

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 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 century 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 manuscripts 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 אֲדֹנָי 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 *Religionsgeschichtliche* 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 Mesopotamien*. 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. Schiffman 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 form 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 Septuaginta gint Jhwh, aber auch andere Gottesbezeichnungen, mit Kyrios wieder. Daher ist es keineswegs selbstverständlich, in die Septuaginta dieselbe konzentrische Struktur wiederzufinden,” 326; see also 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 context¹¹ of the:
 - a. Hebrew terms יהוה, אלהים 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 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 יהוה 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 יהוה presented in 4QDeut^{k2}. Another two examples from the text critical data as presented

¹⁰ The *Vorgeschichte* entails a.) determining 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 synonymous 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 *Vorgeschichte* 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 larger extent.

¹² Both the New Testament (data provided by Nestle-Aland 27 together with NT Transcripts, including, where available, the *Editio Critica Miao*r editions) and Greek Old Testament (data used as supplied by the Göttingen edition of the Septuaginta text) text critical data will be analysed 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 אֲדֹנָי 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 אֱלֹהִים.¹⁴ In other cases,¹⁵ the Samaritan Pentateuch opposes the MT reading אֱלֹהִים 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 authoritative 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	αζ	יהוה	4QExod ^d	ⲚⲓⲚⲓ
Exod 12:27	αω	יהוה	2QExod ^b	ⲚⲓⲚⲓ
Lev 9:24	αυ	יהוה	11QLev ^a	ⲚⲓⲚⲓ
Ps 118:25	αε	יהוה	11QPs ^a	ⲚⲓⲚⲓ
Non-biblical			1QS 8:14	”””
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	ας	יהוה	P.Fouad 266	יהוה
Lev 4:27	αυ	יהוה	4QpapLXXLev ^b	ΙΑΩ
Hab 2:16	αυ	יהוה	8HevXIIgr	𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀

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 יי, the third is old Hebrew characters 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀 (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 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀.¹⁹ Apart from the latter evidence, the comparison between the text critical data provided by the BHS and LXX^{Gött} will auxiliary 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: Vandenhoeck & 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 בְחֶפְזוֹן
ἐξελεύσεσθε	תֵּצְאוּ
οὐδὲ φυγῆ πορεύσεσθε,	וּבְמָנוּסָה
Πορεύεται	לֹא תֵלְכוּן
πρότερος ὑμῶν	כִּי־הָיָה לְפָנֵיכֶם
Κύριος	יְהוָה
καὶ ὁ ἐπισυνάγων ὑμᾶς	וּמֵאַסְפְּכֶם
κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ	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 authoritative 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

Psalms 7:7 ^{LXX}	Psalms 7:7 ^{MT}
ἀνάστηθι, κύριε	קוּמָה יְהוָה
ἐν ὀργῇ σου	בְּאַפָּךָ
ὑψώθητι	הִנָּשָׂא
ἐν τοῖς πέρασι τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου	בְּעֵבְרוֹת צוּרְךָ
ἐξεγέρθητι	וְעוֹרָה
κύριε ὁ θεός μου	אֱלֹהֵי
ἐν προστάγματι, ᾧ ἐνετείλω	מִשְׁפָּט צִוִּיתָ

²¹ The text reading is supported by Uncials 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 אֱלֹהֵי.²² A similar case is found in Ps 139:7, where the Hebrew text reads לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי 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 אֱלֹהֵי 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 חַנָּה
Καὶ εἶπεν Ἐστερεώθη	וַתִּתְאַמֵּר עַל־עַן
ἡ καρδία μου ἐν κυρίῳ	לְבַי בַּיהוָה
ὑψώθη κέρασ μου	רָמָה קַרְנַי
ἐν θεῷ μου	בַּיהוָה
ἐπλατύνη	רָחַב
ἐπὶ ἐχθρούς τὸ στόμα μου	פִּי עַל־אֹיְבָי
εὐφράνθη ἐν σωτηρίᾳ σου	כִּי שָׂמַחְתִּי בִישׁוּעָתְךָ

The κύριος term in the dative case parallels the first preposition בַּ + יהוָה combination, while the second preposition יהוָה 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 as G L¹¹⁵ 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 = אֱלֹהֵי, 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 Ἀβελ ἤνεγκεν	וְהָבִיל הַבְּיָא
καὶ αὐτὸς	גַּם־הָיָא
ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτοτόκων τῶν προβάτων αὐτοῦ	מִבְּכֹרוֹת צֹאֲנָו
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν στεάτων αὐτῶν	וּמִחֶלְבֵּהוּ
καὶ ἐπεῖδεν ὁ θεός	וַיִּשֶׁע יְהוָה
ἐπὶ Ἀβελ	אֶל־הַבֵּיל
καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ	וְאֶל־מִנְחָתוֹ
Genesis 4:9-10 ^{LXX}	Genesis 4:9-10 ^{MT}
καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה
πρὸς Καϊν	אֶל־לָוִן
Ποῦ ἐστὶν Ἀβελ ὁ ἀδελφός σου;	אֵי הִבִּיל אֲחִיךָ
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν	וַיֹּאמֶר
Οὐ γινώσκω	לֹא יָדַעְתִּי
μὴ φύλαξ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μου εἰμι ἐγώ;	הֲשֹׁמֵר אָחִי אָנֹכִי
καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός	וַיֹּאמֶר
Τί ἐποίησας;	מָה עָשִׂיתָ
φωνὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου	קוֹל דְּמֵי אֲחִיךָ צֹעֲקִים אֵלַי
βοᾷ πρὸς με ἐκ τῆς γῆς	מִן־הָאֲדָמָה

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 וַיִּשֶׁע 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 Ἀβραμ	וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם
Δέσποτα	אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה
Genesis 15:8a ^{MT}	Genesis 15:8a ^{LXX}
εἶπεν δέ	וַיֹּאמֶר
Δέσποτα κύριε	אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה

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 אֲדֹנָי and יְהוָה, while the term δεσπότης appears to be the equivalent for אֲדֹנָי in Gen 15:8 and Jos 5:14. In Gen 4:1 the LXX reads θεός as opposed to יְהוָה.²⁵ In Gen 7:1 an alternative reading, opposing יְהוָה is suggested by two Hebrew manuscripts, including the Samaritan Pentateuch and a Syriac version.²⁶ The latter opted for אֱלֹהִים only, while the LXX^{Gött} reads κύριος ὁ θεός. 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] κῦ.

²⁶ 2 Mss **MS** אֱלֹהִים, **Θ** ad ὁ θεός, see also text critical note on Gen 28:4, where the **MS** (Samaritan Pentateuch) again proposes יְהוָה 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 אֲדֹנָי. 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 אֲדֹנָי at that time.

²⁸ See also the text critical data on יְהוָה in Exod 4:1 (**Θ*** 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 (ὕμῶν),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 Pentateuch³³, 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 = יהוה אלהים cf G^{MN min}) and Deut 3:20 (G^{963L min} ad ὁ θεός ἡμῶν (G^{rel} ὕμῶν).

³¹ Scholars specialising 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 discrepancies regarding the terms יהוה and אלהים; 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 $\equiv\eta\equiv\eta$;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

³⁵ The *Letter to Aristeas* or *Letter to Philocrates*, dated the 2nd century BCE, ‘introduced’ the idea that the Torah was the first to be translated into Koine Greek. The letter also talks about the translation of the Hebrew law by 72 interpreters sent from Jerusalem to Egypt.

³⁶ See addendum A for a more extensive list on the reproduction of the Hebrew deity. This list includes both biblical and non-biblical manuscripts found in and around the Judean desert; cf. Parry, “4QSam^a presents a short list of authors that dealt with surrogates for the Tetragram, footnote 1, 106. See also the introductory work of Hoffman, Joel M. *In the Beginning – A Short History of the Hebrew Language*. New York: New York University Press, 2004. Hoffman deals with the ‘Name of God’ or as he calls it ‘Magic Letters and the Name of God’, among other things, 39-48.

³⁷ See Lauterbach, J. Z. “Substitutes for the Tetragramaton.” *AAJR* 2, (1930-31), 39-67, who dealt with some of the substitutes used as opposed to the Tetragram while ascribing it to the hesitance of the scribes to insert the Tetragram into writing; cf. Brownlee, W. H. “The Ineffable Name of God.” *BASOR* 226, (1977), 39-46, who makes reference to 4QTestamonia, 1QS and CDC in his discussion of the verbal form ‘I am’ or ‘I exist’ and the one that ‘brings into existence’ in relation to the name of God. In a more recent article Baumgarten, J. M. “A new Qumran substitute for the divine name and Mishnah Sukkah 4.5.” *JBL* 83.2-3, (1992), 1-5, is of the opinion that $\eta\eta\eta\eta$ located at the end of 4Q266, should be viewed as a substitute for the Tetragram; cf. Parry, “4QSam^a,” 106-108.

³⁸ Cf. P. 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.

³⁹ Cf. Perkins, L. “KYPIOΣ: Articulation and Non-articulation in Greek Exodus.” *BIOSCS* 41, (2008), 17-33. Perkins considered Greek and Hebrew equivalents, 20 and also investigated the ‘original’ translation of the term κύριος, 21-24; cf. Davila, James R. “The Name of God at Moriah: An unpublished fragment from 4QGenExod^a.” *JBL* 110.4, (1991), 577-582.

⁴⁰ Due to the reproductive nature of this manuscript, portraying a reworking of the Pentateuch, it will be dealt with under the heading ‘biblical’ texts. This is also true for 4Q364, 4Q365 and 4Q367 in terms of the Pentateuch. There is no distinction made here between the so-called ‘biblical’ or canonical texts and ‘non-

- 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 $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, 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 Nahal Hever area (see for example 4QDeut^{a-n}, 4QpaleoDeut^g and XHevSeDeut), which represents the Tetragram using $\aleph\aleph\aleph$;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 יי״י.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 $\aleph\aleph\aleph$.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 יהוה 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 אֵל in 6QCompositional Hymn f. 6:5, f. 8:1 and col. ii:5 (Deut 8.11). Another employment of אֵלֵאֵל for the Tetragram is found in 3QLam 1:2 (Lam 1:11). Manuscripts 1QpMic, 1QpZaph and 1QpHab (*Pesharim*) also attest to the Tetragram using אֵלֵאֵל, while 4QpsEzek^c (*Pseudo-Ezekiel*) again used אֵלֵאֵל.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 אֵל, אֱלֹהִים and אֱלֹהִים.⁴⁹ The use of אֱלֹהִים and אֵל 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 אֱלֹהִים or אֵל.

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 practices surrounding the Tetragram, particularly on the ‘divine name’.

⁴⁹ Cf. Gericke, J. W. “What is an אֵל? 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 1QIsa^a.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 1QIsa^a and other related manuscripts found in and around the Judean desert, the Hebrew text tradition appears for the most part intact. There are, however, some 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	1QIsa ^a	MT ^{BHS}	LXX ^{Göt}
Isa 3:15 (line 20)	מלכמה תדכאו עמי ופני עניים תטחנו נואם יהוה ^{אדוני}	מלכם תדכאו עמי ופני עניים תטחנו נואם אדני יהוה צבאות ^א	τί ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε τὸν λαόν μου καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον τῶν πτωχῶν καταισχύνετε
Isa 3:17 (line 24)	קשפה אדוני ^{יהוה} קדקד בנות ציון ואדוני פתהן פתהן יעדה	וקשפה אדני קדקד בנות ציון ויהוה פתהן ^א יערה	καὶ ταπεινώσει ὁ θεὸς ἀρχούσας θυγατέρας Σιων, καὶ κύριος ἀποκαλύψει τὸ σχῆμα αὐτῶν
Isa 3:18 (line 25)	ביום ההוא יסיר יהוה ^{אדוני}	ביום ההוא יסיר אדני	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 העכסימ והשבשים והשהרנים	אֵת תְּפַאֲרַת הָעֶכְסִימ וְהַשְּׁבִיטִים וְהַשְּׁהַרְנִים	τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν 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^etib-Q^ere* 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^ere* – what ought to be read) against what was written (*K^etib* – what ought to be written).⁵⁵ The exception would be that if and when יהוה אדני 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 יהוה (shema – what ought to be read) and not יהוה (adonaj), implying that the vowels adopted from the Aramaic אָדָנָי 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^etib* 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^etib form to be representative of the *Q^ere* 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^etib-Q^ere* problematic surrounding the “naming” of the Hebrew deity might not have been a case of reading אדני, 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 ואלוהי 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 אלהים. 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^{Göt}, does not attest to any equivalent of these terms, while some Greek manuscripts read κύριος κύριος (cf. ⚭ 22-48-763-96) φησι(ν) κύριος κύριος (> oII 233) while others read πῦρι πῦρι (cf. ⚭ φησι κύριος κύριος (adn. πῦρι πῦρι)). Similar cases of *K^etib-Q^ere* “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 יהוה אדני 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 cast in the Hebrew morpheme using ‘suitable’ Greek equivalent terms. The terms יהוה, אלהים and אדוני 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	4QLXXLev ^a (4Q119) f. 1:1	2/1 BCE	pap.	blank space left in recon
Lev 26:13	4QLXXLev ^a (4Q119) f. 1:18	2/1 BCE	pap.	blank space left in recon
Lev 1:11	4QpapLXXLev ^b (4Q120) f. 1:11	2/1 BCE	pap.	[Iαω in recon] ⁷⁰
Lev 2:3	4QpapLXXLev ^b (4Q120) f. 2:1	2/1 BCE	pap.	[Iαω in recon]
Lev 3:12	4QpapLXXLev ^b (4Q120) f. 7:12	2/1 BCE	pap.	Iαω
Lev 3:14	4QpapLXXLev ^b (4Q120) f. 8:2	2/1 BCE	pap.	[Iαω]
Lev 4:27	4QpapLXXLev ^b (4Q120) f. 20:4	2/1 BCE	pap.	Iαω
Lev 2:3	4QLXXLev ^b f. 2	1 BCE	pap.	[Iαω in recon] ⁷¹
Lev 3:11	4QLXXLev ^b f. 2	1 BCE	pap.	[Iαω 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	1 BCE	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	1 BCE	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 Artifacts – 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 4QpapLXXLev^b f. 1:11 and 4QpapLXXLev^b 2:1.

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

⁷² Again, the space used to reconstruct τω Iαω 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	8HevXIIgr ⁷³ col. 18:24	turn of century	parchment	יְיָ
Hab 2:20	8HevXIIgr col. 18:39	turn of century	parchment	יְיָ
Jonah 4:2	8HevXIIgr col. 3:36	turn of century	parchment	יְיָ
Mi 1:3	8HevXIIgr col. 4:33	turn of century	parchment	יְיָ
Zeph 1:14	8HevXIIgr col. 21:29	turn of century	parchment	יְיָ
Zech 1:3	8HevXIIgr col. 28:37	turn of century	parchment	יְיָ
Job 42:11	P.Oxy 3522	1 CE	pap.	יְיָ
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*. Leiden: 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 Tetragram in square Hebrew characters, but it also produces a.) an uncontracted term θεός and b.) the Tetragram – θεός combination, significant 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: Genesis and Deuteronomy*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1980, 3.

⁷⁹ See Koch, D.-A. “Die Überlieferung und Verwendung der Septuagint am ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert.” Pages 42-65 in *Hellenistisches Christentum – Schriftverständnis – Ekklesiologie – Geschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008. Repr. from *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter*. Edited by D.-A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & 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 $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ signifying lordship in its defining form. The LXX^{Gött} in turn reads *ὁ δὲ κύριος* while the MT supports $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ 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 Nahal Hever) 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.

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	וַאֲמַר אֶל־אֲדֹנָי
Gen 24:40a (line 16)	ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΜΟΙ Ο ΘΕΟΣ	καὶ εἶπέν μοι Κύριος,	וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי יְהוָה
Gen 24:42b (line 17)	ΕΙΠΑ ΚΥ... Ο ΟC ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ	εἶπα Κύριε ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου	וַאֲמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲדֹנָי

Both the first (Gen 24:39) and second (Gen 24:42) uncontracted κύριος are used to translate וַאֲדֹנָי, 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 KY by a redactor. The latter is confirmed in that the shape of the *kappa* used for K... in line 3 and KY... 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	θεός 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 θεός 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 – Juxtaposition 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. 4443⁹³ 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 Ἰησοῦς, 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 יהוה, אלהים 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^etib* and *Q^ere* 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 some⁹⁵ 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 κ 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 κ² Ξ Ψ 892 *pc* suggest reading θεου.⁹⁹ A strong group of text witnesses, κ A W Θ Ψ *f*¹, propose that Ἰησουν 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 Ἰησου 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 Ἰησοῦς. An alternative reading for αὐτοῦ in Lk 12:31 is proposed by the witnesses ϙ⁴⁵ A D¹ Q W Θ that reads του θεου (ϙ⁷⁵ 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 κ A B.

⁹⁹ The text reading is supported by κ* A B.

¹⁰⁰ The text reading, however, is supported by κ 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 ϙ⁷⁵ 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 Matthean 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^ο τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ^ο τῇ 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 *Syrophenician* 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 Matthean 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 Apostles¹⁰⁶

In Acts 5:9 an alternative reading (το αγιον) is suggested by P⁷⁴ (a 7th century papyrus) and minuscule 1838, while the text reading is supported by P⁸ & 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 P⁷⁴ 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 Christ as 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 P⁷⁴ & 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 κ A C Ψ 33. 81. 326. 614 *al vg sy^{p,h**}* reading του κυριου after τὸν λόγον, while ℞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 ℞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 ℞⁴⁵ weigh up to the large codices and other manuscripts (℞⁷⁴ κ A B D(*) 33. 81 *pc d vgst 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 κ B 614. 1175. 1505 is opposed by ℞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 (D⁰⁵) 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 NA²⁷).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 assimilation 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 Apostelgeschichte 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 W^s Ψ, among others, namely the term κύριος. The text reading, in turn, is upheld by \mathfrak{P}^{66*} κ D Θ 086 f¹ 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 5:5¹¹¹ requires some attention. An alternative for the term θεός is proposed by κ* D* 81 which reads τον κυριον, with κ* 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. κ² A D² 1739. 1881 \mathfrak{M}) *lat sy co*.

¹¹² κ* 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 δεσποτής 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 ℘²⁰ ⋈ A B C P Ψ 33. 81. 945. 1241. 1739 pc ff t vgst 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 (℘¹⁰⁰ ℳ) only suggest a definite article to be read before the term κύριος. The text reading is supported by ⋈ 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 ⋈ A B, while ℘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 occurrence 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 δεσποτής 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 δεσποτής 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 ^Ɀ δεσπότην ^Ɀ καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι – with the text critical mark ^Ɀ indicating the insertion of the first person personal pronoun by \mathfrak{P}^{72} , while ^Ɀ 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 δεσποτής 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 αὐτου as an alternative for θεοῦ in 1 John 2:17. Another such alternative is found in 1 John 4:15, in which the αὐτω, supported by 614. 630 *pc* *vg*^{mss} and αὐτω εστιν supported by \mathfrak{P}^9 are suggested alternatives for θεῶ 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 θεῶ in 1 John 5:10¹¹⁷ 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* & B P Ψ 0296. 1739^{mg} \mathfrak{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 κ^2 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 \mathfrak{P}^{46} 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. 1241^s. (1739) *pc*.
- c.) του θεου ο εστιν Χριστος D* ar *vg*^{mss}.
- d.) του θεου του εν Χριστω 33.
- e.) του θεου πατρος του (- κ^* 048) Χριστου κ^* 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 κ^2 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* \mathfrak{P}^{46} κ^* B 0208^{vid}. 6. 1241^s. 1739 *pc*; Cl.

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

¹²¹ *txt* \mathfrak{P}^{46} κ^2 B C² D F G Ψ 075. 1739. 1881 \mathfrak{R} *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 πᾶτηρ 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 \aleph^2 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 \aleph^* 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} \aleph B C* D* F G 1175. 1241^s. 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 (\aleph) ‘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} \aleph^2 D² \aleph against manuscripts \aleph^* 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 authoritative 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 \aleph^* A B C* D* F G P 075. 81. 365. 629. 1175. 1241^s. 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 \aleph 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 κυρίως refers to the 'Masters' in the secular sense of the word. The κυρίως 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 κυρίως 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 deductible 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 5:21¹²⁷ and 5:29¹²⁸, requires some reflection.

The θεός reading in Eph 2:22 is supported by \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph 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 κυρίω. The text reading is supported by strong textual witnesses, \mathfrak{P}^{46} \mathfrak{P}^{49} \aleph 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 \mathfrak{P}^{46} proposing Χριστου as alternative. The text reading is supported by \aleph and B. The manuscript support appears to be swaying towards \mathfrak{P}^{46} due its early date or towards \aleph and B, due to the authoritative nature of these codices. The difficulty is that \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph 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 \aleph 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 χριστός. Text witnesses D² \mathfrak{M} propose κυριος in this instance, while such a reading is opposed by numerous witnesses, \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph 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* \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A B P 0278. 6. 33. 81. 365. 1241^s. 1739 *pc*; Hier Aug.

¹²⁷ *txt* \aleph A B D¹ Ψ 0278. 33. 1739. 1881 \mathfrak{M} f vg sy^(p) bo^{pt}; Hier.

¹²⁸ *txt* \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph 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 \aleph and B, is proposed by \mathfrak{P}^{46} reading Χριστου. Even though all three these witnesses testify to the *nomina sacra* form of the terms under discussion, \mathfrak{P}^{46} 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 \mathfrak{P}^{46} was influenced by the phrase ἐπιφάσει 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 ἄδοντες 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 groundbreaking, 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 KYPIOS AND THEOS 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 ἣν 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 κυριῶ than δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ as well as ἔμπροσθεν κυρίου 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 κ^* D* suggest κύριος (1st instance), while only κ^* 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 πατὴρ 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 κ A C D, while \mathfrak{P}^{46} B D* F G (b) suggest an alternative of τη του θῡ και χρ̄υ. 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. - κ^2 C³ 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 \mathfrak{P}^{46} κ A B C P Ψ ; cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 525.

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

¹³⁶ The text reading is supported by \mathfrak{P}^{46} κ^* 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 manuscripts¹³⁷ 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: ἐγὼ μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. Furthermore, the phrase καὶ ἔπαινον θεοῦ in 1:11 is opposed by three independent alternatives (καὶ ἐπαινον Χριστοῦ - D*, καὶ ἐπαινον μοι - F G, θεοῦ καὶ ἐπαινον ἐμοὶ - P⁴⁶ (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 εἰκόν 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 ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο (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 ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο 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 θεῶ introduces a ‘new’ subject matter and not an infinitive of cause or purpose. The implication of such is that the act of ‘considering’ (ἠγήσατο) 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’ ἀρπαγμὸν – 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 ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο
- e.) Subject clause v. 6c (open relating possibilities)
 - τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ

Based on the above proposed thought-structure, governed by the relative clauses, the participle (ὑπάρχων) in combination with the middle voice (ἠγήσατο) 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 θεῶ as the subject matter of ἠγήσατο and to consider the concept ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ being parallel with τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ. This being said, the probability that ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο as a subject clause relating to τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ 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 ὁς 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 ὁς 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’ ἐν κυριῷ (Phlm 19) at the end of the verse, while in Phlm 20 an alternative reading κυριῷ is proposed by D² over and against Χριστῷ.

2.5 THE WORKS OF PHILO¹⁴⁶

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 Philo 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, τῆ θεός καὶ τῆ 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 ταῦτόν 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 occurrences 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 indication 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 δεσποτής, 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 (*Leg.* 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 ἐξάπεστειλεν αὐτὸν κύριος ὁ θεός 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 ἀμφοτέρα – 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 Χαναάν 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' ἐξάϊρετον χάριν τοῦ Σήμ 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 σωτήρ 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 σωτήρ 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 ὄν. 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 κύριος 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 ὄφθη κύριος τῷ Ἀβραάμ. 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· ἐγώ 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 σοῦ 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 θεός 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 JOSEPHUS¹⁵³

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 Ζεβεκηῶν Ἀδωνιζεβέκῳ (Andonibezek) τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐπιτρέψαντες· τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τοῦτο σημαίνει Ζεβεκηῶν κύριος (whose name denotes ‘Lord’ Bezek) for ἀδωνι (Adoni) γὰρ τῇ Ἑβραίων διαλέκτῳ κύριος γίνεται (signifies ‘Lord’ in the Hebrew dialect). The latter would appear to affirm that יְיָ transcribed as ἀδωνι 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 יהיה 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 measure 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 ἀδωναί, 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 θεόν) saying:

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

“Ο 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 δεσποτής 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 δεσποτής is used to refer to the emperor, who is king and has authority.¹⁶⁷ The term δεσποτής 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 δεσποτής 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 δεσποτής

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 δεσποτής, 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 δεσποτής 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.