assume that ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή (Rom 11:2b) correlates in conceptual essence, bearing in mind that Paul's intention is to clearly indicate that cited content is to follow, with καὶ εἶπεν Ηλιου Ζηλῶν ἐζήλωκα (3 Kgdms 19:10) וַיֹּאמֶר קַנֹּא קִנֵּאתִי (1 Kgs 19:10). Such an assumption, nonetheless, would require some form of verification.

INTRODUCTORY FORMULA [Rom 11:2b]

ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή

[but did you not know what the scripture say about Elijah?]

PAUL'S EXAMPLE (Indirect speech) [Rom 11:2c]

ὡς ἐντυγχάνει **τῷ θεῷ** κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ

[such as his appeal to *Theos* about Israel]

FOLLOWED BY WHAT IS SAID (Direct speech) [Rom 11:3a]

κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν

[*Kyrie*, they have killed your prophets]

τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν,
[they have destroyed your sanctuaries]

κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος
καὶ ζητοῦσιν

[I was left behind and they are looking for me]

LXX ACCOUNT
'INTRODUCTORY FORMULA' [3 Kgdms 19:9b-10a]

καὶ ἰδοὺ ῥῆμα **κυρίου** πρὸς αὐτὸν

[and behold the word of the *Kyrios* to him]

καὶ εἶπεν Τί σὺ ἐνταῦθα, Ηλιου;

[and he said: Why are you here Elijah?]

καὶ εἶπεν Ηλιου Ζηλῶν ἐζήλωκα

[and Elijah, the one striving strived and said:]

> τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι
>
> [to *Kyrios* pantakrator]

THE EXAMPLE (Indirect speech)

ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπόν σε οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ·

[that the sons of Israel have forsaken you]

WHAT IS SAID

τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν

[they destroyed your sanctuaries]

καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν

[and they killed your prophets]

ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος

[with the sword, I was the only one who was left behind]

The premise is thus that Paul used 3 Kgdms 19:9-10 as *Vorlage* when he constructed Rm 11:2b-3. Based on the latter premise, it is plausible to interpret that Paul considered 3 Kgdms

19:9b-10a as that what has been said about Elijah, or to put it differently, that which has been ultimately written about Elijah (Rom 11:2b) on what he said. Moreover, it seems as if Paul 'reworked' the first three phrases of 3 Kgdms 19:9b-10a, as a build-up to the reason why Elijah had to address either κύριος or θεός. Dependent on the premise that Rom 11:2b-3 reflects content resembling 3 Kgdms 19:9b-10 and that Paul used such a *Vorlage* and reworked it, one could infer that Paul considered the term θεός in its dative case, together with the definite article as a suitable Greek equivalent for τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι (3 Kgdms 19:10a).[99] Second, it appears as if Paul did not want to use the θεός in its vocative form to indicate direct speech, and opted for the term κύριος. The latter should thus not be interpreted as a representation of the term κύριος in 3 Kgdms 19:10a, but rather as a theological reworking on the part of Paul. The Hebrew counterpart reads יהוה in combination with אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת; the Greek of which would be considered not to be a 'suitable' representation of the Hebrew reading.

One cannot deny nor reject the possibility that Paul's use of the term θεός is due to a different *Vorlage* – a manuscript or traces thereof, not in extant today. What remains undisputed is that Paul reworked his *Vorlage* for his own theological purposes.[100]

The issue at hand is the use of the term θεός, where the LXX consistently reads the term κύριος. The issue is stretched even further with the phrase τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι, which does not seem to represent the Hebrew phrase לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת all that well.

~ A rendition, Greek transmission and theological conceptual problem ~

3.4.11.2   *Romans 11:8*

The issue in this case revolves around the absence of κύριος in Rom 11:8, which reflects content from Deut 29:2. It could be assumed that the redactors of the Greek OT added the term κύριος. The text variants indicate that some minuscule texts do not read κύριος, while some others 'exclude' the term θεός from the text.

---

[99] Capes, *Yahweh Texts,* unqualifyingly mention that it is sufficient to say that Paul had 'God' in mind when he quoted the Old Testament which contained the κύριος, 48. He also considered the term κύριος in Rom 11:3 as referring to *Yahweh*, 48. Despite the fact that one cannot prove with reasonable certainty what Paul had in mind, Capes underestimated the complexity of the matter when he merely interprets Rom 11:3 as speaking of *Yahweh*.
[100] See also the textual comparison between the MT, LXX and Rom 11:3 in Koch, *Schrift,* 74-77; cf. Stanley, *Langauge of Scripture,* 151-152.

NA²⁷ (Rom 11:8)	LXX^Gött (Deut 29:3)	MT^BHS (Deut 29:3)
καθὼς γέγραπται·		
ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς **ὁ θεὸς** πνεῦμα κατανύξεως,	καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν **κύριος ὁ θεὸς** ὑμῖν καρδίαν εἰδέναι	וְלֹא־נָתַן֩ **יְהוָ֨ה** לָכֶ֥ם לֵב֙ לָדַ֔עַת
ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν	καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς βλέπειν	וְעֵינַ֥יִם לִרְאֹ֖ות
καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν,	καὶ ὦτα ἀκούειν	וְאָזְנַ֖יִם לִשְׁמֹ֑עַ
		עַ֖ד הַיֹּ֥ום הַזֶּֽה
ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.	ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης.	

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES						HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT			**OT**			**OT**		
𝔓⁴⁶	A, C, D, F & G	ℵ	S, A, B, Fᵇ M	730	426 54-75' 55	4QDeutˡ	Cod^Len	Cod^Alep
ο θς	ο θς	ο ο θς	κς ο θς	ο θς	κς	יהוה	יהוה	יהוה

Once more the Greek text tradition displays three terms utilised as 'suitable' equivalents for יהוה, if indeed the constructed LXX^Gött and MT^BHS are true representatives of an authentic Old Greek text and Hebrew source text respectively. If one thus presupposes that the constructed MT^BHS text reflects a possible Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the Greek translators, and that the constructed LXX^Gött text replicates a possible *Vorlage* used by NT authors, in this case Paul, then the latter would imply that the יהוה is represented by ο θς, κς ο θς and κς. Based on the source (Deut 29) and target (Rm 11) context, the use of κς ο θς is consistent throughout Deut 29:1-17^LXX – which correlates with Deut 29:1-17^MT consistently utilised[101] יהוה אלהים except of course for Deut 29:3. The intensity of this issue weakens, when one realises that the term θεός in Rom 11:8 intertwines soundly within the immediate literary conceptual context, in which the term θεός dominates (Rom 11:2, 8, 21, 22, 23).

Three distinct Greek terms have been implemented as equivalents for יהוה.

~ A rendering and Greek transmission problem ~

---

[101] With varying use of pre-nominal suffixes.

3.4.11.3   *Romans 11:34*

There are no text critical issues presented by the various eclectic texts. Even though this is the case, the content of this verse which resembles that of Isa 40:13[LXX], will indeed prove to highlight inter- and intra-textual issues.

Literary comparison (Rom 11:34 and Isa 40:13)		
NA[27] (Rom 11:34)	LXX[Gött] (Isa 40:13)	MT[BHS5th] (Isa 40:13)
τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν **κυρίου**;	τίς ἔγνω νοῦν **κυρίου**,	מִי־תִכֵּן אֶת־רוּחַ יְהוָה
ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο	καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο,	וְאִישׁ[a] עֲצָתוֹ יוֹדִיעֶנּוּ
	ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν	

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES		HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT	**OT**	**OT**		
𝔓[46NT]	א A B	S A B	1QIsa[a]	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
-	κυ	κυ	יהוה	יהוה	יהוה

It can be deduced from the tables above, that both the Greek and Hebrew text traditions appear to be intact. Furthermore, the text transmission also seems to show integrity, in other words the general 'rule of thumb' regarding the term κύριος as a suitable representation for יהוה is sustained. Rom 11:34 together with Rom 11:3 are the only two verses accounting for the term κύριος within the immediate literary context where θεός is the dominating acting agent.

The inter-relatedness of the term κύριος in Rom 11:3 and Rom 11:34 with the dominating term θεός would be the ultimate issue to be dealt with here.
~ A theological conceptual problem ~

The literary theological conceptual context captured in chapter 11 again portrays θεός as the primary acting agent. The term θεός remains the term that refers to the entity who accepts or denies (cf. Rom 9:11, 16). It would not be without difficulty to interpret the term θεός as referring to any other, specifically in this case, than to the monotheistic Hebrew deity. The only difference between the term θεός in Romans 9 and Romans 11, is that in the former Paul

clearly intended to emphasise that θεός is not limited to any people, nation or clan, whereas in Romans 11 Paul is preparing his rhetorically loaded imperative polemic grand finale directed towards the Jews. This attempt, however, is more positive in nature. Paul confirms that θεός did not reject his people (Rom 11:2). What would be unique in ch. 11 is not the fact that the θεός is the dominating theological significant agent, but that the only reference made to the term κύριος is limited to cited content (cf. Rom 11:3 and Rom 11:34). The first of which is a reference to Elijah's words (Rom 11:2b-3 [3 Kgdms 19:10]). The thought sequence, with regard to the term θεός and κύριος, for both the Greek and Hebrew OT texts are as follows:

1 Kgs 19:9b	יהוה speaks to Elijah;
1 Kgs 19:10a	Elijah then speaks to לַיהוָה‎ אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת
3 Kgdms 19:9b	κύριος spoke to Elijah;
3 Kgdms 19:10a	Elijah speaks to **τῷ κυρίῳ** παντοκράτορι
Rom 11:2	Elijah's appeal to θεός
Rom 11:3	Elijah speaks to κύριος

A plausible inference would be that the Greek scribes were consistent in applying the term κύριος as equivalent for יהוה (cf. 3 Kgdms 19:9b [1 Kgs 19:9b]; 3 Kgdms 19:10a [1 Kgs 19:10a] and 3 Kgdms 19:11 [1 Kgs 19:11]). It does appear as if they did not account for the term אלהים in 1 Kgs 19:10a. They either ignored the term אֱלֹהֵי, or they regarded τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι as a suitable equivalent for אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת. Finally, it is also possible that the translators had access to a Hebrew manuscript that did not read the status construct form of אלהים. Paul also shows a few inconsistencies, if one accepts that 3 Kgdms 19:9b constitutes the text in Rom 11:2b, when he compares Elijah's words as an appeal to θεός for his people in Rom 11:2b. According to Paul, Elijah's appeal is directed to θεός (Rom 11:2b), which seems odd compared to both the Hebrew and Greek versions of 1 Kings. The 'oddness', however, is supported by the premise that the 'general rule of thumb' is that κύριος was considered the most suitable term as a reproduction of the Tetragram. If such a premise is not accepted, then Paul's 'out of the ordinary' use of the term θεός–when his source text (3 Kgdms 19:9-10) clearly opted for the term κύριος when referring to the personal Hebrew deity–appears to be 'normal.' It is suggested that Paul conceptually considered the term θεός

as a suitable representative for τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι not purely based on his interpretation and understanding of the latter terms, but also, it seems, that the term θεός for Paul sensitively (towards both Jew and Gentile) transmits the essence of the personal Hebrew deity best. It is, though, not essential to assume that when Paul implements two distinct, yet 'generally accepted' theological transposing terms such as the θεός and κύριος, that these two terms denote the same theological entity. Such an assumption might appear logical because in the literary conceptual context their 'being' seems to be overlapping.

Varying terms = similar concept or thought does not necessitate a premise that the alternating terms conceptually refer to the same entity.

The evidence that supposes Paul's loyalty towards his *Vorlage* does not necessarily demand that concept transmission has taken place, the latter which is also true for the opposite. The apparent deviation from the *Vorlage* does not imply that Paul diverges conceptually. In Rm 11:8 the term θεός is yet again presented at this junction forming part of cited text reflecting Deut 29:3. Paul does 'deviate' from his supposed *Vorlage*,[102] but remains consistent in his use of the dominant θεός term (cf. Rom 11:1, 2, 8, 21, 23, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33). The Greek OT text witnesses, however, alternate between ο, ο θς and κς, while the Hebrew text tradition is intact with its reading of יהוה. The terms κύριος ὁ θεὸς in combination dominate the literary source-context in Deut 29 (cf. Deut 29:5, 9, 11, 14 and 17) which represents, for the most part, יהוה in correlation with אלהים. Per implication, supported by the evidence in Rom 11:2b, Paul does appear to regard the term θεός in Rom 11:8 as a reasonable Greek equivalent for the personal Hebrew deity, namely יהוה. There is thus neither reason nor opposing evidence to reject the interpretation that the term θεός in Rom 11:8 conceptually refers to the same entity as the term θεός in both Rom 11:1 as well as in Rom 11:2b. The latter is also true for the remaining part of Romans 11. The question however remains: does the term κύριος in Rom 11:3, the term θεός in Rom 11:8 and the term κύριος in Rom 11:34 refer to the same entity?

It does seem plausible indeed, literary conceptually speaking, that the term θεός in Rom 11:2b and the term κύριος in Rom 11:3a conceptually refers to the same entity, namely the Hebrew deity. The same assumption can be made logically for the term θεός in Rom 11:8. The latter argument is further enforced with the text readings in Rom 11:33 and Rom 11:34. The latter two verses belong to the well known doxology as presented in Rom 11:33-36. In

---

[102] This should again be made clear at this point. It is noted that Paul could have had access to a text that varied from what has been constructed by the LXX[Gött] text. There is enough text critical evidence confirming such a possibility.

Rom 11:33 the depth and richness of θεός' knowledge is emphasised, followed by the cited text taken from Isa 40:13 (Rom 11:34) that nobody could know the mind of κύριος and could be his advisor. The Greek text witnesses agree on the κύριος reading, the latter term which is used at equal intervals within the source context as the term θεός (cf. Isa 40:1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10). Thematically and literary conceptually speaking, it is doubtful that the term θεός in Rom 11:33 and the term κύριος in Rom 11:34 would refer to any other being than the Hebrew deity. This could be an indication that Paul allowed his *Vorlage* to dictate to him, especially because alternating terms when referencing to the Hebrew deity, suited Paul's theological intent in ch. 11. Jesus the χριστός and κύριος does not figure at all in this chapter. However, it remains probable that Paul conceptually regarded the term κύριος as a designation denoting the authority of Jesus as the Χριστός, even though the logical thought sequence might suggest that Paul had to conceptualise the term θεός and κύριος as referring to the same entity. It is evident, though, that Paul does seem to show a certain sense of leniency towards the interchanging of the terms θεός and κύριος when referring to the Hebrew deity – at least in this instance.

3.4.12 Romans 12

3.4.12.1 *Romans 12:19*

The primary significance in this particular point is the phrase λέγει κύριος trailing the cited content. There are no apparent text critical issues noted in the constructed eclectic texts. The text tradition thus appears to be intact.

Literary comparison (Rom 12:19, Heb 10:30 and Deut 32:35a)			
NA[27] Rom 12:19	NA[27th] Heb 10:30	LXX[Gött] (Deut 32:35a-Ode 2:35)	MT[BHS] (Deut 32:35a)
γέγραπται γάρ·		ἐν ἡμέρᾳ	לִי[a] נָקָם֙
ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω,	ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω	ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω,	וְשִׁלֵּ֔ם[b]
		ἐν καιρῷ,	לְעֵ֖ת
λέγει **κύριος**			

128

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT		**OT**	**OT**		
$\mathfrak{P}^{46NT}$	א A B	S A B	4QDeut	Cod^{Len}	Cod^{Alep}
λέγει κς	λέγει κς	- -	- -	- -	- -

In Deut 32:30 ὁ θεός is the subject responsible for restoring them (personal pronoun probably referring to Israel), while κύριος is the subject responsible for deliverance. The LXX^{A} (Deut 32:30a) does not read κύριος at this particular point. In the Hebrew tradition the only acting subject in this literary context seems to be יהוה. The author continues in Deut 32:31 by comparing ὁ θεός with other nation's deities. In Deut 32:36 κύριος is the subject that judges his people, with θεός as the one speaking in the first person, responsible for killing and making alive (Deut 32:39). One can thus also assume that the 1st person singular presented in ἀνταποδώσω (to repay) in the days of punishment, has to refer to θεός (Deut 32:35). It is therefore not clear if θεός and κύριος were interchangeable terms used to refer to the יהוה, and thus to the personal Hebrew deity. This issue is thus indirectly related to Rom 12:19, and specifically the 'inserted' λέγει κύριος. What remains consistent is the dominant use of the term θεός in Romans 12 and Romans 13, making the appearance of the term κύριος in Rom 12:8 and Rom 12:19 noteworthy.

Paul assigns the cited content, which reflects Deut 32:35a introduced by the formula γέγραπται γάρ, to the words spoken by κύριος. To what extent was Paul influenced by his source-text (Deuteronomy 32) and target text (Romans 12) in his decision to utilise λέγει κύριος?

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

The term θεός in Romans 12 is again the dominating theological significant acting agent. In the first two verses of this chapter the mercy and will of θεός are introduced, as well as that which will be pleasing to θεός. Judgement of oneself should thus be regarded in the light of the measure of faith distributed by θεός (Rom 12:3). The term χριστός is introduced in Rm 12:5, yet again with a mediator-corporate function, in whom many in the flesh exist; they are in Χριστῷ. Paul calls for virtuous conduct in Rom 12:11, the conceptual-setting in which the

term κύριος is introduced. According to Paul one should be enthusiastic by spirit, while serving κύριος.[103]

The 'words spoken' and cited in Rom 12:19 are attributed to κύριος. There is no extant OT Greek text witness that could account for the λέγει κύριος which Paul presumably 'added' to the cited text. Deut 32:35a is also cited in Heb 10:30. Text critical notes suggest that there are a few NT Greek text witnesses reading λέγει κύριος;[104] the latter suggested 'additions' could probably be ascribed to a later Christian tradition. The two citations in Heb 10:30a (Deut 32:35a), Heb 10:30b (Deut 32:36a) together with the citation in Rom 12:19 (Deut 32:35a) are consistent in that they both ascribe 'the words' to κύριος, even though Deut 32:35a does not explicitly read λέγει κύριος.[105] The immediate literary context (Deut 32:36-37) does read the term κύριος, however the larger literary context is dominated by the term θεός (cf. Deut 32:1-52) with the term κύριος used frequently. Paul would thus agree with the author/s of Hebrews that the one responsible for ἐκδίκησις and ἀνταποδώσω is indeed κύριος.

The concept introduced in Rom 12:5 is that all are one body in χριστός, while those (most probably referring to the 'body of Christ') should enthusiastically serve κύριος. The same group of people (the believers, the body of Christ) should not take justice into their own hands, because such an action is reserved for κύριος (Rom 12:19). If and to what extent Paul conceptually differentiated between the referent of the term κύριος in Rom 12:19 and Rom 12:11, remains debateable. What is certain is that Paul's audience would not have made a distinction, especially those with a Hellenistic background, even if Paul had such a division in mind. The inter-relatedness of these terms with the term θεός might shed some light on the matter.

In Rom 12:1-3, θεός is regarded as being merciful, the one willing to do good unto all, while the 'potential' wrath of κύριος is placed at the centre in Rom 12:19. This is not to say that conceptually for Paul θεός refers to a merciful entity, while the term κύριος is used when denoting the negative aspects of the nature of the Hebrew deity, if he conceptualised the personal Hebrew deity at all when he is using the term κύριος. This might be mere coincidence that these two terms portray what one would describe as the opposite natures of the Hebrew deity in this case, due to the fact that Paul allowed his *Vorlage* in this particular

---

[103] Interestingly the term καιρω is suggested as alternative reading against the κύριος term suggested by D*.c F G, among others. This term however is the term used in Deut 32:35a, cited by Paul in Rom 12:19, words he assigns to κύριος.

[104] The text witnesses supporting such reading are א² A D² m b r vg^mss sy^h sa^mss; while 𝔓^13vid.46 א* D* P Ψ 6. 33. 629. 1739. 1881 *pc* lat sy^p sa^ms bo uphold the text reading as is presented by the NA²⁷.

[105] For a detail discussion on Deut 32:35, 36 cited in Heb 10:30, see Steyn, G. J. *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011, 300-310.

case to dictate to him. The fact that the cited content is considered to be words spoken by κύριος, the phrase λέγει κύριος – which appears only 11 times in the whole of the NT[106] - could be a strong indication that this term κύριος should be considered as referring to a separate entity other than Jesus as the κύριος. Therefore, one could infer at least three distinct entities: the first is represented by the term θεός, which refers to the monotheistic Hebrew deity, as is unambiguously the case throughout the Romans epistle. The second is the term χριστός, correlating with the term κύριος in Rom 12:11, most plausibly referring to Jesus. The third, is neither an open nor a closed case and highly debateable at that. The term κύριος in Rom 12:19, might be referring to the personal Hebrew deity, the Tetragram. This is not to say that the monotheistic Hebrew deity should be regarded as a separate entity other than that of the personal Hebrew deity. At the most this might signify a nuanced nature of the Hebrew deity.

3.4.13   Romans 13

The term θεός is again the dominating theological agent in Romans 13, the only true authority, the one that established all existing authorities (Rom 13:1-2). In Rom 13:4-6 Paul speaks about the servants of θεός, which most probably refers to those placed in positions of authority by θεός. In the final verse of this chapter Paul calls for the addressees to put on τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν as resistance against the flesh (Rom 13:14). The distinction is thus clear: the term θεός refers to the Hebrew deity, while the term κύριος refers to Jesus as the χριστός.

3.4.14   Romans 14

3.4.14.1   *Romans 14:11*

The citation/s captured in Rom 14:11 is complex to say the least. What makes these citations (Rom 14:11a and Rom 14:11b) particularly significant, is the fact that Rom 14:11a attests to the term κύριος, while Rom 14:11b presents the term θεός. Determining the source of the citation increases the complexity surrounding the text of Rom 14:11, as will become evident from the tables listed below.

---

[106] Cf. Acts 7:49; 15:17; Rom 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor 14:21; 2 Cor 6:17, 18; Heb 8:8, 9, 10; 10:16; Rev 1:8. Three of these references are authentic Pauline material (Rom 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor 14:21), all of which are explicit citations.

Literary comparison (Rom 14:11, Isa 49:18c and Isa 45:23c)

NA²⁷ Rom 14:11	LXX^Gött (Isa 45:23c)	LXX^Gött (Isa 49:18c)	MT^BHS (Isa 45:23c)	MT^BHS (Isa 49:18c)
11a γέγραπται γάρ·				
ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος**,	ἐγώ εἰμι **ὁ θεός**, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος.	ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος**,		חַי־אָ֫נִי נְאֻם־יְהֹוָ֥ה
ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ	ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ		כִּי־לִ֜י תִּכְרַ֣ע כָּל־בֶּ֗רֶךְ תִּשָּׁבַ֖ע כָּל־לָשֽׁוֹן׃	
11b καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται **τῷ θεῷ**.	καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα **τῷ θεῷ**			

Literary comparison (Rom 14:11, Isa 49:22c, 23c)

NA²⁷ Rom 14:11	LXX^Gött (Isa 45:22bc-23c)	MT^BHS (Isa 45:22c-23c)
11a γέγραπται γάρ·		
ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος**,	ἐγώ εἰμι **ὁ θεός**, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος	אֲנִי־אֵ֖ל וְאֵ֥ין עֽוֹד
ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ	ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ	כִּי־לִ֜י תִּכְרַ֣ע כָּל־בֶּ֗רֶךְ
11b καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται **τῷ θεῷ**.	καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα **τῷ θεῷ**	תִּשָּׁבַ֖ע כָּל־לָשֽׁוֹן׃

Ref.	GREEK TEXT WITNESSES									HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
	NT	**OT**								**OT**	
	א, A, B	S A B	A	S*	B	S¹	S²	407 538	309	Codex^Len	Codex^Alepp

								Sa			°
Rom 14:11a / Isa 49:18c	λεγει κυριος	λεγει κυριος								יְהוָֹה	-
Rom 14:11a /Isa 45:22c	λεγει κυριος	-						λεγει κυριος	κύριος	אֲנִי־אֵל	-
Rom 14:11b/Isa 45:23c	τω θεω		θω	τον κν	τον θν	τον θν	τω θω			-	-

The phrase ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος does not form part of Isa 45:22c^{LXX}, while many other text references are familiar with such a phrase (e.g. Num 14:28; Sop 2:9; Isa 49:18c; Jer 24:22; Ez 5:11; 14:16, 18, 20; 16:48; 17:16; 18:3; 20:31, 33; 35:6, 11). What the evidence also points out is the probability that for Paul the phrase ζῶ ἐγώ might have been a suitable Greek equivalent for the phrase ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος (Isa 45:22c). When the MT text is considered, sourcing for Paul's use of ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος evolves even further. In Isa 45:22 the text reads אֲנִי־אֵל וְאֵין עֹוד with its Greek counterpart reading ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος. To put both the MT and LXX^{Gött} phrases into perspective:

Isa 45:21^{MT} Isa 45:21^{LXX}

אֲנִי יְהוָה וְאֵין־עֹוד אֱלֹהִים   ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος.

The possible sources for the cited text in Rm 14:11a are thus as follows:

a.) ἐγώ εἰμι **ὁ θεός**, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος (Isa 45:22c) – The problem is, why would Paul alter his *Vorlage* to such a great extent (if the constructed LXX^{Gött} is a true representative of such a possible *Vorlage*), in order to read ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος?

b.) ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος** (Isa 49:18c) – The issue here is, why would Paul 'jump' to Isa 49, when he is dealing with content from Isaiah 45?

c.) אֲנִי יְהוָה וְאֵין־עֹוד אֱלֹהִים (Isa 45:21c) – The problem is that one would imply that a Hebrew *Vorlage* influenced Paul, and second the alteration of such to read ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος**;

d.) A fourth possibility is opened up by a 9th and 12th century manuscript, hence 407 and 538 (which are in agreement with the Syrian translations). Both of which read λεγει κς

in addition to ἐγώ εἰμι **ὁ θεός**, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος (Isa 45:22c) – The most probable solution is that it reflects a tradition which adapted the Greek OT towards the NT text.

All these proposals are indeed possible, but some are more probable than others. It is the opinion held here that Paul sourced the content of Rom 14:11a from Isa 45:22c, while combining the content with a 'universal' known and used phrase ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος[107] - the latter which might have been sourced from Isa 49:18c due to the fact that Paul cited content from Isa 49:8 in 2 Cor 6:2,[108] as well as content resembling Isa 48:13 in Rom 4:17.[109] It should be noted that Paul did not disregard or ignore the phrase ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος (Isa 45:22c). It is possible that the phrase ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος served his theological intent better, especially the term κύριος, while encapsulating the theological-conceptual essence of ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος. The phrase ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος was used in combination with γέγραπται γάρ, to make it sound as if the cited content is the actual words spoken by the lord, thus ensuring the authoritive nature of the content. What Paul meant by the term 'κύριος' remains uncertain at this stage. As with Rom 12:19, Paul assigns the content cited in Rom 14:11 not only to that which is written, but views it as words uttered by κύριος. The integrity of Rom 14:11a appears intact with its implementation of κύριος (if Is 49:18c is of course considered as the possible *Vorlage*) while the Greek OT text corresponds to the expected יהוה in the Hebrew text tradition. The same cannot be said for Rom 14:11b. The latter text reference presents various variations on the θεός term in its dative case. At least three variants come to the fore: θεός in its dative and accusative case, as well as κύριος in its accusative case without any Hebrew term as counterpart.[110]

The problem on the one hand is the source of the citation in Rom 14:11a. If Isa 45:22c is considered a possible source, then the fact that the Greek OT does not account for any related term whereas the MT does. Moreover, the challenge would be to relate the term κύριος (Rom 14:11a) with the term θεός (Rom 14:11b) as well as with such terms in the remaining literary context of Romans 14.

~ A transmission (both Hebrew and Greek), rendition and theological conceptual problem ~

---

[107] See Koch, *Schrift,* 184

[108] Cf. Wilk, *Bedeutung,* 18.

[109] Cf. Shum, *Paul's use,* 187.

[110] τῷ θεῷ = Rom.] τον θεον O-88 L'`-46-233 C 407 410 449′ 538 544 Wirc. (*per deum*) Co Syl Eus. dem. Tht. Cyr.; τον κυριον S* Θ; + τον αληθινον L'`-233 544 Syl Eus. dem. Tht.: ex 65:16

Within Paul's immediate literary conceptual context, there appears to be no distinction made between the referent of the term θεός and κύριος. They appear inter-twined and inter-related with one another throughout Romans 14. The latter will of course be scrutinised and put to the test in the remainder of the discussion. Moreover, they are also used with a greater frequency than anywhere else in the epistle, while the term Χριστός is also implemented in three instances.

Paul's literary conceptual context could be summarised as follows:

3a   ὁ **θεὸς** γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο   θεός, the one choosing

4b   τῷ ἰδίῳ **κυρίῳ** στήκει ἢ πίπτει   in κύριος he (the servant) stands or falls

4c   ὁ **κύριος** στῆσαι αὐτόν   The κύριος will make him to stand

6a   ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν **κυρίῳ** φρονεῖ   He who determines the day as special, does so in κύριος.

6b   καὶ ὁ ἐσθίων **κυρίῳ** ἐσθίει   he who eats, does so in κύριος

6c   εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ **τῷ θεῷ**   because he is thankful to θεός

6d   ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει   he who does not eat, does so in κύριος

6e   καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ **τῷ θεῷ**   he is thankful to θεός

8a   ἐάν τε γὰρ ζῶμεν, **τῷ κυρίῳ** ζῶμεν   if we live, we live in κύριος

8b   ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, **τῷ κυρίῳ**   if we are mortal, then in κύριος

8d   ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, **τοῦ κυρίου** ἐσμέν   if we are mortal, we are of κύριος

9a   εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ **Χριστὸς** ἀπέθανεν   for that, Χριστός was mortal

10c   πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι **τοῦ θεοῦ**   all will stand in the tribunal of θεός

11a   ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος**   I am the living, says κύριος

11b	καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται **τῷ θεῷ**	every tongue will confess to θεός
12	ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει [**τῷ θεῷ**]	give account before θεός
14a	οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν **κυρίῳ** Ἰησοῦ	knowledge to be in κύριος Jesus
15d	ἀπόλλυε ὑπὲρ οὗ **Χριστὸς** ἀπέθανεν	Χριστός, the one who died
17a	οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία **τοῦ θεοῦ** βρῶσις	the kingdom of θεός
18a	ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ δουλεύων τῷ **Χριστῷ**	servant in Χριστός
18b	εὐάρεστος **τῷ θεῷ**	acceptable for θεός
20a	τὸ ἔργον **τοῦ θεοῦ**	work of θεός
22b	ἐνώπιον **τοῦ θεοῦ**	before θεός

The nature and role imposed on the entity that is referred to by the term θεός remains intact; the monotheistic Hebrew deity. The term refers to the one that holds the authority to choose (Rom 14:3), thanks are directed to θεός (Rom 14:6c and Rom 14:6e). He will head the tribunal (Rom 14:10c), which is also inferred in Rom 14:12 and Rom 14:18b, and to a lesser degree in Rom 14:22b. Θεός is the monotheistic Hebrew deity, to whom every knee will bow and tongue confess (Rom 14:11b), who's work should not be made undone through the dispute over food (Rom 14:20a). The concept underlying the term κύριος on the other hand seems to be fluctuating. In Rom 14:4b the term κύριος refers to a 'Master' in the slave-owner sense of the word. The term κύριος in Rom 14:4c however does seem to refer to an entity that might not be necessarily 'different' in nature, but an entity that appears to be superior to the entity(ies) to whom the term κύριος in Rom 14:4b refers to. The distinction between the concepts underlying the two terms is made possible by the definite article applied to the term κύριος in Rom 14:4c. The intent with the definite article is to make a clear distinction between 'a' κύριος in the socio-cultural sense of the word; a generic profane concept assigned to the term in Rom 14:4b,[111] and 'the' κύριος which is also 'a' 'Master', but corporate in nature.

This κύριος concept or idea is further developed in Rom 14:8 and Rom 14:9. In Rom 14:8 living life as a mortal being, is to live for κύριος. The socio-cultural concept of slave-

---

[111] A synonymous term, δεσποτής, designating a generic-profane meaning of the term is utilised in only eight instances (1 Tim 6:1,2; 2 Tim 2:21; Titus 2:9; 1 Pet 2:18; 2 Pet 2:1; Jude 4 and Rev 6:10) in the NT text.

benefactor or slave-master remains the construct Paul is working with as introduced in Rom 14:4. For Paul, however, being a servant of 'the' κύριος demands a mortal-existential loyalty that affects one's life and death as a mortal. The social construct, that a servant belonged to his 'Master' until his death, would not have been an alien concept for those whom Paul is addressing. The key to understanding Paul's theologically loaded concept is not only to account for the definite article accompanying the term κύριος in Rom 14:4c, but to also interpret it in relation to Rom 14:9. For Paul χριστός also died and was raised to be κυριεύσῃ (the ruler/the κύριος) of both the living and the dead. The term χριστός in Rom 14:9 thus refers to the same entity to whom the κύριος in v. 4c, v. 6 and v. 8 refers to; the latter of which is enforced in v. 18a; that one is a servant of χριστός and that χριστός died (v. 15d). Who then is this κύριος? Who is the χριστός that would become the κύριος for all? The answer might lie in the explicit citation presented in Rom 14:11a. As indicated before, the phrase ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος is either cited from a Greek text that resembled the reconstructed Isa 49:18c or Isa 45:22c text, the latter which is considered to be the more plausible of the two possibilities.

If Isa 49:18c is viewed as a possible *Vorlage,* then the term κύριος Rom 14:11a would indirectly refer to יהוה. But if Isa 45:22b, ἐγώ εἰμι **ὁ θεός**, is considered to be the sourced text, it would then suggest that the term κύριος indirectly refers to אל. This might be an indication that Paul used the terms θεός and κύριος interchangeably. The latter is confirmed by the fact that Rom 14:11b attests to the explicit use of the term θεός. For Paul the concept underlying the term κύριος in Rom 14:11a could either refer to the same entity the referent of the term κύριος in Rom 14:8, but it could also refer to the monotheistic Hebrew deity as related in Rom 14:11b; the one heading the tribunal in v. 10 and to whom everyone will be held accountable (v. 12). It is the opinion held here that Paul intended to be ambiguous to the point that one would consider Paul to be dubious. The phrase in Rom 14:11b confirms this, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ (Isa 45:23d) – every tongue would confess before θεός. To summarise, from the deployment of the terms θεός and κύριος, it is possible to deduce three distinct entities from Romans 14:

1.) Κύριος as a socio-cultural construct referring to the generic-profane 'master' (v. 4b);
2.) 'The' κύριος in v. 4c which is also the χριστός in v. 9, 15 and 18, both of which refers to the same entity κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ (v. 14);

3.) Finally, the term κύριος in v. 11a could either refer to the same entity as does Rm 14:4c and others, or it could refer to the same entity that the term θεός refers to in Rm 14:11b, namely the 'living' monotheistic Hebrew deity.

Moreover, the referent of the term κύριος in Rom 14:4b is subordinate to the referent of the term κύριος in the remaining part of ch. 14 (cf. Rom 14:4c, 6 etc.). The latter coincides with the term χριστός in Romans 9, 15 and 18. This referent, Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, is in the mind of Paul, either subordinate or on a par with the referent or entity referred to using the term θεός in Rom 14:11b.

3.4.15 Romans 15

3.4.15.1 *Romans 15:9*

The obvious issue at hand is the fact that Rom 15:9 does not testify to the κύριος or any related term, while the constructed Greek *Vorlage* (Ps 17:50) proposes the term κύριος, which would appear to be an agreement with its Hebrew counterpart testifying to the use of the Tetragram. It is deemed important that a theological significant term such as κύριος, particularly while it holds the potential reproducing the Tetragram, is 'omitted.'

Literary comparison (Rom 15:9 and Ps 17:50)

NA[27] (Rom 15:9)	LXX[Gött] (Ps 17:50)	MT[BHS] (Ps 18:50)
τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν,		
καθὼς γέγραπται·		
διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν	διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν, **κύριε,**	עַל־כֵּן ׀ אוֹדְךָ בַגּוֹיִם ׀ **יְהוָה**
καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ.	καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ,	וּלְשִׁמְךָ אֲזַמֵּרָה:

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES					HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT				**OT**	**OT**		
𝔓[46]	ℵ[1], A,	ℵ[*]	ℵ[2]	S A B	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]	

	B						
[τουτο]	τουτο	του προφητου	κε	κε	יהוה	יהוה	

Even though this is not an explicit citation containing the term κύριος nor the term θεός, the content presented in Rom 15:9 does, however, hold significance due to the fact that the content which this verse resembles (Ps 17:50) does read κύριε, with its Hebrew counterpart (Ps 18:50) representing יהוה. There should have been a good reason why such a significant term had been 'omitted', if of course the *Vorlage* used resembles that which is constructed in the LXX[Gött] text. The text critical data does show that a 2nd hand 'altered' the 'original' hand of the NT Sinaiticus reading, probably towards the available Greek OT manuscripts that read the term κύριος in its vocative form. This issue becomes even more intriguing when the citation in Rom 15:11 is taken into account. The latter content, which resembles Ps 117:1, does however present the term κύριος. It does appear as if Paul is inconsistent in applying the OT content, especially with regard to the term κύριος. What is deemed plausible is the fact that Paul merely followed his *Vorlage* which did not read the term κύριος (Rom 15:9). It is possible that Paul merely accepted the reading without considering altering his source text. As mentioned, the text critical data could be used as proof for the existence of such a *Vorlage*.

Two alternative readings are suggested: the first is to read nothing more than what is presented by the eclectic text, supported by 𝔓[46] א[*] A and B. The second option is to read κυριε supported by NT manuscripts א[2] 33. 104. 1505, among others, and OT manuscripts S A and B. If determining what could have caused the discrepancy is not complex enough, the term κύριος in Rom 15:11 does indeed correspond to the constructed *Vorlage*, which is further evidence for inconsistency.

The focal issue thus is the possible 'omission' or absence of κύριε in combination with the fact that some NT text witnesses suggest reading κύριε.
~ A Greek transmission problem ~

3.4.15.2 *Romans 15:11*

As mentioned in the previous section, the significance of the citation captured in Rom 15:11 would come into play if and when considered in relation to Rom 15:9 in particular, as well as in the immediate literary context of Romans 15.

Literary comparison (Rom 15:11 and Ps 116:1)		
NA²⁷ (Rom 15:11)	**LXX^Gött (Ps 116:1)**	**MT^BHS (Ps 117:1)**
καὶ πάλιν ·	Ἀλληλουια.	הַלְלוּ
αἰνεῖτε, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, **τὸν κύριον**	Αἰνεῖτε **τὸν κύριον**, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,	אֶת־יְהוָה כָּל־גּוֹיִם
καὶ ἐπαινεσάτωσαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ λαοί.	ἐπαινέσατε αὐτόν, πάντες οἱ λαοί,	שַׁבְּחוּהוּ כָּל־הָאֻמִּים׃

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		**OT**	**OT**	
𝔓⁴⁶	א, A, B	S A	Cod^Len	Cod^Alep
τον κν	τον κν	τον κν	יהוה	יהוה

The primary issue at stake in this instance is related to the theological conceptual integrity of the literary context regarding the term κύριος and θεός and related terms as it presents itself in Rom 15:1-33.

The 'so to seem' intactness of the text traditions, raises suspicion and should undergo further literary scrutiny.

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

When one considers the content of these two verses within its immediate literary conceptual context, they appear to be out of sync. The literary context is dominated by the terms χριστός and θεός, while the term κύριος only occurs within the technical phrase τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Rom 15:6). Conceptually, χριστός is the one who does not consider himself, the unselfish one (Rom 15:3), while θεός is the one that is patient and that encourages (Rm 15:5). The same entity, θεός is also the one providing the ability to consider one another according to Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν (Rom 15:5). The objective of the latter is for θεός, to be

glorified, as the father of τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Rom 15:6). The addressees should accept one another as χριστός accepts them. The objective again is to glorify θεός (Rom 15:7). Χριστός became as servant for the circumcised, on behalf of the truth of θεός (Rom 15:8). The nations will glorify θεός due to his mercy, confirmed by a string of citations, the first taken from Ps 17:50. The concept of glorification, praise and hymns are used in close relation with the term θεός in both the target and source contexts (cf. Ps 17:47). It does however appear as if Paul simply followed his *Vorlage* which did not read the term κύριος in the case of Ps 17:50 (Rom 15:9b). Paul could have considered the term κύριος not suitable at this particular juncture, especially with the δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 15:7), ἀληθείας θεοῦ (Rm 15:8) and δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν (Rom 15:9) concepts already introduced. On the other hand, it did not seem to inconvenience him in Rm 15:11 when he cites Ps 116:1.

It is, however, irrelevant if Paul's *Vorlage* read the term κύριος or not and if one should actually read the term κύριος in Rom 15:9a. The phrase τῷ ὀνόματί σου should refer to no other than κύριος, the latter which should be interpreted as the same κύριος as in Rm 15:11 as well as Rom 15:6. To confirm if this is indeed the case, it would be necessary to establish the extent of the literary conceptual relationship between the term κύριος in Rom 15:11 and the term θεός in the remainder of the literary context. Paul considers himself a servant of Jesus as the χριστός for the nation, a priest for the good news of θεός (Rom 15:16). The good news about χριστός is proclaimed from Jerusalem to Illyricum (Rom 15:19). It seems plausible to deduce that ὠνομάσθη Χριστός (Rom 15:20) conceptually coincides with τῷ ὀνόματί σου in Rom 15:9b. The logical conclusion is therefore that the 'implied' κύριος term in Rom 15:9b and the term χριστός in Rom 15:20 are conceptually for Paul referring to the same entity, the resurrected Jesus (Rom 15:6). The argument that the two κύριος terms (Rom 15:9, 11) imply Jesus as the χριστός – introduced in Rom 15:6 – is further supported by the fact that Rom 15:9a makes a distinction between the one coming to the nations, χριστός, and the one that would be glorified because of this, namely θεός.

There are thus two separate entities referred to in chapter 15, the one is Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος. The second is the monotheistic Hebrew deity referred to using none other than the term θεός. In addition to this it should be noted that it is almost as if Paul made a distinction between the earthly Jesus and χριστός who function on an equal 'altitude' as θεός. It would not be fair, however, to reason that Paul conceptually assimilated the χριστός substance to such an extent that in essence χριστός is, or becomes θεός. It does however appear to be plausible to surmise that the substance of the earthly Jesus have been morphed

into a 'new' being as the exalted χριστός, who is neither the earthly Jesus nor θεός, but Jesus as the exalted κύριος.

3.4.16 Romans 16

The interesting feature of this chapter is that it is the only chapter in the Roman epistle dominated by the term χριστός and κύριος. It is thus an invaluable chapter to determine the concepts underlying the term κύριος separate from the technical phrase κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in particular. In the first two verses the addressees are requested to receive Phoebe, a deacon in κύριος (Rom 16:2). Another call is made to welcome Prisca and Aquilla in Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. It is also mentioned that Epaenetus was the first convert of Asia for χριστός (Rom 16:5). Paul also says that Adronicus and Junia were in χριστός before him (Rom 16:7). Paul continues with this line of thought to greet and welcome a fellow follower of Christ who is either in χριστός or in κύριος. The concept that Jesus as χριστός and κύριος to whom and in whom one is converted to become a member of the church of χριστός (v. 16), seems to be a dominant feature of Romans 16 – especially attested in Rom 16:1-18. The concept of the peace of θεός (Rom 16:20) is not foreign to Paul.[112] However, the phrase τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ (Rom 16:26) and the dative phrase μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ in Rom 16:27 is not only foreign to Paul but also to the New Testament. The concept of the wisdom of θεός is of course not unfamiliar to Paul's thought.[113]

3.5   Summary

One could infer at least four terms used to refer to two distinct entities, and one related entity in the Romans epistle. The first is the term κύριος used in referencing to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος. The second and third is the term χριστός, referring to a.) Jesus as the κύριος and b.) transformed χριστός who is neither Jesus nor θεός. Fourth, is the term κύριος that refers to the personal Hebrew deity, the Tetragram. Finally, the term θεός ultimately refers to the monotheistic Hebrew deity.

---

[112] Cf. Phil 4:7, 9; Rom 15:33; 2 Cor 13:11; 1 Thess 5:23.
[113] Cf. 1 Cor 1:18-25; it should be noted that 1 Cor 1:25-27 is considered by scholars as post-Pauline.

3.5.1 Proposed Solution: *Theological Conceptual Problems*

Most of the explicit κύριος and θεός citations posed a theological conceptual problem due to the fact that evidence did not present any imminent text critical or text historical problems. The theologically assumed conceptual problem presented by the citations in Rom 3:11 and Rom 3:18 can be dismissed based on two criteria: a.) the cited content attesting to the θεός term fits in seamlessly into Paul's *theo*-concept in at least the first 11 chapters; b.) no text critical or text historical issues were deductable from the available data. Moreover, there is no other theological significant acting agent present in Romans 3 other than θεός. The *theo*-concept inferred from the literary context is the monotheistic Hebrew deity. The explicit κύριος citation in Rm 4:8 does indeed pose a theological conceptual problem. Even though Paul follows his *Vorlage* and the term κύριος in Rom 4:8 would indirectly imply the Tetragram, Paul does not share the conceptual value that the term κύριος might have had in the OG text. For Paul the term κύριος refers to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, the one raised from the dead (Rom 4:24). Thus, the *kyrio*-concept is Jesus as the χριστός.

The θεός concept as represented by the explicit citation in Rom 9:26 is none other than the Hebrew deity, for obvious reasons. The term κύριος presented in Rom 9:29, in correlation with the term κύριος in Rom 9:28, calls the personal Hebrew deity into mind. Paul allowed his *Vorlage* to dictate to him and therefore the term κύριος in this case not only designates the Tetragram but it conceptually relates to the *theos*-concept in its immediate literary conceptual context. Although it is reasonable to interpret the term κύριος in Rom 10:13 as referring to Jesus as the κύριος, an uncomfortable ambiguity remains. The term κύριος in Rom 10:16 should be interpreted as a term representing the Tetragram. The same applies to the term κύριος in Rom 11:34. The underlying concept in this case remains the monotheistic Hebrew deity. The phrase λέγει κύριος, read in addition to the cited content in Rom 12:19, refers to an entity other than Jesus as the κύριος. Words spoken and ascribed to κύριος is well known in the OG text, but it only appears 11 times in the whole of the NT of which most if not all, forms part of explicit cited content. The opposite is inferred from the 'implied' κύριος term in Rom 15:11 and Rom 15:9 for that matter – the referent of this term is indeed Jesus as the χριστός. The theological conceptual problem thus remains: why did Paul use the term κύριος, separate from the explicit citation, when he referred to Jesus as the Χριστός and the term κύριος as part of the explicit citations when he referred to the Tetragram or the personal Hebrew deity? Was it because Paul implicitly wanted to draw a literary conceptual line between Jesus as the κύριος and the personal Hebrew deity 'named'

κύριος? Or was Paul merely playing on the idea that the Hebrew deity, as the κύριος, has the authority to judge and is the ruler of all rulers?

3.5.2 **Proposed Solution:** *Translation and Greek Transmission Problems*

The explicit citations that present a translation problem are Rom 4:3; Rom 9:28; Rom 10:16; Rom 11:3 and Rom 14:11, and/or those that present a Greek transmission problem are Rom 2:24; Rom 9:28; Rom 11:3; Rom 14:11 and Rom 15:9. This is where the Greek translators opted for a Greek equivalent that is not the 'expected' term and that the NT text differs in reading from the OT text. The problem in Rom 2:24 can at least be explained based on Paul's dominating *theos*-concept and that it was 'required' that the explicit citation read the term θεός. What is more plausible is that Paul's *Vorlage* read the term θεός (Isa 52:5c) especially when dealing with the Isaiah text. The latter is made even more possible if one considers that ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ is in fact referring to the term κύριος as the 'name' of θεός. It should, however, not be excluded that based on manuscript data that the term θεός might have been considered as a 'suitable' Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. The translation or rendering issue between the Hebrew and Greek text traditions has no effect on the explicit θεός citation in Rom 4:3. The citation blends seamlessly into Paul's *theo*-concept. Rom 9:28, also attests to an Isaiah citation (Isa 10:22c-23c). The problem was initiated by the Greek translators who battled with the rendering of the Hebrew deity in general and the Tetragram in particular. The fact that Paul read κύριος and not θεός as suggested by the LXX^Gött should not necessarily be interpreted as a conceptual shift made by Paul. It is highly likely, especially in this case, that Paul followed his *Vorlage* that read the term κύριος which also implies that this particular term reproduces the Tetragram. Finally, the so-called 'omission' of the term κύριος could be explained that the *Vorlage* did not read the term. Paul clearly did not have a problem citing this term (cf. Rom 15:11) and it would be mere speculation to assign such a variation originating with Paul.

CHAPTER 4 - EXPLICIT ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ CITATIONS IN THE LITERARY CONCEPTUAL CONTEXT OF FIRST AND SECOND CORINTHIANS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Although the nature and characteristics of the Corinthian Letters differ in comparison with the Roman Epistle, the primary objective remains to determine to what extent the explicit κύριος and θεός citations influenced the immediate literary concept of Paul, and *vice versa*. Attention will thus be given to the intertextual influence with regards to conceptual meaning underlying the κύριος and θεός terms, as well as the intratextual impact. As with Chapter III, the intertextual influence will not be the primary focus. Special attention will be given to the intratextual impact. The first necessary introductory steps would be a.) to relate the Romans epistle to the literary problem formulated in chapter 2, and b.) to establish the explicit citations.

4.2 ESTABLISHING THE ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ TEXT IN 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS

4.2.1   1 Corinthians 1

4.2.1.1   *1 Corinthians 1:31*

The importance of this verse, apart from the fact that it is an explicit κύριος citation, is that the NT manuscripts attest to the dative use of the term κύριος, while the OT Greek manuscripts do not hold any evidence of a κύριος or related term – the latter which correlates with its Hebrew counterpart.[114] There is no extant Greek or Hebrew textual evidence from where one could argue for a different *Vorlage*. The emanating problem is thus a

---

[114] Koch, *Schrift,* 35 considers the citation in 1 Cor 1:3 as one with an uncertain source. He poses the possibility that the cited content could have been sourced from Apocrypha material in which the citation existed independently. Koch, however, appears to be certain that 1 Cor 1:31, together with 1 Cor 2:9 and 1 Cor 9:10b, was taken over from an oral tradition; originated in a hellenistic Synogoue or from a pre-Pauline hellenistic *Urchristentum*, 42; contra Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* 187, who suggests that the wording in 1 Cor 1:31 goes back to Paul himself. In a fairly recent article Tuckett, C. M. "Paul, Scripture and Ethics - Some Reflections." *NTS* 48.3, (2000), 403-424, concurs with Wagner that 1 Cor 1:31 was sourced from 1 Kgdms 2:10, 417. Cape, *Yahweh-Texts,* 134-135 concludes that this 'Yahweh text' is applied to Christ, which according to him, was understood by Paul as the "wisdom of God." Cf. Williams, Drake H. H. III. "Of Rags and Riches – The Benefits of Hearing Jeremiah 9:23-24 within James 1:9-11." *TB* 53.2, (2002), 273-282; 278-279. Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians.* Adam & Charles Black: London, 1968, suggests that it is the text of his (Paul's sermon) taken from Haptorah for this day and that the Semitic use of the conditional participle as subject is due to the LXX, 61.

theologically-interpretive one. The text critical evidence is streamlined to such an extent that one is forced to investigate the subject matter from an intratextual point of view.[115]

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Literary comparison (1 Cor 1:31, 2 Cor 10:17 and Jer 9:23a)</th></tr>
<tr><td>NA[27] (1 Cor 1:31)</td><td>NA[27] (2 Cor 10:17)</td><td>LXX[Gött] (Jer 9:23a)</td><td>MT[BHS] (Jer 9:23a)</td></tr>
<tr><td>ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται·</td><td></td><td>ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ</td><td>כִּי אִם־בְּזֹאת</td></tr>
<tr><td>ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω.</td><td>Ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω·</td><td>καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος,</td><td>יִתְהַלֵּל הַמִּתְהַלֵּל</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν</td><td>הַשְׂכֵּל וְיָדֹעַ אוֹתִי</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ποιῶν ἔλεος</td><td>כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָֹה עֹשֶׂה חֶסֶד מִשְׁפָּט</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,</td><td>וּצְדָקָה בָּאָרֶץ</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>ὅτι ἐν τούτοις τὸ θέλημά μου,</td><td>כִּי־בְאֵלֶּה חָפַצְתִּי</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>λέγει κύριος.</td><td>נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה: ס</td></tr>
</table>

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT		**OT**	**OT**		
$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	ℵ, A, B	S A B	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]	4QSam[a]
κω	κω	---	---	---	---

In Jer 9:22, the prophet initiates his train of thought with the phrase: τάδε λέγει κύριος. It is said that boasting in terms of wisdom (καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ), to boast of strength in terms of strength (καυχάσθω ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ) and to boast of wealth in terms of wealth (καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ) is not advised, but rather to boast in terms of boasting about knowing and understanding that ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ("I am

---

[115] Williams, "Of Rags and Riches," argues that if the echo of Jer 9:23-24 is heard within Jas 1:9-11, then the 'boasting' Christian could be identified, 273. The likelihood that James echoes Jer 9:23-24, according to Williams, is based on the words καυχάομαι along with πλούσιος, 277.

Kyrios"). Clearly it is κύριος who is the dominating acting agent in the source context (Jeremiah 9), while the term θεός dominates the target context. Thus the thought sequence with regard to the use of the term κύριος and/or θεός is evident from Jer 9:22 onwards (source-context)–in comparison with Paul's train of thought from 1 Cor 1:18-31–could be presented as follows:[116]

Target Context (1 Cor 1:18-31)	Source Context (Jer 9:22-24)
ἡμῖν δύναμις **θεοῦ** ἐστιν (v. 18)	Τάδε λέγει **κύριος** (v. 22)
οὐχὶ ἐμώρανεν **ὁ θεὸς** τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου (v. 20)	ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι **κύριος** (v. 23)
ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ **τοῦ θεοῦ** (v. 21)	λέγει **κύριος** (v. 23)
διὰ τῆς σοφίας **τὸν θεόν** (v. 21)	λέγει **κύριος** (v. 24)
εὐδόκησεν **ὁ θεὸς** διὰ τῆς μωρίας (v .21)	
Χριστὸν **θεοῦ** δύναμιν καὶ **θεοῦ** σοφίαν (v. 24)	
ὅτι τὸ μωρὸν **τοῦ θεοῦ** (v. 25)	
τὸ ἀσθενὲς **τοῦ θεοῦ** (v. 25)	
κόσμου ἐξελέξατο **ὁ θεός** (v. 26)	
τὰ ἐξουθενημένα ἐξελέξατο **ὁ θεός** (v. 26)	
σὰρξ ἐνώπιον **τοῦ θεοῦ** (v. 29)	
σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ **θεοῦ** (v. 30)	
ἐν **κυρίῳ** καυχάσθω (v. 31)	

The dictating theme in the target context is boasting in wisdom related to the term θεός, while the governing theme in the source context is about boasting related to the term κύριος. If Jeremiah 9 is considered a plausible source context for the explicit citation in 1 Cor 1:31 and if it is accepted that Paul used a manuscript that contained Jeremiah 9 (among others), then the following question comes to the fore: *why does the term θεός and with that the term χριστός dominate the first chapter, while the term κύριος dominates Jeremiah 9?* Is Paul merely 'ignoring' his source in this regard? Or is it a question of not contemplating the extent

---

[116] See also Williams, "Rags and Riches," 278.

of the impact the term κύριος might have on Paul's target context, and particularly the terms θεός and χριστός in this particular case?

The NT eclectic texts read κύριος in the dative case, while the Greek source texts, including the Hebrew counterpart (which presents the יהוה), reads: συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ποιῶν ἔλεος. The issue thus revolves around Paul's theological interpretation of his source text, if the possibility of a different *Vorlage* is ruled out.

~ A Greek transmission problem ~

The first chapter of the first Corinthian correspondence is dominated by the terms θεός and χριστός. The term χριστός is primarily used in correlation with Jesus and or κύριος in the first nine verses,[117] while the term θεός, on the other hand, is less frequently used. The term θεός does however appear to be referring to the primary acting agent, at least in the first nine verses. As an entity, the term θεός refers to the one to whom gratitude is directed (1 Cor 1:4 and 14), the one who is faithful (1 Cor 1:9) and the one the congregation belongs to (1 Cor 1:2). The term θεός is also used in correlation with the concept of wisdom dealt with in 1 Cor 1:18-25. The question is how does the term χριστός relate with the term θεός and how do these terms relate to the term κύριος in 1 Cor 1:31? In an attempt to answer this question, such relatedness will be evaluated by dividing chapter one into three main sections: a.) 1 Cor 1:1-9, b.) 1 Cor 1:10-17 c.) 1 Cor 1:18-31.

The first section is a typical epistolary introduction, in which Paul usually employs the technical phrase τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, or variants thereof. The concepts τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ and πιστὸς ὁ θεός are uniquely Pauline.[118] There should thus be no doubt that in the first section of chapter one and in general, Paul's concept of Jesus is none other than the κύριος and χριστός, the one who's name is called (1 Cor 1:2) as the subordinate one to the father (1 Cor 1:3). The gift of grace is found in Jesus as the χριστός (1 Cor 1:4); of whom one can be a martyr (1 Cor 1:6).[119] Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος is also referring to the one that would return (1 Cor 1:8); and ultimately for Paul, Jesus

---

[117] See for example 1 Cor 1:1, 3, 7, 8 and 9.

[118] Cf. Philo, *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*. 93.5, who also employs πιστὸς ὁ θεός.

[119] A text critical note suggests an alternative reading θεός supported by B* F G 81. 1175 *al* sa[ms]; Eus; while the text reading is sustained by 𝔓[46] ℵ A B[2] C D Ψ 33. 1739. 1881 𝔐 lat sy co; Ambst.

as the κύριος and χριστός is the son of θεός (1 Cor 1:9).[120] The term θεός clearly refers to an all encompassing deity, who wills (1 Cor 1:1); to whom the congregation belongs to (1 Cor 1:2); the one capable of offering grace and peace (1 Cor 1:3). The term θεός refers to the one to whom one should extent gratitude (1 Cor 1:4). It is thus undisputed that the terms χριστός and κύριος in the first section refer to Jesus, while the term θεός refers beyond any reasonable doubt to the monotheistic Hebrew deity.

The term χριστός dominates in the second section of the first chapter (1 Cor 1:10-17); this section is introduced using the well-known and established phrase τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, after which χριστός appears to be dealt with as one of many options in 1 Cor 1:12. The phrase ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ thus forces one not to interpret the term χριστός as referring to anyone else either than the earthly Jesus. One could argue that the term χριστός could not refer to any other being than the earthly Jesus due to the fact that χριστός is positioned as being on a par with Paul, Peter and Apollos, followed by Paul's rhetorical question, if χριστός is divided.[121] The term χριστός refers to the one who sent Paul to proclaim the good news, the one crucified on the cross (1 Cor 1:17).

The section of text, beginning at 1 Cor 1:18, shows the overwhelming dominance of the term θεός – who is the one that makes the wisdom of the world foolish (1 Cor 1:20). The wisdom of the world is nullified by the wisdom of θεός. The wisdom of the world was not sufficient enough to know θεός (1 Cor 1:21), but through the proclamation of the crucifixion of χριστός, the world can be saved.[122] The crux of the correlation between the term χριστός and θεός is to be found in 1 Cor 1:24. Paul's concept is clear, χριστός is not only the crucified one, but he is also the wisdom of θεός. The content of the message which is proclaimed, that is the crucified χριστός, also becomes the wisdom of θεός through which the world will be saved (1 Cor 1:25).[123] The final question to be addressed is: how does the term κύριος in 1

---

[120] Cf. Rom 1:1-6; Gal 1:1-5; 1 Thess 1:1-3 and Phil 1:1-2.

[121] Conzelmann, H. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. KEK 5/11; Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1967, 147-149, presents an excursion into the so-called *Christus-Partei* shows that *pneumatische Erhöhungs-Christologie* was a reality in Corinth; which would imply that if and where such a 'group constituting' perspective exists, a *Christus-Partei* is plausible. Conzelmann represents the view of Heinrici, who suggests that if Christ is understood as the crucified, then the *Christus-Parole* would not have been a reality; cf. Thiselton, A. C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000, (see also Thiselton's discussion on the 'group' theology, 125-133), 122.

[122] According to Mihaila, C. *The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance Toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric*. T & T Clark: London, 2005, Paul reveals the nature of the Corinthains' wisdom as well as the fact that 'boasting' is contrary to the identity of the Corinthians in 1 Cor 1:31, 40.

[123] Cf. Conzelmann, *Korinther*, 63;

Cor 1:31 relate to θεός and χριστός respectively?[124] In 1 Cor 1:29 Paul states that ὅπως μὴ καυχήσηται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ,[125] no one being of flesh could boast before θεός; because of θεός they (the Jews and Greeks) are united in Jesus as the Χριστός, he who became the wisdom that originated from θεός (1 Cor 1:30). Paul then cites scripture to enforce his argument, ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω. Jer 9:23a, however, does not read the term κύριος, but implies it. It is clear from Paul's inclusion of the term κύριος that he kept to the concept of the source text, if one accepts the influence of the source text (Jer 9:1-22).[126]

Jeremiah 9:22 reads Τάδε λέγει κύριος Μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, which plays well into the concept of wisdom in relation to θεός (1 Cor 1:18-31). Paul adapts Jer 9:23a for what seems to be obvious reasons: he was inclined to remain true to the literary context of his *Vorlage*. The cited text thus underlines the following: a.) Paul follows his source text which dealt with boasting in terms of κύριος; b.) Paul does not transmit the concept underlying the term κύριος in Jer 9:22-25 as a representation of the Tetragram; c.) although it is logically plausible that the referent of both the term θεός in vv. 18-31 and the term κύριος of Jer 9:22-25 are referring to the same entity. The term κύριος in 1 Cor 1:31 does not seem to hold the same thought concept. Paul consequently is not making a clear distinction, literary speaking, between the term κύριος related to Jesus as the χριστός and the term κύριος in his cited text as a reproduction of the Hebrew Tetragram. However, he does not conceptually regard the two κύριος terms to be referring to any other being either than Jesus as the χριστός.

4.2.2   1 Corinthians 2

4.2.2.1   *1 Corinthians 2:9*

At first glance, it appears as if Paul shifted the content of Isa 64:3 around when he cited the text in 1 Cor 2:9. Apart from the fact that both the Hebrew and Greek text traditions appear to be intact, Paul also followed his *Vorlage* which reads the term θεός, while the Hebrew

---

[124] For Weiss, Johannes. *Der Erste Korintherbrief.* KEK 9; Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1910, the phrase ἐν κυρίῳ refers in general to 'Gott', but in this case it is used as reference to Christus, 43.

[125] Some NT text witnesses, (א²) C* Ψ 629. 1241 *pc* f vg sy, read αυτου. Syntactically the 3rd person singular pronoun refers to θεός in v. 28, which implies that the concept regarding 'boasting before' θεός remains intact.

[126] See Tuckett, *Paul and Ethics,* 418-419, for a discussion on the possible OT background in support of 1 Cor 1:26-31.

counterpart attests to the expected אלהים. The only discrepancy would be between the accusative and nominative use of the term θεός.[127]

Literary comparison (1 Cor 2:9 and Isa 64:3-4)

NA[27] (1 Cor 2:9)	LXX[Gött] (Isa 64:3)	MT[BHS] (Isa 64:3)
ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται·		
	ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος	וּמֵעוֹלָם
ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν		
καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν	οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν	לֹא־שָׁמְעוּ
καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη,		
	οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν	לֹא הֶאֱזִינוּ עַיִן
	εἶδον **θεὸν** πλὴν σοῦ	לֹא־רָאָתָה **אֱלֹהִים** זוּלָתְךָ
	καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου,	
ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ **θεὸς** τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.	ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον.	יַעֲשֶׂה לִמְחַכֵּה[c]־לוֹ׃

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT		**OT**	**OT**		
𝔓[46]	א, A, B	S A B	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]	1QIsa[a]

---

[127] Berger, Klaus. "Die Herkunft von 1 Kor II. 9." *NTS* 24.2, (1978), 270-283, mentions that the origin of the citation, suggested by Origenes' notion of an Elias-Apocalyptic as source, as a *Wandertradition*, 271. Klaus then considers Ethiopian Esra-Apocalyptic, 271-272; Syrian Daniel-Apocalyptic, 272-273 and Apocalyptic of Pseudo-Hippolyt, 273-274 including Peter and Pseudo-Johns gospel apocalyptic, 274-275. The *vorgeschichte* diagram, 280, does offer valuable insight. Frid, Bo. "The enigmatic ΑΛΛΑ in 1 Corinthians 2.9." *NTS* 31.4, (1985), 603-611, argues that the conjunction ἀλλὰ, introducing v. 9, is misunderstood, 603. The general assumption that ἀλλὰ refers back to v. 8 is rejected by Frid, 604-605. The solution for Frid is when one considers v. 9 as an elliptical mode of expression, 606; cf. Weiss, *Korintherbrief,* 57. Ponsot, H. "D'Isaïe, LXIV, 3 A I Corinthiens, II, 9." *RB* 90.2, (1983), 229-242, accepts that at the time of Paul the text, Isa 64 in particular, was used as part of a Synogue liturgy. Like Berger, Ponsot attempts to trace the tradition on the content of the citation, traditionally presented by Isa 64:3, 231-235, from where he concludes that the origin of Isa 64:3 is to be found in Deuteronomy, 235. The short contribution by Dubois, Jean D. "L'utilisation gnostique du centon biblique cité en 1 Corinthiens 2,9." *Kata tus* 70 (1995), 371, with regard to the Gnostic influences on 1 Cor 2:9 could not be accessed in full, but his contribution is noted; see also Willis, "The 'Mind of Christ," briefly commenting on the work of Ulrich Wilckens' dissertation on Gnosticism and 1 Cor 1-4, 110; cf. Conzelmann, *Korinther,* 81-82 and Weiss, *Korintherbrief,* 58-59, in terms of the origin of the citation.

Θς	θς	θν	אֱלֹהִים֙	אֱלֹהִ֔ים	אלוהים

The variation between the NT and OT text witnesses is not severe at all, the former reading the nominative case of the term θεός, while the latter (Greek OT) text witnesses read the accusative case. There is no text evidence at one's disposal suggesting any other reading than the term θεός. The cited text intertwines seamlessly into its immediate literary conceptual context, regarding the term θεός. The *theos*-concept dominates the second chapter with the exception of a κύριος term in 1 Cor 2:8.

The explicit θεός citation slots in well within the conceptual context. The challenge would be to relate the term θεός with the term κύριος (1 Cor 2:8, 16) and the term χριστός in 1 Cor 2:16.

<div align="center">~ A theological conceptual problem ~</div>

4.2.2.2   *1 Corinthians 2:16*

A comparison between the NT eclectic text with the Greek OT text does not deliver any apparent discrepancies with regard to the term κύριος or θεός. Both Hebrew and Greek text traditions appear to be intact. These statements are valid alone if one accepts the validity of the 'rule of thumb'.

Literary comparison (1 Cor 2:16 and Isa 40:13)		
NA[27] (1 Cor 2:16)	LXX[Gött] (Isa 40:13)	MT[BHS] (Isa 40:13)
τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν **κυρίου**,	τίς ἔγνω νοῦν **κυρίου**,	מִי־תִכֵּ֞ן אֶת־ר֣וּחַ יְהוָ֗ה
ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;	καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο, ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν;	וְאִ֥ישׁ[a] עֲצָת֖וֹ יוֹדִיעֶֽנּוּ׃
ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν		

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT		OT	OT		
𝔓[46]	א, A, B	S A B	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]	1QIsa[a]
κυ	κυ	κυ	יְהוָֽה	יְהוָ֗ה	יהוה

152

This verse cannot be classified as an explicit citation, but rather as an indirect marked citation.[128] The issue in this case is more towards answering the question about how the term κύριος (1 Cor 2:16) was integrated into the literary conceptual context. To what extent was the term κύριος (1 Cor 2:16) associated with terms such as θεός, χριστός and Ιησοῦς respectively? This verse also attests to a noteworthy text critical issue signalled as (ˎ). It is suggested that χριστοῦ (1 Cor 2:16c) is replaced with κύριος in B D* F G 81, while the NA[27] reading is supported by $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ A C D[1] Ψ 048. 0289[vid]. 33. 1739. 1881, among others.[129] If one considers the latter alternative proposed within the literary conceptual context (1 Cor 2:10-16), then the interrelated dynamics between the term θεός, κύριος and χριστός, as well as the term κύριος becomes apparent.

The problem at hand is one of integration and inter-relating the term κύριος within the literary conceptual context

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

The term θεός refers to the dominating theological significant acting agent used in eight verses of which one forms part of a cited text in 1 Cor 2:9. The term refers to the one who reveals himself through his spirit (1 Cor 2:10), and through whom' the spirit alone can be known (1 Cor 2:11). The first person personal pronoun ἡμεῖς refers to those who did not receive the spirit of the world, but the spirit of θεός (1 Cor 2:12) for the purpose of knowing through θεός the gracious gift (1 Cor 2:12). The term κύριος is used in two verses, one of which is found in 1 Cor 2:8 combined with τῆς δόξης. The second instance is found in 1 Cor 2:16, a citation taken from Isa 40:13a. The term Χριστός is used only twice, once in 1 Cor 2:2 relating to Jesus, and in the other instance in 1 Cor 2:16. There should be little doubt that the term χριστός would conceptually refer for Paul to none other than Jesus, as is the case in ch. 1. The integrity of the χριστός reading in 1 Cor 2:16b is questioned. Text witnesses B D* F G 81, among others, propose reading the term κύριος, while the text reading is supported by text witnesses such as $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ A C D[1] Ψ. In an attempt to understand the reasoning behind the scribes' decision, one has to consider the alternative within the literary context of the phrase, τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν; ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν. The underlying concept is to have the mind of either χριστός or κύριος. For the scribes of B D* and F the term κύριος in 1 Cor 2:16b would have been a more suitable term, since the term

---

[128] Cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 23.
[129] Cf.Metzger, *Textual Commentary,* 482.

κύριος was used in 1 Cor 2:16a and it would thus make logical sense to re-employ the same term. A second possibility, although speculative is that if the scribes knew that 1 Cor 2:16a was taken from a Greek OT source and that the term κύριος used was comparable to the Tetragram, the term κύριος could have been a strong theological motivation to read κυρίου and not χριστοῦ. The latter however, due to its speculative nature, should not be regarded as a pre-requisite for the proposed alternative reading.

A third possibility is that the scribes had access to a Greek manuscript that read the term κύριος at this particular point. Unfortunately, there is no data to support the latter claim. The second possibility, a mere syntactical consideration, seems to be the more probable solution. The latter reduces all the premises one has to adopt to argue for a theological consideration. The possibility of having access to a Greek text that read the term κύριος when the scribe constructed the codices, should not be ruled out. The question is however, what would the implications be if the reading is accepted as is, or if the reading proposed by codex B and others are allowed? If the text reading is accepted it would entail that in this particular case, the referent of both the term κύριος in 1 Cor 2:16a and the term χριστός 1 Cor 2:16b appears to be the same being. This would logically imply that the term χριστός and its referent, which is Jesus, are positioned to be 'equal' to the personal Hebrew deity, if the underlying concept that the term κύριος in 1 Cor 2:16a is a representation of the Tetragram, was adopted by Paul. Allowing the alternative reading would entail that syntactically, at first glance, it would make more sense to answer the question about knowing the mind of κύριος with an affirmation that the mind of κύριος has been received. It is the opinion held here that Paul strictly followed his *Vorlage* when he quoted from Isa 40:13, which reads κύριος. Paul did not adopt the concept underlying the term κύριος, that is to say understanding the term κύριος as being a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. Paul conceptualised the term κύριος in this instance as a title or epithet used for Jesus, and therefore would not have had any difficulty relating such a term with χριστός in 1 Cor 2:16b.[130]

To validate such a theory, one is compelled to consider the cited text in 1 Cor 2:9 (attesting to the term θεός) together with 1 Cor 2:8 attesting to the term κύριος. The term κύριος in 1 Cor 2:8 is sandwiched in between the term θεός in 1 Cor 2:7b and the term θεός in 1 Cor 2:9. The predestination of θεός comes into play in 1 Cor 2:7b, through which the glory of them (most probably referring to the followers of Christ), had been predestined by

---

[130] See the discussion on 1 Cor 2:16 will special reference to the term νοῦς in relation to the Hebrew term רוּחַ, Thiselton, *Corinthians,* 274-276. For Thiselton, the change of expression from 'Lord' in v. 16a to 'Christ' in v. 16b binds the true divine wisdom to the crucified Christ, 276; cf. Weiss, *Korintherbrief,* 68.

θεός. Paul goes further stating that none of the rulers of this world knew this, because if they did, they would not have crucified the κύριος of glory. Evidently, the one that predestined glory cannot be the predestined one, covered in glory. The term θεός thus refers to the monotheistic Hebrew deity, the only one being capable of predestination, while the term κύριος refers to Jesus as the crucified one, through whom he became the glorified κύριος. The θεός term in turn, appears to be an equivalent for the Hebrew *Elohim* - if of course one accepts the arguments that this is a cited text taken from Isa 64:3, which reads the term θεός while its Hebrew counterpart reads אלהים. A pertinent question is to whom does the 3rd person pronoun αὐτόν 1 Cor 2:9 refer to? Is it pointing back to ὁ θεὸς or alternatively to τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης in 1 Cor 2:8? The proposed source context of Isa 64:3 implements the 2nd person, which ultimately refers to the term θεός in Isa 64:3b. There is no obvious reason why one would not regard the 3rd person pronoun αὐτόν in 1 Cor 2:9 as referring to θεός.

It thus seems plausible to deduce from this exposition that in 1 Cor 2:7–9 two distinct terms are used as referents to two distinct entities. The first is the term κύριος in 1 Cor 2:8, which clearly refers to Jesus as the crucified one. The second is the term θεός, found in 1 Cor 2:9 as well as elsewhere in ch. 2 (e.g. v. 1, 5, 7, 10-12 etc.), referring to the monotheistic Hebrew deity and in particular to *Elohim.* The cited text in 1 Cor 2:9 (Isa 64:3) and 1 Cor 2:16 (Isa 40:13a) does indicate, at least in this case that what the Jewish scriptures read, what we would refer to as the *Vorlage*, was of primary importance. If the implementation of the explicit citation caused confusion, particularly with regard to the terms θεός and κύριος, cannot be confirmed nor denied and surely not proven. The term θεός in 1 Cor 2:9 is clearly a distinct reference to an entity different from the κύριος in 1 Cor 2:7 and 1 Cor 2:8, while the term κύριος in 1 Cor 2:16a refers to the same entity as the term χριστός in 1 Cor 2:16b. In support for the latter, the answer to the question posed in 1 Cor 2:16a is given by 1 Cor 2:16b: the mind of κύριος can be known by those that do have the mind of χριστός.[131] This should be a clear indication that the NT authors, as well as the scribes for that matter, made a clear distinction between the referent of the terms θεός and κύριος based on the cited OT content. The θεός term remains the primary Greek equivalent for the monotheistic Hebrew deity, while the term κύριος could conceptually be a representation of the Tetragram or merely Jesus as the κύριος. It is also clear that the concept underlying the cited term θεός was easily adopted with little or no resistance, indicating a general acceptance of this term as an

---

[131] Willis, "Mind of Christ," 119, concurs with Jewett that the term νοῦς should be understood as "the constellation of thoughts and assumptions which make up the consciousness of the persona and act as the agent of rational discernment and communication," 118.

equivalent for the Hebrew deity, while the concept underlying the cited term κύριος was much more complex with the potential for various theological and profane interpretive possibilities.

4.2.3   1 Corinthians 3

4.2.3.1   *1 Corinthians 3:20*

There appears to be no obvious transmission or translation related issue with regard to 1 Cor 3:20 and its cited content (Ps 93:11[LXX] and Ps 94:11[MT]). The term κύριος in Ps 93:11 is reflected in 1 Cor 3:20, while the Hebrew counterpart (Ps 94:11) reads the 'expected' Tetragram.

Literary comparison (1 Cor 3:20 and Ps 93:11)		
NA[27] (1 Cor 3:20)	LXX[Gött] (Ps 93:11)	MT[BHS] (Ps 94:11)
καὶ πάλιν·		
κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς	**κύριος** γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς	יְהֹוָה יֹדֵעַ מַחְשְׁבוֹת
τῶν σοφῶν	τῶν ἀνθρώπων	אָדָם
ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι	ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι	כִּי־הֵמָּה הָבֶל

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		**OT**	**OT**	
𝔓[46] 𝔓[11]	א, A, B	S A B	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
κϛ	κϛ	κϛ	יהוה	יהוה

This chapter is dominated by the term θεός, with the term χριστός used in three instances, once in relation to Jesus (1 Cor 3:11), being children in Christ (1 Cor 3:1) and the replicated term χριστός in relation to the θεός in 1 Cor 3:23 – causing the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5 and 1 Cor 3:20 to be more noticeable. The reproduction, translation and transmission of the Tetragram, as the rule of thumb goes (in the Hebrew as well as in the Greek text tradition), appears to be intact. The text critical data thus confirms the integrity of the 1 Cor 3:20

reading; the problem consequently revolves around the inter-relatedness of the relevant terms, especially with the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20.[132]

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

The primary theological entity at work in ch. 3 is none other than θεός, the term that dominates this chapter. The theme Paul intends addressing in this chapter revolves around the question if and when one is considered to be a spiritual or physical being. The phrase ὡς πνευματικοῖς – like one in the spirit and ὡς σαρκίνοις ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ - like one in the flesh, like children of χριστός is evidence thereof (1 Cor 3:1). With a secondary and related theme, Paul introduces the 'physical' or mortal orientated mentality of his fellow believers by disputing who is supporting who (e.g. Apollos, Paul or κύριος). For Paul it boils down to the service assigned to each by κύριος (1 Cor 3:4-5). There appears to be no obvious correlation between the term χριστός in 1 Cor 3:1 (related to the concept as children of χριστός) and the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5 (the one who assigns a service). It would be improper to interpret νηπίοις, with a negative connotation (1 Cor 3:1) as being equal to διάκονοι (1 Cor 3:5)–the righteous had each been assigned a task. The term θεός refers to the one that causes to grow and for Paul the only one to be considered for such a task (1 Cor 3:7). In 1 Cor 3:9 Paul states that they (he, Apollos and the others) are helpers of θεός, which might suggest that there is a closer correlation between the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5 and the term θεός in 1 Cor 3:9, if one regards the 'giver' of tasks to be the same as the one to whom one belongs. It would not be unusual to consider διάκονοι and συνεργοί as interchangeable terms referring to a person in service responsible for a specific task. On the other hand, although it would not be as obvious to consider κύριος as the 'giver' of the tasks and θεός as the one to whom the 'task receiver' belongs to as referring to the same entity, the cited text in 1 Cor 3:20 might shed some light on this matter.

In 1 Cor 3:19 Paul declares that ἡ γὰρ σοφία τοῦ κόσμου τούτου μωρία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐστιν (the wisdom of the world is being foolish according to θεός) after which he quotes from Job 5:13 and Ps 93:11 to validate the point he makes in 1 Cor 3:19. The explicit κύριος

---

[132] Thiselton, *Corinthians,* confirms that Paul is citing from the LXX (Ps 93:11), 323. Thiselton then offers brief statistics on Paul's use of the OT text in its Greek and Hebrew forms, 323-325. Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* is of the opinion that σοφῶν is to be considered as the original reading, making the alternative suggestion ανθρωπων secondary, 194. Koch, *Schrift,* 152, suggests that Paul was influenced by the ring composition 1 Cor 1:18-3:23, in altering the opening citation (1 Cor 1:19) and the closing citation (1 Cor 3:20). Thererfore, according to Koch, the content of the citations had to be adapted for it to say something about σοφοί, 153; cf. Conzelmann, *Korintherbrief,* 99. See also Weiss, *Korintherbrief,* who assigned the deviation of the citation to the fact that Paul was familiar with the use of the 'words' in such a way that citing it here (in Cor 3:20), was done unconsciously, 87. He then refers to Vollmer, who in turn noted that such deviations are often visible in the Targum, 87.

citation in 1 Cor 3:20 is significant in this regard. It is κύριος who knows the thoughts of wisdom, which appears to be empty (κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῶν σοφῶν ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι). Based on the literary conceptual evidence, the logical conclusion is that Paul considered the term θεός in 1 Cor 3:19 as referring to the same entity as the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20. If Paul conceptually had the same entity in mind when he used the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5, remains uncertain. What does seem to be undisputed is the fact that the term χριστός in 1 Cor 3:1 and 1 Cor 3:11, as well as the χριστός terms in 1 Cor 3:23 are distinguished from the term θεός (as is emphasised in 1 Cor 3:23). Thus, the referent of the term χριστός, who refers to Jesus, does not imply the same referent as with the term θεός, as expected. Returning to the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5 and its relationship towards the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20: noteworthy is the fact that nowhere else in the 'genuine' Pauline epistles had Paul used the term διάκονος in relation to the κύριος term, except in 1 Cor 3:5. In Rom 13:4 the servant belongs to θεός, in the latter case the authoritative person, probably refers to the emperor, while in Rm 15:8 it is Christ who became a servant on behalf of the truth of θεός. In Rom 16:1 διάκονος is used in relation with Φοίβην, a woman and servant working for the church in Cenchrea, while in 2 Cor 3:6 it is θεός who has made the apostles competent servants, belonging to θεός (2 Cor 6:4). The use of διάκονος in 2 Cor 11:15 seems to be referring to χριστός in 2 Cor 11:13, which is confirmed in 2 Cor 11:23; the latter which is also confirmed in Gal 2:17.

It is suggested that the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5 be interpreted and understood as a term not referring to the same entity as the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20, but to rather consider this term as referring to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, the one who will be the judge of Paul (1 Cor 4:4) and who will come to judge (1 Cor 4:5). The concept that the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5 refers to the one granting tasks would fit the concept well, in that κύριος will also come to judge the 'tasks' being done. Furthermore, χριστός Ἰησοῦς were introduced as the foundation in 1 Cor 3:11, from where everyone's 'task' could be inferred, the task of 'building' would suit κύριος best, the one handing down the tasks (1 Cor 3:5). In conclusion thus, the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5 correlates with the χριστός terms in 1 Cor 3:11 and 1 Cor 3:23, while referring to Jesus as the χριστός (servant of θεός) and κύριος (the one awarding tasks and who will come to judge the tasks being done). The term θεός would refer to the monotheistic Hebrew deity who makes to grow (1 Cor 3: 6 and 1 Cor 3:7), who is merciful (1 Cor 3:10), the one who makes the believer a temple of himself through the spirit who lives within them (1 Cor 3:16-17). This θεός is also the one considering the wisdom of the world to be foolish (1 Cor 3:19) and he is also the κύριος, the one who knows the thoughts of the

wisdom as being empty (1 Cor 3:20). Thus, it appears plausible and highly likely that Paul conceptualised the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20 as a representation of the Tetragram, hence the personal Hebrew deity.[133]

4.2.4   1 Corinthians 4

The dominating theologically significant acting agent is χριστός. The term occurs six times in four verses, two of which are related to Jesus. The term κύριος and θεός both occur in four instances that are spread over four verses. The term χριστός is used in correlation with the followers being helpers of χριστός (1 Cor 4:1), being foolish because of χριστός and being wise in χριστός (1 Cor 4:10), having guardians in χριστός, while being a father for the followers in χριστός Jesus (1 Cor 4:15) and the way of life in χριστός Jesus (1 Cor 4:17). The term κύριος refers to the one who judges (1 Cor 4:4) and who will come to judge (1 Cor 4:5). Timothy, the beloved one, is called faithful in κύριος (1 Cor 4:17), with κύριος also having the ability to 'will' for something to occur or not (1 Cor 4:19). In 1 Cor 4:1 it is stated that χριστός is entrusted with the mysteries of θεός. The things hidden in the hearts of men will be revealed, upon which, everyone will receive their praise from θεός (1 Cor 4:5). The term θεός also refers to the one who considers a person an apostle (1 Cor 4:9)–the entity to whom the kingdom of power belongs to (1 Cor 4:20).

The text critical issue found at the second χριστός reading in 1 Cor 4:10, **P¹¹**, a seventh century manuscript, suggests reading κυριω as opposed to the χριστός. Apart from the weak manuscript support, there seems to be no imminent reason why the κύριος reading should be considered as the more probable one. The term χριστός slots in well with the literary conceptual context and should thus remain as the most plausible reading. It would be fair to surmise that Paul has not introduced any new or any 'out of the ordinary' concepts relating to the term κύριος and θεός and their inter-relatedness. The Hebrew deity is again referred to using the term θεός, while the term κύριος denotes Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος.

---

[133] Duke, Williams III, H. H. "The Psalms in 1 and 2 Corinthians." Pages 163-180 in *The Psalms in the New Testament.* Edited by Steve Moyise & Maarten J. J. Menken. London: T & T Clark, 2000, infers at least two functions of the citation in 1 Cor 3:20. The first is to support Paul's assertion that the worldly wisdom is considered foolish by God and second, great rewards await those that conform to God's plan, 166.

4.2.5 1 Corinthians 5

The term κύριος, particularly in association with Jesus, dominates chapter five; while the term θεός only appears in 1 Cor 5:13 with the term χριστός being used only in 1 Cor 5:7. The first occurrence of the term κύριος is found within a prepositional clause in a genitive construction with the first person personal plural pronoun and the term Ἰησοῦ. The term κύριος in the second occurrence is used in a similar fashion. In 1 Cor 5:5 the term κύριος is brought into play with the concept 'in the day of the lord'. The term χριστός in 1 Cor 5:7 is used in relation to his killing, while being connected to the slaying of the Passover meal. The term θεός (1 Cor 5:13) refers to the one who judges. The use of the κύριος and θεός, and related terms in chapter five could be characterised as being the 'generally' expected function assigned to the relevant terms. It is thus also plausible to deduce that in this case, as is in many others, Jesus is considered to be κύριος and χριστός with the term θεός referring to an entity separate from Jesus, the monotheistic deity, the Hebrew deity.

4.2.6 1 Corinthians 6

The use of the κυριός, θεός and related terms in this chapter is not only diverse but intriguing. The term θεός dominates with occurrences in eight distinct verses, while the term κύριος is used once as part of the technical phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, while being employed in three other verses as an independent term (see 1 Cor 6:13, 14 and 17). The term Χριστός is used only in 1 Cor 6:15, apart from the phrase in 1 Cor 6:11. The kingdom of θεός concept can be observed in 1 Cor 6:9 and 1 Cor 6:10, while the spirit of θεός is introduced in 1 Cor 6:11. It is further stated that θεός will declare both the stomach and food useless (1 Cor 6:13b), while the physical body is for κύριος and κύριος is for the physical body. The food is for the stomach and the reverse is called to mind in 1 Cor 6:13a. The concept that both food and stomach are equally important and belong to one another, the idea that the body is not for sexual impurity because it belongs to κύριος is introduced in 1 Cor 6:13b. The ruling or dominant character of κύριος is brought to the fore as the one to whom the physical body is supposed to submit, but the entity referred to using θεός, remains the one that will nullify the importance of the physical. In fact, it is θεός who raised κύριος from the dead, the latter who has dominion over the physical body; but it is θεός who has the ultimate power not only to raise the ruler of the physical body from the dead, but also other mortal beings.

Paul continues with the line of thought by posing a rhetorical question that if they (the Christian mortals), did not know that their bodies are a part of χριστός and that one should

and cannot take a part of the body of χριστός and make it a prostitute. Paul thus not only conceptualised both the term κύριος and χριστός as referring to the same entity, namely the risen and exalted Jesus, but through this idea he implies immortality as well as morality for the mortal followers of Jesus. Paul then develops this thought by shifting from the physical to the spiritual when he says that anyone who unites in κύριος is one with him (κύριος) in the spirit (1 Cor 6:17). The term θεός as a distinct entity, the monotheistic Hebrew deity, is re-introduced in 1 Cor 6:19-20. Paul states that the 'holy spirit' was received from θεός for the purpose of glorifying θεός. For Paul thus, at least deducible from this section of text, is that Jesus remains the risen κύριος and χριστός allowing the fellow mortal followers to unite with him through the Holy Spirit – all made possible by the most powerful θεός. The term κύριος and θεός thus refers to two distinct entities, the referent of the former being the mortal Jesus as the risen immortal χριστός, while the referent of the latter is most probably the Hebrew deity.

4.2.7   1 Corinthians 7

The term κύριος dominates chapter seven with the term θεός utilised often. The term χριστός is used only once in 1 Cor 7:22. Chapter seven is one of the rare instances found in the Pauline literature in which the term κύριος is employed distinctly separate from the terms Χριστός or Jesus. In three of the cases (1 Cor 7:10, 12, 17) both the term κύριος and θεός are accompanied by the definite article in the nominative case (see 1 Cor 7:10, 12 as well as 1 Cor 7:15, 17).[134] The term θεός refers to the one who has given each one a spiritual gift (1 Cor 7:7), the one who calls to peace (1 Cor 7:15). Paul states that those called by θεός should remain where they are (1 Cor 7:17).[135] The concern should not be the question of circumcision or uncircumcision but to adhere to the commands of θεός (1 Cor 7:19). Again it is confirmed that where ever one is called, to remain with θεός (1 Cor 7:24). Finally Paul is of the opinion that he has received the spirit of θεός (1 Cor 7:40).[136]

Paul draws a distinction between his παραγέλλω (orders) in general and the orders of κύριος (1 Cor 7:10 and 12). A clear distinction between the referent of the terms κύριος and θεός in 1 Cor 7:17 is unclear to say the least. Some manuscripts argued for a θεός *et* θεός

---

[134] See Blass, *BDF*, with regard to the use of the definite article, 79 and *BDF,* which suggest that the definite article used to designate a person has the objective to confirm that the person or being is one of a kind, 133.
[135] The *majority text* together with a Syriac version suggests reading the κύριος term in this instance.
[136] The scribes of 𝔓[15] and minuscule 33 proposed reading the term χριστός as opposed to the term θεός.

reading,[137] while others opted for a θεός *et* κυριός reading.[138] The NA[27] text reading however, is supported by strong text witnesses,[139] supporting the reading κύριος *et* θεός. The use of the κύριος term in 1 Cor 7:22 appear to be closely related to the term χριστός in 1 Cor 7:22, both of which refer to the 'owner' of the δοῦλος. It is thus safe to assume that the conceptual relationship between the referent of both the terms κύριος and χριστός are one and the same entity. In 1 Cor 7:25 the authority or command is again assigned to κύριος together with faithfulness. Some remarks should be in order to clarify the literary conceptual connection between the term κύριος and θεός, particularly in 1 Cor 7:17-25.

Based on the text critical data, together with thematic overlapping of the term κύριος and θεός, it does appear as if the referents of these two terms are considered to be conceptually the same entity. One should, however, have make a distinction between the term θεός – which refers to the one that calls (etc. 1 Cor 7:15; 17 and 24)–and the term κύριος as the one calling (1 Cor 7:22). The former seems to be a reference to an overarching deity that has the authority to call and to command in relation to circumcision (1 Cor 7:17-19), which seems fitting to assign such capabilities to the Hebrew deity.[140] On the other hand, the term κύριος appears to be referring to the 'authoritative' one who commands (1 Cor 7:10, 12) and who calls into mind contra servant-owner relationship, claiming to be free servants of κύριος and χριστός (1 Cor 7:22). One could thus deduce from the thematic data that the referent of the term θεός is the Hebrew deity, while the term κύριος refers to Jesus as the χριστός. Critique against such an assumption can be found in 1 Cor 7:24, which reads ἕκαστος ἐν ᾧ ἐκλήθη, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τούτῳ μενέτω παρὰ θεῷ - everyone who was called brothers, should remain there with θεός. The term θεός relates to the one that does seem, in this instance, to be conceptually closely associated with the referent of the term κύριος in 1 Cor 7:22. Alternatively the phrase in 1 Cor 7:22 is merely emphasising the idea or concept introduced in 1 Cor 7:17. The use of the term κύριος in 1 Cor 7:25-39 seems no different compared to 1 Cor 7:1-24 with regard to the implementation and conceptualisation, while the use of the term θεός in 1 Cor 7:40 confirms the concept introduced in 1 Cor 7:6.

---

[137] Ψ 629. 1881 *pc* vg[mss].

[138] 𝔐 sy[h].

[139] 𝔓[46] ℵ A B C D F (G) 33. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1739. 2464, among others.

[140] The term ἐντολή,-ῆς (Gn 26:5; Ex 12:17; 15:26; 16:28; 24:12) is a stereotypical rendition of מצוה; *command of God, law* Deut 26:13, see Lust, J. et al. "ἐντολή,-ῆς." *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Revised Edition*. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 2003.

4.2.8   1 Corinthians 8

The term θεός again dominates this chapter, while the term κύριος is used only within the technical phrase εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, except for its significant use in 1 Cor 8:6. The term χριστός is used in 1 Cor 8:11 and 1 Cor 8:12. The θεός who is loved in 1 Cor 8:3 refers to the same θεός in 1 Cor 8:4, the entity who is ultimately the one and only deity opposing the θεοί in 1 Cor 8:5. The latter verse could be considered as one of the most explicitly significant verses separate from the explicit citation, if not thee, with regard to Paul's concept underlying the term κύριος and θεός. Two socio-religious specific 'conditional' concepts are repeated by Paul in 1 Cor 8:5; the first is that it is said that there are θεοί if in heaven or on earth. The second is that there are many θεοί including many κύριοι. One could thus infer from 1 Cor 8:5 that Paul does seem to accept the socio-religious distinction made between the referent of the term κύριος and θεός. Not only can one assume such a distinction, but it appears to be probable that Paul also recognised that there might have existed a multitude of deities and lords.[141] The peripheral issue for Paul, however, is the diversity that such a multitude implies, which could be deduced from his response in 1 Cor 8:6. Paul is of the opinion and communicates it to his fellow believers, that there is only one θεός ὁ πατὴρ through whom the multitude exist, but in whom they are one. The same 'mono' concept is repeated for κύριος Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς, even though the term θεός might have referred to a separate entity other than Jesus as the κύριος. Paul continues his argument stating that food cannot cause one to be closer to θεός (1 Cor 8:8), while χριστός is the one who became mortal against whom one sins (1 Cor 8:11-12). In summary thus, the issue for Paul is not the so-called 'assumed fact' that there are θεοί and κύριοι. Paul is interested in the division and diversity this could have caused, while for Paul the mono-*theistic* and mono-*kyriolistic* concept is not only an opposing theological concept, but it 'causes' unity.[142]

---

[141] For an in-depth overview on the socio-religious context of Corinth, see the compilation of essays in Schowalter, Daniel N. and Friesen, Steven J. *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth. Interdisciplinary Approaches.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005 as well as Williams, II, C. K. "The City of Corinth and its Domestic Religion." *Hesperia* 50, (1981), 408-421; Smith, D. E. "The Egyptian Cults at Corinth." *HTR* 70, (1977), 201-231; Milleker, E. J. "Three Heads of Sarapis from Corinth." *Hesperia* 54, (1985), 121-135; Hoskins Walbank, M. E. "Evidence for the Imperial Cult in Julio-Claudian Corinth." Pages 201-214 in *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity.* Edited by A. Small. ANN ARBOR MI, printed by Thomson-Shore; Michigan: Dexter, 1996; Fisher, J. E. "Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore on Acrocorinth." *Hesperia* 63, (1974), 266-307; Broneer, O. "Paul and the Pagan Cults at Isthmia." *HTR* 64, (1971), 169-187; Broneer, O. "Hero Cults in the Corinthian Agora." *Hesperia* 11, (1942), 128-161; Bookidis, N. and Fisher, J. E. "Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore on Acrocorinth-Preliminary Report V: 1971-1973." *Hesperia* 43, (1974), 267-307. The studies conducted by these scholars, among others, does paint a plausible socio-religious picture of 1st century Corinth against which one could interpret 1 Cor 8:5-6 in particular and 1 Cor 8-11 in general.

[142] Cf. Bauchham, "Paul's Christology," 15; see also the syntax of 1 Cor 8:4b-6 in Woyke, *Götter,* 179-188. Woyke argues further addressing the fundametal issue: "Existenz und Wesen der, sog. Götter'," 188-200. For

4.2.9   1 Corinthians 9

The opening lines of this chapter are characterised by a small number of rhetorical questions, one of which reads: οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἑόρακα (cf. Acts 8:5). Paul claims to have seen Jesus as the κύριος after which he poses the question that those belonging to κύριος are indeed 'proof' of his, Paul's, apostleship. This chapter is dominated by the term κύριος (1 Cor 9:1, 2, 5, 14) while the term θεός is only employed twice (1 Cor 9:9, 21). In both the latter instances the term θεός is used in relation to the law as the theme, with the term χριστός in 1 Cor 9:21 used to refer to the one that embodies the law. The term κύριος for Paul constitutes his apostleship (1 Cor 9:2, 5). It is the one who determines that those proclaiming the 'good news' should live within the 'good news' (1 Cor 9:14), while χριστός is the 'possessor', grammatically speaking, of the 'good news' (1 Cor 9:12). It does appear as if Paul draws a distinction between the referent of the term κύριος and χριστός, specifically visible in comparison between 1 Cor 9:12 and 1 Cor 9:14. In the former, the 'good news' belongs to χριστός, while κύριος is the one instructing those proclaiming the 'good news' that they should live within the 'good news' (1 Cor 9:14).

Although a slight distinction between the term κύριος and χριστός, such a distinction is not significant to conclude that Paul conceptualised these terms as referring to separate entities. The term κύριος thus evidently relates to Jesus, while the term χριστός would conceptually be more intimate with the term θεός. 1 Cor 9:21 could be used as support for such a statement. In this verse, Paul conceptually replaces the 'lawlessness' of θεός with 'being in the law' of χριστός. This does not necessarily imply that the existential substance of the monotheistic deity, or the entity referred to when using θεός, is considered equal to the existential substance of the one the term χριστός refers to. It is plausible though to infer that a close relatedness does exist, especially with regard to functionality and authority.

4.2.10 1 Corinthians 10

4.2.10.1   *1 Corinthians 10:26*

The text transmission, translation and text traditions appear intact, based on the data on hand. The 'rule of thumb' with regard to the term κύριος as a 'suitable' Greek equivalent for the Tetragram, is sustained.

---

him 1 Cor 8:5a refers to cultic deity worship. In his own words: "Es geht also, wie oben bereits gezeigt, in V. 5a weder um die angelologisch oder dämonologisch interpretierte, 189; cf. Weiss, *Korintherbrief,* 219-227.

Literary comparison (1 Cor 10:26 and Ps 23:1a)		
NA[27] (1 Cor 10:26)	**LXX[Gött] (Ps 23:1a)**	**MT[BHS] (Ps 24:1a)**
	Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ.	מִזְמֹור לְדָוִד
τοῦ **κυρίου** γὰρ ἡ γῆ	**Κύριος** ποιμαίνει με,	**יְהוָה** רֹעִי לֹא אֶחְסָר
καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς	καὶ οὐδέν με ὑστερήσει	

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		**OT**	**OT**	
$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	ℵ, A, B	S A B	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
του κυ	του κυ	του κυ	יהוה	יהוה

The majority and most authoritative manuscripts, both for the OT and NT, read του κυ with the Hebrew counterpart reading, as expected, יהוה. Furthermore, the term κύριος together with the term θεός seems to be dominating this section of the text, ensuring that the term κύριος niches seamlessly into the literary conceptual context. The term κύριος is implemented twice in 1 Cor 10:21 and once in 1 Cor 10:22. It appears as if the term κύριος is used in close conceptual relatedness in 1 Cor 10:18-33, with the potential of also indicating close-knit literary-conceptual ties with the term χριστός in 1 Cor 10:14-17. As mentioned before, text critically this section of text appears to be intact, with little or no indication of immediate textual issues surrounding the term κύριος and θεός.

The problem revolves around the literary conceptual relation and association between the terms κύριος and θεός and other related terms considered.
~ A theological conceptual problem ~

This chapter would be the first to be dealt with in which the terms χριστός and κύριος, as opposed to the term θεός, are dominating as theologically important primary acting agents. In 1 Cor 10:4 the concept that χριστός is the rock that the Israelites drank from while being in the desert, is introduced. Paul asserts that θεός was not pleased with most of the Israelites (1 Cor 10:5). This concept clearly distinguishes between the referent of the term χριστός and that of the term θεός. In 1 Cor 10:9 an alternative reading for the term χριστός is being noted. Strong text witnesses, ℵ B C P 33. 104. 326. 365. 1175. 2464 propose reading κυριον, while A 81 suggest reading θεον. The text reading is conversely supported by $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ D F G Ψ 1739

included from the NA 25th edition onwards. Codex Sinaiticus and Vaticanus in combination are strong witnesses, but 𝔓⁴⁶, a 2nd century papyrus, would evidently weigh more than the two 4th century codices. The term ἐκπαιράζω (the present subjunctive from of the verb used in 1 Cor 10:9) is found only in Lk 10:25 in the whole of the NT, apart from this occurrence. This term relates to an expert in the law tempting the διδάσκαλος, which refers to Jesus. If one regards the influence of the cited text in 1 Cor 10:7, taken from Exod 32:6, to be extensive and influential in Pauline thought, then it is indeed plausible to read either the term κύριος or θεός in 1 Cor 10:9 as suggested.[143] Literary speaking the term κύριος would be the best possible reading due to the fact that the source context of Exod 32:6 demands that κύριος is the primary theological significant entity. Conceptually, for Paul that is, the term θεός would be a more probable reading if one accepts that the θεός is the primary term used by Paul when referring to the Hebrew deity and that his intent was to refer to this deity. The probability of the θεός reading is further supported by the use of the term θεός in 1 Cor 10:5, referring to the one that was not pleased with all of those drinking from the rock in the desert.

With the acceptance of the χριστός reading, especially due to 𝔓⁴⁶ supporting such a reading, one has to account for the term θεός in 1 Cor 10:5, as well as the term θεός in 1 Cor 10:13, which refers to the one that is in charge of temptation, so to speak. It should also then be necessary to decide against the strong influence of the explicit citation taken from Exod 32:6 on literary context, which seem to ensure a theological-historical framework in which the temptation in 1 Cor 10:9 is to be understood. The manuscript data would suggest reading the term χριστός, but based on the literary conceptual source context (Exod 32) the κύριος reading would be the most preferable one. If the κύριος reading is opted for as the most plausible one, then it would imply that the term κύριος in 1 Cor 10:9 does not refer to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, but rather to κύριος as a Greek term equivalent to the Hebrew deity, or specifically the Tetragram.

The other two χριστός terms used in 1 Cor 10:16 relates to the cup of thanksgiving, which is the blood of χριστός while the bread is the body of χριστός. The term κύριος in 1 Cor 10:21-22 is used together with the concept of the cup and meal of κύριος compared with

---

[143] The term κύριος would be the term in question, the one for whom the Israelites held a feast (see Exod 32:3-6). The referent of the term κύριος in Exod 32:5, 7 appears not to be the same referent as the nominative plural of the term θεός in Exod 32:4, 9. The latter should rather be considered as a term referring to idols in general. The Septuagint in this case appears to differentiate between the entities referred to in Exod 32:4, 9 and Exod 32:11. In the former they employ the plural use of the term θεός, while the singular use of the term θεός is used in correlation with יהוה in Exod 32:11. Hebrew does not make a clear distinction between the referents in this case, when they apply אלהים in both Exod 32:4, 9 and Exod 32:11.

that of the idols.[144] In 1 Cor 10:22 it is stated that the jealousy of κύριος should not be provoked, which brings to mind the temptation concept of 1 Cor 10:9. The latter would thus suggest that if the κύριος reading (1 Cor 10:9) is adopted as the most suitable and if the concept of tempting an entity to whom the term κύριος refers to, then it is highly likely that these two κύριος terms relate and simultaneously refer to Jesus as the χριστός. Such an interpretation, which is plausible, suggests that either a κύριος or χριστός reading would surmise. The question remains: to what extent does the term κύριος in 1 Cor 10:26 relate to the κύριος terms in '1 Cor 10:9' and 1 Cor 10:21-22? The text in 1 Cor 10:26 reflects a cited text taken from Ps 23:1a, the latter which also reads the term κύριος being parallel with its Hebrew counterpart reading the Tetragram. It does seem as if Paul a.) followed his *Vorlage* stringently; b.) he adopted the concept implied by such a term, being an equivalent for the Tetragram. The term κύριος in 1 Cor 10:26 would therefore be used for the Tetragram as opposed to the term κύριος in '1 Cor 10:9' and 1 Cor 10:21-22. The concept underlying the κύριος terms in 1 Cor 10:21-22 (including the alternative reading in 1 Cor 10:9) would thus be different from the concept underlying the term κύριος in 1 Cor 10:26. The former would be a reference to Jesus as the χριστός, while the latter would call the personal Hebrew deity into mind; yet again not necessarily for readers of Paul.[145]

---

[144] According to Koch, *Schrift,* the issue of food offered to idols that is addressed by the citation in 1 Cor 10:26, is considered christologically, 287 and 299; cf. Conzelmann, *Korintherbrief,* 207-208 and Weiss, *Korintherbrief,* 264. Scholars have dealt with the issue of 'food offered to idols' to a great extent, see for example: Newton, D. *Diety and Diet – The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998. Newton's interest is to contruct the socio-religious and cultural setting of the Greco-Roman world that underlies 1 Cor 8-11, 79-242; Cheung, A.T. *Idol Food in Corinth – Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, follows a similar approach as Newton when he constructs a social meaning of eating idol food, 27-38, but he also considers the issue against a Jewish background, 39-81; Fotopoulos, J. *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003, constructs a cult context of eating idol food, 49-157, after which he deals with Greco-Roman dining in particular, 158-178. Koch, D.-A. "Alles, was ἐν μαχέλλῳ verkauft wird, eßt ...«, Die macella von Pompeji, Gerasa und Korinth und ihre Bedeutung für die Auslegung von 1Kor 10,25." *ZNW* 90.3/4, (1999), 194-219, enlightens the reader with his detailed information on the archaeological evidence on the *macellum,* agora and altars of Corinth for a clearer understanding of 1 Cor 10:25. Koch, does this by comparing the *macellum* unearthed at Pompeii, 199-205 and Gerasa, 205-208; see also Koch, *Hellenistisches Christentum,* 145-164.

[145] Williams, The Psalms, concur with scholarship in general that the citation in 1 Cor 10:26 should be considered in the broader context of this passage, 167. The citation is in direct support of 1 Cor 10:25 regarding the issue of food offered to idols. Apart from the fact that the citation supports Paul's argument, according to Williams, the citation also confirms God's sovereignty, 169. Woyke, J. *Götter, ‚Götzen', Götterbilder – Aspekte einer paulinschen ‚Theologie der Religionen.'* Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005, dealt with this issue while focusing on 1 Cor 10:19-20, 215-257. Woyke, *Götter,* offers valuable insight into the Greek and Hellenistic-Roman Epik and Philosophy regarding deities and demons, 220-225; see also his discussion on how these concepts are dealt with in the Septuaginta, 225-228.

4.2.11 1 Corinthians 11

The term θεός and κύριος equally dominate this chapter, with the term χριστός used in three instances, spread over two verses (1 Cor 11:1 and 3). The term χριστός is used in relation to the hierarchical thought concept of Paul, that χριστός is the head of the man, with the man the head of the woman, while θεός in turn is the head of χριστός. Paul continues with his line of thought in 1 Cor 11:7, when he states that it is not necessary for a man to cover his head because he should glorify θεός. Paul further states that a man and woman should not be considered separate from one another, but they are 'joined' in κύριος (1 Cor 11:11). It is also considered to be proper for a woman to pray to θεός with her head covered (1 Cor 11:13), with the congregation belonging to θεός (1 Cor 11:16, 22).

The term κύριος dominates 1 Cor 11:23-34 when Paul confirms that conceptually he considers the term κύριος as referring to Jesus (see 1 Cor 11:23); the κύριος who died 1 Cor 11:26 and to whom the eating of the bread and drinking of the cup refers (1 Cor 11:27). There should be little or no doubt that the term κύριος in this chapter refers to the crucified Jesus whereas the term θεός refers to the one highest level of the theological hierarchical thought-concept, the entity who receives prayers. Again, one is inclined to consider the term χριστός to be conceptualised 'closer' to the term θεός, due to the fact that the term χριστός might have been thought of as being elevated to be in close proximity to θεός, through whom θεός mediates. Paul thus seems to make a clear distinction between the referent of the term θεός and κύριος.

4.2.12 1 Corinthians 12

The concept underlying the use of the term κύριος in 1 Corinthians 12 is no different in comparison to the previous chapter. The term is conceptualised as referring to Jesus, while Paul remarks that no one can declare that Jesus is κύριος without the 'holy spirit' (1 Cor 12:3). Paul is also of the opinion that there are different services, but one κύριος who assigns them (1 Cor 12:5). On the other hand it is θεός to whom the spirit belongs (1 Cor 12:3). With θεός being the overarching ruling entity (1 Cor 12:6), the one who arranged the body parts where he wanted them (1 Cor 12:18; see also 1 Cor 12:24). The term θεός also refers to the one who appointed the apostles, prophets and teachers (1 Cor 12:28). The term Χριστός appears to be designated as the 'corporate' embodying of the believers (1 Cor 12:12, 27).

Deducible from the literary conceptual context, is that the term κύριος, χριστός and θεός refer to separate entities. Jesus is considered to be κύριος, the one who allocates various

services. Χριστός on the other hand, appears to be more. The χριστός in this instance emerges as one that 'transcends' Jesus as the κύριος. The term χριστός refers to the one who surpasses the 'mortal' believer, the monotheistic-universal figure embodying those in the service of the one κύριος. The overarching, all encompassing characteristic and functionality remains reserved for the referent of the term θεός. It should also be noted, that Paul regarded all three terms to portray monotheistic characteristics (see 1 Cor 12:5, 6 and 27). The latter could be used as valid critique opposing the argument or idea that the term κύριος, χριστός and θεός refer to separate entities.[146]

4.2.13 1 Corinthians 13

1 Corinthians 13 is indeed 'out of the ordinary' due to the fact that it is the only chapter in the Pauline literature without any reference to the θεός, κύριος, χριστός or any other related term. Although this is an interesting matter in its own right, this chapter will not serve the objective of this particular study.

4.2.14 1 Corinthians 14

4.2.14.1 *1 Corinthians 14:21*

The citation in 1 Cor 14:21, taken from Isa 28:11-13a, has been altered and adapted to a great extent.[147] The intent is not to discuss the discrepancies that exist between the text versions, nor to discuss how the cited text is reconstructed.[148] What is of importance is the 'dynamic' representation of Isa 28:13a (τὸ λόγιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ θλῖψις) in 1 Cor 14:21c (λέγει κύριος).

Literary comparison (1 Cor 14:21 and Isa 28:11-13a)		
NA²⁷ (1 Cor 14:21)	LXX^Gött (Isa 28:11-13a)	MT^BHS (Isa 28:11-13a)
ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι		
ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις	διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων	כִּי בְּלַעֲגֵי שָׂפָה

---

[146] There are no κύριος, θεός and χριστός terms in chapter thirteen.
[147] Cf. Koch, *Schrift,* 64 and Stanley, *Language of Scripture,* 198.
[148] Koch, *Schrift,* 63-66, discussed this very issue in great detail.

NT Greek	LXX Greek	Hebrew
		וּבְלָשׁוֹן אַחֶרֶת
καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων	διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας,	
		יְדַבֵּר אֶל־הָעָם הַזֶּה:
λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ	ὅτι λαλήσουσιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ	
	λέγοντες αὐτῷ Τοῦτο	אֲשֶׁר׀ אָמַר אֲלֵיהֶם זֹאת
	τὸ ἀνάπαυμα τῷ πεινῶντι	הַמְּנוּחָה הָנִיחוּ לֶעָיֵף
		וְזֹאת הַמַּרְגֵּעָה
	καὶ τοῦτο τὸ σύντριμμα,	
		וְלֹא אָבוּא שְׁמוֹעַ:
καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακούσονταί μου,	καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ἀκούειν.	
		וְהָיָה לָהֶם
	καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῖς	
	τὸ λόγιον **κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ** θλῖψις	דְּבַר־**יְהֹוָה** צַו
λέγει **κύριος**		

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES				HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES			
NT		OT		OT			
$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	ℵ, A, B	A B S *O'' L'* `	` *C''*	4QIsaᵃ	4QIsaᶜ	Cod^Len	Cod^Alep
κς	κς	κυ	θυ	יהוה	𐤉𐤅𐤄𐤉	יהוה	יהוה

The text critical data might be considered worthless if it can be proven that the phrase λέγει κύριος (1 Cor 14:21c) is a Pauline creation. Such a consideration will be revisited once the cited verse has been discussed in detail. The text critical data in comparison relies on the presumption that the phrase τὸ λόγιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ θλῖψις (1 Cor 14:21c) has been reworked by Paul to read λέγει κύριος.[149] Although the suggestion is made that Paul's account of Is 28:11-13 appears to be 'closer' to the MT,[150] the reading of Isa 28:13aᴸˣˣ is

---

[149] See Koch, *Schrift,* 65.
[150] Koch, *Schrift,* 63-66.

noticeably closer to its Hebrew counterpart.[151] The fact that Paul 'added' λέγει κύριος to the cited text in Rom 12:19 (Deut 32:35a) strengthens the plausibility for a Pauline 'addition' of λέγει κύριος in 1 Cor 14:21. Caution should be taken if and when the text critical readings and discrepancies, however valuable, are considered as support for a *Vorlage* dependence on λέγει κύριος. If the *Vorlage* dependence approach is followed, the variation between the nominative use of the κύριος term (support by all the major NT manuscripts) over and against the genitive use of the κύριος term (supported by all the major OT manuscripts), with some manuscripts reading the genitive form of the term θεός, would be superfluous. Essentially two interpretive possibilities exist with regard to Paul's use of Isa 28:11-13: a.) If the MT is considered to be the source text influencing how Paul interpreted what he cited in 1 Cor 14:21, indicates that 'God' will not speak to people using 'tongues' because they refused to listen when he spoke to them using intelligible words;[152] b.) The LXX in turn appears to suggest that those speaking are delivering a message of gloom and judgement.[153] In both these cases, it is intelligible words that are spoken by both 'God' (MT) and people (LXX). The literary conceptual context presented by the Greek OT, as presented by the LXX[Gött] (Isa 28:7-13) is opted for as the most plausible that influenced Paul's use of 1 Cor 14:21.

The Greek OT text witnesses either read κυ or θυ, while the NT text witnesses all read κς. It is possible that Paul 'added' λέγει κύριος to the cited text, which he 'adapted' his *Vorlage* or that he made use of a Greek OT text that read λέγει κύριος.

<div align="center">

~ A translation, transmission and theological conceptual problem ~

</div>

For some, the issue presented in 1 Corinthains 14 revolve around why *speaking in tongues* is for the unbeliever, while prophecy is for the believer (1 Cor 14:20-25).[154] Others in turn focus their attention on *speaking in tongues* and how it relates to women who have been ordered not to be silent at such gatherings (1 Cor 14:35-36).[155] The crucial issue at hand is that Paul

---

[151] Conzelmann, *Korinther,* 285, is of the opinion that Paul does not follow the Hebrew nor the Greek, as represented by the eclectic text editions, but that Paul used a different translation.

[152] Cf. Johanson, Bruce C. "Tongues, a Sign for Unbelievers? : a structural and exegetical study of I Corinthians XIV.20-25 / B.C." *NTS* 25.2, (1979), 180-203," 182.

[153] Cf. Johanson, "Tongues a Sign," 182.

[154] Representatives of this angle of approach are Grudem, Wayne A. "1 Corinthians 14.20-25: Prophecy and Tongues as Signs of God's Attitude." *WTJ* 41.2, (1979), 381-396; Roperts, P. "A sign - Christian or Pagan?" *ET* 90.7, (1979), 199-203; Sandnes, Karl O. "Prophecy - A Sign for Believers (1 Cor 14, 20-25)." *Biblica* 77.1, (1996), 1-15.

[155] See for example Flanagan, Neal M. "Did Paul put down women in 1 Cor 14:34-36?" *BTB* 11.1, (1981), 10-12; Odell-Scott, David W. "Let the women Speak in Church : an egalitarian interpretation of 1 Cor 14:33b-36." *BTB* 13.3, (1983), 90-93; Allison, Robert W. "Let Women be Silent in the Churches (1 Cor. 14.33b-36) : what did Paul really say, and what did it mean?" *JSNT* 32, (1988), 27-60; Rowe, Arthur J. "Silence and the Christian

assigns the content of this text (Isa 28:11-13) as words spoken by κύριος. Second, it is also important to establish how Paul relates this term κύριος with the term κύριος in the literary conceptual context. It is indeed plausible, based on the proposal that Paul reworked his *Vorlage*, that he interpreted Isa 28:13a τὸ λόγιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ – the words of κύριος θεός as being λέγει κύριος. The problem with such a view is: why would Paul 'omit' a theological significant term such as θεός, a term which supported his *theo*-logie extremely well? The term κύριος is used twice, one of which forms part of the cited content (1 Cor 14:21), the other in 1 Cor 14:37. Paul makes it clear in 1 Cor 14:2 that anyone speaking in 'a certain' language speaks to θεός.[156]. The theme of speaking in a 'tongue' or 'language' is central throughout chapter 14. In 1 Cor 14:18 he states that he is grateful to θεός that he could speak in languages or tongues more than any of the addressees. Paul continues saying that he would rather speak five intelligible words when in the congregation to teach others than to speak a thousand words in a 'tongue' (1 Cor 14:19) the latter which might imply that Paul meant 'linguistically unsound' language in 1 Cor 14:2. He then encourages the addressees not to be like children in thought, but to be a child in evil and adults in thinking (1 Cor 14:20). He confirms his statement by quoting from Isa 28:11-13.

If the literary conceptual context of the source text is taken into consideration and if one accepts that such a context underlies Paul's conceptual thinking, then it is plausible to deduce that κύριος σαβαωθ (Isa 28:5), τὸ λόγιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ θλῖψις (Is 28:13) or τοῦτο ἀκούσατε λόγον κυρίου (Isa 28:14) influenced Paul's concept that the cited text in 1 Cor 14:21 are the words spoken by κύριος. It might not have been a case of either-or, but rather that the dominating use of the term κύριος in Isaiah 28 influenced Paul to such an extent that he reworked Isa 28:13a into λέγει κύριος. If one accepts such an argument as plausible, then one is still required to account for how Paul conceptually understood the term κύριος as a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. One should also determine how this term κύριος relates to the term κύριος in 1 Cor 14:37, as well to the term θεός used within the literary conceptual context. Paul's *kyrio-theo*-concept is structured as follows:

Women of Corinth." *Communio viatorum* 33.1/2, (1990), 41; Jervis, L. A. "1 Corinthians 14.34-35: A Reconsideration of Paul's Limitation of the Free Speech of Some Corinthian Women." *JSNT* 58, (1995), 51-74; Niccum, C. "The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: the external evidence for 1 Cor 14.34-5." *NTS* 43.2, (1997), 242-255; Eriksson, Anders. "'Women Tongue Speakers, be Silent': a reconstruction through Paul's rhetoric." *BI* 6.1, (1998), 80-104; Kontzi-Méresse, Nicola. "Le silence des femmes dans l'assemblée : réflexion autour de 1 Corinthiens 14,34-35." *ETR* 80.2, (2005), 273-278; Greenbury, J. "1 Corinthians 14:34-35: evaluation of prophecy revisited." *JETS* 51.4, (2008), 721-731.
[156] It is not yet certain if Paul meant a language not known to linguistics, or if he meant any language, be it linguistically sound, unsound or merely unstructured.

ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις	he who speaks in tongues does not speak to humans
λαλεῖ ἀλλὰ θεῷ	but he speaks to *Theos*
Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ,	I (Paul) thank *Theos*
πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶ	that I can speak more languages than all of you

Paul makes it clear that speaking in tongues or languages, be that a language in the linguistic sense of the word or an utterance of sounds unknown to linguistic paradigms, that θεός is the one who not only grasps such a type of language, but that θεός is also granting one the ability to speak such a language. In 1 Cor 14:21 Paul cites scripture as the support for the case being put forward:

ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται	it is written in the law
ὅτι ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις	that in a foreign language
καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ	and on the lips of others I will speak to these people
καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακούσονταί μου,	but event then they will not listen to me
λέγει κύριος	says *Kyrios*

The implication of the train of thought is that Paul does not limit his critique against speaking in a language only known by θεός to the addressees, but he includes himself, as well as κύριος. The idea is that the addressees, including Paul, would not achieve anything productive within the congregation when speaking in a 'foreign' language; nor will κύριος when speaking to the people in 'such a' language. The literary source context is to be clearly understood: the author of Isa 28:7-13 appears to be critical towards the prophets and priests this is evident from Isa 28:7 - οὗτοι γὰρ οἴνῳ πεπλανημένοι εἰσίν, ἐπλανήθησαν διὰ τὸ σικερα· ἱερεὺς καὶ προφήτης ἐξέστησαν διὰ τὸν οἶνον – because they are lead astray by wine, they have been lead astray by *sikera*. Priest and prophets are confused due to the wine. The author of the Isaiah text then uses the first person plural saying 'to whom did we report evil and to whom did we report a message, those weaned from their mother's milk, ripped away from her breast' (Isa 28:9). It seems as if the author/s distances themselves from the priest and prophets who are being criticised in Isa 28:7 and Isa 28:8. The crux of the matter is

particularly relevant for what Paul addresses in ch. 14 is Isa 28:11 - διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας, ὅτι λαλήσουσιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ-through contemptuous lips, through the language of others, because they will speak to this nation... Isa 28:12 - καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ἀκούειν – and they have willed not to listen. The sequence of thought is thus:

Priest and Prophets

> → They are being lead astray
> → They report about affliction for the people
> → They speak with contemptuous lips in a foreign language
> → They will experience affliction upon affliction

Author/s

> → Not the ones reporting
> → They are reporting the oracle of *Kyrios Theos*

People

> → They willed not to listen

For the authors then, the critique is not directed against those who opted not to listen, but the ones, the priest and prophets, 'ruling' over those people (Isa 28:14). The oracle of κύριος ὁ θεός, as opposed to what they (the priests and prophets) might have communicated to the people, is thus directed to the priest and prophets, not towards the people. At first glance it appears as if Paul reworked and re-interpreted Isa 28:11 to such an extent for it to sound as if 'the people' are criticised and that it is the words spoken by κύριος. Paul does however, implement this verse, in a similar fashion regarding the addressees. The critique is directed to the ones speaking in tongues, teaching and prophesying in the Corinthian congregation, implying that they would have been considered to be the leaders of the congregation (cf. Isa 28:7-13). It would thus be possible to regard 1 Cor 14:1-19 as the forerunner for Paul's 'oracle' concerning ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ - he who speaks in a tongue (1 Cor 14:1; cf. Isa 28:7-13), followed by the qualification and evaluation of a 'oracle about delivering an oracle' in 1 Cor 14:20-21. Speaking in a foreign language, and in the lips of others is dubbed not to be effective when speaking to the people (1 Cor 14:21). According to Paul, this is written in the law and considered to be insufficient by κύριος as well. Therefore, αἱ γλῶσσαι εἰς σημεῖόν εἰσιν οὐ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπίστοις, ἡ δὲ προφητεία οὐ τοῖς ἀπίστοις ἀλλὰ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν – the tongues is not a sign for those who believe, but for the unbeliever; on

the other hand, with regard to εἰς σημεῖόν εἰσιν, prophecy is not for unbelievers, but for believers (1 Cor 14:22). The latter statement of Paul is based on the content of his *Vorlage* and therefore not necessarily what he conceptualised. What Paul does conceptualise is when a prophecy is proclaimed, it has the potential to allow an unbeliever to re-consider everything (1 Cor 14:24) after which he will bow down before θεός (1 Cor 14:25).

With the citation in 1 Cor 14:21, Paul has placed the concept underlying γλῶσσα on a par with the underlying concept of ἑτερόγλωσσος. If the concept of the former is related to sounds that do not make linguistic sense, the latter would imply a language linguistically sound, so to speak, which one is unfamiliar with. A third concept could also be inferred from Is 28:11 reading διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας, which seemingly indicates that the translator/s understood φαυλισμὸν χειλέων and γλώσσης ἑτέρας as words uttered which do not project wisdom, well-thought ideas, ignorant and hear-say information.[157] What Paul thus accomplished, probably intentionally, when he cited Isa 28:11-13a in 1 Cor 14:21, is to culminate the concepts underlying these terms into one single idea represented by ἑτερόγλωσσος, which holds a.) conceptual possibilities of γλῶσσα (linguistic unsound), b.) ἑτερόγλωσσος (linguistic sound, not familiar) and c.) φαυλισμὸν χειλέων and γλώσσης ἑτέρας (linguistic sound, familiar but not structured well – not legitimate). The legitimacy of his attempt is for the readers undisputed, due to the fact he has bracketed the idea in between ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι and λέγει κύριος. Paul's concept is emphasised in 1 Cor 14:23-25, where he explains the impact of prophecy, understood as linguistically sound, well-structured and familiar to both believer and unbeliever. Such an unbeliever will then fall down and worship θεός and announce that θεός is in their midst (1 Cor 14:25). As to whether Paul had the Hebrew deity in mind when he used the term κύριος in 1 Cor 14:21, remains uncertain. What seems to be probable is that Paul was influenced by his *Vorlage* which might have been dominated by the term κύριος. This is not to say that he shared the concept that the latter term was the Greek representation of the Tetragram. There appears to be a clear distinction between the κύριος term in 1 Cor 14:21, which refers to the one willing to speak in a foreign language, in another tongue as opposed to the term θεός, referring to the one who should be spoken to when using γλῶσσα (linguistic unsound). He is also the one being thanked by Paul for the 'gift' and ability to be able to speak using γλῶσσα.

---

[157] cf. Hos 7:16[LXX] which speaks of ἀπαιδευσίαν γλώσσης – incontrollable, undisciplined, ignorant tongue.

It is clear that the term θεός dominates this chapter, while the use of the term κύριος has been limited to 1 Cor 14:21 and 1 Cor 14:37[158]. The well known *theos*-concepts are repeated here, gratitude or thanks as well as prayer is directed to θεός (1 Cor 14:18; 1 Cor 14:25; 1 Cor 14:28). The 'word of *Theos*' (1 Cor 14:36), 'says *kyrios*' (1 Cor 14:21) and the 'command of *kyrios* (1 Cor 14:37) concepts allows one to associate the term θεός and κύριος without any obvious resistance. One could thus assume with a reasonable amount of certainty that both the term θεός and κύριος refer to the monotheistic Hebrew deity.[159]

4.2.15 1 Corinthians 15

The term χριστός is used more in 1 Cor 15, than in any other chapter of any New Testament document. It dominates this chapter in its entirety. It is utilised fifteen times and has been spread over fourteen verses. The term θεός in turn, is used in eleven instances, spread over nine verses, while the term κύριος is used in two verses relating to Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός (1 Cor 15:31, 57). This chapter attests to a literary conceptual correlation between the terms θεός and χριστός. Paul employs the term χριστός as a central figure while discussing the issue of resurrection. The term θεός is implemented with reference to ἐκκλησία (τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ - 1 Cor 15:9) and χάρις (χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ - 1 Cor 15:10), as well as βασιλεία (τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ - 1 Cor 15:24). Moreover, Paul refers to θεός in his discussion of μαρτυρία (1 Cor 15:15) and when referring to the one who has dominion over all (1 Cor 15:28). Finally, Paul accuses the addressees of not having any knowledge of θεός (1 Cor 15:34)–the latter who will give form to the resurrected body, as he pleases (1 Cor 15:38).

In this chapter there is no obvious literary or conceptual correlation between the terms θεός and κύριος. The only reference to the term κύριος, apart from its use as a title assigned to Jesus as the χριστός (1 Cor 15:31 and 1 Cor 15:57), is with Paul's final call for them (addressees) to continue with the work of κύριος (1 Cor 15:38). The term θεός remains the only term used to refer to the one who has the ability to resurrect the dead; but in this instance Paul discusses resurrection in terms of only χριστός and not Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός (see e.g. Rom 4:24; Rom 8:11; Rom 10:9; and 1 Cor 6:14[160]).

---

[158] Codex Alexandrinus propose reading the term θεός as oppose to the term κύριος.
[159] A detailed investigation concerning tongues and prophecy in 1 Cor 14:26-40, see Hiu, Elim. *Regulations Concerning Tongues and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians 14.26-40.* London: T & T Clark, 2010.
[160] In this instance θεός resurrects κύριος.

4.2.16 1 Corinthians 16

The term κύριος, as a primary theological significant acting agent, dominates the final chapter of the 1ˢᵗ epistle to the fellow followers of Christ situated in Corinth. The term is used in five instances in five distinct verses. The concept of the instruction and works of κύριος (1 Cor 16:7; 1 Cor 16:10 respectively) are again introduced here–as is so often the case (see e.g. 1 Cor 15:38). The term κύριος is also used to call upon the congregation to greet Aquila and Priscilla in κύριος (1 Cor 16:19), while Paul also mentions that if one is not a friend of κύριος, cursed is he (1 Cor 16:22). Finally, the term κύριος is used as a title for Jesus this is clear from 1 Cor 16:23. The implementation and the underlying concept of the term κύριος deduced from this chapter, enforces Paul's dominate use and underlying concept of the term κύριος throughout his epistles.

4.2.17 2 Corinthians 1 and 2

The term θεός again dominates the first two chapters, while the term χριστός is used just as frequently. The term κύριος is used in only three instances, notably limited to the technical phrase: κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The introductory phrases found in chapter one appears to be within the expected conceptual confines of Paul's thoughts: θεός is the father, while Jesus is the χριστός and κύριος (cf. 1 Thess 1:1; Gal 1:1; 1 Cor 1:1:3; Phil 1:2). What could be considered as unique is the concept τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Cor 1:1), already introduced in 1 Cor 1:2. It seems as if Paul had no intention of introducing a 'new' θεός or κύριος concept either than what was introduced in the first letter to his fellow followers of Christ (see 2 Cor 1:2-3 and 19). What is significant is how the term θεός relates to the term χριστός and *vice versa*.

Apart from the concept that θεός is the father of Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός (2 Cor 1:2-3), the term θεός is again used to refer to the one capable of resurrecting a mortal being from the dead (2 Cor 1:9) and extending grace (2 Cor 1:12; 2 Cor 2:14): the one who is faithful (2 Cor 1:18). Paul uses the term θεός when referring to the one who established a solid foundation in χριστός, through whom θεός anoints (2 Cor 1:21), with θεός called as witness (2 Cor 1:23). The phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 2:12), found only in the Pauline literature (see Rom 15:9; 2 Cor 9:13 and Gal 1:7), requires further attention. The use of the phrase is limited to Pauline thought, which includes τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ implemented in Rom 15:16; 1 Thess 2:2, 8 and 1 Thess 2:9 – with the exception of Mk 1:14. The latter attests to a text critical note suggesting that της βασιλειας be inserted before τοῦ

θεοῦ.[161] The data would imply that in Pauline thought, the referent of both the term χριστός and θεός relating to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is placed on a par. It is κύριος however, who opened the door for the 'good news' to be proclaimed (2 Cor 2:12). The mediating character of the term χριστός is again strengthened in 2 Cor 2:14 and 2 Cor 2:15. In 2 Cor 2:14, thanks is to be given to θεός who leads one in triumph in χριστός, while Paul considers the believers as being a fragrance to θεός through χριστός (1 Cor 2:15).

4.2.18 2 Corinthians 3

4.2.18.1 *2 Corinthians 3:16*

The content cited in 2 Cor 3:16 is not introduced by an introductory formula, making it difficult to determine if the content in 2 Cor 3:16 should be considered as an explicit citation.[162] Although Paul reworked the cited text to a large extent, it is reasonable to deduce that the content in 2 Cor 3:16 would have been recognised as a citation based on 'key' terms and phrases used, such as: περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα, as well as ἡνίκα δὲ ἐάν. Moreover, ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωϋσῆς (2 Cor 3:15) prepares the reader to some extent that a cited text might follow.

Literary comparison (2 Cor 3:16 and Exod 34:34a)		
NA[27] (2 Cor 3:16)	LXX[Gött] (Exod 34:34a)	MT[BHS] (Exod 34:34a)
ἡνίκα δὲ ἐάν	ἡνίκα δ᾽ ἂν	
ἐπιστρέψῃ[163]	εἰσεπορεύετο Μωυσῆς	וּבְבֹא מֹשֶׁה
πρὸς **κύριον**,	ἔναντι **κυρίου** λαλεῖν αὐτῷ,	לִפְנֵי **יְהוָה** לְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ
περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα	περιηρεῖτο τὸ κάλυμμα	יָסִיר אֶת־הַמַּסְוֶה

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES		HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES
NT	OT	OT

---

[161] Manuscripts supporting such an alternative include A D W, among others.

[162] Koch, *Schrift,* categorised the citation in 2 Cor 3:16 as the modification of the tempo, gender and mode of the verb, 114.

[163] The motivation for Paul's adaptation of the cited text becomes visible in 2 Cor 3:15 with the phrase ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωϋσῆς. It was therefore not required to repeat the proper name 'Moses' when he cited his *Vorlage.*

$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	א, A, B	B	Cod^{Len}
$\varkappa\nu$	$\varkappa\nu$	Κυ	יהוה

The reading of the cited content in 2 Cor 3:16 is in no way certain. The κύριος reading and its Hebrew counterpart appears, at first glance, to be intact. The only discrepancy is where B^{OT} reads κύριος in the genitive case,[164] as opposed to the accusative case supported by all the major NT text witnesses. The integration of the cited content containing the term κύριος is well adapted to its target context, in which the term κύριος refers to the primary acting agent (2 Cor 3:16-18).

The challenge is to relate the term κύριος with the terms θεός, χριστός and κύριος in its literary conceptual context.

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

Within the confines of this literary conceptual context, one is confronted with a rare case in which the term κύριος dominates as the primary acting agent. The term occurs five times in three distinct verses, whereas both the term θεός and χριστός occur in three instances spread over three verses. A cluster of the term κύριος is also observable in the last few verses of chapter three, with the terms θεός and χριστός being used inter-related in 2 Cor 3:3-5–with the exception of the term χριστός in 2 Cor 3:14. Attention will thus first be given to the terms θεός and χριστός located in 2 Cor 3:3-5.

Paul calls the addressees 'a letter' of χριστός. Such a letter is not written with black ink, but by the spirit of θεός (2 Cor 3:3). This speaks of confidence, a type of confidence not born within, but it is made possible through χριστός before θεός (2 Cor 3:4). The capabilities originate with θεός (2 Cor 3:5). Finally Paul states that they (presumably referring to himself and his co-workers) are not like Moses who covered his face to hide the fact that the reflection of the radiance is seen by the people. There is a shift from the veil on the face of Moses to the veil on the reading of the old covenant–and then on the heart of non-Christian listeners of the old covenant. It is only in χριστός that this veil could be taken away (2 Cor 3:14). Paul is hereby alluding to the content of Exodus 34. In 2 Cor 3:16 Paul cites Exod 34:34a whereby he is inclined to use the term κύριος, if he wanted to stay 'true' to his *Vorlage*. Paul introduces this cited text with the statement that even in his day, when Moses is

---

[164] The κύριος reading is not visible in codex S^{OT} or A^{OT}.

read, a veil covers their (probably referring to the Jews) hearts, but if and when one turns towards κύριος the veil will be taken away. Conceptually Paul stuck with the source context idea that the veil was taken away when turned towards κύριος. In the source context (Exodus 34) the author narrates that Moses went before κύριος to speak with him, the veil was taken away until he departed (Exod 34:34). For all practical purposes the term κύριος used in 2 Cor 3:16 indirectly represents the Tetragram. It would be extremely difficult to infer otherwise, and even more complex is to determine if Paul adopted the concept underlying the term κύριος, that this term is a Greek equivalent and thus reproduces the Tetragram.[165]

What seems to be probable is that Paul conceptually regarded the term κύριος as referring to the same entity as does the term χριστός. In 2 Cor 3:17 he claims that the spirit is κύριος and where the spirit of κύριος is, freedom is to be found. He continues saying that the unveiled faces, project the glory of κύριος, by which their glory increases because κύριος is the spirit (2 Cor 3:18). Being 'a letter' of χριστός (2 Cor 3:3) implies that one radiates something that is written, in this case not written in black ink, but with the spirit of θεός, and for Paul the ministry of the spirit glorifies (2 Cor 3:8). Moreover, Paul declares that κύριος is the spirit (2 Cor 3:17 and 2 Cor 3:18) and that those being unveiled reflect the glory of κύριος (2 Cor 3:18). It thus appears as if the ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 3: 3) refers to the same entity as ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν (2 Cor 3:17) – both phrases of which show the glory of κύριος and χριστός. This spirit originates with θεός - πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος (2 Cor 3:4).

The key in understanding the concept underlying the explicit κύριος citation lies with how one interprets Paul's allegorical interpretation of this term in 2 Cor 3:17. It is not Paul's intent to conceptually relate the term Χριστός in 2 Cor 3:3 with the term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16. The intent rather is to call πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος (2 Cor 3:3) to mind and by doing so the assumption that Paul conceptualised the term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16 (Exod 34:34a), the κύριος whom Moses visited on Mount Sinai, as the Tetragram. Paul continues with this concept in 1 Cor 3:17- 18. The κύριος terms in these verses refer thus to the same entity as the term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16. The term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:17-18 is literary and conceptually closely related to the term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16–both of which are underlined with the spirit of κύριος or then κύριος being the spirit. It seems highly unlikely that Paul conceptualised the

---

[165] According to Plummer, A. *Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians.* ICC, II Corinthians. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1960, Paul probably says κύριος rather than χριστός because of ἔναντι κυρίου in Exodus, 102; cf. Grosheide, F. W. *Tweede Brief aan Korinthe.* Commentar op het neuwe Testament. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959, 107-108; Windisch, H. *Der Zweite Korintherbrief.* KEK 9; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924, 122-124; Matera, Frank J. *II Corinthians – A Commentary.* NTL; Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 2003, 95-96; Barnett, P. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians.* NICNT; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1997, 196-199.

term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16 as a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. Paul's line of thought was governed by the κάλυμμα theme, which provided him with enough leverage to conceptualise the term κύριος in the context of the Exod 34 source as referring to the κύριος as the spirit. The mediating character of the term χριστός is again put to the fore in 2 Cor 3:4 and clearly also deducible from the 'epistle' metaphor, namely that one is an epistle of χριστός.

4.2.19 2 Corinthians 4

This is one of the very few chapters in the Pauline Literature where Jesus, together with the term θεός, is the dominating acting agent. There are nine references to Jesus spread over five verses, while the term θεός is used in eight cases spread over five verses. The term χριστός is used in three verses with the term κύριος employed in two instances only. The 'general' expected use of the term κύριος is followed. It is used in association with either Jesus (2 Cor 4:14) or Jesus as the χριστός (2 Cor 4:5). The use of the Χριστός and θεός in the phrase τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ enforces the close conceptual relation between these two terms. Moreover, the 'mediating' character underlying the term χριστός is yet again confirmed.[166] The use of the term Ἰησοῦς, especially in 2 Cor 4:9-14, refers to the earthly Jesus, his life and death. In this chapter Jesus is again presented as the κύριος and χριστός while the concept underlying the θεός appears the originator of the service to proclaim the 'good news', the one who is overseeing that his word comes into fulfilment (2 Cor 4:2-4).

4.2.20 2 Corinthians 5 – 9

The term χριστός and θεός are once more the dominating theological significant acting agents in 2 Corinthians 5 - 9. The term κύριος is used in only nine instances, two of which occur in 2 Cor 6:14 – 7:1. Due to a reasonable amount of consensus that the latter is *post*-Pauline, the two references will not be considered here – thus implying that the term κύριος is effectively used seven times in 2 Corinthians 5 - 9. Moreover, an alternative reading for the term κύριος is suggested in 2 Cor 8:5b. The text reading is supported by codex ℵ and B, while 𝔓⁴⁶ propose reading the term θεός in its dative case. The manuscript witness is obviously sufficient to consider altering the text reading, but the vital question is thus to what extent were the scribes influenced by the literary conceptual context when they proposed the alternative reading?

---

[166] The idea captured in this phrase is repeated in 2 Cor 4:6 (cf. 2 Cor 4:15 with regard to the glory of θεός), while adding Jesus to this concept.

Second, and just as important, why is the κύριος reading considered to be a more suitable term? If the scribes approached this reading from a thematical point of view, and if they added a broad conceptual overview of how δίδωμι should be used, an argument would be that the New Testament never hints in the direction of the term κύριος in the act of δίδωμι. To limit the discussion to the Pauline literature, it becomes apparent that the act of δίδωμι is only associated with the term θεός (cf. Rom 4:20; Rom 14:12), or where θεός is the acting subject acting out the act of giving towards 'them' (cf. Rom 11:8 and 1 Cor 15:38). The term κύριος refers to as the one who is acting out δίδωμι (cf. 1 Cor 3:5; 2 Cor 10:8; 2 Cor 13:10).

Inferred from such a thematical approach, it is plausible to read the term θεός when dealing with the direction of δίδωμι, as is the case in 2 Cor 8:5b. Conceptually then, the terms κύριος and θεός in its sequence in 2 Cor 8:5, makes perfect sense. Paul's conceptual context could be inferred to as follows:

- καὶ οὐ καθὼς ἠλπίσαμεν – it is more than what we hoped for;
- κύριος ἀλλὰ ἑαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν - but they first gave themselves to κύριος and then to us ;
- διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ - through the will of θεός.

Clearly Paul interprets 'giving themselves' first to κύριος and then to them positively–which implies that κύριος is the higher authority to whom one should submit, while Paul and his fellow workers should be regarded as secondary authorities. An even higher authority, it seems, is θεός–the one who wanted this to occur. The latter literary conceptual context of θεός fits well into Pauline thought (cf. Rom 15:13; 1 Cor 1:1 and 2 Cor 1:1 in terms of the will of θεός). If one considers this texts critical discrepancy with that noted in 2 Cor 8:21, it becomes evident that the scribes responsible for 𝔓[46] were consistent in opting for the term θεός as opposed to the term κύριος. On the other hand, codex ℵ and B are in turn also consistent in reading the term κύριος. Interesting is the fact that in both cases (2 Cor 8:5 and 2 Cor 8:21) the position relative to κύριος is to be 'before' (ἐνώπιον – preposition, genitive) κύριος. The latter would imply that the intent of the scribes to alternate the κύριος with the term is purely based on the fact that the preposition ἐνώπιον involves a certain submissive character of the one before whom he resides, while ἐνώπιον would, for the scribes of P[46], entail a certain statue of the one before whom one resides. What would be necessary is to investigate how P[46] in its entirety utilised the preposition ἐνώπιον relative to both the term

κύριος and θεός. Although necessary, such an investigation is beyond the scope of this study. The reason for the alternative readings in 2 Cor 8:5 and 2 Cor 8:21 are in no way certain, although a strong case can be made towards the alternative readings proposed by P[46]. The term κύριος is further used in this discussion of being either away from κύριος or being with him (2 Cor 5:6, 8). Moreover, it is stated that the φόβον of κύριος is well known (2 Cor 5:11). His grace is also known (2 Cor 8:9), the one deserving of glory (2 Cor 8:19). There is no reference made to any term κύριος in chapter nine, the latter which stimulates the thought that in these chapters, the author intended to use the term θεός as the primary acting agent (cf. 2 Cor 5:1-6:7; 2 Cor 7:6-12; 2 Cor 9:7-15) and therefore that P[46] (in the case of 2 Cor 8:5 and 2 Cor 8:21) attests to the 'original' reading.

The term θεός is introduced with the concept οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ ἔχομεν – having the building of *Theos* (2 Cor 5:1). *Theos* is also the one who prepared them (the followers of Christ) for the change from an earthly house to the building of *Theos* (2 Cor 5:5). *Theos* is also the one responsible for the 'new' life (2 Cor 17-18) followed by the concept of reconciliation with θεός in and through χριστός (2 Cor 5:18-21). *Theos* is the one motivating, calling one to rise up (2 Cor 7), but according to Paul θεός is also the one who causes irritation (2 Cor 7:9, 10). A concept that we are used to is that θεός offers grace, is well known in these chapters (cf. 2 Cor 6:1; 2 Cor 8:1, 16; 2 Cor 9:14, 15), the powerful one (2 Cor 6:7; 2 Cor 9:8) who wills for something (2 Cor 8:5); the one to whom one should extend gratitude and praise (2 Cor 9:11, 12, 13). The closeness of the terms χριστός and θεός is again observable (cf. 2 Cor 5:13-21 and 2 Cor 9:10-15). Moreover, the concept that θεός mediates through χριστός is again attested in these chapters. The literary conceptual context (2 Cor 5–2 Cor 9) thus confirms that θεός refers to the monotheistic Hebrew deity, while χριστός as an entity does not refer to Jesus as the κύριος, but a being that has transcended, a being to whom honour can also be bestowed (2 Cor 8:23). The term κύριος however, would be the term used that would call Jesus as the κύριος to mind.

4.2.21 2 Corinthians 10

4.2.21.1 *2 Corinthians 10:17*

The cited text in 2 Cor 10:17 (cf. 1 Cor 1:31) is in no way certain, but it is considered to be reasonably plausible that the cited content in 2 Cor 10:17 could have been taken from Jer

9:23a, or at least the construction thereof. The significance of the cited text is that Paul reads the term κύριος in its dative case, with no OT manuscript supporting such reading.

Literary comparison (2 Cor 10:17 and Jer 9:23a)		
NA[27] (2 Cor 10:17)	LXX[Gött] (Jer 9:23a)	MT[BHS] (Jer 9:23a)
	ἀλλ᾽ ἢ ἐν τούτῳ	כִּי אִם־בְּזֹאת
Ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος ἐν **κυρίῳ** καυχάσθω·	καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος	יִתְהַלֵּל הַמִּתְהַלֵּל הַשְׂכֵּל

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES
NT		**OT**	**OT**
𝔓[46]	ℵ, B	S A B	Cod[Len]
κω	Κω	-	-

As per the discussion on the citation in 1 Cor 1:31, it is argued that Paul was influenced by his literary source context when he decided on utilising the term κύριος in this regard. Although the phrase Ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω· varies from its constructed *Vorlage*, it does make sense to read ἐν κυρίῳ if the source context read ἀλλ᾽ ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος. In both these phrases it is implied that boasting should be directed towards ἐν κυρίῳ (2 Cor 10:17) and ἐν τούτῳ (Jer 9:23a) – the latter which refers to ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος (Jer 9:23b). Within the confines of the literary conceptual context it is indeed plausible to assume that the ἐν κυρίῳ reading was influenced by such a context, which influenced the use of the κύριος term in 2 Cor 10:18. This does not necessitate that Paul considered or conceptualised the term κύριος utilised in the thought-context of Jer 9 as representing the Tetragram or the Hebrew deity for that matter. It is, however, more probable that the concept underlying the term κύριος in 2 Cor 10:17 is Jesus as χριστός and κύριος.

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

This cited text is taken up into the literary conceptual context dominated by the term χριστός. The term occurs five times, being spread over four verses, with the term θεός occurring in three verses, and the same being true for the term κύριος. To reiterate, it was concluded that the term κύριος in 1 Cor 1:31, also citing Jer 9:23a, does not appear to share the same referent

as the term θεός. The question would be if Paul is consistent–not necessarily in applying the citation, but being consistent with regard to the conceptualisation of the term in relation to the term θεός and χριστός in particular. The first question that requires attention is: how did Paul conceptualise the term χριστός? Paul calls for the humility and fairness of χριστός (2 Cor 10:1), that every thought is made obedient to χριστός (2 Cor 10:5). In 2 Cor 10:8, χριστός is used in connection with those who belong to him, while Paul visited them with the gospel of χριστός (2 Cor 10:14). Paul clearly states, with regard to the term θεός, that they have the ability in θεός to destroy any opposition. They even have the ability to remove the arguments used against the knowledge of θεός (2 Cor 10:4-5). Paul and his co-workers' boasting is also limited to the field or measure assigned to them by θεός (2 Cor 10:13).

Paul employs the term κύριος when he speaks of boasting about the authority given to them by κύριος. He continues using the term κύριος when arguing along similar lines in 2 Cor 10:17. Paul makes it clear that they do not want to boast about work done in another man's territory (2 Cor 10:16), after which he reconfirms that if one has to boast, one should boast in κύριος (2 Cor 10:17).[167] Paul then argues that it is not the one who commends himself who will be approved, but the one commended by κύριος (2 Cor 10:18). As in 1 Cor 1:31, Paul does not seem to regard the term κύριος in 2 Cor 10:17 as referring to anyone other than to whom the κύριος term in 2 Cor 10:18 and 2 Cor 10:17 refers to–being Jesus as the χριστός. For Paul the referent of the term κύριος in 2 Cor 10:17 is the same as the term κύριος in 2 Cor 10:8; the one who provided the authority. Paul is thus consistent in applying the concept underlying the term κύριος throughout the Corinthian correspondence. For Paul the concept underlying the term θεός remains the monotheistic Hebrew deity. Finally, the term χριστός again appears to be functioning not merely as mediator or as a term referring to Jesus. The term χριστός seems to designate an entity with a different state of being in comparison to the entity the term κύριος refers to. The referent of the term κύριος is not assimilated into the 'being' represented by the term θεός. Formulated differently Paul makes a distinction between Jesus as the κύριος and Jesus as the χριστός. This distinction appears to be far more extreme compared to the distinction between the terms θεός and χριστός. The latter two terms thus appear conceptually closer to one another.

---

[167] A similar concept adopted in 2 Cor 10:8.

4.3 SUMMARY

The *theos*, *kyrios* and *christos* concepts in the first and second Corinthian correspondence, correlate, with regard to entity reference, in essence with the concepts presented in the Romans epistle. It would be fair to surmise that Paul's concept of the Hebrew deity, as portrayed by these terms within the respective literary conceptual context, is less coherent in the Corinthian correspondence compared to the Romans epistle. Moreover, the extent of Paul's distinction between the concept underlying the terms θεός, κύριος and χριστός appears more severe in comparison to the Romans epistle. Deduced from the literary conceptual context, Jesus as the κύριος (apart from the introductory phrases) is not used as often and the Jesus-*kyrios*-concept seems to function on a different frequency as does the χριστός. The latter is functionally conceptual, not only being mediator between the believers and θεός, but this referent appears more independent compared to Jesus as the *kyrios*. The so-called independent use of the term κύριος, in most cases, would call the Tetragram to mind. This seems at least true for Paul.

4.3.1   **Proposed Solution:** *Theological Conceptual Problems*

The explicit κύριος citation (Jer 9:22a) attested in 1 Cor 1:31 and 2 Cor 10:17 refers, in both cases, to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος. Even though the χριστός-θεός concept in the first chapter dominates, thematically and literary logically speaking, the term κύριος in 1 Cor 1:31 could not refer to any other entity than Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος (1 Cor 1:10; 1 Cor 1:30). Although not as distinctive as in 1 Cor 1:31, 2 Cor 10:17 would share such a sentiment. The *theos*-concept in chapter two remains unchanged; with this term the Hebrew deity proper is called to memory for Paul and most probably his audience as well. The explicit κύριος citation in 1 Cor 2:9 and 1 Cor 2:16a could not refer to any other entity than Jesus as the χριστός (1 Cor 2:2 and 1 Cor 2:16b). The term κύριος is clearly referring to a different entity than the term θεός – especially the referent of the term θεός in 1 Cor 2:9.

The term κύριος attested in the explicit citation in 1 Cor 3:20 does not seem to refer to the same entity as the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5. The latter is conceptually closer to the term χριστός (1 Cor 3:1, 11, 23). There is a clear distinction between the referent of the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5 and the term θεός in 1 Cor 3:6ff. Such a distinction should not be inferred between the term θεός in 1 Cor 3:19 and the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20. The θεός term refers to the Hebrew deity proper, while the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20 is a reproduction of the Tetragram, thus the personal Hebrew deity. A similar conclusion could be drawn from 1 Cor

10:26. The term κύριος in the explicit citation does hold the likely potential to be a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. Moreover, it appears to be plausible that Paul not only used the term but he also adopted the underlying concept, which implies that with the term κύριος Paul intended to call the personal Hebrew deity to mind and not Jesus as the κύριος. The term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16 and the underlying concept is that of the personal Hebrew deity, the Tetragram, allegorically interpreted as the spirit. The κύριος terms in 2 Cor 3:17-18 thus refers to the same entity, while the mediating character of the term χριστός is again emphasised. The term θεός remains undisputedly a reference to the monotheistic Hebrew deity.

4.3.2 **Proposed solution:** *A Translation, Transmission and Theological Conceptual Problem*

Finally, the explicit citation assigned to λέγει κύριος poses a few problems. The fact that Paul regarded the explicit citation, taken from Is 28:11ff, as words spoken by κύριος, implies that a.) he had to be influenced by his text *Vorlage* and b.) he considered the term κύριος as a referent for the Tetragram. This is the same entity implied by the phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor 10:36) and κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή (1 Cor 10:37). The translation problem has no impact on Paul's conceptual process in this regard. The content of the 'word', 'that which is spoken'; the 'utterance of language', a 'prophecy', that which is 'commanded', are concepts that were assigned to the term κύριος as in the Tetragram, who is the θεός. Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος appears not relevant for the discussion in chapter 14.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION
OBSERVATIONS ON PAUL'S CONCEPT OF A HEBREW DEITY

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Is it indeed possible to infer a Pauline concept of a Hebrew deity based on the explicit κύριος and θεός citations? Before some observations are made in this regard, itis would be important to determine to what extent, if at all, the study succeeded in:

1.) Finding a possible 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.**

2.) Offering reasonable arguments to uphold 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**

Therefore, the relevant effectiveness of the study will determined by:

a.) Evaluating if, and to what extent the objective: *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* was achieved.

b.) Evaluate if the 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* produced valuable insights that would support the proposed theory and assist in offering a plausible solution for the defined problem.

5.2 EVALUATING THE JEWISH-HELLENISTIC BACKDROP

The Hebrew manuscript evidence (chapter 2) has shown, without any reasonable doubt, that אל or אלהים and related forms such as אלוה were written as reference to the monotheistic Hebrew deity. This deity was 'named' and the 'name' written as יהוה primarily. The following written forms (*K^{e}tib* tradition) could be deduced from the 3rd century BCE onwards:

For אלהים

    a.) אלהים

    b.) אל

    c.) la

    d.) יהוה

And for יהוה

    a.) יהוה

    b.) Hwhy

    c.) יייי

    d.) אדני

The complexity of the matter revolved around the prohibition in uttering the 'name' of the Hebrew deity, in other words uttering יהוה. The *Q^{e}re* tradition (that which ought to be read or uttered) attests to an array of options, from the 3rd century BCE onwards:

    a.) אדני

    b.) אלהים and

    c.) שׁמא

The various possibilities offered within the *K^{e}tib* and *Q^{e}re* tradition could have forced one to make a distinction between the concept of the Hebrew deity based on its 'written' form (especially in terms of the Tetragram) and its 'oral' form. Therefore, writing and uttering the term אל or אלהים would call a wise creator deity into mind, the monotheistic Hebrew deity

proper, so to speak, the deity that resided on Mount Sinai. The 'written' form of the Tetragram could cause one of three concepts: 1.) an authoritive most respectful figure '*Lord*', 2.) the Hebrew deity proper or 3.) the Tetragram as the most Holy One, the 'God of the covenant, the personal Hebrew deity. These concepts of the Hebrew deity would concur with the concepts one infers from the $Q^e re$ tradition. These are but only three deductable concepts from the manuscript data discussed in chapter 2 of this study. These are not the only concepts that could be formulated, but they represent concepts that might have been commonplace from the 3rd century BCE onwards. These concepts however, did not make it easier for the Greek translators and therefore the question is: *is it possible to construct a concept of the Hebrew deity in its Greek frame of conceptual reference, considering the complex $K^e tib$ and $Q^e re$ tradition as a backdrop?*

The complex backdrop painted by the $K^e tib$ and $Q^e re$ tradition and the concepts they offer for the Hebrew deity would become one of the most influential elements in rendering the Hebrew deity with 'suitable' Greek equivalents. One would therefore expect variations, inconsistencies and discrepancies to say the least. It is clear that no standardised system was in circulation and operational from the 3rd century BCE up until at least the second half of the 2nd century. Second, it is reasonable to assume that the alternative Greek equivalents are due to the $K^e tib$ and $Q^e re$ issue. The Greek equivalents for אלהים were:

- a.) θεός and
- b.) κύριος (or at least the *nomina sacra* forms for the most part).[168]

To find a 'suitable' Greek equivalent for the Tetragram (יהוה), however was much more complex. The terms that were used to render or reproduce the Tetragram, deductable from the 2nd century BCE onwards varied between:

- a.) ΙΑΩ
- b.) Open space
- c.) יהוה
- d.) Hwhy
- e.) ΚΣ (nomina sacra)
- f.) ΘΣ (nomina sacra)
- g.) δεσπότης and
- h.) θεός

---

[168] See Tuckett, C. M. "Nomina Sacra in Codex E." *JTS* 57.2, (2006), 487-499 and Hurtado, L. W. "P52 (P. Rylands GK 457) and the nomina sacra: Method and Probability." *TB* 54.1, (2003), 1-14.

It should be noted from this position, that none of the above mentioned terms were applied consistently, nor were any of these considered as the 'norm' or the 'most' suitable Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. Notwithstanding, that such an array of possibilities in rendering the Tetragram had a significant impact on how the Hebrew deity was conceptualised in the Greek frame of reference.[169] The conceptual distinction between אלהים and יהוה was already initiated in the Hebrew text tradition. This conceptual distinction was not only taken to the next level in the Greek frame of conceptual reference, but the concepts underlying both the term אלהים and יהוה became interchangeable – almost to a point of confusion in some instances. The concepts produced by the Greek translators were θεός as the monotheistic Hebrew deity, who could also be κύριος, the authoritive figure and ruler over all and *vice versa*. The concepts offered by Philo and Josephus, did not only affirm that no standardised system was in place during the first two centuries CE, but they would also indicate that the term θεός was widely accepted as a 'suitable' Greek equivalent when reference is made to the monotheistic Hebrew deity.[170] Second, the sensitivity towards the term κύριος used when referring to the Hebrew deity is evident in the writing of Philo, while Josephus shows utter discontent utilising such a term. This would then form the literary conceptual backdrop against which Paul would ultimately construct his concept of a Hebrew deity based on the Greek equivalents attested in the explicit κύριος and θεός citations. Although the final word concerning the Jewish-Hellenistic literary backdrop regarding the terms θεός and κύριος has not yet been spoken, the manuscript data offers sufficient evidence and insights as to why Paul could have adopted his consistent use of the term θεός and ambiguous use of the term κύριος. It is thus indeed possible to construct a plausible Pauline concept(s) of the Hebrew deity based on these terms, as presented by the explicit κύριος and θεός citations. It would thus be fair to state that:

1.) Some discrepancies and inconsistencies related to the term יהוה already existed in the Hebrew text tradition from the 3rd century BCE onwards;

2.) These inconsistencies spilled over into the Greek OT text, which in turn, increased in frequency and complexity;

---

[169] See Woyke's, *Götter,* discussion on the Old Testament backdrop on the concept of *JHWH, Gottheiten* and *Götterbilder*, 67-72.

[170] Cf. Shaw, Frank. "The Emperor Gaius' Employment of the Divine Name." *Studia Philonica annual* 17 (2005), 33-48 and Wright, Nicholas T. "Paul's Gospel and Caeser's Empire." Pages 160-183 in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation.* Edited by Richard A. Horsley.
see also Crüsemann, M. "Der Gottesname im Neuen Testament." *Junge Kirche* 68.4, (2007), 16-21.

3.) Authors such as Paul, Philo and others, writing in the 1st century CE, could not have escaped these complex inconsistencies related to the 'name' of the Hebrew deity.

5.3 PAUL'S ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ CONCEPTS

The terms θεός and κύριος together with χριστός, are three of the most significant theological terms in the New Testament when a.) one is referring to the Hebrew deity and b.) assigning a title of the utmost authority and conceptual status to Jesus, while c.) emphasising the salvation character of Jesus as the χριστός. Moreover, these terms encapsulate the NT *theo*-logie,[171] *christo*-logie and what one would call *kyrio*-logie. This section of the chapter has no intention in repeating what has already been written on Paul's theology and christology.[172] The objective is neither to develop a uniquely different train of thought as proposed by scholars working in the field of Pauline theology and christology.[173] The pre-mediated intent is threefold: 1.) to summarise the *theos* and *kyrios* concepts attested in the 'authentic' letters of Paul 2.) determining if the Greek equivalents presented in the explicit κύριος and θεός citations pose a 'unique' concept of a Hebrew deity and finally 3.) to formulate a possible Pauline concept of a Hebrew deity in relation to Jesus. If one would formulate the objective into a question: *could the Greek equivalents for the Hebrew deity, including their underlying concepts, assist in determining Paul's concept of the Hebrew deity in relation to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος?*

---

[171] According to Dunn, James D. G. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998. Paul's convictions about God are all too axiomatic and because of this Paul never made much effort to expound on them, 28. Paul's beliefs about God were common place and he shared such beliefs with his readers, 29. Schnelle, *Theologie.* According to Schnelle, Paul proclaims two fundamental principals concerning his 'God' concept, in his own words: "Er (Paul) ist sowohl Herr der Geschichte als auch Herr des persönlichen Lebens," 198.

[172] Bauckham, "Paul's Christology," interprets Rom 10:13; Rom 14:11; Rom 9:33 as "YHWH texts with Jesus Christ as referent", 2; and Rom 4:7-8; Rom 9:27-28, 29; Rom 10:16; Rom 11:3; Rom 11:34; Rom 15:11 and Rom 12:19 (among others, see also page 7) as "YHWH texts with God as referent", 6.

[173] The work done in this regard is enormous, to the extent that listing the contributions would clutter this section of the study; reference would thus be made to only some studies. Fitzmeyr, Joseph A. *Pauline Theology, a Brief Sketch by Joseph A. Fitzmeyr.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967; Trasher, B. *The Attribute of God in Pauline Theology.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1986; Theissen, G. *Psychological aspects of Pauline Theology .* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987; Dunn, *Theology of Paul*; Dunn, James D. G. *The New Perspective on Paul.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005; Schnelle, *Leben und Denken.* Porter, Stanley E. (ed.). *Paul and His Theology.* Leiden: Brill, 2006; Woyke, *Götter.* Two recent publications that deal with the Theology of the New Testament should also be noted: Hahn, F. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments – Bd. I: Die Vielfalt des Neuen Testaments.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck (UTB), 2011; *Theologie des Neuen Testaments – Bd. II: Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck (UTB), 2011;. For brief but insightful discussion on the *Grundmodelle* developed in approaching the theology of Paul, see Hahn, *Theologie – Bd. I,* 181-188.

5.3.1 SUMMARY: PAUL'S ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ CONCEPTS - *NON-CITATIONS*

In 1 Thessalonians Paul presents a *theos*-concept that portrays a monotheistic Hebrew deity–the father of Jesus as the κύριος.[174] Paul's *kyrios*-concept is related to Jesus as an authoritave person demanding great respect while his *christos*-concept appears under-developed at this stage.[175] The *theos*-concept remains unchanged in the Galatian epistle with a much more developed *christos*-concept. The latter concept is specifically a Jesus induced concept, Jesus is the the *christos*, the saviour. The *kyrios*-concept is downplayed and limited to the concept of Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος. In Philemon however, the *theos*-concept is downplayed while being combined with a dominant Jesus induced *christos* and *kyrios*-concept. A frequently applied *christos*-concept is discernible in Philemon, with Jesus as the χριστός. The saviour and messiah concept is strongly emphasised in this letter. Paul remains conceptually static in terms of his *theos*-concept as the Hebrew deity, while the *kyrios*-concept is the typical authorative nature of Jesus.

5.3.2 GREEK EQUIVALENTS ATTESTED IN THE EXPLICIT CITATION – *UNIQUE ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ CONCEPT?*

In the first Corinthian letter a highly developed *christos*-concept is visible, almost to the extent of inducing Paul's *theos*-concept.[176] This *christos*-concept transcends the crucified Jesus as the κύριος and 'becomes' an entity who is neither the earthly and crucified Jesus, nor the transcended monotheistic Hebrew deity. Stated differently, existentially the *christos*-concept would be closer to Paul's *theos*-concept than his *kyrio*-concept, the latter which is related to Jesus. Apart from the *christos*-concept, the *kyrios*-concept deduced from the explicit citations also presents a unique characteristic, that of ambiguity. Paul intentionally and implicitly used the κύριος citations with the intent to call the personal Hebrew deity to mind for the Jews among his readers. This would have 'forced' the Jewish believers to consider their personal Hebrew deity, κύριος, in association with Jesus as the κύριος. The concept Paul had in his mind while deploying the explicit κύριος citation was primarily the personal Hebrew deity, the Tetragram. The ambiguity lies in the fact that in some instances

---

[174] For Schnelle, *Theologie,* the basis for the Christology relies on the premise that God acts in and through Jesus Christ. God is the one that raised Jesus from the dead (cf. Thess 1:10), 186; see also Woyke, *Götter,* 104-155; cf. Meeks, "Social Context," who interprets the paradox of the Messiah's crucifixion, as presented by Paul, as the end of the boundary-setting of the Torah.

[175] Cf. Dunn, *Theology,* 245. For Schenlle, *Leben und Denken,* God as the origin and subject of salvation history in 1 Thessalonians, was the *Primat der Theo*logie, 183; see also Schnelle, *Leben und Denken,* 199-200 in terms of 1 Thessalonians presenting Paul's 'shaping' theology; cf. Hahn, *Theologie,* 311-312.

[176] See the conversion fron 'Gotter' to 'Gott' based on 1 Cor 9b-10 in Woyke, *Götter,* 104-155.

Paul's *kyrios*-concept is explicitly Jesus as the κύριος, while in other cases the *kyrios*-concept as the Tetragram is made explicit while Jesus as the κύριος is implicitly implied. It would be unreasonable to suggest that Paul only had the Tetragram or Jesus as κύριος in mind – it was merely a case of implicit and explicitness. **Finally, the concept underlying the term θεός is never anything other than the monotheistic Hebrew deity. This term, for Paul, would always designate the creator and just Hebrew deity, the one who has the ability to raise Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός from the dead.** Even though this is the case, it would also be fair to say that the closest, conceptually speaking, that the earthly Jesus would come to 'be' the Hebrew deity would be through the underlined concept of the term χριστός in some instances. What follows next is a brief summary of the *theos* and *kyrios*-concepts presented in the explicit citations. In summary:

a.) the *kyrios*-concept deduced from the explicit citations presents a unique characteristic, that of ambiguity. Paul intentionally and implicitly used the κύριος citations with the intent to call the personal Hebrew deity to mind for the Jews among his readers;

b.) The ambiguity lies in the implicit and explicit use of the term κύριος in referencing to κύριος and the Tetragram respectively;

c.) The concept underlying the term θεός is never anything other than the monotheistic Hebrew deity. This term, for Paul, would always designate the creator and just Hebrew deity, the one who has the ability to raise Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός from the dead.

5.3.3 The *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ* and *ΘΕΟΣ* concepts in the Romans epistle

The most plausible concept underlying the term θεός in Rom 2:24; Rom 3:11, 18, which would include Rom 1:1-3:20 for that matter is the monotheistic Hebrew deity, the creator and rightful judge. The term θεός in Rom 4:3 would hold the same conceptual value as with the other three cited texts mentioned. Noteworthy is that the translation of יהוה with the the term θεός did not originate in the Pauline school, but this was a theological-conceptual shift that was made by the Greek scribes that translated the Hebrew Scriptures. The term κύριος in Rom 4:8 (Ps 31:2) validates the assumption that θεός is the primary term used when Paul refers to the monotheistic Hebrew deity. The same could be inferred from the cited text in Rom 9:26 (Hos 2:1b-c). This conjecture is due to the fact that Paul does not share the theological-conceptual view of the Greek translators (in this case at least), that the term κύριος reproduces the Tetragram. In the mind of Paul, the term κύριος in Rom 4:8 refers to

no one other than Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος (cf. Rom 4:23-24), a term Frenschkowski would categorise as an epithet, metonym or title.[177] One could, with a reasonable amount of certainty, conclude that Paul is for the most part consistent in his use of the *theo*, *kyrio* and *christo*-concepts in Romans 1 up until Romans 8. The four explicit θεός (Rom 2:24; Rom 3:11, 18 and Rom 4:3) and one explicit κύριος citation (Rom 4:8) did not deter Paul from conceptualising that the term θεός as a reference to the monotheistic Hebrew deity, while the term κύριος refers to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος. The inter-relatedness and theological-conceptual data of the explicit citations in Romans 9 proved to be a bit more complex.

The Hos 2:1b-c citation (Rom 9:26) again attests to the θεός concept denoting the monotheistic Hebrew deity. The subject matter related to the term κύριος in Rom 9:28 (Isa 10:22) and Rom 9:29 (Isa 1:9) strongly suggests a monotheistic Hebrew deity concept and not a mere epithet or title for Jesus as the χριστός. The literary conceptual context captured in Romans 9 is one of those rare cases where it is extremely difficult to distinguish between the concept underlying the χριστός, κύριος and θεός terms. It appears as if Paul not only allowed his *Vorlage* to dictate, but Paul also adopted the concept that the term κύριος 'represents' the personal Hebrew deity of Israel, the Tetragram. The latter permitted Paul to bridge the theological conceptual fissure between the χριστός and θεός, including the κύριος referent. **A clear, unambiguous distinction between the referent of the κύριος, χιστός and θεός terms in Romans 9, is thus extremely difficult to determine.** Paul ingeniously sets the *theo*-logie stage for what would become the grand θεός doxology finale in Rom 11:33-36. What would be interesting is if Paul allowed for this conceptual bridge to be extended to chapter ten leading up to Romans 11.

The pivotal terms in support of Paul's *christo, kyrio* and *theo*-logie are evenly spread in Romans 10; with the term κύριος dominating the cited content yet again. The most obvious and most likely conclusion is that the term κύριος refers to Jesus as the κύριος (cf. Rom 10:9), the risen χριστός (cf. Rom 10:7). Paul's *christ-kyrio*-logie remains intact - this includes his *theo*-logie. Both the term χριστός and κύριος refer to Jesus, while the term θεός refers to non other than the monotheistic Hebrew deity. The *theo-kyrio*-logie however, remains uncertain and with that the conceptual relation between the referents implied by the term θεός and κύριος. As expected, the term θεός dominates Romans 11, with the term κύριος again limited to the cited content (cf. Rom 11:3 and 34). Paul's theological-conceptual frame of reference implies that he not only knew that the term κύριος coins a Greek equivalent for the

---

[177] Frenschkowski, "Kyrios in Context," 96.

Tetragram, but he also allowed openness for the readers to interpret both the term θεός and κύριος to call the personal monotheistic Hebrew deity to mind. Paul's more integrated *theo-kyrio*-logie in relation to his χριστός concept was introduced in Romans 9, while balanced in Romans 10 and ultimately made more public in Romans 11. Paul's intent with his intertwined *theo-kyrio-christo*-logie introduced in Romans 9 was to ensure optimal theological effectiveness with the explicit representation of his *theo-kyrio*-logie in Romans 11, and ultimately the grand finale in the form of a doxology in Rom 11:33-36. For the optimal impact of the doxology Paul had to make a theological-conceptual shift from Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος to θεός as the κύριος. The latter term was not primarily to denote the authoritive nature of θεός, but is to explicitly call upon a deity as the personal-covenant Hebrew deity. The explicit κύριος citations in Rom 10:13 and Rom 10:16 ensured the possibility for a dual conceptual understanding; on the one hand Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός and on the other hand, the cosmic rule of θεός as יהוה. In Rom 11:3 and 11:34 however, in the mind of Paul that is, the term κύριος appears to be conceptually limited to the θεός as יהוה.

A strongly emphasised *theo*-logie, with the open possibility of a *theo-kyrio*-logie rooted in a *christo*-logie suited a more indicative mode of interaction as is apparent in Rom 1-11. With the transition from a more indicative mode of conversing to a more imperative mode, Paul ensures to deploy his *theo-kyrio-christo*-logie with the term θεός dominating Rom 12:1-4, with χριστός as the mediator with an *in*-cooperating function (Rom 12:5). This includes his *kyrio*-logie as one of authoritative rule demanding service (Rom 12:11). It does seem as if Paul kept with his *theo-kyrio*-logie evident from the cited content in Rom 12:19. The wrath of κύριος had the reasonable potential not just to call θεός as the Hebrew deity into mind, but also the personal Hebrew deity. Paul's dominating *theo*-logie explicitly denoted by the term θεός in Rom 13:1-6, while Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός concludes this chapter (cf. Rom 13:14). Paul's *theo-kyrio*-logie becomes even more evident in Romans 14, again with a possible varied conceptual undertone.

The explicit and emphasised *theo-kyrio*-logie in Rom 14:1-10 is unique in terms of its intensity. The *theo-kyrio*-logie dominates vv. 1-10, the latter which is confirmed by the explicit *kyrios-theos* citation in Rom 14:11. It remains debatable if the term κύριος in Rm 14:1-10, confirmed in Rom 14:11a, refers to Jesus as the κύριος in the theological conceptual sense of the word (cf. Rom 14:14). The term χριστός in Rom 14:9 suggests a Jesus as κύριος and χριστός frame of reference in Rom 14:10. Stronger evidence in support for such a *kyrio-christo* flavoured *theo*-logie is the topic on mortality and that one's mortality is constituted by

κύριος, which makes it highly unlikely that any other theological concept is implied other than Jesus, who died. The *theos-kyrios* inter-relatedness is not so much based on theological-conceptual commonalties, but rather that they represent existentially different entities. The term θεός refers to the immortal transcendent entity, while the term κύριος refers to Jesus as the mortal, in and through whom, every believer's mortality is constituted–not as an emphasis of their mortality but that this κύριος is the living κύριος (cf. Rom 14:11a). The concept of 'living' in correlation with κύριος together with the term θεός could have triggered a dual theological concept: a.) the risen κύριος (cf. Rom 14:9) and b.) θεός as the living κύριος, 'Lord' and ruler. A third possibility could also be inferred, namely that of Jesus as the risen κύριος–and *because* Jesus morphed from mortal being to immortal being every knee shall bow and every tongue will confess that he is θεός. Even though the term κύριος refers to Jesus, the *theo-kyrio*-logie developed in Romans 14 should not be underestimated. Such a theological view does provide ample plausible ground to regard Jesus as the New Testament יהוה.

The 'uniting' and 'final' chapter (Romans 15); considered to 'conclude' the 'primary' epistle addressed to the fellow followers of Christ living in Rome,[178] attests to Paul's *christological* theology, or differently stated, his *theological* christology. The well-known and frequently used concept that θεός is the father of Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός is again introduced in Rom 15:6 with an all too familiar dominance of the term χριστός and θεός in combination. The dual potential, based purely on its use within the thought-context of the term κύριος is again made possible by the explicit citation in Rom 15:11, but what the *kyrio*-logie gained from Romans 9 onwards had been toned down in Romans 15–which one would have expected if Paul wanted to frame his *christological theo*-logie or *theological christo*-logie. If and to what extent Romans 16 is considered to form part of the 'main' body of the Romans epistle could account for the developed *christo-kyrio*-logie of Romans 16. The term θεός features only in three verses (cf. Rom 16:20, 26 and 27) with the deployment of both the χριστός and κύριος terms that dominates the literary conceptual context. Such a 'developed' *kyriological* Christology does not blend in well with Paul's theological, christological and kyriological concepts introduced throughout Romans 1-15. This does not necessarily imply that Romans 16 should be considered 'non-Pauline', but the 'out-of-the-ordinary' features of this chapter does demand closer investigation. The theological-conceptual impact presented

---

[178] Michel, *Römerbrief,* 338-339, Käsemann, *Romans,* 409, Wilckens, *Die Römer,* 132 and Schlier, *Der Römerbrief,* 440 would not reject Rom 16:1-27 as not being authentic Pauline material. What is indeed plausible is the fact that Romans 16 did not form part of the 'original' main Romans epistle.

in Romans 16 is thus intentionally ignored when some concluding remarks on the Romans epistle are formulated. The *kyrio* and *theos*-concept discernible from the Romans epistle could thus be summarised as:

a.) Romans 1-8: Paul *theos*-concept is presented by the term θεός and refers to the monotheistic Hebrew deity, while his *kyrios*-concept is called to mind using the term κύριος referring to Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός (explicit citations in Rom 2:24; Rom 3:11, 18; Rom 4:3, 7 support the *theos*-concept);

b.) Romans 9-11: Paul's intent with his intertwined *theo-kyrio-christo*-logie introduced in Romans 9 was to ensure optimal theological effectiveness with the explicit representation of his *theo-kyrio*-logie in Romans 11, and ultimately the grand finale in the form of a doxology in Rom 11:33-36. For the optimal impact of the doxology Paul had to make a theological-conceptual shift from Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος to θεός as the κύριος (The explicit κύριος citations, Rom 9:28, 29; Rom 10:13, 16 and Rom 11:2c-3; Rom 11:34, support the ambiguous *kyrios* and *christos*-concept);

c.) Romans 14-15: The explicit citations in Romans 14 again supports the ambiguous *kyrios*-concept in Romans 14, while the citations in Romans 15 attests to Paul's *christological* theology, or differently stated, his *theological* christology;

d.) Romans 16: If and to what extent Romans 16 is considered to form part of the 'main' body of the Romans epistle could account for the developed *christo-kyrio*-logie of Romans 16. Such a 'developed' *kyriological* christology does not blend in well with Paul's theological, christological and kyriological concepts introduced throughout Romans 1-15.

5.3.4 The *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ* and *ΘΕΟΣ* concepts in the 1st Corinthian letter

What is evident from the first four chapters of the first Corinthian epistle is that the term θεός refers to the wisdom of the cosmos, the all powerful Hebrew deity. Second, is the all too familiar concept of Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος. This remains undisputed throughout the Pauline literature and especially in the Corinthian letters. The latter does not however, exclude nuanced variations of such concepts. Four such theological-moulded altering instances are found in the first four chapters (1 Cor 1:31; 1: Cor 2:8, 16; 1 Cor 3:20). These instances do bring a slightly nuanced concept of the term κύριος to the fore. Of these four the term κύριος in 1 Cor 1:31 should be understood and conceptualised as referring to Jesus as

the χριστός (cf. 1 Cor 1:30). Although the use of the term κύριος seems out of place in terms of the immediate literary conceptual context, Paul deliberately chose and adapted his *Vorlage* to read the term κύριος as part of the cited text for authoritative emphasis, which he slotted in neatly between 1 Cor 1:30 ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ and εἰ μὴ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν (1 Cor 2:2).

The θεός citation in 1 Cor 2:9, preceded by the rare combination of the τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης, is considered within the New Testament text as a whole. A plausible inferred theological concept in this case is a *kyrio-theo*-logie–a concept where the theological undertone supporting both the term κύριος and θεός appears to be overlapping. Paul does make it possible, ever so slightly, to conceptualise κύριος as referring to the same entity as does the term θεός–especially with the explicit citation in 1 Cor 2:9 in combination with 1 Cor 2:8. If considered within the immediate literary conceptual context, there is no obvious reason why the term κύριος in 1 Cor 2:8 would refer to any other entity other than Jesus. The same could be said for the term κύριος in 1 Cor 2:16a, although one cannot ignore the range of possibilities this explicit κύριος citation offers. Even though one could eventually consider 1 Cor 2:16a as referring to the same entity as does the term χριστός in 1 Cor 2:16b, and therefore Jesus in 1 Cor 2:2. It does appear as if a more independent *kyrio*-logie is enforced by the explicit κύριος citation in 1 Cor 2:16. Stated differently, the term κύριος is used more independently from Jesus as the χριστός, or so it seems to be in the first few chapters of first Corinthians.

The concept underlying the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20, related to wisdom, correlates with the underlying concept suggested with the term θεός in 1 Cor 3:19. If Paul had the same referent in mind when he used the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5, remains uncertain. What appears to be certain is the fact that the referent of the term χριστός (1 Cor 3:1, 11 and 23) and the term θεός are distinguished from one another. The *theo-kyrio*-logie of 1 Corinthians 3 is clearly determined by the explicit κύριος citation in 1 Cor 3:20 in combination with the use of the term θεός in 1 Cor 3:19. The *theo*-logie of 1 Corinthians 3 is thus two-fold: a.) christo-*logie* and b.) kyrio·theo-*logie*. 1 Corinthians 4-7 does not pose any 'out-of-the-ordinary' concepts related to the terms θεός, κύριος and χριστός. In general, Jesus is referred to as the χριστός and κύριος while the monotheistic Hebrew deity is called to mind with the use of the term θεός. The latter concepts are true for chapter eight for the most part. Paul's *theos* and *kyrios* concepts in 1 Cor 8:4-6 do offer dynamic concepts in this regard. The *mono*-theistic character of the Hebrew deity represented by the term θεός appears to be challenged in 1 Cor 8:5. Paul recognises the 'reality' that there are many θεοί in heaven and on earth; there are also many κύριοι. The theological issue is not 'if' other θεοί do indeed exist, neither did Paul

want to engage the multitude of κύριοι as opposed to Jesus as the κύριος. Paul's *theo*-logie, and with that his *kyrio*-logie, remains intact. His primary intent is to emphasise the unity of θεός as father and Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος.

The terms χριστός and κύριος in combination are more dominant in 1 Corinthians 10 than any other chapter in the Pauline literature. This includes a clear existential distinction between the referent of the term χριστός and θεός. The *christo*-logie as well as the *theo*-logie remains intact, whereas the *kyrio*-logie demands the conception that Jesus is the κύριος (cf. 1 Cor 10:21-22) with the term κύριος referring to the Hebrew deity (cf. 1 Cor 10:9[179] and 1 Cor 10:26). What seems to be quite obvious is that Paul's deductable christo-*logie*, theo-*logie* and kyrio-*logie* in the Corinthian correspondence, particularly evident in 1 Cor 8 and 10, are socio-culturally induced. It is thus reasonable to assume that the Hellenistic θεός and κύριος concepts of his time would have had a major impact on Paul's thought processes. Ironically, in the case of 1 Cor 10:26 (cf. 1 Cor 10:9), one would have expected the introduction of a more 'Hellenistic' concept of the term κύριος and not so much a concept that is rooted in the Jewish scripture. The latter might pose the question: would Paul be more inclined to rely on his Jewish roots or Christian beliefs when confronted by the religious dynamic society of his time?[180] Paul's theology with regard to the theological significant terms in question, remains integrally inferred from chapters eleven and twelve.[181]

1 Corinthians 14 would be considered to be of key importance in understanding the conceptual relationship between the terms κύριος and θεός. Moreover, the explicit citation in 1 Cor 14:21 (Is 28:11-13) assigned to λέγει κύριος would be the focal point in discovering the key to Paul's theology and kyriologie in this chapter. The term θεός remains the undisputed monotheistic deity, whereas the term κύριος holds the potential to call both Jesus as the κύριος or the Tetragram to mind. In this case, it is reasonable to understand the term κύριος (cf. 1 Cor 14:21, 37), conceptually and logically speaking, as referring to the personal Hebrew deity. It should be re-iterated at this stage, that the conceptual nuance between אלהים and יהוה was introduced by the Jewish scriptures, which spilled over into the Greek version of these texts with the term θεός (equivalent for אלהים) and κύριος (equivalent for יהוה). The nuanced character, portrayed by these terms, became more complex in the Hellenstic period; the very complexity Paul is struggling with. It is the challenge to remain true to the Jewish

---

[179] The argument is only valid, and with that logical, if the premise is accepted that the term κύριος is the most suitable reading.

[180] See Meeks, Wayne A. "The Social Context of Pauline Theology." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 36.3, (1982), 266-277.

[181] 1 Corinthians 13 is the only chapter with no explicit reference to the terms θεός, κύριος and χριστός.

roots captured and maintained by the Jewish scriptures, while simultaneously interpreting the Jewish scriptures. The *theo*-logie in 1 Corinthians 14 is thus supported by the *kyrio*-logie (cf. 1 Cor 14:21 and 1 Cor 14:37). In 1 Corinthians 15 it is the christology that supports Paul's theology. This is the most christological dense chapter in Pauline thought. It is almost as if Paul wanted to counter balance the Jewishness of his *kyrio*-logie in 1 Corinthians 14 by putting his conscience at rest with an overwhelming amount of references to χριστός. Paul goes even further with the dominant use of the term κύριος in 1 Corinthians 16, whereby he confirms the fact that Jesus as the χριστός is the κύριος. It would have been confusing for the readers of Paul if he had jumped from κύριος as the Tetragram (1 Corinthians 14) to Jesus as κύριος (1 Corinthians 15). Paul's deductable thought sequence looks as follows:

- Kyriological supported theology (1 Corinthians 14)
- Christological supported theology (1 Corinthians 15)
- Theological supported kyriology (1 Corinthians 16)

These three chapters in particular, is an example of Paul's balanced Christological-kyriological theology. Not that he intended it to be this way, but this is clear evidence of a Jew that applied and interpreted the Hebrew deity in terms of Jesus as the Χριστός and κύριος in an attempt to establish reasonable coherence between religious Jews and faithful Christ followers, between Jewish texts and Christian contexts. In summary:

a.) 1 Corinthians 1-13: *Christo-kyrio* induced theo-*logie*, in some instances challenged by the explicit citations;

b.) 1 Corinthians 14: Kyriological supported theology, made possible by the explicit κύριος citations;

c.) 1 Corinthians 15: Christological supported theology;

d.) 1 Corinthians 16: Theological supported kyriology.

5.3.5 The *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ* and *ΘΕΟΣ* concepts in the 2nd Corinthian letter

As is the case in the first Corinthian letter, a christologically supported theology is at work in the 2nd Corinthian epistle, with the implementation of the term κύριος and with that a *kyrio*-logie that appears to be deployed at key sections of the epistle. The latter is specifically made possible with the employment of explicit κύριος citations. This is palpable for the most part of the epistle, with the exception of chapter seven, which only attests to the term θεός. The

pertinent question is if the explicit κύριος citations in 2 Cor 3:16 (Exod 34:34a) and 2 Cor 10:17 (Jer 9:23a) offer a 'new' concept of the Hebrew deity and the relationship with Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος? Logically speaking, and for all practical purposes, the term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16 is a reproduction of the Tetragram and thus refers to the personal Hebrew deity. The *kyrio*-logie inferred from 2 Cor 3:15-18 is not that obvious, as if it refers to Jesus as the χριστός. Paul's intent was to be ambiguous, to force the reader to ponder the κύριος idea. What Paul is suggesting here is that when Moses is read (the torah), a veil covers the reader's mind. This veil is removed when turning towards κύριος (2 Cor 3:16). In Exod 34:34 it is Moses who covers his face, but when κύριος is addressed the veil is removed. This κύριος for Paul is ὁ κύριος who is also the spirit (2 Cor 3:18), and those who's faces are unveiled see the glory of κύριος. Paul then concludes with καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος (this comes from κύριος the spirit). There should be little or no doubt that the κύριος in this literary context refers to none other than the Hebrew deity who resides on Mount Sinai. The concept introduced by Paul in this case is a pneumatological supported *kyrio*-logie–the referent of which is clearly distinguished from χριστός, but the same cannot be said for the term θεός. The explicit κύριος citation in 2 Cor 10:17 does not offer any other κύριος concept than Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος.

5.4 PAUL'S CONCEPT OF A HEBREW DEITY

Paul's concept of a Hebrew deity is aligned with the Old Testament concept of such a Hebrew deity in general. Paul's concept would thus be in line with Jewish contemporaries and Jewish thought in general between the 3rd century BCE and the 2nd century CE, at least until the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Paul also shared the inferred practise that the term θεός was predominately used to refer to the Hebrew deity. One major difference in this regard would be the fact that Paul intentionally used the term κύριος to refer to the personal Hebrew deity, the Tetragram. Deploying such a possible 'profane' term would not have been common place among Jewish thought, nor would it have been an accepted practice.

The explicit κυριός citations in particular as well as the θεός citations are considered to be the 'missing' link between the Hebrew deity and Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός. Paul made the conceptual shift between *the Tetragram* as the personal Hebrew deity who delivered the Israelites from Egypt, the 'God' of the covenant, the one who spoke through the prophets, who initiated the deliverance of the Jews and *Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός* who became the crucified personal deity. Paul's concept of a Hebrew deity should therefore not be

characterised as being 'incoherent' but rather ambiguous. For Paul θεός, as the living Hebrew deity, became the personal covenantal 'God'–for the Israelites as יהוה, while Jesus became the χριστός and κύριος, the personal 'God' for both Jew and gentile. Paul constructs a christologically induced theology governed by his ambiguous *kyrio*-logie.

5.5 PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research study made an attempt to propose a possible solution for Paul's alleged 'incoherent' understanding of a Hebrew deity in terms of Jesus as κύριος and χριστός based on his explicit κύριος and θεός citations. Apart from the obvious outcomes of such a research venture, recognising limitations and observing future research possibilities form part and parcel thereof. The limitations would evidently be that the socio-religious or Hellenistic context of both the terms κύριος and θεός, especially with regard to Emperor Cults, were deliberately underplayed.[182] The Greaco-Roman conceptual context of the terms κύριος and θεός could have contributed to a better understanding of these terms and the potential conceptual value they convey.[183]

This research study however could be regarded as a stepping stone for the following proposed future research endeavours:

a.) An in-depth text-critical investigation into the history of both the OG and NT text (with a particular focus on dominating manuscript witnesses) with regard to the terms θεός and κύριος. Such an investigation would shed some light on possible scribal traditions that might have existed at various intervals.

b.) An investigation into the use of the terms θεός and κύριος in 'non-Biblical' text in the second temple period and to determine what conceptual possibilities they hold.

c.) A final suggestion would be to investigate the works of Philo and how his concept of the terms θεός and κύριος relate to his contemporaries, including NT authors.

---

[182] See for example Miller, C. "The Imperial Cult in the Pauline Cities of Asia Minor and Greece." *CBQ* 72.2 (2010), 314-332; MacGraw, D. "The Imperial Cult: a new paradigm for understanding 2 Cor 2:14." *RQ* 52.3 (2010), 145-156; Finney, Mark T. "Christ Crucified and the Inversion of Roman Imperial Ideology in 1 Corinthians." *BTB* 35.1, (2005), 20-33, to mention only three.

[183] See for example Shaw, "The Emperor Gaius," 33-48; Meeks, Wayne A. "The Social Context of Pauline Theology." *Interpretation* 36.3 (1982), 266-277; Barclay, John M. G. "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity." *JSNT* 47, (1992), 49-74; Horsley, *Paul and Empire.*; *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation.* Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000; *Paul and the Roman Imperial Order.* Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2004.

These are but a few proposals suggested for this interesting field. The conceptual potential the terms θεός and κύριος, terms used to refer to a possible deity, project and communicate. None of these proposed studies, including this study would offer absolute or final remarks on these terms, but a tapestry of studies in this regard could produce a responsible and plausible conceptual understanding of the terms θεός and κύριος.

ADDENDUM A

Manuscripts for the Judean Desert (DJD Series)			
Biblical (canonical) content		**Non-Biblical content and *Pesharim***	
4QGen^b		**1Q14 (1QpMic)**	
fr. 1, col. ii:3 (Gen 2:16)	יהוה אלהים	fr. 1_5:1	דְוֹדֶ
fr. 1, col. ii:5 (Gen 2:18)	יהוה אלהים	**1Q15 (1QpZeph)**	
fr. 3, col. i:3 (Gen 4:3)	יהוה	fr. 1:4	דְוֹדֶ
4QGen^d		**1QpHab**	
fr. 1 (Gen 1:18, 20)	אלהים	6:14	דְוֹדֶ
4QGen^f		10:7	דְוֹדֶ
fr. 1 (Gen 48:9)	אלהים	10:14	דְוֹדֶ
4QGen^g		11:10	דְוֹדֶ
fr. 1 (Gen 1:2-10)	אלהים	**1Q29 (Liturgy of the three tongues of fire)**	
4QGen^j		fr. 1:7	יהוה
fr. 2, col. i (Gen 41:250	האלהים	Fr. 3_4:3	יהוה
4Qpaleo-Gen^m		**1QS (Rule of the community)**	
PAM 41.387:5 (Gen 26:25)	יהוה	8:14	יייי
4QGen-Exod^a		**2Q21 (2QApocryphon of Moses?)**	
fr. 24-25, col. i:4 (Exod 4:28)	יהוה	fr. 1:4	יהוה
fr. 25, col. ii	יהוה	**2Q22 (2QApocryphon of David?)**	
line 5 (Exod 6:7)	יהוה אלהים	fr. 1:1	יהוה
line 9 (Exod 6:10)	יהוה	**2Q30 (Unclassified)**	
fr. 28:11 (Exod 6:13)	יהוה	Fr. 1.1	יהוה
fr. 33:2 (Exod 7:6)	יהוה	**4Q88 (4QPs^f)**	
fr. 34-35:3 (Exod 7:17)	יהוה	9.5 Eschatological Hymn	יהוה
4QExod^b		9.14	יהוה
fr. 2:6 (Exod 1:20)	אלהים	10.13 Apostrophe to Judah	יהוה
fr. 3, col. ii 5-6i		**4Q158 (4QReworked Pentateuch^a)**	
line 2 (Exod 3:14)	אלהים	fr. 1_2:15 (Gen 32.25-33; Exod 4:27-28)	יהוה
line 4 (Exod 3:15)	אלהים	fr. 1_2:16	יהוה
line 6 (Exod 3:16)	אלהים יהוה	fr.1_2:18	יהוה
line 10 (Exod 3:18)	אלהים יהוה	fr. 4:8 Ex 3.12; 24.4-6	יהוה
4QExod^c		fr. 5:3 Ex 19.17-23	יהוה
fr. 4:25, col. i (Exod 8:1)	יהוה	fr. 6:4 Ex 20.19-21	יהוה
fr. 5:30, col. i	יהוה	fr. 7_8:3 (Exod 20.12-17; Deut 5.30-31; Exod 20:22-26; 21:1-10)	יהוה

4QExod^d		fr. 10-12:10 (Exod 21:32-37; 22:1-3)	יהוה
PAM 43.012:1 (Exod 13:15)	יהוה	**4Q161 (4QpIsa^a)**	
4QExod^j		fr. 8-10, col. iii:13 (Isa 11:1-5)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
fr. 2:3 (Exod 8:1a)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	**4Q162 (4QpIsa^b)**	
2QExod^b		2.3 (Isa 5:11-14)	יהוה
fr. 2 (Exod 12:27)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	2.7 (Isa 5:24)	יהוה
fr. 7 (Exod 31:16)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	2.8 (Isa 5:25)	יהוה
fr. 8 (Exod 34:10)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	**4Q163 (4QpIsa^c)**	
4QpaleoExod^m		fr. 4-6, col. ii:17 (Is 10:22-23)	יהוה
col. i:7 (Exod 6:29)	יהוה	fr. 6_7, col. ii:19 (Isa 10:24)	יהוה
col. i:8 (Exod 6:30)	יהוה	fr. 15_16:1 (Isa 29:10-12)	יהוה
col.ii:8 (Exod 7:18b)	יהוה	fr. 21:9 (Isa 30:1-5)	יהוה
col. v:13 (Exod 9:12)	יהוה	fr. 23, col. ii:9 (Isa 30:15-18)	יהוה
4QpaleoGen-Exod^l		**4Q168 (4QMicah Pesher?)**	
fr. 4:12 (Exod 3:1)	יהוה	f. 1+3:4 Mic 4.8-12	יהוה
fr. 10, col. ii:14 (Exod 14:24)	יהוה	**4Q169 (4QpNah)**	יהוה
fr. 17:2 (Exod 16:33)	יהוה	fr. 3_4, col. ii:10 (Nah 3:5)	יהוה
fr. 20:7 (Exod 18:21)	יהוה	**4Q170 (4QpZeph)**	
4QpaleoGen-Exod		fr. 1_2:1 (Zeph 1:12-13)	יהוה
fr. 4:12	אלהים	**4Q171 (4QpPs^a)**	
fr. 5, col. ii 5, 7	יהוה אלהים	fr. 1_10, col. ii:4 (Ps 37:9)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
fr. 7, col. ii 10	יהוה	fr. 1_10, col. iii:5 (Ps 37:20)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
fr. 10, col. ii	יהוה	**4Q173 (4QpPs^b)**	
fr. 17	יהוה	fr. 4:2 (Ps 129:7-8)	יהוה
fr. 20	יהוה	**4Q174 (4QFlorilegium)**	
4QExod-Lev^f		3:3 (Exod 15:17-18)	יהוה
fr. 2ii:11, col. ii f(Exod 40:16)	יהוה	3:10 2 (Sam 7:12-14)	יהוה
PAM 43.012 (Exod 13:15)	יהוה	3:18 (Ps 2:1)	יהוה
fr. 1-2 (Exod 8:1a)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	**4Q175 (4QTestimonia)**	
fr. 2-3 (Lev 14:27)	יהוה	1:1 (Deut 5:28-29)	יייי
fr. 16-19 (Lev 19:5)	יהוה	1:19 (Deut 33:8-11)	יייי
fr. 20 (Lev 24:12)	יהוה	**4Q176 (4QTanhumim)**	
11QLev^a (11Q2)		fr. 1_2, col. i:6 (Isa 40:1-5)	יייי
fr. 2 (Lev 9:24)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 1_2, col. i:7 (Isa 40:1-5)	יייי
Lev 10.1	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 1_2, col. i:9 (Isa 40:1-5)	יייי
4QLev^b		fr. 1_2, col. ii:6 (Isa 49:13-17)	יייי
fr. 1:16 (Lev 1:13)	יהוה	fr. 8_11:6 (Isa 54:4-10)	יייי

fr. 1:22 (Lev 2:1)	יהוה	fr. 8_11:8 (Isa 54:4-10)	יייי
fr. 8:5 (Lev 3:12)	יהוה	fr. 8_11:10 (Isa 54:4-10)	יייי
4QLev^c		**4Q177 (4QCatena A)**	
fr. 2:5 (Lev 4:2)	יהוה	1:7	ביהוה
4QLev^d		2:2	יהוה
fr. 4:4 (Lev 17:4)	יהוה	4:8 (Ps 6:4-5)	יהוה
4QLev^e		**4Q183 (4QHistorical Work)**	
fr. 3:2 (Lev 19:34)	יהוה	fr. 1, col. ii:3	ל 𐤅
4QLev^g		fr. 2:1	𐤆𐤅𐤆𐤉
PAM 43.036:8 (Lev 7:25)	𐤆𐤅𐤆𐤉	**4Q185 (4QSapiential Work)**	
4QLev-Num^a		fr. 1_2, col. ii:3	יהוה
fr. 2:6 (Lev 14:27)	יהוה	**4Q216 (4QJubilees^a)**	
fr. 16-19:1 (Lev 19:3)	יהוה	1:3	יהוה
fr. 16-19:2 (Lev 19:5)	יהוה	1:5	יהוה
fr. 20:2 (Lev 24:12)	יהוה	**4Q222 (4QJub^g)**	
4QLev-Num^a		fr. 1:5	יהוה
fr. 33, col. i:13 (Num 3:11)	יהוה	**4Q225 (4QpJub^a)**	
fr. 46, col. ii:14 (Num 4:49)	יהוה	fr. 2, col. ii:10	יהוה
fr. 53-54:7 (Num 9:8)	יהוה	**4Q248 (Acts of a Greek King)**	
4QNum^b		fr. 1:5	יייי
fr. 1-4:12, col. i (Num 12:6)	יהוה	**4Q266 (4QDamascus Document^a)**	
XHev/SeNumbers^b		fr. 7:2	יהוה
col. i:24 (Num 2:3)	יהוה	**4Q306 (4QMen of People who Err)**	
col. i:30 (Num 2:6)	יהוה	fr. 3:5	יייי
4QDeut^a		**4Q364 (4QReworked Pentateuch^b)**	
PAM 43.102:7 (Deut 24:4)	יהוה	fr. 14:3 Exod 19:17?; 24.12-14	יהוה
4QDeut^b		fr. 24a_c:3 (Deut 2:30-3.2)	יהוה
fr. 6:8, col. III (Deut 31:30)	יהוה	fr. 25a_c:4 (Deut 3:18-23)	יהוה
fr. 3:15, col. I (Deut 30:11)	יהוה	fr. 25a_c:8 (Deut 3:18-23)	יהוה
4QDeut^c		fr. 26ai:4 (Deut 9:6-7)	יהוה
fr. 5:2 (Deut 8:2)	יהוה	fr. 26aii:2 (Deut 9:22-24)	יהוה
fr. 33, col. i:9 (Deut 16:11)	יהוה	fr. 26aii:5 (Deut 9:22-24)	יהוה
fr. 53:3 (Deut 29:19)	יהוה	fr. 26bii+e:1 (Deut 9:21?, 25?, 10:1-4)	יהוה
4QDeut^d		f. 26bii+e:3 (Deut 9:21?, 25?, 10:1-4)	יהוה

col. I:14 (Deut 2:33)	יהוה	fr. 26bii+e:9 (Deut 9:21?, 25?, 10:1-4)	יהוה
col. II:8 (Deut 3:20)	יהוה	**4Q365 (4QReworked Pentateuch^c)**	
4QDeut^e		fr. 2:5 (Exod 8:13-19)	יהוה
fr. 1:1 (Deut 3:24)	יהוה	fr. 2:6	יהוה
fr. 2i:17, col. i (Deut 7:12)	יהוה	fr. 2:7	יהוה
4QDeut^f		fr. 6b:3 (Exod 15:16-20)	יהוה
fr. 5:6 (Deut 8:6)	יהוה	fr. 6aii+6c:12 (Exod 15:22-26)	יהוה
fr. 9:2 (Deut 18:8)	יהוה	fr. 11i:2 (Exod 35:3-5)	יהוה
4QDeut^g		fr. 12biii:2 (Exod 39:1-16)	יהוה
fr. 9:12 (Deut 26:4)	יהוה	fr. 12biii:7	יהוה
4QDeut^{k2}		fr. 17a_c:4 (Lev 11:1-2)	יהוה
fr. 5:6 (Deut 26:3)	ܩܘܘܩ	fr. 21:2 (Lev 13:51-52)	יהוה
4QDeut^l		fr. 23:2 (Lev 23:42-24:2)	יהוה
fr. 4-5 (Deut 29:5)	יהוה	fr. 23:3	יהוה
4QpaleoDeut^r		fr. 23:4	יהוה
fr. 3-4:1 (Deut 7:1)	יהוה	fr. 35ii:5 (Num 17:20-24)	יהוה
fr. 6:5 (Deut 7:18)	יהוה	**4Q367 (4QReworked Pentateuch^e)**	
5QDeut		fr. 1a_b.2 (Lev 11:47-13:1)	יהוה
fr. 1 col. i:2 (Deut 7.16)	יהוה	fr. 1a_b.10	יהוה
fr. 1 col. i:5 (Deut 7.17)	יהוה	fr. 2a_b.3 (Lev 15:14-15; 19:1-4, 9-15)	יהוה
XHev/Se 3 (XHevSeDeut)		**4Q368 (4QapocrPent A)**	
col. ii:4 (Deut 9:22)	יהוה	fr. 2:6	יהוה
XHev/SePhylactery		fr. 9:2	יהוה
fr. 1:1 (Exod 13:1)	יהוה	fr. 9:4	יהוה
fr. 1:5 (Exod 13:12)	יהוה	**4Q370 (4QExhortation based on the flood)**	
fr. 1:8 (Deut 6:5)	יהוה	fr. 1i.2	יהוה
fr. 1:15 (Deut 11:17)	יהוה	fr. 1i.3	יהוה
Unknown province[1]		fr. 1ii.2	יהוה
col. I:26 Josh 1:8	יהוה	fr. 1ii.7	יהוה
1QIsa^a		**4Q372 (4QapocrJoseph^b)**	
col. i (Isa 1:3, 9, 18, 20)	יהוה	fr. 1:26	יהוה

---

[1] Dated to 86 BCE – 46 CE.

col. iii (Isa 3:15)	אדני יהוה	fr. 2:2	יהוה
col. iii (Isa 3:18)	אדני יהוה	fr. 3:7	יהוה
col. iii (Isa 6:12)	יהוה	fr. 4:4	יהוה
col. iii (Isa 7:3)	יהוה	**4Q373 (4QapocrJoseph^c)**	
col. iii (Isa 7:7)	יהוה	fr. 1a+b:6	יהוה
4QIsa^a		**4Q374 (4QDiscource on the Exodus)**	
fr. 2, col. i (Isa 21:10)	צבאות אלהי	fr. 9:3	יהוה
fr. 2, col. ii (Isa 22:20)	יהוה	**4Q375 (4QapocrMoses^a)**	
4QIsa^b		fr. 1i:2	יהוה
fr. 3:12 (Isa 3:17)	אדני	fr. 1ii:8	יהוה
fr. 3:11, col. ii (Isa 5:25)	יהוה	**4Q377 (4QapocrPent B)**	
fr. 10-11:3 (Isa 18:7)	יהוה צבאות	fr. 2ii:3	יהוה
fr. 10-11:4 (Isa 18:7)	ליהוה צבאות	fr. 2ii:5	יהוה
fr. 10-11:18 (Isa 19:12)	יהוה צבאות	**4Q378 (4QapocrJoshua^a)**	
fr. 10-11:19 (Isa 19:14)	יהוה	fr. 11:1	יהוה
fr. 10-11:24 (Isa 19:17)	יהוה צבאות	fr. 12:3	יהוה
fr. 10-11:27 (Isa 19:19)	יהוה צבאות	fr. 14:4	יהוה
fr. 10-11:28 (Isa 19:20)	יהוה	**4Q379 (4QapocrJoshua^b)**	
fr. 25:12 (Isa 39:8)	יהוה	fr. 3i:2	יהוה
fr. 25:15 (Isa 40:2)	יהוה	fr. 3i:4	יהוה
fr. 31:6, col. ii (Isa 44:23)	יהוה	fr. 14:1	יהוה
fr. 33:5, col. i (Isa 45:24)	יהוה	fr. 22ii:5	יהוה
fr. 33:6, col. i (Isa 45:25)	יהוה	**4Q380 (4QNon-Canonical Psalms A)**	
4QIsa^c		fr. 1i.5	יהוה
fr. 2:11(Isa 9:12)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 1i.8	יהוה
fr. 6:6 (Isa 11:9)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 1i.9	יהוה
fr. 8:2 (Isa 14:1)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 2.4	יהוה
fr. 8:6 (Isa 14:3)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 2.5	יהוה
fr. 9:26, col. i (Isa 22:12)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	**4Q381 (4QNon-Canonical Psalms B)**	
fr. 9:15, col. ii (Isa 23:11)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr.1:2	יהוה
fr. 12:24, col. ii (Isa 23:17)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 24a+b:4	יהוה
fr. 12:25, col.ii (Isa 23:18)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 24a+b:8 Ps 18.3	יהוה
fr. 54:26, col. i (Isa 23:18)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 33+35:2	יהוה
fr. 54:30, col.i (Isa 24:3)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 76_77:12	יהוה
fr. 54:40, col.i (Isa 24:14)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	fr. 86:2	יהוה

fr. 13:8 (Isa 24:21)	⅂ⅎ�略	**4Q382 (4QParapfrase of Kings)**	
fr. 53:30, col. ii (Isa 26:4)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 9:5	יהוה
fr. 53:34, col.ii (Isa 26:8)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	**4Q385 (4QpsEzekᵃ)**	
fr. 20:11 (Isa 30:15)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 2:3 (cf. Ezekiel 37)	יהוה
fr. 21:1 (Isa 33:2)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 2:4	יהוה
fr. 22:4 (Isa 33:5)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 2:8	יהוה
fr. 24:36 (Isa 44:5)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 2:9	יהוה
fr. 24:38 (Isa 44:6)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 3:2	יהוה
fr. 24:39 (Isa 44:6)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 3:3	יהוה
fr. 25:35 (Isa 45:3)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 3:4	יהוה
fr. 37:2 (Isa 52:10)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 4:4 cf. (Ezekiel 10)	יהוה
fr. 37:3 (Isa 52:10)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 4:7	יהוה
fr. 44,45:5 (Isa 54:13)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	**4Q385a (4QpsMosesᵃ)**	
fr. 46:17 (Isa 54:17)	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂	fr. 16a_b:7	יהוה
4QIsaᶠ		fr. 18ia_b:2	יהוה
fr. 1-2 (Isa 1:11)	יהוה	**4Q385b (4QapocrJerᶜ)**	
4Q51-4QSamᵃ		fr. 1:1	יהוה
fr. 158:21 (2 Sam 22:50)	יהוה	**4Q386 (4QpsEzekᵇ)**	
4QPsᵃ		fr. 1ii.1	יהוה
fr. 1 (Ps 5:13)	יהוה	fr. 1ii.2	יהוה
fr. 9, col. ii (Ps 71:1)	יהוה	fr. 1ii.3	יהוה
fr. 22, col. i (Ps 103:1)	יהוה	fr. 1iii.1	יהוה
4QPsᵇ		**4Q388 (4QpsEzekᵈ)**	
fr. 22, col. i (Ps 103:1)	יהוה	fr. 7.6	יהוה
4QPsᶜ		**4Q391 (4QpsEzekᵉ)**	
fr. 6-7 (Ps 27:13)	יהוה	fr. 36:1	יייי
4QPsᵈ		fr. 36:4	יייי
col. i Ps (147:2)	יהוה	fr. 52:5	יייי
col. ii Ps 104:1)	יהוה	fr. 55:2	יייי
4QPsᵉ		fr. 58:3	יייי
fr. 8 (Ps 89:50)	אדוני	fr. 65:5	יייי
fr. 8 (Ps 89:51)	אדוני	**4Q393 (4QCommunal Confessions)**	
fr. 14 (Ps 104:1)	יהוה יהוה	fr. 3:6	יהוה
4QPsᶠ		**4Q406 (4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrificeᵍ)**	
col. ii (Ps 107:15)	ליהוה	fr. 1:2	⅂ⅎⅠ⅂⅄
4QPsᵍ		**4Q411 (4QSapiential**	

		Hymn)	
col. 6, fr. 1, col. i (Ps 119:41)	יהוה	fr. 1ii.2	יהוה
4QPs^h		fr. 1ii.11	יהוה
fr.1-2 (Ps 119:12)	יהוה	fr. 1ii.12	יהוה
4QPs^m		fr. 1ii.13	יהוה
fr. 5-6 (Ps 97:6-9)	יהוה	fr. 1ii.17	יהוה
8QPs		**4Q429 (4QHodayot^c)**	
fr. 9:2 (Ps 18:7)	יהוה	fr. 6:2	יהוה
11QPs^a (11Q2)		**4Q460 (4QNarrative Work and Prayer)**	
fr. Ei (Ps 118:25, 26, 27)	קוקק (paleo-Hebrew)	fr. 9i:10	יהוה
fr. Eii (Ps 104:31)	קוקק (paleo-Hebrew)	**4Q461 (4QNarrative B)**	
11QPs^c (11Q7)		fr. 1.9	יהוה
fr. 1-2 (Ps 2:4)	אדוני	fr. 1.10	יהוה
fr. 4-7 (Ps 14:6)	יהוה	**4Q462 (4QNarrative C^a)**	
5/6HevPsalms (1b)[2]		fr. 1:7	ייייי
col. iii, fr. 1, col. i:14 Ps 7.18	יהוה	fr. 1:12	ייייי
col. iv, fr. 1, col. ii:17 Ps 9.17	יהוה	**4Q466 (4QText Mentioning the Congregation of the Lord)**	
col. iv, fr. 1, col. ii:25 Ps 10:3)	יהוה	fr. 1.3	יהוה
col. ix, fr. 6:18 (Ps 18:32)	יהוה	**4Q474 (4QText Concerning Rachel and Joseph)**	
		fr. 1.4	יהוה
		4Q480 (4QNarrative F)	
		fr. 1ii.2	יהוה
		4Q522 (4QapocrJoshua^c?)	
		fr. 5:4	יהוה
		fr. 9ii:5	יהוה
		4Q528 (4QHymnic or Sapiential Work B)	
		fr. 1:5	יהוה
		6Q15 (Damascus Document)	
		fr. 3:5	[drawn symbol]
		6Q?? (Composed Hymn)	
		fr. 6:5	[drawn symbol]

---

fr. 8.1	$\angle_{\not{F}}$
8Q5 (4QHymn)	
fr. 2:3	יהוה
11Q5 (11QPsᵃ)	
18:3 Ps 154.3-19 (Syriac Ps II)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
18:14	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
18:15	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
19:4 Plea for Deliverance	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
19:6	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
19:7	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
19:11	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
19:13	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
19:16	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
24:3 Ps 144.15; 155.1-19 (Syriac Ps III)	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
24:6	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
24:8	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
24:12	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
24:13	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
24:15	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
24:16	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
26:9 Ps 149.9-150.6; Hymn to the Creator	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
27:4 2 Sam 23.7; David's Composition; Ps 140.1-5	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
28:5 Ps 134, 151A, 151B	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
28:10	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄
11Q6 (11QPsᵇ)	
fr. 4_5.14 Plea for Deliverance	יהוה
11Q11 (11QapocrPs)	
1:4	ביהוה
3:3	יהוה
3:9	יהוה
3:10	יהוה
4:4	יהוה
5:8	יהוה
11Q19 (11QTempleᵃ)	
13:13	ליהוה
14:7	ליהוה

15:13	יהוה
17:12	ליהוה
17:13	ליהוה
18:13	ליהוה
18:14	ליהוה
20:14	יהוה
21:3	יהוה
21:8	יהוה
21:10	יהוה
21:16	יהוה
22:8	יהוה
22:14	יהוה
22:16	יהוה
23:17	ליהוה
24:9	יהוה
25:4	יהוה
25:13	ליהוה
28:6	יהוה
34:14	יהוה
39:8	ליהוה
54:14	יהוה
48:7	ליהוה
48:8	ליהוה
48:10	ליהוה
51:7	יהוה
53:8	יהוה
54:12	יהוה
54:13	יהוה
54:16	יהוה
55:9	ליהוה
55:14	ליהוה
60:21	יהוה
61:3	יהוה
63:7	יהוה
63:8	יהוה
11Q20 (11QTemple[b])	

1:4	ליהוה
1:19	יהוה
4:4	יהוה
6:2	ליהוה
fr. 37:1	יהוה
11Q22 (11QpaUnid)	
fr. 7.1	יהוה
PAM43663	יהוה
fr. 26.1	יהוה
PAM43674	יהוה
fr. 40:2	יהוה
PAM43678	יהוה
fr. 66:1	יהוה
fr. 68ii:1	יהוה
PAM43682	יהוה
fr. 28:1	יהוה
PAM43692	יהוה
fr. 40:1	יהוה
fr. 57:1	יהוה
fr. 78:1	יהוה
PAM43696	יהוה
fr. 26.1	יהוה

ADDENDUM B

Manuscripts from the Judean & Egyptian desert			
Judean Desert (DJD Series)		**Egyptian Desert**	
4QUnid gr		**P.Oxy 3522**	
fr. 2:6	eite kurio	fr. 1 (Job 42)	יהוה
P. Fouad 266		**P.Oxy 4443 (Ester 8-9)**	
col. iv, fr. 5 (Deut 18:15)	qeos	Esther 8-9	Qeos
col. iv, fr. 5 (Deut 18:15)	qeos	**P.Bodmer II 𝔓66**	KS, KU, KE
col. iv, fr. 6 (Deut 18:16)	blank space	**P.Bodmer XIV 𝔓75**	KS, KU, KE
col. viii, fr. 10 (Deut 19:10)	blank space qeos	**P. Oxy 656**	
col. viii, fr. 11 (Deut 19:14)	hwhy	plate 2 frg. c (Gen 24.42)	ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου
col. xv, frg. 21 (Deut 21:8)	hwhy	**P. Oxy 1007**	
col. xxxiii, fr. 49 (Deut 25:15)	hwhy qeos	Gen 2 :8	ZZ QSN
col. xxxiv, fr. 149 (Deut 25:16)	hwhy	Gen 2:18	ZZ QSN
col. xxxix, fr. 59 (Deut 27:2)	hwhy qeos	**P. Oxy 1166**	
4Q119 4QLXXLev^a		Genesis 16	KSN QSN
fr. 1:1 (Lev 26:2)	blank space left in recon	**P. Berlin 17213**	
fr. 1:18 (Lev 26:13)	blank space left in recon	Gen 19:17	--- three letters
4Q120 4QpapLXXLev^b		Gen 19:18	--- three letters
fr. 1:11 (Lev 1:11)	[Iaw]	**P. Oxy 1075**	
fr. 2:1 (Lev 2:3)	[Iaw]	Exodus 40	KUN
fr. 7:12 (Lev 3:12)	Iaw	**P. Heid 1359**	
fr. 8:2 (Lev 3:14)	[Iaw]	Unknown	IAW
fr. 20:4 (Lev 4:27)	Iaw	**Codex Sinaiticus**	
4Q121 4QLXXNum		In all instances	KS,KU,KE, QSN
col.i, fr. 2:10 (Num 3:42)	blank space left in recon	**Codex Vaticanus**	
4Q122 4QLXXDeut		In all instances	KS,KU,KE, QSN
fr. 1:5 (Deut 11.4)	blank space left in recon	**Codex Alexandrinus**	
7Q1 4QLXXExodus		In all instances	KS,KU,KE, QSN
Exodus 28			
7Q2 Epistle of Jer			
Baruch 6	----		
8HevXIIgr			
col. xviii:24 (Hab 2:16)	יהוה		
col. xviii:39 (Hab 2:20)			
col. iii:36 (Jo 4:2)	יהוה		
col. iv:33 (Mi 1.3)	יהוה		
col. vii:39 (Mi 4.4)	יהוה		

col.vii:41 (Mic 4.5)	𐤄𐤉𐤄𐤅
col.viii:6 (Mic 4.7)	𐤄𐤉𐤄𐤅
col.viii:40 (Mic 5.3(4))	𐤄𐤉𐤄𐤅
col. xxi:29 Zp 1.14	𐤄𐤉𐤄𐤅
col.xxi:37 Zp 1.17	𐤄𐤉𐤄𐤅
col.xxii:42 Zp 2.10	𐤄𐤉𐤄𐤅
col.xxviii:37 Za 1.3	𐤄𐤉𐤄𐤅
col.xxviii:42 Za 1.4	𐤄𐤉𐤄𐤅
col.xxxi:38 Za 3.6	𐤄𐤉𐤄𐤅
col. B2:3 Za 9.1	𐤄𐤉𐤄𐤅
P. Chester Beauty II $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	KS, KU, KE

New Testament Text Tradition (κύριος and θεός terms)

Ref	𝔓[46]	𝔓[41]	𝔓[45]	𝔓[49]	𝔓[20]	𝔓[72]	𝔓[15]	𝔓[11]	𝔓[9]	𝔓[47+]	𝔓[47c]	𝔓[74]	𝔓[100]	ℵ[*]	ℵ[1]	ℵ[2]	A	B[*]	B	D[*]	D[1]	D[2]	D[3]	C[*]	C[1]	C[2]	C[3]	F	G	Other
2Thess																														
2v2														κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ		Χυ						κυ	κυ	
2v13														κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ		θυ								
3v3														κυ			θυ	κυ	κυ	θυ		κυ								
Col																														
2v2														θυ χυ		θυ	θυ χυ			θυ χς	θυ	θυ χυ								
3v16	χυ													κυ		χυ	θυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	θυ		χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	
3v16	θω													θω	θω	θω	θω	θω	θω	θω					θω			κω		
3v22	θν													κν			θν	κν	κν	κν		θν						κν	κν	
4v3	χυ													θυ		χυ	χυ	θυ										χυ		
Eph																														
2v22	θυ													θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	χυ	χυ	χυ										
5v10	κω			κω										κω	κω	κω	κω	κω	κω	θω								θω	θω	
5v17	χυ													κυ	κυ	κυ	θυ	κυ	κυ	κυ										
5v21	χυ													χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ								
5v29	χς													χς	χς	χς	χς	χς	χς	χς	χς	κς						χς	χς	
1 Tim																														
5v5														κν		θν	θν			κν		θν		θν	θν	θν	θν	θν	θν	
2 Tim																														
1v6														θυ	θυ	θυ	χυ													
2v14														χυ	χυ	χυ	κυ			κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ			
1 Peter																														
3v15						χυ								χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ		χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ			θν
3v18						θω								θω	θω	θω	θω													πατρι
4v2						θυ								ανθ	θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ										
5v1						θυ								χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ	χυ									
2 Peter																														
1v1						θυ								κυ	κυ	κυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ										κυ
3v12						θυ								θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ										κυ
1 Jh																														
2v17														θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ				θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ			αυτου
4v3																														
4v15									αυτω					θω	θω	θω	θω	θω	θω	θω										αυτω
5v10														θω	θω	θω	θω	υιω	υιω	υιω										θω
James																														
3v9					κν									κν	κν	κν	κν	κν	κν	κν				κν	κν	κν	κν			κν / θν
4v10													κω	κω	κω	κω	κω	κω	κω	κω										κω / θν
Rev																														
11v4														κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ													θυ
11v17											ο θυ ο θυ ο θυ ο κυ ο θυ ο θυ						κω ο θς	κε ο θς											
14v7											θν						θν	θν												κν
14v13											κω						κω	κω												χω / θω

Ref	𝔓46	𝔓41	𝔓45	𝔓49	𝔓20	𝔓72	𝔓15	𝔓11	𝔓9	𝔓47*	𝔓47c	𝔓74	𝔓100	B*	B2	D*	D1	D2	D3	C*	C1	C2	C3	F	G	Other
Luke																										
1v9														κυ	κυ	κυ	θυ			θυ						
2v9														κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ									θυ
Acts																										
2v17														θς	θς	θς	κς			θς						κς
5v9																										
6v7														θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	κυ		θυ						κυ
8v24														κυ	κυ	κυ	κυ	θυ		κυ						κυ
8v25														θυ	κυ	θυ	κυ	κυ		κυ						κυ
10v33			κυ											θυ	κυ	κυ	κυ	θυ		κυ						
13v5														θυ	θυ	θυ	θυ	κυ				θυ				θυ
16v10														θς	θς	θς	θς	κς		θς						θς
16v14														κω	κω	κω	κω	θω		κω						
16v32			κυ											κυ	θυ	κυ	κυ	θυ		κυ						κυ
20v28		κυ												κυ	θυ	κυ	θυ	κυ		κυ		κυ…θυ				κυ
20v32														κω	κω	κω	θω	κω		κω						κω
21v20														θν	θν	θν	θν	κν		θν						θν
1 Thess																										
3v9a														κω	θω	θω	θω									
3v9b														κω	θυ	θυ	θυ									
1 Cor																										
1v6	χυ													κυ		κυ	θυ	κυ								θυ
4v10								κω																		
7v40							χυ																			
10v9	χυ													κυ		θυ	κυ	χυ						χυ	χυ	χυ
2 Cor																										
8v5	θω													κω		κω										
8v21	τ. θυ													κυ		κυ										
11v17	κυ													κυ		κυ										θυ / ανθ
Rom																										
8v35														θυ		θυ…χω										
10v17	χυ													χυ	θυ	θυ	χυ	χυ		χυ						
16v9	χω													χω		χω	χω	κω		κω						
Phil																										
4v7	θυ													θυ		χυ	θυ									
Phlm																										
20														χω		χω	χω	κω		χω						

Bibliography

Aageson, James 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.

____. 1992. *Written Also for Our Sake – Paul and the Art of Biblical Interpretation.* Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press

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

Achim, B. "Gen 15,6 und das Vorverständnis des Paulus." *ZNW* 109. 3 (1997), 329-332.

Aletti, J.-N. "Romans 4 et Genese 17 Quelle evnigmé et quelle solution?" *Biblica* 84, (2003), 305-325.

Allison, Robert W. "Let women de silent in the churches (1 Cor. 14.33b-36): what did Paul really say, and what did it mean?" *JSNT* 32, (1988), 27-60.

Arndt, W. et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature : A translation and adaption of the fourth revised and augmented edition of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-deutsches Worterbuch zu den Schrift en des Neuen Testaments und der ubrigen urchristlichen Literatur (267).* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Barclay, John M. G. "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity." *JSNT* 47, (1992), 49-74.

Barnett, P. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. NICNT; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1997.

Barthélemy, D. and Milik, J. T. *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I). Oxford: Clarendon, 1955. xi + 163 pp. + xxxvii plates.

Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians.* Adam & Charles Black: London, 1968.

Bauckham, R. "Paul's Christology of Divine Identity.", 1-26. Cited 2 Feb. 2012. Online: http://www.forananswer.org/Top_JW/Richard_Bauckham.pdf.

Baumgarten, J. M. "A new Qumran Substitute for the Divine Name and Mishnah Sukkah 4.5." *JBL* 83.2-3, (1992), 1-5.

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.

Bellinger, J. R. and Farmer, W. R. (eds.). *Jesus and the Suffering Servant Isaiah Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins.* Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1998, 193-222.

Benoit, P., Milik, J. T. and de Vaux, R. *Les grottes de Murabba'at* (DJD II ; 2 vols). Oxford: Clarendon, 1961). xv + 314 pp. + cvii plates.

Berger, K. "Die Herkunft von 1 Kor II. 9." *NTS* 24.2, (1978), 270-283.

_____. 1995. *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums 2.Auflage-UTB Für Wissenschaft.* Tübingen: Francke Verlag.

Bernstein, M. et al., (eds.). *Legal Texts and Legal Issues – Proceeding of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies.* Leiden: Brill, 1997, 437-449.

Blass, F., Debrunner, A., & Funk, R. W. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature (78).* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blum, E. "Der vermeintliche Gottesname >Elohim<," in *Gott Nennen.*" Pages 98-119 in *Gott Nennen – Religion in Philosophy and Theology* 35. Edited by Ingolf U. Dalferth and Phillip Stoellger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Bookidis, N. and Fisher, J. E. "Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore on Acrocorinth-Preliminary Report V:1971-1973." *Hesperia* 43, (1974), 267-307.

Bousset, W. *Kyrios Christos – Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.

Brandenburger, E. "Paulinische Schrifauslegung in der Kontroverse um das Verheißungswort Gottes (Röm 9)." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 82.1, (1985), 1-47.

Broneer, O. "Hero Cults in the Corinthian Agora." *Hesperia* 11, (1942), 128-161.

_____. 1971. "Paul and the Pagan Cults at Isthmia." *HTR* 64 169-187.

Brotzman, Ellis R. *Old Testament – Textual Criticism – A Practical Introduction.* Michigan: Baker Books House Co, 1994, 37-62.

Brownlee, W. H. "The Ineffable Name of God.*"BASOR* 226, (1977), 39-46.

Capes, David B. *Paul's use of Old Testament Yahweh-Texts and its Implications for his Christology.* Tübingen: Mohr & Paul Siebeck, Year?.

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

Charles, B. (ed.). *Studies in Jewish Bibliography, History, and Literature in Honor of I. Edward.* Kiev: Ktav Publishing House, 1974, 581-587.

Cheung, A.T. *Idol Food in Corinth – Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Cohn, L. and Wendland, P. (eds.). *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1896-1915.

Colson, F. H. Loeb Classical Library, *Hypothetica* and *De Providentia* in the Philo–edition of the Loeb Classical Library 9. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1941.

Conzelmann, H. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. KEK 5/11; Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1967, 147-149.

Cotton, H. M. and A. Yardeni. Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Documentary Texts from Nahal Hever and Other Sites, with an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts (The Seiyâl Collection II) (DJD XXVII ; Oxford: Clarendon). xxvii + 381 pp. + 33 figures + lxi plates, 1997.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Epistle to the Romans*. ICC vol. 1, Romans I-VIII. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975.

Crüsemann, M. "Der Gottesname im Neuen Testament." *Junge Kirche* 68.4, (2007) 16-21.

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

Dahl, N. A. and Segal, Alan F. "Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God." *JSJ* 9.2, (1978), 1-28.

Dalferth, Ingolf U. and Stoellger, P. (eds). *Gott Nennen – Religion in Philosophy and Theology,* vol. 35*,* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 23-71; 73-95; 98-119 and 143-172.

Davila, James R. "The Name of God at Moriah: An unpublished fragment from 4QGenExod[a]." *JBL* 110.4, (1991), 577-582.

De Troyer, K. "The Pronunciation of the Names of God." In *Gott Nennen – Religion in Philosophy and Theology* 35. Edited by Ingolf U. Dalferth and Phillip Stoellger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 143-172.

Delcor, M. "Des Diverses Manières d'écrire le Tétragramma Sacré dans les Anciens Documents Hébraïques," *RHR* 147.

Dewey, Arthur J. "A Re-Hearing of Romans 10:1-15." *Semeia* 65, (1994), 109-126.

Dubois, Jean D. "L'utilisation Gnostique du Centon Biblique Cité en 1 Corinthiens 2,9." *Kata tus* 70, 1995, 371.

Duke Williams III, H. H. The Psalms in 1 and 2 Corinthians. Pages 163-180 in *The Psalms in the New Testament.* Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. T & T Clark: London, 2004.

Dunn, James. D. G. *Romans 1-8.* WBC vol. 38a; Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1988, 11.

____. 1997."ΚΥΡΙΟΣ in Acts." *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift: Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums.* Edited by Christof Landmesser; Hans Joachim and Hermann Lichtenberger, 363-378.

____. 1998. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans,.

____. 2005. *The New Perspective on Paul.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans,

Ehrman, Bart D. *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament – New Testament Tools and Studies* 33. Leiden: Brill, 2006, 148-149.

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

Epp, Eldon J. "Textual Criticism in the Exegesis of the New Testament, originally... with an Excursus on Canon." Pages 461-496 in *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism – Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 116.* Edited by M. M. Mitchell and D. P. Moessner. Leiden: Brill, 2005. Repr. from *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter; New Testament Tools and Studies 25. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 45-97.

____. 2005. "The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: 'Not without honor except in their hometown'?" Pages 743-801 in *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism – Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 116.* Edited by M. M. Mitchell and D. P. Moessner. Leiden, Brill. Repr. from *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123.1, (2004), 5-55.

Eriksson, A. "'Women tongue speakers, be silent': a reconstruction through Paul's rhetoric." *BI* 6.1, (1998), 80-104.

Eshel, E et al., in consultation with VanderKam, J. and Brady, M. *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XI). Oxford: Clarendon, 1998, xi + 473 pp. + xxxii pl.

Evans, Craig A. and Sanders, James A. (eds.). *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993, 52-57 and 64-69.

Finney, Mark T. "Christ crucified and the inversion of Roman imperial ideology in 1 Corinthians." *BTB* 35.1, (2005) 20-33

Fischer, J. B. "The Term ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ in Josephus." *JQR* 49.2, (1958), 132-138.

Fisher, J. E. "Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore on Acrocorinth." *Hesperia* 63, (1974), 266-307.

Fisk, Bruce N. "Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge among the Christians of Rome." Pages 157-185 in *As it is Written – Studying Pauls use of Scripture.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Fitzmeyr, Joseph A. *Pauline Theology, a Brief Sketch by Joseph A. Fitzmeyr.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

____. 1993. Romans – A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. AB 33; New York: Doubleday,

Flanagan, Neal M. "Did Paul put down women in 1 Cor 14:34-36?" *BTB* 11.1, (1981), 10-12

Flint, P. W. and Ulrich, E. *Qumran Cave 1.II: The Isaiah Scrolls* (DJD XXXII). Oxford : Clarendon, 2010.

Foerster, W. "κύριος, D. 'Lord' in Later Judaism." *TDNT* 3, 1081-1085.

____. "κύριος, E. κύριος in the New Testament." *TDNT* 3, 1086-1095.

____. "κύριος." *TDNT* 3, 1039-1058.

Fotopoulos, J. *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Frenschkowski, M. "Kyrios in Context – Q6:46, the Emperor as 'Lord' and the Political Implication of Christology in Q." Pages 95-118 in *Zwischen den Reichen - Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft.* Edited by Michael Labahn and Jürgen Zangenberg. Marburg: Francke Verlag, 2002.

Frid, Bo. "The Enigmatic ΑΛΛΑ in 1 Corinthians 2.9." NTS 31.4 (1985), 603-611.

García Martínez, F., Tigchelaar, E. J. C. and van der Woude A. S. *Qumran Cave 11.II: (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)* (DJD XXIII). Oxford: Clarendon, (1998). xiii + 487 pp. + liv plates.

Gericke, J. W. "What is an אל? A Philosophical Analysis of the Concept of Generic Godhood in the Hebrew Bible. " *OTE* 22.1, (2009), 21-46.

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

Greenbury, J. "1 Corinthians 14:34-35: evaluation of prophecy revisited." *JETS* 51.4, (2008), 721-731.

Grosheide, F. W. Tweede Brief aan Korinthe. Commentar op het neuwe Testament. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959.

Grudem, Wayne A. "1 Corinthians 14.20-25: prophecy and tongues as signs of God's attitude." *WTJ* 41.2, (1979), 381-396.

Hahn, F. Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum. Göttingen: *FRLANT* 83. 1963.

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

_____. 2011. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments – Bd. I: Die Vielfalt des Neuen Testaments.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck (UTB),

_____. 2011. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments – Bd. II: Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck (UTB).

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

Hartenstein, Friedhelm. "Die Geschichte JHWH's im Spiegel seiner Namen." Pages 73-95 in *Gott Nennen – Religion in Philosophy and Theology* 35. Edited by Ingolf U. Dalferth and Phillip Stoellger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul.* London: Yale University Press, 1989, xi.

Heil, John P. "From Remnant to Seed of Hope for Israel: Romans 9:27-29." *CBQ* 26.4, (2002), 703-720.

Hengel, M. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture – Its Prehistory and the Problem of its Canon.* London: T & T Clark International, xi, 2004.

Hiebert, Robert. J. et al. (ed.). *The Old Greek Psalter – Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma. JSOTS* 332, (2001), 21-35.

Hiu, E. *Regulations Concerning Tongues and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians 14.26-40.* London: T & T Clark, 2010.

Hoffman, Joel M. *In the Beginning – A Short history of the Hebrew Language.* New York: New York University Press, 2004

Holst, R. "The Meaning 'Abraham believed God' in Romans 4:3." *WTJ* 59, (1997), 319-326.

Horsley, Richard A (ed.). *Paul and Empire – Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society.* Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997, 160-183.

_____. 2000. *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation.* Harrisburg: Trinity Press International,

_____. 2004. *Paul and the Roman Imperial Order.* Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, .

Hoskins Walbank, M. E. "Evidence for the imperial cult in Julio-Claudian Corinth." Pages 201-214 in *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity.* Edited by A. Small. ANN ARBOR MI, printed by Thomson-Shore; Michigan: Dexter, 1996.

Howard, G. "The Tetragram and the New Testament." *JBL* 96.1, (1978), 63-83.

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.

Hurtado, Larry W. "New Testament Christology: A Critique of Bousset's Influence." *TS* 40.2, (1979), 306-317.

_____. 1980. "Forschungen zur Neutestamentlichen Christologie seit Bousset – Forschungrichtungen und Bedeutende Beiträge." *TB* 11.4, (1980)158-171,

_____. 1998. "The Origin of the Nomina Sacra: A Proposal." *JBL* 117.4, 655-673.

_____. 2003. "P52 (P. Rylands GK 457) and the nomina sacra: Method and Probability." *TB* 54.11-14.

_____. 2006. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts – Manuscripts and Christian Origin.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans

Jervis, L. A. "1 Corinthians 14.34-35: A Reconsideration of Paul's Limitation of the Free Speech of Some Corinthian Women." *JSNT* 58, (1995), 51-74.

Johanson, Bruce C. "Tongues, a Sign for Unbelievers?: a structural and exegetical study of I Corinthians XIV.20-25 / B.C." *NTS* 25.2, (1979), 180-203.

Jull, A. J. T. et al. "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 37.1, (1994), 11-19.

Kahana, H. *Esther – Juxaposition of the Septuagint Translation with the Hebrew text.* Leuven: Peeters, 2005.

Kammler, H.-C. "Die Prädikation Jesu Christi als »Gott« und die paulinische Christologie." *ZNW* 94.3/4, (2003), 164-180.

Käsemann, E. *Commentary on Romans.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: SCM Press Ltd, 1980.

Kautsch, E. *De Veteris Testamenti loci a Paulo Apostolo Allegatis.* Leipzig: Lipsiae, 1869.

Keener, C. S. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament.* Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Keesmaat, Sylvia C. "The Psalms in Romans and Galatians." Pages 139-162 in *The Psalms in the New Testament.* Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Klumbies, P.-G. "Der Eine Gott des Paulus - Röm 3,21-31 als Brennpunkt paulinischer Theologie." *ZNW* 85.3-4, (1994), 192-206.

Koch, D.-A. *"Beobachtungen zum Christologischen Schriftgebrauch in den Vorpaulinischen Gemeinden." ZNW* 71.3-4, (1980), 174-191.

____. 1985. *"Der Text von Hab.2.4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament."* ZNW 76.1-2, 68-85.

____. 1986. *"Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums."* Tübingen: Mohr & Siebeck.

____. 1999. "Alles, was ἐν μακέλλῳ verkauft wird, eßt ...«, Die macella von Pompeji, Gerasa und Korinth und ihre Bedeutung für die Auslegung von 1Kor 10,25." *ZNW* 90.3-4, 194-219

____. 2008. "Die Überlieferung und Verwendung der Septuagint aim Ersten Nachchristlichen Jahrhundert." Pages 42-65 in *Hellenistiches Christentum – Schriftverständnis – Ekklesiologie – Geschichte.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht,

____. 2008. *Hellenistisches Christentum: Schfriftverstädnis – Ekklesiologie – Geschichte.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 145-164,

____. 2010. *"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, 223-240.

Koch, D.-A. And Lichtenberger (eds.). *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993, 215-244.

Koenen, L. *Three Rolls of the Early Septuaginta: Geneis and Deuteronomy.* Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1980, 3.

Kontzi-Méresse, N. "Le Silence des Femmes dans L'assemblée : réflexion autour de 1 Corinthiens 14, 34-35." *ETR* 80.2, (2005), 273-278.

Kraus, Thomas J. *Ad Fontes: Original Manuscripts and Their Significance for Studying Early Christianity.* Leidein: Brill, 2007, 239-240.

Labahn, M. and Zangenberg, J. (eds.). *Zwischen den Reichen: Neues Testament un Romische Herrschaft: Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies.* Tübingen: Francke, 2002, 95-118.

Landmesser. C. et al., (eds.). *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift: Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums.* 363-378.

Lauterbach, J. Z. "Substitutes for the Tetragramaton." *AAJR* 2, 1930-1931, 39-67.

Lindörer, M. "Das Schriftgemässe Evangelium des Paulus nach dem Zeugnis des Römerbrief – Funktionalität und Legitimität des Römerbriefes." Ph.D. diss., University of South Africa, 2006.

Lohse, E. Der Brief an die Römer. KEK 4-15; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003

Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 92-95.

Louw, J. P., & Nida, E. A. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains (electronic ed. of the 2nd edition.). New York: United Bible Societies, 1996.

Lust, J. "The Divine Titles האדון and אדני in Proto-Isaiah and Ezekiel," In *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by M. N. van der Meer et al. Leiden: Brill, 2010, 131-149.

Lust, J., et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint : Revised Edition*. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, S.d. ἐντολή,-ῆς, 2003.

MacGraw, D. "The Imperial Cult: a new paradigm for understanding 2 Cor 2:14." *RQ* 52.3, (2010), 145-156.

Malina, B. J. and Pilch, J. J. *Letters of Paul – Social-Scientific Commentary.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.

Mamorstein, A. *Philo and the Names of God. JQR* 22.3, (1932), 295-306.

Marcos, N. Fernandez. *The Septuagint in Context – Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible.* Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2000, 18-20.

Matera, Frank J. II Corinthians – A Commentary. NTL; Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 2003.

Meeks, Wayne A. "The Social Context of Pauline Theology." *Interpretation: A Journal Of Bible and Theology* 36.3, (1982), 266-277.

Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, second edition a Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament,* 4th revised ed. London: United Bible Societies, 1994

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

_____. 1978. *Römerbrief.* KEK 4-14; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 70.

Mihaila, C.*The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance Toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric.* T & T Clark: London, 2005.

Milleker, E. J. "Three Heads of Sarapis from Corinth." *Hesperia* 54, (1985), 121-135.

Miller, C. "The Imperial Cult in the Pauline Cities of Asia Minor and Greece." *CBQ* 72.2, (2010), 314-332.

Mitchell, M.M. and Moessner, D. P. (eds.). *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism – Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 116. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 461-496 and 743-801.

Moo, Dougles J. The Epistle to the Romans. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1996.

Moyise, S and Menken, Maarten J.J. (eds.). *The Psalms in the New Testament.* T & T Clark: London, 2004, 139-180.

____. 2008. "Quotations." Pages 15-28 in *As it is Written – Studying Pauls use of Scripture.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, .

Murtonen, A. *A Philological and Literature Treatise on the Old Testament Divine Names [El, Eloha, Elohim] and [Yahweh].* Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1952.

Newton, D. *Diety and Diet – The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Niccum, C. "The voice of the manuscripts on the silence of women : the external evidence for 1 Cor 14.34-5." *NTS* 43.2, (1997), 242-255

Niehoff, Maren R. "Questions and Answers in Philo Genesis Rabbah." *JSJ* 39, (2008), 337-366.

Odell-Scott, David W. "Let the women speak in church : an egalitarian interpretation of 1 Cor 14:33b-36." *BTB* 13.3, (1983), 90-93.

Omanson, R. L., & Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament: An Adaptation of Bruce M. Metzger's Textual Commentary for the Needs of Translators.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Parry, Donald W. "4QSam[a] and the Tetragrammaton." Pages 106-125 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls – Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

____. 1997. "Notes on Divine Name avoidance in scriptural units of the legal texts of Qumran." Pages 437-449 in *Legal texts and Legal issues – Proceeding of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies.* Edited by M. Bernstein; F. G. Martinez and J. Kampen. Leiden: Brill,

Parry, Donald. W. and Ricks, Stephen. D. (eds.). *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls – Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Leiden: Brill, 1996, 106-125.

Perkins, L. "ΚΥΡΙΟΣ: Articulation and Non-articulation in Greek Exodus." *BIOSCS* 41, (2008), 17-33.

Perrot, C, "Kyrios/Herr," Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart – Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft Band 4 I-K. J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck): Tübingen.

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

Pietersma, A. and Cox, C. (eds.). *De Septuaginta Studies in honor of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday.* Canada: Benben Publications, 1984, 85-114.

Pike, D. M. and Skinner, A. with a contribution by Szink, T. L. in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, Qumran Cave 4.XXIII: Unidentified Fragments (DJD XXXIII)**.** Oxford : Clarendon, 2001. xv + 376 pp. + xli plates.

Plummer, A. Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians. ICC, II Corinthians. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1960.

Ponsot, H. "D'Isaïe, LXIV, 3 A I Corinthiens, II, 9." *RB* 90.2, (1983), 229-242.

Porter, Stanley E. New Testament Tools and Studies 25. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 45-97.

____. 1999. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 195.

____. 2006. *Paul and His Theology.* Leiden: Brill,

____. 2008. "Paul and his Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel." Pages 97-124 in *As it is Written – Studying Pauls use of Scripture.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature,

Porter, Stanley. E. and Stanley, Christopher D. (eds.). *As it is Written – Studying Pauls use of Scripture.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008, 15-28; 9-124 and 157-185.

Quesnel, M. "La figure des Moïse en Romains 9-11." *New Testament Studies,* 49.3, (2003), 321-335.

Rasmussen, K. L. et al. "The Effects of Possible Contamination on the Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls I: Castor Oil." *Radiocarbon* 43.1, (2001), 127-132.

Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1999, 92-95.

Ridderbos, H. *Aan de Romeinen*. Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament; Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959, 66.

Roperts, P. "A Sign - Christian or Pagan?" *ET* 90.7, (1979), 199-203.

Rösel, M. 1955. "אדון," in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten* ([*ThWQ*]; Bd. 1; (eds.) H.-J. Fabry and U. Dahmen. 2011. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1955.

____. 2000. *Adonaj - Warum Gott ‚Herr' Genannt Wird.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, .

____. 2007. "The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch." *JSOT* 31.4, 411-428.

Rostock, G. Quell. "κύριος, C. The Old Testament Name of God." *TDNT* 3, 1058-1081.

Rowe, Arthur J. "Silence and the Christian Women of Corinth." *Communio viatorum* 33.1-2, (1990), 41.

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

Royse, James R. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri.* Leiden: Brill, 2008.

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.

____. 1965. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs a)* (DJD IV). Oxford: Clarendon. xi + 97 pp. + xvii plates.

Sandnes, Karl O. "Prophecy - A Sign for Believers (1 Cor 14,20-25)." *Biblica* 77.1, (1996), 1-15.

Schlier, H. *Der Römerbrief.* HThK 6/3; Freiburg: Herder, 1987, 17.

Schmithals, W. *Der Römerbrief - Ein Kommentar.* Gütersloh, 1988.

Schnelle, U. *Leben und Denken.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

____. 2007. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 345 and 350-351.

____. 2007. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 521.

Schowalter, Daniel N. and Friesen, Steven J. *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth. Interdisciplinary Approaches.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Seitz, E. "λόγον συντέμνων – eine Gerichtsankündigung? (Zu Römer 9,27/28)." *BN* 109, (2001), 56-82.

Shaw, F. "The Emperor Gaius' Employment Of The Divine Name." *SPA* 17, (2005), 33-48.

Shiffman, L. H. et al. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery.* Israel: Israel Exploration Society, 2000, 40-50.

Shum, S.-L. *Paul's use of Isaiah in Romans.* Tübingen: Mohr & Siebeck, 2002.

Siegel, J. P. "The Employment of Paleo-Hebrew Characters for the Devine Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaic Sources." HUC 42, (1971), 159-172.

____. 1972. "The Alexandrians in Jerusalem and their Torah Scroll with Gold Tetragrammata." *IEJ* 22, 39-43.

Skehan, P. W., Ulrich, E. and Sanderson J. E. 1992. *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX). Oxford: Clarendon, 1992. xiii + 250 pp. + xlvii plates.

Small, A. (ed.). *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity.* ANN ARBOR MI, printed by Thomson-Shower; Michigan: Dexter, 1996, 201-214.

Smith, D. E. "The Egyptian Cults at Corinth." *HTR* 70, (1977), 201-231.

Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture – Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 3-28.

____. 1993. "The Significance of Romans 11:3-4 for the Text History of the LXX Book of Kingdoms." *JBL* 112.1, 43-54.

Steymans, H. Ulrich. "Die Gottesbezeichnung Kyrio im Psalter der Septuaginta." L'Ecrit et l'Esprit, 2005, 325-338

Steyn, G. J. *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011, 300-310.

Talmon, S. "The Transmission History of the Text of the Hebrew Bible in the Light of Biblical Manuscripts from Qumran and other sites in Judean Desert." Pages 40-50 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery*. Edited by L. H. Shiffman (et al.). Israel: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.

Theissen, G. *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Thiselton, A. C. The First Epistle to the Corinthians : A Commentary on the Greek Text. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000.

Tov, E. with the collaboration of R. A. Kraft. The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (DJD VIII) reprinted with corrections 1995. x + 169 pp. + xx plates. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

____. 2004. *Scribal Practises and Approaches Reflected in the Texts found in the Judean Desert*. Leiden: Brill, 218 – 221.

____. 2008. http://www.emanueltov.info/docs/varia/est.varia.pdf, 519-521.

Trasher, Bill. *The Attribute of God in Pauline Theology.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1986.

Trobisch, D. *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996, 22-25.

Tuckett, C. M. "Paul, Scripture and Ethics. Some Reflections." *NTS* 48.3, (2000), 403-424, 417.

_____. 2006. "Nomina Sacra in Codex E." *JTS* 57.2, 487-499.

Uehlinger, C. "Arbeit an Altorientalischen Gottesnamen." Pages 23-71 in *Gott Nennen – Religion in Philosophy and Theology 35.* Edited by Ingolf U. Dalferth and Phillip Stoellger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 23-71.

Ulrich, E., Cross, F. M. et al. *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV). Oxford: Clarendon; 1995; reprinted 1999). xv + 183 pp. + xxxvii plates.

_____.1999. *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD XII). Oxford: Clarendo. xv + 272 pp. + xlix plates.

Van der Meer, M. N. (ed.). *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Leiden: Brill, 131-149.

Vegge, T. *Paulus und das Antike Schulwesen – Schule und Bildung des Paulus.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.

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.

_____. 2003. *Herhalds of the Good News – Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans.* Leiden: Brill, 6.

Watson, F. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith.* Londen: T & T Clark, 2004, 58.

Weiss, B. *Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschicte Textkritische Untersuchung, TU* 17, (1897) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Weiss, J. *Der Erste Korintherbrief.* KEK 9; Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1910.

Wevers, J. William. "The Rendering of the Tetragram in the Psalter and Pentateuch: A Comparative Study." Pages 21-35 in *The old Greek Psalter – Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma.* Edited by Robert J. Hiebert (et al.), *JSOTS* 332, (2001).

Whiston, W. *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.

Wilckens, U. *Der Brief an der Römer.* EKK 6-1; Zürich: Benziger and Neukirchener Verlag, 1973.

____. 2003. *Der Brief*, 150 and Lohse, Eduard. *Der Brief an die Römer.* KEK IV/XV; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 112.

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

Williams, II, C. K. "The City of Corinth and its Domestic Religion." *Hesperia* 50, (1981), 408-421.

Williams, Drake H. H. III. "Of Rags and Riches – The Benefits of Hearing Jeremiah 9:23-24 within James 1:9-11." *TB* 53.2, (2002) 273-282.

Willis, W. L. "The 'Mind of Christ' in 1 Corinthians 2,16." *Biblica* 70.1, (1989), 110-122.

Windisch, H. Der Zweite Korintherbrief. KEK 9; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wolters, A. "The Tetragrammaton in the Psalms Scroll." *Textus* 18, (1996), 87-99.

Woyke, J. Götter, ‚Götzen', Götterbilder – Aspekte einer Paulinschen ‚Theologie der Religionen.' Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005.

Wright, Nicholas T. "Paul's Gospel and Caeser's Empire." Pages 160-183 in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation.* Edited by Richard A. Horsley.

Wutz, F. *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus.* Stuttgart: TUVMG, 1933.

Yonge, C. D. *The Works of Philo : Complete and Unabridged.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 'Foreword.', 1996.

Zeitlin, S. "The Origin of the Pharisees Reaffirmed." *JQR*, 59 no. 4 (1969), 255-267.

Zimmerman, F. "A Suggested Source for some of the Substitute Names for YHWH." Pages 581-587 in *Studies in Jewish Bibliography, History, and Literature in Honor of I. Edward.* Edited by Berlin Charles. Kiev: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

Digital Resources

Logos Digital Library – version 4

Internet

http://egora.uni-muenster.de/intf/veroef/ausgaben.shtml

http://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/bap/bap04.htm

http://www.tertullian.org/rpearse/manuscripts/josephus_all.htm

http://www.tlg.uci.edu/