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

3.1 INTRODUCTION

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

3.1.1 Relating Romans to the Literary Problem

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

Tabled summary: Literary problem

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

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

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

3.2 ESTABLISHING THE EXPLICIT CITATIONS

3.2.1 Citations with Introductory Formulae

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

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

[1] The key argument in considering the available Greek OT text witnesses as being Christian in origin is the practise referred to as the *nomica sacra*, cf. Hurtado, L. "The Origin of the Nomina Sacra: A Proposal." *JBL* 117.4 ,(1998), 655-673, 658.
[2] Cf. Hurtado, "The Origin," 655.
[3] Koch, *Schift*, 13-20, lists six other markers that are of importance and value if and when content are to be qualified as an explicit citation.
[4] Cf. Koch's, *Schrift*, 25-32, discussion on the introductory formulae.

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

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

3.3 EXPLICIT CITATIONS *WITHOUT* INTRODUCTORY FORMULAE

3.3.1 Romans 11:34 and 1 Corinthians 2:16

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

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

3.3.2 1 Corinthians 10:26

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

3.3.3 2 Corinthians 3:16

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

[5] See also Koch, *Schrift*, who makes it clear that a cited text without a clearly defined introductory formula could be regarded as a citation if the text is syntactically not in accordance with the broader context and the reader is able to realise that the text does not form part of the actual context, 13.
[6] Koch, *Schrift*, present Rom 11:34 as an example, 14.
[7] Blass, F., Debrunner, A., & Funk, R. W. “(A) The Adnominal Genitive – 162. Genitive of Origin and Relationship.” *BDF*, 89-90.

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

3.4 ESTABLISHING THE ΚΥΡΙΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ TEXT IN ROMANS

3.4.1 Romans 1

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

[8] Koch, *Schrift*, argues that the interpretation that follows in 1 Cor 3:17 indicates that 2 Cor 3:16 might present a cited text, 13.
[9] Schlier, H. *Der Römerbrief*. HThK 6/3; Freiburg: Herder, 1987, 17.
[10] Cf. Dunn, James D. G. *Romans 1-8*. WBC vol. 38a; Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 11.
[11] Wilckens, U. *Der Brief an der Römer*. EKK 6/1; Zürich: Benziger and Neukirchener Verlag, 1973 suggests that εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ is employed in two ways: 1.) through the relative clause in Rm 1:2, and b.) by the content of the v. 3f that does not belong to v. 2, 56; Käsemann, E. *Commentary on Romans*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: SCM Press Ltd, 1980 refers to the Calendar inscription from Priene (dated to circa 9 BCE). This inscription, according to Käsemann, does not sufficiently explain the absolute and technical use of εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ in the NT, 7.

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

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

3.4.2 Romans 2

3.4.2.1 *Romans 2:24*

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

[12] Cf. Rom 2:16; Rom 16:25 for the use of εὐαγγέλιόν μου and 2 Cor 4:3; 1 Thess 1:5 for the use of εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν.
[13] Cf. 2 Thess 1:8.
[14] Cf. Rom 15:16; 2 Cor 11:7; 1 Thess 2:2; 1 Thess 2:8; 1 Thess 2:9.
[15] Cf. Michel, O. *Römerbrief.* KEK 4/14; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, 70. See also the excursion on Apostleship and the gospel, 70-72. The association of the concept in Rm 1:4 with Rm 1:2 and Rm 1:3 remains valid, even though Rm 1:3ff is considered pre-Pauline material, Michel, *Römerbrief*, 72-73; see also Schlier, *Der Römerbrief*, 23-27.
[16] Cf. Rom 5:21; Rom 7:25; Rom 6:27; Gal 1:1; Phil 1:11; 1 Thess 4:14
[17] Cf. Rom 14:6; 1 Cor 1:4; 1 Cor 1:14; 1 Cor 14:18; Phil 1:3-6; 1 Th 1:2-4; 1 Th 2:3; Phlm 4-5.
[18] With source text is meant any Greek version of the Old Testament Hebrew text. This study utilised both the Ralhfs and Göttingen eclectic texts (also referred to as the LXX), together with other Greek manuscripts reflecting content from the Old Testament.

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

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

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES					HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES			
NT		**OT**			**OT**			
$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	א, A, B	A B Q S V	ʽa		1QIsa^{a}	4QIsa^{c21}	Cod^{Len}	Cod^{Alep}
-	θυ	μου (κς)	ΠΙΠΠ		יהוה	𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄	יהוה	יהוה

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

[19] The enigma and complexity surrounding the Tetragram and the ‘naming’ of the Hebrew God cannot be avoided when dealing with the issue at hand.
[20] The Aquila recension offers an alternative reading ΠΙΠΠ within the phrase και νυν το μοι ωδε φησι πιπι presented by codex Marchalianus. This is a clear indication of the intent to follow the Hebrew, without the proper background knowledge to do so.
[21] This manuscript only accounts for Isa 52:10 - Isa 53:3. The manuscript dominately applied 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 for the Tetragram, from where one could infer that it would have been the case with Isa 52:5.
[22] See for example Josephus, *Ant* 1 ch. 20 line 4 (δεσπότης ὁ θεὸς); *B.J. Book* II section 3 line 1 (διαθήκας τῶν ὅλων δεσπότης); *Vita* section 346 line 5 (πρὸς τοὺς δεσπότας), to mention only three.

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

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

[23] Cf. Exod 20:7 using יהוה with regard to blasphemy, who is אלהים.
[24] Cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 87, suggests that Paul was conscious of the fact that whenever he explicitly cited an Old Testament text containing the κύριος term, the יהוה and therefore the Hebrew deity (Koch uses "Gott").
[25] Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, 85-86, assigns this change to a Pauline adaptation.
[26] Howard, G. "The Tetragram and the New Testament." *JBL* 96.1, (1978), 63-83, 77; cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 143, who suggests that Paul opted for the 2nd person personal pronoun, the latter which implies θεός, ensuring a literary link with Rom 2:23, 143; cf. Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, 86; cf. Wilk, *Die Bedeutung*, 391, interprets the citation as Paul's attempt to indicate the universal character of sin, the latter which includes the Jews. Shum, *Paul's use,* 178, suggests that the implementation of the 2nd person personal pronoun is due to the fact that the κύριος term is almost exclusively used for Jesus as the χριστός.
[27] Howard, "Tetragram," 77.

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

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

~ A translation and theological conceptual problem ~

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

[28] Lindörer, M. "Das Schriftgemässe Evangelium des Paulus nach dem Zeugnis des Römerbrief – Funktionalität und Legitimität des Römerbriefes." Ph.D. diss., University of South Africa, 2006, would concur that the change from the personal pronoun μου to τοῦ θεοῦ should be assigned to Paul, 239.
[29] Cf. Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, 85-86; Wilk, *Die Bedeutung*, 18; 49.
[30] Contra Wagner, *Herhalds of the Good News*, 176-178. Wagner is of the opinion that Paul is not only aware of the literary context underlying Isa 52:1-10, but he (Paul) appears to be influenced by the 'original' setting of both Isa 52:5c as well as Isa 52:7; cf. Moyise, S. "Quotations." Pages 15-28 in *As it is Written – Studying Pauls use of Scripture.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008. Moyise concurs with Hays' opinion that Paul had indeed respected the context of Is 52 and the implementation of such a text, in this case Isa 52:5. The citation and its source context could only be understood from multiple readings of the text, 23. Fisk, Bruce N. "Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge among the Christians of Rome." Pages 157-185 in *As it is Written – Studying Pauls use of Scripture.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008, on the other hand affirms that Paul diverges to a great extent from the context of Isaiah 52, forcing one not to assume that he was engaging his audience on the level of biblical exegesis, 158.
[31] Cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 105, who indicates that Paul connects the citation taken from Isa 52:5c with Rom 2:23 to such an extent, that he (Paul) even postponed the introductory formula to be read at the end of the verse. Koch furthermore suggests that by introducing the verse with τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ Paul has successfully increased the importance of the content that follows, 105; see also Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, 85 and Wilk, *Die Bedeutung*, 231. It is generally accepted by scholars that Paul interprets the blasphemy of 'God' by the Jews as disobeying the law (Rom 2:23), cf. Schlier, *Der Romerbrief*, 87; Wilckens, *Der Brief*, 150 and Lohse, E. *Der Brief an die Römer*. KEK 4/15; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003, 112. Malina, B. J and Pilch, J. J. *Letters of Paul – Social-Scientific Commentary.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006, formulates it as follows: "That non-Iraelites dishonour the person of the God of Israel is due to Israelites living among non-Israelites. It is those Israelites living among non-Israelities who have been Paul's target audience of the innovation he proclaimed, 235.

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

Chapter 2

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

Chapter 3

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

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

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

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

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

[33] Rom 3:27 speaks boasting as excluded.
[34] Michel, *Römerbrief*, 131-132 confirms Paul's reworking of the citation, has the effect of increasing the theological weight of the content; while καθως γεγραπται emphasises the authority of the content of the citation; cf. Ridderbos, H. *Aan de Romeinen*. Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament; Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959, 66, with regard to Paul's reversed deployment of Isa 52:5c. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief*, 87; Wilckens, *Die Römer*, 150. Schmithals, W. *Der Römerbrief - Ein Kommentar*. Gütersloh, 1988, comments that Rom 2:24 is the climax and third section of his Synogogue sermon (Rom 2:17-24), 98.
[35] Cf. Wilk, *Die Bedeutung*, 391.
[36] Which is most likely also true for the cited text in Rom 3:11 (Ps 13:2c) and Rom 3:18 (Ps 35:2b).

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

3.4.3 ROMANS 3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

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

---

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

[39] Mss. 55.

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

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

3.4.4 ROMANS 4

3.4.4.1 *Romans 4:3*

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

~ A translation or rendition problem ~

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4.4.2 *Romans 4:8*

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

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

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

Agent responsible for the act of reckoning

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

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

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

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4.5 Romans 5

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

[53] Interestingly though, is that Michel, *die Römer*, does not make a distinction between the κύριος and θεός term when he deals with Rom 4:6-8; he merely refers to *Gott* as the acting subject, 165. The latter is true for most commentators.
[54] Cf. Rom 5:21 with regard to the mediating quality of Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος.

3.4.6 Romans 6

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

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

3.4.7 Romans 7

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

3.4.8 Romans 8

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

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

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

3.4.9 Romans 9[59]

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

3.4.9.1 *Romans 9:26*

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

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

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

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

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

3.4.9.2 *Romans 9:28*

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

[61] See also the text critical comments on Rom 9:26 in Koch, *Schrift*, 54 (refer to footnote 33).
[62] Cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 167-168; Wilk, *Die Bedeutung*, 225 as well as Shum, *Paul's use*, 210. Seitz, E. "λόγον συντέμνων – eine Gerichtsankündigung? (Zu Römer 9,27/28)." *BN* 109, (2001), 56-82. Seitz offers a comparison between Isa 10:22, Hos 2:1 and Rom 9:27, 58 as well as between Rom 9:28 and Isa 10:23, 61-62.

Literary comparison (Rom 9:27, 28 and Isa 10:22, 23)		
NA[27] (Rom 9:27, 28)	LXX[Gött] (Isa 10:22, 23)	MT[BHS] (Isa 10:22, 23)
27 Ἡσαΐας δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ·		
ἐὰν ᾖ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ	**22** καὶ ἐὰν γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ισραηλ	**22** כִּֽי אִם־יִהְיֶ֤ה עַמְּךָ֙ יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל
ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ ὑπόλειμμα σωθήσεται·	ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν σωθήσεται·	כְּחוֹל֙ הַיָּ֔ם שְׁאָ֥ר יָשׁ֖וּב בּ֑וֹ כִּלָּי֥וֹן חָר֖וּץ שֹׁוֵטֵ֥ף צְדָקָֽה׃
	λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ,	
28 λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων[63]	**23** ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον	**23** כִּ֣י כָלָ֔ה וְנֶחֱרָצָ֖ה
ποιήσει **κύριος**	ποιήσει **ὁ θεὸς**	אֲדֹנָ֨י יְהוִ֤ה צְבָאוֹת֙ עֹשָׂ֔ה
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.	ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ.[64]	בְּקֶ֖רֶב כָּל־הָאָ֥רֶץ׃ ס

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

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

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

[63] Schlier. *Der Römerbrief,* notes that συντελῶν and συντέμνων are also closely related in Dan 5:27 and Dan 9:24, 304; cf. Cranfield, *Romans,* 502 footnote 1.
[64] For an explanation on the variation between ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ see Koch, *Schrift,* 245-146.
[65] The BHS text critical apparatus note that יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת has probable been deleted (2 Mss 𝔊, prb dl). See also Metzger's response to the συντέμνων term in, *A Textual Commentary*, 462.

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

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

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

~ A translation and Greek transmission problem ~

3.4.9.3 *Romans 9:29*

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

Literary comparison (Rom 9:29 and Isa 1:9)

NA[27] (Rom 9:29)	LXX[Göttingen] (Isa 1:9)	MT[BHS] (Isa 1:9)
καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας·		
εἰ μὴ **κύριος** σαβαὼθ	καὶ εἰ μὴ **κύριος** σαβαωθ	לוּלֵי **יְהוָה** צְבָאוֹת
ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα,	ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα,	הוֹתִיר לָנוּ שָׂרִיד
ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ	ὡς Σοδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ	כִּמְעָט

[66] Cf. Rösel, *Adonaj*.

ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὡμοιώθημεν.	ὡς Γομορρα ἂν ὡμοιώθημεν.	כִּסְדֹם הָיִינוּ לַעֲמֹרָה דָּמִינוּ׃ ס

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

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

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

Romans 9:5 can be divided into three parts:

5a ὧν οἱ πατέρες

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[76] Cf. Käsemann's statement that which is addressed in Rom 9:5 should not be isolated from what precedes it, *Romans*, 259; cf. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief*, 288; cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 461.
[77] See Rom 9:6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 20, 22 and 26.
[78] According to Schlier, *Der Römerbrief*, Paul wants to appeal that the Gentiles belong to the people of God with the Hos 2:1 citation, 303; the Isa 10:22-23 confirms the true Israel as the Ekklesia. These citations also confirm the sovereign action of God, 304. For Schlier, it is also evident that ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος (Rom 9:26) indicates Paul's opposing stance over and against the Jewish-Apocalyptic and Rabbinic position, 304. Koch, *Schrift*, mentions that the suggested redaction of the Israelites in Isa 10:22 is a portrait of a legal act of *Yahweh*. 146.
[79] Cf. Käsemann, *Romans*, notes that the citated content taken from Hos 2:1 does not denote Palestine as the place where Gentiles will gather eschatologically. What Paul does is to take the promise made to Israel and relate it to the Gentile – Christians, 274.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[83] Rösel, *Adonaj*, 31.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[88] Cf. Käsemann, *Romans,* 259.
[89] To quote Kammler, "Die Prädikation:" „Der Begriff θεός wäre dabei nicht im Sinne eines *Nomen proprium* verwendet, sondern als *Wesensbezeichnung*, „ 171.

3.4.10 Romans 10[90]

3.4.10.1 *Romans 10:13*

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

Literary comparison (Rom 10:13 and Joel 3:5a)		
NA[27] (Rom 10:13)	LXX[Göttingen] (Joel 3:5a)	MT[BHS] (Joel 3:5a)
πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται	καὶ ἔσται πᾶς, ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται	וְהָיָה כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָא
τὸ ὄνομα **κυρίου** σωθήσεται.	τὸ ὄνομα **κυρίου**, σωθήσεται·	בְּשֵׁם **יְהוָה** יִמָּלֵט

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

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

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

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

3.4.10.2 *Romans 10:16*

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

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

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		**OT**	**OT**	
𝔓[46]	א A B	S A B	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
κε	κε	κε	-	-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[93] Rowe, "Name of the Lord," 135, considers the term κύριος in Rom 10:13 as 'proof' that Paul relates God of the Old Testament with Jesus and that this holds profound implications for the understandingof the identity of the God of the Old Testament.
[94] Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, ascribes the 'omission' of χριστοῦ in several Western witnesses as carelessness, 463-464.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4.11 Romans 11

3.4.11.1 *Romans 11:3*

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

[96] Cf.Rowe. "Name of the Lord," 149-151.
[97] Cf. Bruggen, *Romeinen*, 157; Wilckens, *Die Brief*, 237. Cranfield, *Romans*, points to the fact that there are many examples from the Rabbinic literature of reference to sections of Scriptures by means of titles derived from their subject matter, 545-546; cf. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief*, 322.
[98] See Stanley, Christopher D. "The significance of Romans 11:3-4 for the Text History of the LXX Book of Kingdoms." *JBL* 112.1, (1993), 43-54. Stanley presents the nature of the problem in terms of the History of LXX Book of Kingdoms, 43-46. He also offers a comparison between the LXX, $LXX_{L,}$ MT and Rom 11:3 and Rom 11:4, 47-48.

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

NA[27] (Rom 11:2b-3)	LXX[Gött] (3 Kgdms 19:10)	MT[BHS] (1 Kgs 19:10)
2b ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή,	καὶ ἰδοὺ ῥῆμα **κυρίου** πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν Τί σὺ ἐνταῦθα, Ηλιου	
[ὡς ἐντυγχάνει]		
[τῷ θεῷ] [κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ];		
	10 καὶ εἶπεν Ηλιου Ζηλῶν ἐζήλωκα	וַיֹּאמֶר קַנֵּא קִנֵּאתִי
3 κύριε,[τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν]	**τῷ κυρίῳ** παντοκράτορι,	**לַיהוָה׀ אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת**
ὡς ἐντυγχάνει κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ	ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπόν σε οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ·	כִּי־עָזְבוּ בְרִיתְךָ֣ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵ֑ל
τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν,	τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν	אֶת־מִזְבְּחֹתֶ֖יךָ הָרָ֥סוּ
τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν,	καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν	וְאֶת־נְבִיאֶ֛יךָ הָרְג֥וּ בֶחָ֖רֶב
κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος καὶ ζητοῦσιν	ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος	וָאִוָּתֵ֤ר אֲנִי֙ לְבַדִּ֔י וַיְבַקְשׁ֥וּ אֶת־נַפְשִׁ֖י לְקַחְתָּֽהּ׃

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

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

INTRODUCTORY FORMULA [Rom 11:2b]

ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή
[but did you not know what the scripture say about Elijah?]

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

ὡς ἐντυγχάνει **τῷ θεῷ** κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ
[such as his appeal to *Theos* about Israel]

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

κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν
[*Kyrie*, they have killed your prophets]

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

κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος
καὶ ζητοῦσιν
[I was left behind and they are looking for me]

LXX ACCOUNT

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

καὶ ἰδοὺ ῥῆμα **κυρίου** πρὸς αὐτὸν
[and behold the word of the *Kyrios* to him]

καὶ εἶπεν Τί σὺ ἐνταῦθα, Ηλιου;
[and he said: Why are you here Elijah?]

καὶ εἶπεν Ηλιου Ζηλῶν ἐζήλωκα
[and Elijah, the one striving strived and said:]

τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι
[to *Kyrios* pantakrator]

THE EXAMPLE (Indirect speech)

ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπόν σε οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ·
[that the sons of Israel have forsaken you]

WHAT IS SAID

τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν
[they destroyed your sanctuaries]

καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν
[and they killed your prophets]

ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος
[with the sword, I was the only one who was left behind]

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

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

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

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

~ A rendition, Greek transmission and theological conceptual problem ~

3.4.11.2 *Romans 11:8*

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

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

Literary comparison (Rom 11:8 and Deut 29:3)		
NA[27] (Rom 11:8)	LXX[Göt** (Deut 29:3)	MT[BHS] (Deut 29:3)
καθὼς γέγραπται·		
ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς **ὁ θεὸς** πνεῦμα κατανύξεως,	καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν **κύριος ὁ θεὸς** ὑμῖν καρδίαν εἰδέναι	וְלֹא־נָתַן֩ **יְהוָ֨ה** לָכֶ֜ם לֵ֣ב לָדַ֗עַת
ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν	καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς βλέπειν	וְעֵינַ֤יִם לִרְאוֹת
καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν,	καὶ ὦτα ἀκούειν	וְאָזְנַ֙יִם֙ לִשְׁמֹ֣עַ
ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.	ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης.	עַד הַיּ֥וֹם הַזֶּֽה

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES						HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT			**OT**			**OT**		
𝔓[46]	A, C, D, F & G	א	S, A, B, F[b] M	730	426 54-75' 55	4QDeut[l]	Cod[Len]	Cod[Alep]
ο θς	ο θς	ο ο θς	κς ο θς	ο θς	κς	יהוה	יהוה	יהוה

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

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

~ A rendering and Greek transmission problem ~

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

3.4.11.3 *Romans 11:34*

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

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

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

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

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4.12 Romans 12

3.4.12.1 *Romans 12:19*

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

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

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

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

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

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

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

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

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

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

[103] Interestingly the term καιρω is suggested as alternative reading against the κύριος term suggested by D*·c F G, among others. This term however is the term used in Deut 32:35a, cited by Paul in Rom 12:19, words he assigns to κύριος.
[104] The text witnesses supporting such reading are ℵ^{2} A D^{2} m b r vg^{mss} sy^{h} sa^{mss}; while 𝔓$^{13vid.46}$ ℵ* D* P Ψ 6. 33. 629. 1739. 1881 *pc* lat sy^{p} sa^{ms} bo uphold the text reading as is presented by the NA^{27}.
[105] For a detail discussion on Deut 32:35, 36 cited in Heb 10:30, see Steyn, G. J. *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011, 300-310.

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

3.4.13 Romans 13

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

3.4.14 Romans 14

3.4.14.1 *Romans 14:11*

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

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

Literary comparison (Rom 14:11, Isa 49:18c and Isa 45:23c)				
NA[27] Rom 14:11	LXX[Gött] (Isa 45:23c)	LXX[Gött] (Isa 49:18c)	MT[BHS] (Isa 45:23c)	MT[BHS] (Isa 49:18c)
11a γέγραπται γάρ·				
ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος**,	ἐγώ εἰμι **ὁ θεός**, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος.	ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος**,		חַי־אָנִי נְאֻם־יְהוָה
			כִּי־לִי תִּכְרַע כָּל־בֶּרֶךְ	
ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ	ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ		תִּשָּׁבַע כָּל־לָשׁוֹן:	
11b καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται **τῷ θεῷ**.	καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα **τῷ θεῷ**			

Literary comparison (Rom 14:11, Isa 49:22c, 23c)		
NA[27] Rom 14:11	LXX[Gött] (Isa 45:22bc-23c)	MT[BHS] (Isa 45:22c-23c)
11a γέγραπται γάρ·		
ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος**,	ἐγώ εἰμι **ὁ θεός**, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος	אֲנִי־אֵל וְאֵין עוֹד
	ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ	כִּי־לִי תִּכְרַע כָּל־בֶּרֶךְ
ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ		
	καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα **τῷ θεῷ**	תִּשָּׁבַע כָּל־לָשׁוֹן:
11b καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται **τῷ θεῷ**.		

Ref.	GREEK TEXT WITNESSES									HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
	NT	**OT**								**OT**	
	א, A, B	S A B	A	S*	B	S[1]	S[2]	407 538	309	Codex[Len]	Codex[Alepp]

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

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

Isa 45:21^{MT}	Isa 45:21^{LXX}
אֲנִי יְהוָה וְאֵין־עֽוֹד אֱלֹהִים׃	ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[107] See Koch, *Schrift*, 184
[108] Cf. Wilk, *Bedeutung*, 18.
[109] Cf. Shum, *Paul's use,* 187.
[110] τῷ θεῷ = Rom.] τον θεον *O*-88 *L*′′`-46-233 *C* 407 410 449′ 538 544 Wirc. (*per deum*) Co Syl Eus. dem. Tht. Cyr.; τον κυριον S* Θ; + τον αληθινον *L*′′`-233 544 Syl Eus. dem. Tht.: ex 65:16

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

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

3a	ὁ **θεὸς** γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο	θεός, the one choosing
4b	τῷ ἰδίῳ **κυρίῳ** στήκει ἢ πίπτει	in κύριος he (the servant) stands or falls
4c	ὁ **κύριος** στῆσαι αὐτόν	The κύριος will make him to stand
6a	ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν **κυρίῳ** φρονεῖ	He who determines the day as special, does so in κύριος.
6b	καὶ ὁ ἐσθίων **κυρίῳ** ἐσθίει	he who eats, does so in κύριος
6c	εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ **τῷ θεῷ**	because he is thankful to θεός
6d	ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει	he who does not eat, does so in κύριος
6e	καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ **τῷ θεῷ**	he is thankful to θεός
8a	ἐάν τε γὰρ ζῶμεν, **τῷ κυρίῳ** ζῶμεν	if we live, we live in κύριος
8b	ἐάν τε ἀποθνῄσκωμεν, **τῷ κυρίῳ**	if we are mortal, then in κύριος
8d	ἐάν τε ἀποθνῄσκωμεν, **τοῦ κυρίου** ἐσμέν	if we are mortal, we are of κύριος
9a	εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ **Χριστὸς** ἀπέθανεν	for that, Χριστός was mortal
10c	πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι **τοῦ θεοῦ**	all will stand in the tribunal of θεός
11a	ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει **κύριος**	I am the living, says κύριος

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4.15 Romans 15

3.4.15.1 *Romans 15:9*

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

Literary comparison (Rom 15:9 and Ps 17:50)		
NA^{27} (Rom 15:9)	LXX^{Gött} (Ps 17:50)	MT^{BHS} (Ps 18:50)
τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν,		
καθὼς γέγραπται·		
διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν	διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν, **κύριε,**	עַל־כֵּ֤ן אוֹדְךָ֙ בַּגּוֹיִ֔ם יְהוָ֖ה
καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ.	καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ,	וּלְשִׁמְךָ֥ אֲזַמֵּֽרָה׃

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES					HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT				**OT**	**OT**		
𝔓^{46}	א^{1}, A,	א*	א^{2}	S A B	Cod^{Len}	Cod^{Alep}	

	B						
[τουτο]	τουτο	του προφητου	κε	κε	יהוה	יהוה	

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

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

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

~ A Greek transmission problem ~

3.4.15.2 *Romans 15:11*

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

Literary comparison (Rom 15:11 and Ps 116:1)		
NA^{27} (Rom 15:11)	LXX^{Gött} (Ps 116:1)	MT^{BHS} (Ps 117:1)
καὶ πάλιν ·	Αλληλουια.	הַלְלוּ
αἰνεῖτε, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, **τὸν κύριον**	Αἰνεῖτε **τὸν κύριον**, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,	אֶת־יְהוָה כָּל־גּוֹיִם
καὶ ἐπαινεσάτωσαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ λαοί.	ἐπαινέσατε αὐτόν, πάντες οἱ λαοί,	שַׁבְּחוּהוּ כָּל־הָאֻמִּים׃

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		**OT**	**OT**	
𝔓^{46}	א, A, B	S A	Cod^{Len}	Cod^{Alep}
τον κν	τον κν	τον κν	יהוה	יהוה

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

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

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

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

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

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

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

3.4.16 Romans 16

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

3.5 Summary

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

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

3.5.1 **Proposed Solution:** *Theological Conceptual Problems*

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

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

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

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

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