

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

4.1 INTRODUCTION

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

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

4.2.1 1 Corinthians 1

4.2.1.1 1 Corinthians 1:31

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

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

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

Literary comparison (1 Cor 1:31, 2 Cor 10:17 and Jer 9:23a)			
NA ²⁷ (1 Cor 1:31)	NA ²⁷ (2 Cor 10:17)	LXX ^{Göt} (Jer 9:23a)	MT ^{BHS} (Jer 9:23a)
ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται·		ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ	כִּי אִם-בְּזֵאת
ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω.	Ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω·	καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος,	יְתַהַלֵּל הַמְתַּהַלֵּל
		συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν	הַשֶּׁבַל וְיִדַע אֹתוֹ
		ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ποιῶν ἔλεος	כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה עוֹשֶׂה חֶסֶד מִשְׁפָּט
		καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,	וְצִדְקָה בְּאַרְצֵךְ
		ὅτι ἐν τούτοις τὸ θέλημά μου,	כִּי-בְאַלְהָהּ חִפְצָתִי
		λέγει κύριος.	נְאֻם-יְהוָה: ס

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES		HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES			
NT		OT	OT		
ⲑ ⁴⁶	Ⲱ, A, B	S A B	Cod ^{Len}	Cod ^{Alep}	4QSam ^a
κω	κω	---	---	---	---

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

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

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

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

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

¹¹⁶ See also Williams, “Rags and Riches,” 278.

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

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

~ A Greek transmission problem ~

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

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

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

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

¹¹⁹ A text critical note suggests an alternative reading θεός supported by B* F G 81. 1175 *al sa*^{ms}; Eus; while the text reading is sustained by Φ ⁴⁶ \aleph A B² C D Ψ 33. 1739. 1881 \aleph lat sy co; Ambst.

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹²³ Cf. Conzelmann, *Korinther*, 63;

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

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

4.2.2 1 Corinthians 2

4.2.2.1 1 Corinthians 2:9

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

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

¹²⁵ Some NT text witnesses, (κ²) C* Ψ 629. 1241 *pc* f vg sy, read αὐτου. Syntactically the 3rd person singular pronoun refers to θεός in v. 28, which implies that the concept regarding 'boasting before' θεός remains intact.

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

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

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

NA ²⁷ (1 Cor 2:9)	LXX ^{Gött} (Isa 64:3)	MT ^{BHS} (Isa 64:3)
ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται·		
	ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος	מֵעוֹלָם
ὃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν		
καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν	οὐκ ἤκούσαμεν	לֹא שָׁמָעוּ
καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη,		
	οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν	לֹא רָאוּ עֵינֵינוּ
	εἶδον θεὸν πλὴν σοῦ	לֹא רָאוּ אֱלֹהִים זֶה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
	καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου,	
ὃ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.	ὃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον.	עֲשֵׂה לְמַחְבְּבָיו לְ:ו

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT		OT	OT		
ⲡ ⁴⁶	κ, A, B	S A B	Cod ^{Len}	Cod ^{Alep}	1QIsa ^a

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

Θς	θς	θν	אלהים	אלהים	אלוהים
----	----	----	-------	-------	--------

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

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

4.2.2.2 1 Corinthians 2:16

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

Literary comparison (1 Cor 2:16 and Isa 40:13)					
NA ²⁷ (1 Cor 2:16)	LXX ^{Göt} (Isa 40:13)	MT ^{BHS} (Isa 40:13)			
τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου,	τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου,		מִי־תֵבֶן אֶת־רוּחַ יְהוָה		
ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;	καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο, ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν;		וְאִישׁ אֶעֱצֹתוֹ יוֹדִיעֵנוּ:		
ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν					

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES			HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES		
NT		OT	OT		
ϕ ⁴⁶	κ, A, B	S A B	Cod ^{Len}	Cod ^{Alep}	1QIsa ^a
κυ	κυ	κυ	יהוה	יהוה	יהוה

This verse cannot be classified as an explicit citation, but rather as an indirect marked citation.¹²⁸ The issue in this case is more towards answering the question about how the term κύριος (1 Cor 2:16) was integrated into the literary conceptual context. To what extent was the term κύριος (1 Cor 2:16) associated with terms such as θεός, χριστός and Ἰησοῦς respectively? This verse also attests to a noteworthy text critical issue signalled as (r). It is suggested that χριστοῦ (1 Cor 2:16c) is replaced with κύριος in B D* F G 81, while the NA²⁷ reading is supported by Ϝ⁴⁶ ⋈ A C D¹ Ψ 048. 0289^{vid}. 33. 1739. 1881, among others.¹²⁹ If one considers the latter alternative proposed within the literary conceptual context (1 Cor 2:10-16), then the interrelated dynamics between the term θεός, κύριος and χριστός, as well as the term κύριος becomes apparent.

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

The term θεός refers to the dominating theological significant acting agent used in eight verses of which one forms part of a cited text in 1 Cor 2:9. The term refers to the one who reveals himself through his spirit (1 Cor 2:10), and through whom' the spirit alone can be known (1 Cor 2:11). The first person personal pronoun ἡμεῖς refers to those who did not receive the spirit of the world, but the spirit of θεός (1 Cor 2:12) for the purpose of knowing through θεός the gracious gift (1 Cor 2:12). The term κύριος is used in two verses, one of which is found in 1 Cor 2:8 combined with τῆς δόξης. The second instance is found in 1 Cor 2:16, a citation taken from Isa 40:13a. The term Χριστός is used only twice, once in 1 Cor 2:2 relating to Jesus, and in the other instance in 1 Cor 2:16. There should be little doubt that the term χριστός would conceptually refer for Paul to none other than Jesus, as is the case in ch. 1. The integrity of the χριστός reading in 1 Cor 2:16b is questioned. Text witnesses B D* F G 81, among others, propose reading the term κύριος, while the text reading is supported by text witnesses such as Ϝ⁴⁶ ⋈ A C D¹ Ψ. In an attempt to understand the reasoning behind the scribes' decision, one has to consider the alternative within the literary context of the phrase, τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν; ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν. The underlying concept is to have the mind of either χριστός or κύριος. For the scribes of B D* and F the term κύριος in 1 Cor 2:16b would have been a more suitable term, since the term

¹²⁸ Cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 23.

¹²⁹ Cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 482.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2.3 1 Corinthians 3

4.2.3.1 1 Corinthians 3:20

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

Literary comparison (1 Cor 3:20 and Ps 93:11)		
NA ²⁷ (1 Cor 3:20)	LXX ^{Göt} (Ps 93:11)	MT ^{BHS} (Ps 94:11)
καὶ πάλιν·		
κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς	κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς	יְהוָה יְדַע מַחְשְׁבוֹת
τῶν σοφῶν	τῶν ἀνθρώπων	אֱדָם
ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι	ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι	כִּי־הִמָּה הַבַּל

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES		HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		OT	
ⲡ ⁴⁶ ⲡ ¹¹	ⲛ, A, B	S A B	Cod ^{Len}
κς	κς	κς	Cod ^{Alep}
		יהוה	יהוה

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

reading; the problem consequently revolves around the inter-relatedness of the relevant terms, especially with the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20.¹³²

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2.4 1 Corinthians 4

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

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

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

4.2.5 1 Corinthians 5

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

4.2.6 1 Corinthians 6

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

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

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

4.2.7 1 Corinthians 7

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

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

¹³⁴ See Blass, *BDF*, with regard to the use of the definite article, 79 and *BDF*, which suggest that the definite article used to designate a person has the objective to confirm that the person or being is one of a kind, 133.

¹³⁵ The *majority text* together with a Syriac version suggests reading the *κύριος* term in this instance.

¹³⁶ The scribes of \mathfrak{P}^{15} and minuscule 33 proposed reading the term *χριστός* as opposed to the term *θεός*.

reading,¹³⁷ while others opted for a θεός *et* κυρίως reading.¹³⁸ The NA²⁷ text reading however, is supported by strong text witnesses,¹³⁹ supporting the reading κύριος *et* θεός. The use of the κύριος term in 1 Cor 7:22 appear to be closely related to the term χριστός in 1 Cor 7:22, both of which refer to the ‘owner’ of the δοῦλος. It is thus safe to assume that the conceptual relationship between the referent of both the terms κύριος and χριστός are one and the same entity. In 1 Cor 7:25 the authority or command is again assigned to κύριος together with faithfulness. Some remarks should be in order to clarify the literary conceptual connection between the term κύριος and θεός, particularly in 1 Cor 7:17-25.

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

¹³⁷ Ψ 629. 1881 *pc* *vg*^{mss}.

¹³⁸ ℞ *sy*^h.

¹³⁹ ℞⁴⁶ ⋈ A B C D F (G) 33. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1739. 2464, among others.

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

4.2.8 1 Corinthians 8

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

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

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

4.2.9 1 Corinthians 9

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

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

4.2.10 1 Corinthians 10

4.2.10.1 1 Corinthians 10:26

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

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

Literary comparison (1 Cor 10:26 and Ps 23:1a)		
NA ²⁷ (1 Cor 10:26)	LXX ^{Gott} (Ps 23:1a)	MT ^{BHS} (Ps 24:1a)
	Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ.	מְזִמֹר לְדָוִד
τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ ἡ γῆ	Κύριος ποιμαίνει με,	יְהוָה רִעֵי לֹא אֶקְדֶּר
καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς	καὶ οὐδέν με ὑστερήσει	

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES		HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		OT	
ⲡ ⁴⁶	ⲛ, A, B	S A B	Cod ^{Len}
του κυ	του κυ	του κυ	Cod ^{Alep}
		יהוה	יהוה

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

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

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

This chapter would be the first to be dealt with in which the terms χριστός and κύριος, as opposed to the term θεός, are dominating as theologically important primary acting agents. In 1 Cor 10:4 the concept that χριστός is the rock that the Israelites drank from while being in the desert, is introduced. Paul asserts that θεός was not pleased with most of the Israelites (1 Cor 10:5). This concept clearly distinguishes between the referent of the term χριστός and that of the term θεός. In 1 Cor 10:9 an alternative reading for the term χριστός is being noted. Strong text witnesses, ⲛ B C P 33. 104. 326. 365. 1175. 2464 propose reading κυριον, while A 81 suggest reading θεον. The text reading is conversely supported by ⲡ⁴⁶ D F G Ψ 1739

included from the NA 25th edition onwards. Codex Sinaiticus and Vaticanus in combination are strong witnesses, but \mathfrak{P}^{46} , a 2nd century papyrus, would evidently weigh more than the two 4th century codices. The term ἐκπαιράζω (the present subjunctive form of the verb used in 1 Cor 10:9) is found only in Lk 10:25 in the whole of the NT, apart from this occurrence. This term relates to an expert in the law tempting the διδάσκαλος, which refers to Jesus. If one regards the influence of the cited text in 1 Cor 10:7, taken from Exod 32:6, to be extensive and influential in Pauline thought, then it is indeed plausible to read either the term κύριος or θεός in 1 Cor 10:9 as suggested.¹⁴³ Literary speaking the term κύριος would be the best possible reading due to the fact that the source context of Exod 32:6 demands that κύριος is the primary theological significant entity. Conceptually, for Paul that is, the term θεός would be a more probable reading if one accepts that the θεός is the primary term used by Paul when referring to the Hebrew deity and that his intent was to refer to this deity. The probability of the θεός reading is further supported by the use of the term θεός in 1 Cor 10:5, referring to the one that was not pleased with all of those drinking from the rock in the desert.

With the acceptance of the χριστός reading, especially due to \mathfrak{P}^{46} supporting such a reading, one has to account for the term θεός in 1 Cor 10:5, as well as the term θεός in 1 Cor 10:13, which refers to the one that is in charge of temptation, so to speak. It should also then be necessary to decide against the strong influence of the explicit citation taken from Exod 32:6 on literary context, which seem to ensure a theological-historical framework in which the temptation in 1 Cor 10:9 is to be understood. The manuscript data would suggest reading the term χριστός, but based on the literary conceptual source context (Exod 32) the κύριος reading would be the most preferable one. If the κύριος reading is opted for as the most plausible one, then it would imply that the term κύριος in 1 Cor 10:9 does not refer to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος, but rather to κύριος as a Greek term equivalent to the Hebrew deity, or specifically the Tetragram.

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

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

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

¹⁴⁴ According to Koch, *Schrift*, the issue of food offered to idols that is addressed by the citation in 1 Cor 10:26, is considered christologically, 287 and 299; cf. Conzelmann, *Korintherbrief*, 207-208 and Weiss, *Korintherbrief*, 264. Scholars have dealt with the issue of ‘food offered to idols’ to a great extent, see for example: Newton, D. *Diety and Diet – The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998. Newton’s interest is to construct the socio-religious and cultural setting of the Greco-Roman world that underlies 1 Cor 8-11, 79-242; Cheung, A.T. *Idol Food in Corinth – Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, follows a similar approach as Newton when he constructs a social meaning of eating idol food, 27-38, but he also considers the issue against a Jewish background, 39-81; Fotopoulos, J. *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003, constructs a cult context of eating idol food, 49-157, after which he deals with Greco-Roman dining in particular, 158-178. Koch, D.-A. “Alles, was ἐν μακέλλῳ verkauft wird, eßt ...», Die macella von Pompeii, Gerasa und Korinth und ihre Bedeutung für die Auslegung von 1Kor 10,25.” *ZNW* 90.3/4, (1999), 194-219, enlightens the reader with his detailed information on the archaeological evidence on the *macellum*, agora and altars of Corinth for a clearer understanding of 1 Cor 10:25. Koch, does this by comparing the *macellum* unearthed at Pompeii, 199-205 and Gerasa, 205-208; see also Koch, *Hellenistisches Christentum*, 145-164.

¹⁴⁵ Williams, *The Psalms*, concurs with scholarship in general that the citation in 1 Cor 10:26 should be considered in the broader context of this passage, 167. The citation is in direct support of 1 Cor 10:25 regarding the issue of food offered to idols. Apart from the fact that the citation supports Paul’s argument, according to Williams, the citation also confirms God’s sovereignty, 169. Woyke, J. *Götter, ‚Götzen‘, Götterbilder – Aspekte einer paulinischen ‚Theologie der Religionen‘*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005, dealt with this issue while focusing on 1 Cor 10:19-20, 215-257. Woyke, *Götter*, offers valuable insight into the Greek and Hellenistic-Roman Epik and Philosophy regarding deities and demons, 220-225; see also his discussion on how these concepts are dealt with in the Septuaginta, 225-228.

4.2.11 1 Corinthians 11

The term θεός and κύριος equally dominate this chapter, with the term χριστός used in three instances, spread over two verses (1 Cor 11:1 and 3). The term χριστός is used in relation to the hierarchical thought concept of Paul, that χριστός is the head of the man, with the man the head of the woman, while θεός in turn is the head of χριστός. Paul continues with his line of thought in 1 Cor 11:7, when he states that it is not necessary for a man to cover his head because he should glorify θεός. Paul further states that a man and woman should not be considered separate from one another, but they are ‘joined’ in κύριος (1 Cor 11:11). It is also considered to be proper for a woman to pray to θεός with her head covered (1 Cor 11:13), with the congregation belonging to θεός (1 Cor 11:16, 22).

The term κύριος dominates 1 Cor 11:23-34 when Paul confirms that conceptually he considers the term κύριος as referring to Jesus (see 1 Cor 11:23); the κύριος who died 1 Cor 11:26 and to whom the eating of the bread and drinking of the cup refers (1 Cor 11:27). There should be little or no doubt that the term κύριος in this chapter refers to the crucified Jesus whereas the term θεός refers to the one highest level of the theological hierarchical thought-concept, the entity who receives prayers. Again, one is inclined to consider the term χριστός to be conceptualised ‘closer’ to the term θεός, due to the fact that the term χριστός might have been thought of as being elevated to be in close proximity to θεός, through whom θεός mediates. Paul thus seems to make a clear distinction between the referent of the term θεός and κύριος.

4.2.12 1 Corinthians 12

The concept underlying the use of the term κύριος in 1 Corinthians 12 is no different in comparison to the previous chapter. The term is conceptualised as referring to Jesus, while Paul remarks that no one can declare that Jesus is κύριος without the ‘holy spirit’ (1 Cor 12:3). Paul is also of the opinion that there are different services, but one κύριος who assigns them (1 Cor 12:5). On the other hand it is θεός to whom the spirit belongs (1 Cor 12:3). With θεός being the overarching ruling entity (1 Cor 12:6), the one who arranged the body parts where he wanted them (1 Cor 12:18; see also 1 Cor 12:24). The term θεός also refers to the one who appointed the apostles, prophets and teachers (1 Cor 12:28). The term Χριστός appears to be designated as the ‘corporate’ embodying of the believers (1 Cor 12:12, 27).

Deducible from the literary conceptual context, is that the term κύριος, χριστός and θεός refer to separate entities. Jesus is considered to be κύριος, the one who allocates various

services. Χριστός on the other hand, appears to be more. The χριστός in this instance emerges as one that ‘transcends’ Jesus as the κύριος. The term χριστός refers to the one who surpasses the ‘mortal’ believer, the monotheistic-universal figure embodying those in the service of the one κύριος. The overarching, all encompassing characteristic and functionality remains reserved for the referent of the term θεός. It should also be noted, that Paul regarded all three terms to portray monotheistic characteristics (see 1 Cor 12:5, 6 and 27). The latter could be used as valid critique opposing the argument or idea that the term κύριος, χριστός and θεός refer to separate entities.¹⁴⁶

4.2.13 1 Corinthians 13

1 Corinthians 13 is indeed ‘out of the ordinary’ due to the fact that it is the only chapter in the Pauline literature without any reference to the θεός, κύριος, χριστός or any other related term. Although this is an interesting matter in its own right, this chapter will not serve the objective of this particular study.

4.2.14 1 Corinthians 14

4.2.14.1 1 Corinthians 14:21

The citation in 1 Cor 14:21, taken from Isa 28:11-13a, has been altered and adapted to a great extent.¹⁴⁷ The intent is not to discuss the discrepancies that exist between the text versions, nor to discuss how the cited text is reconstructed.¹⁴⁸ What is of importance is the ‘dynamic’ representation of Isa 28:13a (τὸ λόγιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ θλίψις) in 1 Cor 14:21c (λέγει κύριος).

Literary comparison (1 Cor 14:21 and Isa 28:11-13a)

NA²⁷ (1 Cor 14:21)

LXX^{Göt} (Isa 28:11-13a)

MT^{BHS} (Isa 28:11-13a)

ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται

ὅτι

ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις

διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων

כִּי בְלַעַגֵי שִׁפְוֹתָא

¹⁴⁶ There are no κύριος, θεός and χριστός terms in chapter thirteen.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 64 and Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, 198.

¹⁴⁸ Koch, *Schrift*, 63-66, discussed this very issue in great detail.

		וּבְלִשׁוֹן אֲחֵרָה
καὶ ἐν χεῖλεσιν ἐτέρων	διὰ γλώσσης ἐτέρας,	
		דַבָּר אֲלֵהֶם הַזֶּה:
λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ	ὅτι λαλήσουσιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ	
	λέγοντες αὐτῷ Τοῦτο	אֲשֶׁר אָמַר אֱלֹהִים בְּאֵזְבֵּי
	τὸ ἀνάπαυμα τῷ πεινῶντι	הַמְנוּחָה הַגְּיוּחַ לְעַרְבֵי
	καὶ τοῦτο τὸ σύντριμμα,	וְאֵת הַמַּרְגָּעָה
καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακούσονται μου,	καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ἀκούειν.	אֶתְּ אֲבֹא שְׂמוּעָה:
	καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῖς	הַזֶּה לְהָה
λέγει κύριος	τὸ λόγιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ θλιψις	דַבְּרֵי יְהוָה צֵרוּ

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES				HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES			
NT		OT		OT			
ⲑ ⁴⁶	κ, A, B	A B S O'' L'''	' C''	4QIsa ^a	4QIsa ^c	Cod ^{Len}	Cod ^{Alep}
κς	κς	κς	θς	יהוה	יהוה	יהוה	יהוה

The text critical data might be considered worthless if it can be proven that the phrase λέγει κύριος (1 Cor 14:21c) is a Pauline creation. Such a consideration will be revisited once the cited verse has been discussed in detail. The text critical data in comparison relies on the presumption that the phrase τὸ λόγιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ θλιψις (1 Cor 14:21c) has been reworked by Paul to read λέγει κύριος.¹⁴⁹ Although the suggestion is made that Paul's account of Is 28:11-13 appears to be 'closer' to the MT,¹⁵⁰ the reading of Isa 28:13a^{LXX} is

¹⁴⁹ See Koch, *Schrift*, 65.

¹⁵⁰ Koch, *Schrift*, 63-66.

noticeably closer to its Hebrew counterpart.¹⁵¹ The fact that Paul ‘added’ λέγει κύριος to the cited text in Rom 12:19 (Deut 32:35a) strengthens the plausibility for a Pauline ‘addition’ of λέγει κύριος in 1 Cor 14:21. Caution should be taken if and when the text critical readings and discrepancies, however valuable, are considered as support for a *Vorlage* dependence on λέγει κύριος. If the *Vorlage* dependence approach is followed, the variation between the nominative use of the κύριος term (support by all the major NT manuscripts) over and against the genitive use of the κύριος term (supported by all the major OT manuscripts), with some manuscripts reading the genitive form of the term θεός, would be superfluous. Essentially two interpretive possibilities exist with regard to Paul’s use of Isa 28:11-13: a.) If the MT is considered to be the source text influencing how Paul interpreted what he cited in 1 Cor 14:21, indicates that ‘God’ will not speak to people using ‘tongues’ because they refused to listen when he spoke to them using intelligible words;¹⁵² b.) The LXX in turn appears to suggest that those speaking are delivering a message of gloom and judgement.¹⁵³ In both these cases, it is intelligible words that are spoken by both ‘God’ (MT) and people (LXX). The literary conceptual context presented by the Greek OT, as presented by the LXX^{Gött} (Isa 28:7-13) is opted for as the most plausible that influenced Paul’s use of 1 Cor 14:21.

The Greek OT text witnesses either read κυ or θυ, while the NT text witnesses all read κς. It is possible that Paul ‘added’ λέγει κύριος to the cited text, which he ‘adapted’ his *Vorlage* or that he made use of a Greek OT text that read λέγει κύριος.

~ A translation, transmission and theological conceptual problem ~

For some, the issue presented in 1 Corinthians 14 revolve around why *speaking in tongues* is for the unbeliever, while prophecy is for the believer (1 Cor 14:20-25).¹⁵⁴ Others in turn focus their attention on *speaking in tongues* and how it relates to women who have been ordered not to be silent at such gatherings (1 Cor 14:35-36).¹⁵⁵ The crucial issue at hand is that Paul

¹⁵¹ Conzelmann, *Korinther*, 285, is of the opinion that Paul does not follow the Hebrew nor the Greek, as represented by the eclectic text editions, but that Paul used a different translation.

¹⁵² Cf. Johanson, Bruce C. “Tongues, a Sign for Unbelievers? : a structural and exegetical study of I Corinthians XIV.20-25 / B.C.” *NTS* 25.2, (1979), 180-203,” 182.

¹⁵³ Cf. Johanson, “Tongues a Sign,” 182.

¹⁵⁴ Representatives of this angle of approach are Grudem, Wayne A. “1 Corinthians 14.20-25: Prophecy and Tongues as Signs of God’s Attitude.” *WTJ* 41.2, (1979), 381-396; Roperts, P. “A sign - Christian or Pagan?” *ET* 90.7, (1979), 199-203; Sandnes, Karl O. “Prophecy - A Sign for Believers (1 Cor 14, 20-25).” *Biblica* 77.1, (1996), 1-15.

¹⁵⁵ See for example Flanagan, Neal M. “Did Paul put down women in 1 Cor 14:34-36?” *BTB* 11.1, (1981), 10-12; Odell-Scott, David W. “Let the women Speak in Church : an egalitarian interpretation of 1 Cor 14:33b-36.” *BTB* 13.3, (1983), 90-93; Allison, Robert W. “Let Women be Silent in the Churches (1 Cor. 14.33b-36) : what did Paul really say, and what did it mean?” *JSNT* 32, (1988), 27-60; Rowe, Arthur J. “Silence and the Christian

assigns the content of this text (Isa 28:11-13) as words spoken by κύριος. Second, it is also important to establish how Paul relates this term κύριος with the term κύριος in the literary conceptual context. It is indeed plausible, based on the proposal that Paul reworked his *Vorlage*, that he interpreted Isa 28:13a τὸ λόγιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ – the words of κύριος θεός as being λέγει κύριος. The problem with such a view is: why would Paul ‘omit’ a theological significant term such as θεός, a term which supported his *theo*-logie extremely well? The term κύριος is used twice, one of which forms part of the cited content (1 Cor 14:21), the other in 1 Cor 14:37. Paul makes it clear in 1 Cor 14:2 that anyone speaking in ‘a certain’ language speaks to θεός.¹⁵⁶ The theme of speaking in a ‘tongue’ or ‘language’ is central throughout chapter 14. In 1 Cor 14:18 he states that he is grateful to θεός that he could speak in languages or tongues more than any of the addressees. Paul continues saying that he would rather speak five intelligible words when in the congregation to teach others than to speak a thousand words in a ‘tongue’ (1 Cor 14:19) the latter which might imply that Paul meant ‘linguistically unsound’ language in 1 Cor 14:2. He then encourages the addressees not to be like children in thought, but to be a child in evil and adults in thinking (1 Cor 14:20). He confirms his statement by quoting from Isa 28:11-13.

If the literary conceptual context of the source text is taken into consideration and if one accepts that such a context underlies Paul’s conceptual thinking, then it is plausible to deduce that κύριος σαβαωθ (Isa 28:5), τὸ λόγιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ θλίψις (Is 28:13) or τοῦτο ἀκούσατε λόγον κυρίου (Isa 28:14) influenced Paul’s concept that the cited text in 1 Cor 14:21 are the words spoken by κύριος. It might not have been a case of either-or, but rather that the dominating use of the term κύριος in Isaiah 28 influenced Paul to such an extent that he reworked Isa 28:13a into λέγει κύριος. If one accepts such an argument as plausible, then one is still required to account for how Paul conceptually understood the term κύριος as a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. One should also determine how this term κύριος relates to the term κύριος in 1 Cor 14:37, as well to the term θεός used within the literary conceptual context. Paul’s *kyrio-theo*-concept is structured as follows:

Women of Corinth.” *Communio viatorum* 33.1/2, (1990), 41; Jervis, L. A. “1 Corinthians 14.34-35: A Reconsideration of Paul’s Limitation of the Free Speech of Some Corinthian Women.” *JSNT* 58, (1995), 51-74; Niccum, C. “The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: the external evidence for 1 Cor 14.34-5.” *NTS* 43.2, (1997), 242-255; Eriksson, Anders. “‘Women Tongue Speakers, be Silent’: a reconstruction through Paul’s rhetoric.” *BI* 6.1, (1998), 80-104; Kontzi-Méresse, Nicola. “Le silence des femmes dans l’assemblée : réflexion autour de 1 Corinthiens 14,34-35.” *ETR* 80.2, (2005), 273-278; Greenbury, J. “1 Corinthians 14:34-35: evaluation of prophecy revisited.” *JETS* 51.4, (2008), 721-731.

¹⁵⁶ It is not yet certain if Paul meant a language not known to linguistics, or if he meant any language, be it linguistically sound, unsound or merely unstructured.

ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσση οὐκ ἀνθρώποις	he who speaks in tongues does not speak to humans
λαλεῖ ἀλλὰ θεῷ	but he speaks to <i>Theos</i>
Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ,	I (Paul) thank <i>Theos</i>
πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶ	that I can speak more languages than all of you

Paul makes it clear that speaking in tongues or languages, be that a language in the linguistic sense of the word or an utterance of sounds unknown to linguistic paradigms, that θεός is the one who not only grasps such a type of language, but that θεός is also granting one the ability to speak such a language. In 1 Cor 14:21 Paul cites scripture as the support for the case being put forward:

ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται	it is written in the law
ὅτι ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις	that in a foreign language
καὶ ἐν χεῖλεσιν ἑτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ	and on the lips of others I will speak to these people
καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακούσονται μου,	but event then they will not listen to me
λέγει κύριος	says <i>Kyrios</i>

The implication of the train of thought is that Paul does not limit his critique against speaking in a language only known by θεός to the addressees, but he includes himself, as well as κύριος. The idea is that the addressees, including Paul, would not achieve anything productive within the congregation when speaking in a ‘foreign’ language; nor will κύριος when speaking to the people in ‘such a’ language. The literary source context is to be clearly understood: the author of Isa 28:7-13 appears to be critical towards the prophets and priests this is evident from Isa 28:7 - οὔτοι γὰρ οἴνω πεπλανημένοι εἰσίν, ἐπλανήθησαν διὰ τὸ σικερα· ἱερεὺς καὶ προφήτης ἐξέστησαν διὰ τὸν οἶνον – because they are lead astray by wine, they have been lead astray by *sikera*. Priest and prophets are confused due to the wine. The author of the Isaiah text then uses the first person plural saying ‘to whom did we report evil and to whom did we report a message, those weaned from their mother’s milk, ripped away from her breast’ (Isa 28:9). It seems as if the author/s distances themselves from the priest and prophets who are being criticised in Isa 28:7 and Isa 28:8. The crux of the matter is

particularly relevant for what Paul addresses in ch. 14 is Isa 28:11 - διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας, ὅτι λαλήσουσιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ-through contemptuous lips, through the language of others, because they will speak to this nation... Isa 28:12 - καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ἀκούειν – and they have willed not to listen. The sequence of thought is thus:

Priest and Prophets

- They are being lead astray
- They report about affliction for the people
- They speak with contemptuous lips in a foreign language
- They will experience affliction upon affliction

Author/s

- Not the ones reporting
- They are reporting the oracle of *Kyrios Theos*

People

- They willed not to listen

For the authors then, the critique is not directed against those who opted not to listen, but the ones, the priest and prophets, ‘ruling’ over those people (Isa 28:14). The oracle of κύριος ὁ θεός, as opposed to what they (the priests and prophets) might have communicated to the people, is thus directed to the priest and prophets, not towards the people. At first glance it appears as if Paul reworked and re-interpreted Isa 28:11 to such an extent for it to sound as if ‘the people’ are criticised and that it is the words spoken by κύριος. Paul does however, implement this verse, in a similar fashion regarding the addressees. The critique is directed to the ones speaking in tongues, teaching and prophesying in the Corinthian congregation, implying that they would have been considered to be the leaders of the congregation (cf. Isa 28:7-13). It would thus be possible to regard 1 Cor 14:1-19 as the forerunner for Paul’s ‘oracle’ concerning ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσση - he who speaks in a tongue (1 Cor 14:1; cf. Isa 28:7-13), followed by the qualification and evaluation of a ‘oracle about delivering an oracle’ in 1 Cor 14:20-21. Speaking in a foreign language, and in the lips of others is dubbed not to be effective when speaking to the people (1 Cor 14:21). According to Paul, this is written in the law and considered to be insufficient by κύριος as well. Therefore, αἱ γλῶσσαι εἰς σημεῖον εἰσιν οὐ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπίστοις, ἢ δὲ προφητεία οὐ τοῖς ἀπίστοις ἀλλὰ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν – the tongues is not a sign for those who believe, but for the unbeliever; on

the other hand, with regard to εἰς σημεῖόν εἰσιν, prophecy is not for unbelievers, but for believers (1 Cor 14:22). The latter statement of Paul is based on the content of his *Vorlage* and therefore not necessarily what he conceptualised. What Paul does conceptualise is when a prophecy is proclaimed, it has the potential to allow an unbeliever to re-consider everything (1 Cor 14:24) after which he will bow down before θεός (1 Cor 14:25).

With the citation in 1 Cor 14:21, Paul has placed the concept underlying γλῶσσα on a par with the underlying concept of ἑτερόγλωσσος. If the concept of the former is related to sounds that do not make linguistic sense, the latter would imply a language linguistically sound, so to speak, which one is unfamiliar with. A third concept could also be inferred from Isa 28:11 reading διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας, which seemingly indicates that the translator/s understood φαυλισμὸν χειλέων and γλώσσης ἑτέρας as words uttered which do not project wisdom, well-thought ideas, ignorant and hear-say information.¹⁵⁷ What Paul thus accomplished, probably intentionally, when he cited Isa 28:11-13a in 1 Cor 14:21, is to culminate the concepts underlying these terms into one single idea represented by ἑτερόγλωσσος, which holds a.) conceptual possibilities of γλῶσσα (linguistic unsound), b.) ἑτερόγλωσσος (linguistic sound, not familiar) and c.) φαυλισμὸν χειλέων and γλώσσης ἑτέρας (linguistic sound, familiar but not structured well – not legitimate). The legitimacy of his attempt is for the readers undisputed, due to the fact he has bracketed the idea in between ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι and λέγει κύριος. Paul's concept is emphasised in 1 Cor 14:23-25, where he explains the impact of prophecy, understood as linguistically sound, well-structured and familiar to both believer and unbeliever. Such an unbeliever will then fall down and worship θεός and announce that θεός is in their midst (1 Cor 14:25). As to whether Paul had the Hebrew deity in mind when he used the term κύριος in 1 Cor 14:21, remains uncertain. What seems to be probable is that Paul was influenced by his *Vorlage* which might have been dominated by the term κύριος. This is not to say that he shared the concept that the latter term was the Greek representation of the Tetragram. There appears to be a clear distinction between the κύριος term in 1 Cor 14:21, which refers to the one willing to speak in a foreign language, in another tongue as opposed to the term θεός, referring to the one who should be spoken to when using γλῶσσα (linguistic unsound). He is also the one being thanked by Paul for the 'gift' and ability to be able to speak using γλῶσσα.

¹⁵⁷ cf. Hos 7:16^{LXX} which speaks of ἀπαιδευσίαν γλώσσης – incontrollable, undisciplined, ignorant tongue.

It is clear that the term θεός dominates this chapter, while the use of the term κύριος has been limited to 1 Cor 14:21 and 1 Cor 14:37¹⁵⁸. The well known *theos*-concepts are repeated here, gratitude or thanks as well as prayer is directed to θεός (1 Cor 14:18; 1 Cor 14:25; 1 Cor 14:28). The ‘word of *Theos*’ (1 Cor 14:36), ‘says *kyrios*’ (1 Cor 14:21) and the ‘command of *kyrios*’ (1 Cor 14:37) concepts allows one to associate the term θεός and κύριος without any obvious resistance. One could thus assume with a reasonable amount of certainty that both the term θεός and κύριος refer to the monotheistic Hebrew deity.¹⁵⁹

4.2.15 1 Corinthians 15

The term χριστός is used more in 1 Cor 15, than in any other chapter of any New Testament document. It dominates this chapter in its entirety. It is utilised fifteen times and has been spread over fourteen verses. The term θεός in turn, is used in eleven instances, spread over nine verses, while the term κύριος is used in two verses relating to Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός (1 Cor 15:31, 57). This chapter attests to a literary conceptual correlation between the terms θεός and χριστός. Paul employs the term χριστός as a central figure while discussing the issue of resurrection. The term θεός is implemented with reference to ἐκκλησία (τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ - 1 Cor 15:9) and χάρις (χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ - 1 Cor 15:10), as well as βασιλεία (τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ - 1 Cor 15:24). Moreover, Paul refers to θεός in his discussion of μαρτυρία (1 Cor 15:15) and when referring to the one who has dominion over all (1 Cor 15:28). Finally, Paul accuses the addressees of not having any knowledge of θεός (1 Cor 15:34)—the latter who will give form to the resurrected body, as he pleases (1 Cor 15:38).

In this chapter there is no obvious literary or conceptual correlation between the terms θεός and κύριος. The only reference to the term κύριος, apart from its use as a title assigned to Jesus as the χριστός (1 Cor 15:31 and 1 Cor 15:57), is with Paul’s final call for them (addressees) to continue with the work of κύριος (1 Cor 15:38). The term θεός remains the only term used to refer to the one who has the ability to resurrect the dead; but in this instance Paul discusses resurrection in terms of only χριστός and not Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός (see e.g. Rom 4:24; Rom 8:11; Rom 10:9; and 1 Cor 6:14¹⁶⁰).

¹⁵⁸ Codex Alexandrinus propose reading the term θεός as oppose to the term κύριος.

¹⁵⁹ A detailed investigation concerning tongues and prophecy in 1 Cor 14:26-40, see Hiu, Elim. *Regulations Concerning Tongues and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians 14.26-40*. London: T & T Clark, 2010.

¹⁶⁰ In this instance θεός resurrects κύριος.

4.2.16 1 Corinthians 16

The term κύριος, as a primary theological significant acting agent, dominates the final chapter of the 1st epistle to the fellow followers of Christ situated in Corinth. The term is used in five instances in five distinct verses. The concept of the instruction and works of κύριος (1 Cor 16:7; 1 Cor 16:10 respectively) are again introduced here—as is so often the case (see e.g. 1 Cor 15:38). The term κύριος is also used to call upon the congregation to greet Aquila and Priscilla in κύριος (1 Cor 16:19), while Paul also mentions that if one is not a friend of κύριος, cursed is he (1 Cor 16:22). Finally, the term κύριος is used as a title for Jesus this is clear from 1 Cor 16:23. The implementation and the underlying concept of the term κύριος deduced from this chapter, enforces Paul's dominate use and underlying concept of the term κύριος throughout his epistles.

4.2.17 2 Corinthians 1 and 2

The term θεός again dominates the first two chapters, while the term χριστός is used just as frequently. The term κύριος is used in only three instances, notably limited to the technical phrase: κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The introductory phrases found in chapter one appears to be within the expected conceptual confines of Paul's thoughts: θεός is the father, while Jesus is the χριστός and κύριος (cf. 1 Thess 1:1; Gal 1:1; 1 Cor 1:1:3; Phil 1:2). What could be considered as unique is the concept τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Cor 1:1), already introduced in 1 Cor 1:2. It seems as if Paul had no intention of introducing a 'new' θεός or κύριος concept either than what was introduced in the first letter to his fellow followers of Christ (see 2 Cor 1:2-3 and 19). What is significant is how the term θεός relates to the term χριστός and *vice versa*.

Apart from the concept that θεός is the father of Jesus as the κύριος and χριστός (2 Cor 1:2-3), the term θεός is again used to refer to the one capable of resurrecting a mortal being from the dead (2 Cor 1:9) and extending grace (2 Cor 1:12; 2 Cor 2:14): the one who is faithful (2 Cor 1:18). Paul uses the term θεός when referring to the one who established a solid foundation in χριστός, through whom θεός anoints (2 Cor 1:21), with θεός called as witness (2 Cor 1:23). The phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 2:12), found only in the Pauline literature (see Rom 15:9; 2 Cor 9:13 and Gal 1:7), requires further attention. The use of the phrase is limited to Pauline thought, which includes τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ implemented in Rom 15:16; 1 Thess 2:2, 8 and 1 Thess 2:9 – with the exception of Mk 1:14. The latter attests to a text critical note suggesting that της βασιλειας be inserted before τοῦ

θεοῦ.¹⁶¹ The data would imply that in Pauline thought, the referent of both the term χριστός and θεός relating to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is placed on a par. It is κύριος however, who opened the door for the ‘good news’ to be proclaimed (2 Cor 2:12). The mediating character of the term χριστός is again strengthened in 2 Cor 2:14 and 2 Cor 2:15. In 2 Cor 2:14, thanks is to be given to θεός who leads one in triumph in χριστός, while Paul considers the believers as being a fragrance to θεός through χριστός (1 Cor 2:15).

4.2.18 2 Corinthians 3

4.2.18.1 2 Corinthians 3:16

The content cited in 2 Cor 3:16 is not introduced by an introductory formula, making it difficult to determine if the content in 2 Cor 3:16 should be considered as an explicit citation.¹⁶² Although Paul reworked the cited text to a large extent, it is reasonable to deduce that the content in 2 Cor 3:16 would have been recognised as a citation based on ‘key’ terms and phrases used, such as: περιαιρείται τὸ κάλυμμα, as well as ἡνίκα δὲ ἐὰν. Moreover, ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκῃται Μωϋσῆς (2 Cor 3:15) prepares the reader to some extent that a cited text might follow.

Literary comparison (2 Cor 3:16 and Exod 34:34a)		
NA ²⁷ (2 Cor 3:16)	LXX ^{Gött} (Exod 34:34a)	MT ^{BHS} (Exod 34:34a)
ἡνίκα δὲ ἐὰν	ἡνίκα δ' ἂν	
ἐπιστρέψῃ ¹⁶³	εἰσεπορεύετο Μωυσῆς	וּבָבֹא מֹשֶׁה
πρὸς κύριον,	ἐναντι κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ,	לִפְנֵי יְהוָה לְדַבֵּר אֵלָיו
περιαιρείται τὸ κάλυμμα	περιηρεῖτο τὸ κάλυμμα	וַיִּסֶר אֶת־הַמָּסָךְ

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES		HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES
NT	OT	OT

¹⁶¹ Manuscripts supporting such an alternative include A D W, among others.

¹⁶² Koch, *Schrift*, categorised the citation in 2 Cor 3:16 as the modification of the tempo, gender and mode of the verb, 114.

¹⁶³ The motivation for Paul’s adaptation of the cited text becomes visible in 2 Cor 3:15 with the phrase ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκῃται Μωϋσῆς. It was therefore not required to repeat the proper name ‘Moses’ when he cited his *Vorlage*.

Ⓟ ⁴⁶	κ, A, B	B	Cod ^{Len}
κν	κν	Κυ	יהוה

The reading of the cited content in 2 Cor 3:16 is in no way certain. The κύριος reading and its Hebrew counterpart appears, at first glance, to be intact. The only discrepancy is where B^{OT} reads κύριος in the genitive case,¹⁶⁴ as opposed to the accusative case supported by all the major NT text witnesses. The integration of the cited content containing the term κύριος is well adapted to its target context, in which the term κύριος refers to the primary acting agent (2 Cor 3:16-18).

The challenge is to relate the term κύριος with the terms θεός, χριστός and κύριος in its literary conceptual context.

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

Within the confines of this literary conceptual context, one is confronted with a rare case in which the term κύριος dominates as the primary acting agent. The term occurs five times in three distinct verses, whereas both the term θεός and χριστός occur in three instances spread over three verses. A cluster of the term κύριος is also observable in the last few verses of chapter three, with the terms θεός and χριστός being used inter-related in 2 Cor 3:3-5—with the exception of the term χριστός in 2 Cor 3:14. Attention will thus first be given to the terms θεός and χριστός located in 2 Cor 3:3-5.

Paul calls the addressees ‘a letter’ of χριστός. Such a letter is not written with black ink, but by the spirit of θεός (2 Cor 3:3). This speaks of confidence, a type of confidence not born within, but it is made possible through χριστός before θεός (2 Cor 3:4). The capabilities originate with θεός (2 Cor 3:5). Finally Paul states that they (presumably referring to himself and his co-workers) are not like Moses who covered his face to hide the fact that the reflection of the radiance is seen by the people. There is a shift from the veil on the face of Moses to the veil on the reading of the old covenant—and then on the heart of non-Christian listeners of the old covenant. It is only in χριστός that this veil could be taken away (2 Cor 3:14). Paul is hereby alluding to the content of Exodus 34. In 2 Cor 3:16 Paul cites Exod 34:34a whereby he is inclined to use the term κύριος, if he wanted to stay ‘true’ to his *Vorlage*. Paul introduces this cited text with the statement that even in his day, when Moses is

¹⁶⁴ The κύριος reading is not visible in codex S^{OT} or A^{OT}.

read, a veil covers their (probably referring to the Jews) hearts, but if and when one turns towards κύριος the veil will be taken away. Conceptually Paul stuck with the source context idea that the veil was taken away when turned towards κύριος. In the source context (Exodus 34) the author narrates that Moses went before κύριος to speak with him, the veil was taken away until he departed (Exod 34:34). For all practical purposes the term κύριος used in 2 Cor 3:16 indirectly represents the Tetragram. It would be extremely difficult to infer otherwise, and even more complex is to determine if Paul adopted the concept underlying the term κύριος, that this term is a Greek equivalent and thus reproduces the Tetragram.¹⁶⁵

What seems to be probable is that Paul conceptually regarded the term κύριος as referring to the same entity as does the term χριστός. In 2 Cor 3:17 he claims that the spirit is κύριος and where the spirit of κύριος is, freedom is to be found. He continues saying that the unveiled faces, project the glory of κύριος, by which their glory increases because κύριος is the spirit (2 Cor 3:18). Being ‘a letter’ of χριστός (2 Cor 3:3) implies that one radiates something that is written, in this case not written in black ink, but with the spirit of θεός, and for Paul the ministry of the spirit glorifies (2 Cor 3:8). Moreover, Paul declares that κύριος is the spirit (2 Cor 3:17 and 2 Cor 3:18) and that those being unveiled reflect the glory of κύριος (2 Cor 3:18). It thus appears as if the ἐπιστολή Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 3: 3) refers to the same entity as ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν (2 Cor 3:17) – both phrases of which show the glory of κύριος and χριστός. This spirit originates with θεός - πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος (2 Cor 3:4).

The key in understanding the concept underlying the explicit κύριος citation lies with how one interprets Paul’s allegorical interpretation of this term in 2 Cor 3:17. It is not Paul’s intent to conceptually relate the term Χριστός in 2 Cor 3:3 with the term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16. The intent rather is to call πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος (2 Cor 3:3) to mind and by doing so the assumption that Paul conceptualised the term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16 (Exod 34:34a), the κύριος whom Moses visited on Mount Sinai, as the Tetragram. Paul continues with this concept in 1 Cor 3:17- 18. The κύριος terms in these verses refer thus to the same entity as the term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16. The term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:17-18 is literary and conceptually closely related to the term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16—both of which are underlined with the spirit of κύριος or then κύριος being the spirit. It seems highly unlikely that Paul conceptualised the

¹⁶⁵ According to Plummer, A. *Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*. ICC, II Corinthians. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1960, Paul probably says κύριος rather than χριστός because of ἐναντι κυρίου in Exodus, 102; cf. Grosheide, F. W. *Tweede Brief aan Korinthe*. Commentar op het nieuwe Testament. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959, 107-108; Windisch, H. *Der Zweite Korintherbrief*. KEK 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924, 122-124; Matera, Frank J. *II Corinthians – A Commentary*. NTL; Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 2003, 95-96; Barnett, P. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1997, 196-199.

term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16 as a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. Paul's line of thought was governed by the κάλυμμα theme, which provided him with enough leverage to conceptualise the term κύριος in the context of the Exod 34 source as referring to the κύριος as the spirit. The mediating character of the term χριστός is again put to the fore in 2 Cor 3:4 and clearly also deducible from the 'epistle' metaphor, namely that one is an epistle of χριστός.

4.2.19 2 Corinthians 4

This is one of the very few chapters in the Pauline Literature where Jesus, together with the term θεός, is the dominating acting agent. There are nine references to Jesus spread over five verses, while the term θεός is used in eight cases spread over five verses. The term χριστός is used in three verses with the term κύριος employed in two instances only. The 'general' expected use of the term κύριος is followed. It is used in association with either Jesus (2 Cor 4:14) or Jesus as the χριστός (2 Cor 4:5). The use of the Χριστός and θεός in the phrase τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ enforces the close conceptual relation between these two terms. Moreover, the 'mediating' character underlying the term χριστός is yet again confirmed.¹⁶⁶ The use of the term Ἰησοῦς, especially in 2 Cor 4:9-14, refers to the earthly Jesus, his life and death. In this chapter Jesus is again presented as the κύριος and χριστός while the concept underlying the θεός appears the originator of the service to proclaim the 'good news', the one who is overseeing that his word comes into fulfilment (2 Cor 4:2-4).

4.2.20 2 Corinthians 5 – 9

The term χριστός and θεός are once more the dominating theological significant acting agents in 2 Corinthians 5 - 9. The term κύριος is used in only nine instances, two of which occur in 2 Cor 6:14 – 7:1. Due to a reasonable amount of consensus that the latter is *post*-Pauline, the two references will not be considered here – thus implying that the term κύριος is effectively used seven times in 2 Corinthians 5 - 9. Moreover, an alternative reading for the term κύριος is suggested in 2 Cor 8:5b. The text reading is supported by codex \aleph and B, while \wp ⁴⁶ propose reading the term θεός in its dative case. The manuscript witness is obviously sufficient to consider altering the text reading, but the vital question is thus to what extent were the scribes influenced by the literary conceptual context when they proposed the alternative reading?

¹⁶⁶ The idea captured in this phrase is repeated in 2 Cor 4:6 (cf. 2 Cor 4:15 with regard to the glory of θεός), while adding Jesus to this concept.

Second, and just as important, why is the κύριος reading considered to be a more suitable term? If the scribes approached this reading from a thematical point of view, and if they added a broad conceptual overview of how δίδωμι should be used, an argument would be that the New Testament never hints in the direction of the term κύριος in the act of δίδωμι. To limit the discussion to the Pauline literature, it becomes apparent that the act of δίδωμι is only associated with the term θεός (cf. Rom 4:20; Rom 14:12), or where θεός is the acting subject acting out the act of giving towards ‘them’ (cf. Rom 11:8 and 1 Cor 15:38). The term κύριος refers to as the one who is acting out δίδωμι (cf. 1 Cor 3:5; 2 Cor 10:8; 2 Cor 13:10).

Inferred from such a thematical approach, it is plausible to read the term θεός when dealing with the direction of δίδωμι, as is the case in 2 Cor 8:5b. Conceptually then, the terms κύριος and θεός in its sequence in 2 Cor 8:5, makes perfect sense. Paul’s conceptual context could be inferred to as follows:

- και οὐ καθὼς ἠλπίζαμεν – it is more than what we hoped for;
- κύριος ἀλλὰ ἑαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ κυρίῳ και ἡμῖν - but they first gave themselves to κύριος and then to us ;
- διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ - through the will of θεός.

Clearly Paul interprets ‘giving themselves’ first to κύριος and then to them positively—which implies that κύριος is the higher authority to whom one should submit, while Paul and his fellow workers should be regarded as secondary authorities. An even higher authority, it seems, is θεός—the one who wanted this to occur. The latter literary conceptual context of θεός fits well into Pauline thought (cf. Rom 15:13; 1 Cor 1:1 and 2 Cor 1:1 in terms of the will of θεός). If one considers this texts critical discrepancy with that noted in 2 Cor 8:21, it becomes evident that the scribes responsible for P⁴⁶ were consistent in opting for the term θεός as opposed to the term κύριος. On the other hand, codex 8 and B are in turn also consistent in reading the term κύριος. Interesting is the fact that in both cases (2 Cor 8:5 and 2 Cor 8:21) the position relative to κύριος is to be ‘before’ (ἐνώπιον – preposition, genitive) κύριος. The latter would imply that the intent of the scribes to alternate the κύριος with the term is purely based on the fact that the preposition ἐνώπιον involves a certain submissive character of the one before whom he resides, while ἐνώπιον would, for the scribes of P⁴⁶, entail a certain statue of the one before whom one resides. What would be necessary is to investigate how P⁴⁶ in its entirety utilised the preposition ἐνώπιον relative to both the term

κύριος and θεός. Although necessary, such an investigation is beyond the scope of this study. The reason for the alternative readings in 2 Cor 8:5 and 2 Cor 8:21 are in no way certain, although a strong case can be made towards the alternative readings proposed by P⁴⁶. The term κύριος is further used in this discussion of being either away from κύριος or being with him (2 Cor 5:6, 8). Moreover, it is stated that the φόβον of κύριος is well known (2 Cor 5:11). His grace is also known (2 Cor 8:9), the one deserving of glory (2 Cor 8:19). There is no reference made to any term κύριος in chapter nine, the latter which stimulates the thought that in these chapters, the author intended to use the term θεός as the primary acting agent (cf. 2 Cor 5:1-6:7; 2 Cor 7:6-12; 2 Cor 9:7-15) and therefore that P⁴⁶ (in the case of 2 Cor 8:5 and 2 Cor 8:21) attests to the ‘original’ reading.

The term θεός is introduced with the concept οικοδομῆν ἐκ θεοῦ ἔχομεν – having the building of *Theos* (2 Cor 5:1). *Theos* is also the one who prepared them (the followers of Christ) for the change from an earthly house to the building of *Theos* (2 Cor 5:5). *Theos* is also the one responsible for the ‘new’ life (2 Cor 17-18) followed by the concept of reconciliation with θεός in and through χριστός (2 Cor 5:18-21). *Theos* is the one motivating, calling one to rise up (2 Cor 7), but according to Paul θεός is also the one who causes irritation (2 Cor 7:9, 10). A concept that we are used to is that θεός offers grace, is well known in these chapters (cf. 2 Cor 6:1; 2 Cor 8:1, 16; 2 Cor 9:14, 15), the powerful one (2 Cor 6:7; 2 Cor 9:8) who wills for something (2 Cor 8:5); the one to whom one should extend gratitude and praise (2 Cor 9:11, 12, 13). The closeness of the terms χριστός and θεός is again observable (cf. 2 Cor 5:13-21 and 2 Cor 9:10-15). Moreover, the concept that θεός mediates through χριστός is again attested in these chapters. The literary conceptual context (2 Cor 5–2 Cor 9) thus confirms that θεός refers to the monotheistic Hebrew deity, while χριστός as an entity does not refer to Jesus as the κύριος, but a being that has transcended, a being to whom honour can also be bestowed (2 Cor 8:23). The term κύριος however, would be the term used that would call Jesus as the κύριος to mind.

4.2.21 2 Corinthians 10

4.2.21.1 2 Corinthians 10:17

The cited text in 2 Cor 10:17 (cf. 1 Cor 1:31) is in no way certain, but it is considered to be reasonably plausible that the cited content in 2 Cor 10:17 could have been taken from Jer

9:23a, or at least the construction thereof. The significance of the cited text is that Paul reads the term κύριος in its dative case, with no OT manuscript supporting such reading.

Literary comparison (2 Cor 10:17 and Jer 9:23a)		
NA ²⁷ (2 Cor 10:17)	LXX ^{Göt} (Jer 9:23a)	MT ^{BHS} (Jer 9:23a)
	ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ	תְּיָאֵם בְּאֵלֶיךָ
Ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω.	καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος	הֲלֵלְךָ הַמְהִלְךָ הַשֵּׁבִלִי

GREEK TEXT WITNESSES		HEBREW TEXT WITNESSES	
NT		OT	
ⲡ ⁴⁶	Ⲱ, B	S A B	Cod ^{Len}
κω	Κω	-	-

As per the discussion on the citation in 1 Cor 1:31, it is argued that Paul was influenced by his literary source context when he decided on utilising the term κύριος in this regard. Although the phrase Ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω· varies from its constructed *Vorlage*, it does make sense to read ἐν κυρίῳ if the source context read ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος. In both these phrases it is implied that boasting should be directed towards ἐν κυρίῳ (2 Cor 10:17) and ἐν τούτῳ (Jer 9:23a) – the latter which refers to ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος (Jer 9:23b). Within the confines of the literary conceptual context it is indeed plausible to assume that the ἐν κυρίῳ reading was influenced by such a context, which influenced the use of the κύριος term in 2 Cor 10:18. This does not necessitate that Paul considered or conceptualised the term κύριος utilised in the thought-context of Jer 9 as representing the Tetragram or the Hebrew deity for that matter. It is, however, more probable that the concept underlying the term κύριος in 2 Cor 10:17 is Jesus as χριστός and κύριος.

~ A theological conceptual problem ~

This cited text is taken up into the literary conceptual context dominated by the term χριστός. The term occurs five times, being spread over four verses, with the term θεός occurring in three verses, and the same being true for the term κύριος. To reiterate, it was concluded that the term κύριος in 1 Cor 1:31, also citing Jer 9:23a, does not appear to share the same referent

as the term θεός. The question would be if Paul is consistent—not necessarily in applying the citation, but being consistent with regard to the conceptualisation of the term in relation to the term θεός and χριστός in particular. The first question that requires attention is: how did Paul conceptualise the term χριστός? Paul calls for the humility and fairness of χριστός (2 Cor 10:1), that every thought is made obedient to χριστός (2 Cor 10:5). In 2 Cor 10:8, χριστός is used in connection with those who belong to him, while Paul visited them with the gospel of χριστός (2 Cor 10:14). Paul clearly states, with regard to the term θεός, that they have the ability in θεός to destroy any opposition. They even have the ability to remove the arguments used against the knowledge of θεός (2 Cor 10:4-5). Paul and his co-workers' boasting is also limited to the field or measure assigned to them by θεός (2 Cor 10:13).

Paul employs the term κύριος when he speaks of boasting about the authority given to them by κύριος. He continues using the term κύριος when arguing along similar lines in 2 Cor 10:17. Paul makes it clear that they do not want to boast about work done in another man's territory (2 Cor 10:16), after which he reconfirms that if one has to boast, one should boast in κύριος (2 Cor 10:17).¹⁶⁷ Paul then argues that it is not the one who commends himself who will be approved, but the one commended by κύριος (2 Cor 10:18). As in 1 Cor 1:31, Paul does not seem to regard the term κύριος in 2 Cor 10:17 as referring to anyone other than to whom the κύριος term in 2 Cor 10:18 and 2 Cor 10:17 refers to—being Jesus as the χριστός. For Paul the referent of the term κύριος in 2 Cor 10:17 is the same as the term κύριος in 2 Cor 10:8; the one who provided the authority. Paul is thus consistent in applying the concept underlying the term κύριος throughout the Corinthian correspondence. For Paul the concept underlying the term θεός remains the monotheistic Hebrew deity. Finally, the term χριστός again appears to be functioning not merely as mediator or as a term referring to Jesus. The term χριστός seems to designate an entity with a different state of being in comparison to the entity the term κύριος refers to. The referent of the term κύριος is not assimilated into the 'being' represented by the term θεός. Formulated differently Paul makes a distinction between Jesus as the κύριος and Jesus as the χριστός. This distinction appears to be far more extreme compared to the distinction between the terms θεός and χριστός. The latter two terms thus appear conceptually closer to one another.

¹⁶⁷ A similar concept adopted in 2 Cor 10:8.

4.3 SUMMARY

The *theos*, *kyrios* and *christos* concepts in the first and second Corinthian correspondence, correlate, with regard to entity reference, in essence with the concepts presented in the Romans epistle. It would be fair to surmise that Paul's concept of the Hebrew deity, as portrayed by these terms within the respective literary conceptual context, is less coherent in the Corinthian correspondence compared to the Romans epistle. Moreover, the extent of Paul's distinction between the concept underlying the terms θεός, κύριος and χριστός appears more severe in comparison to the Romans epistle. Deduced from the literary conceptual context, Jesus as the κύριος (apart from the introductory phrases) is not used as often and the Jesus-*kyrios*-concept seems to function on a different frequency as does the χριστός. The latter is functionally conceptual, not only being mediator between the believers and θεός, but this referent appears more independent compared to Jesus as the *kyrios*. The so-called independent use of the term κύριος, in most cases, would call the Tetragram to mind. This seems at least true for Paul.

4.3.1 Proposed Solution: *Theological Conceptual Problems*

The explicit κύριος citation (Jer 9:22a) attested in 1 Cor 1:31 and 2 Cor 10:17 refers, in both cases, to Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος. Even though the χριστός-θεός concept in the first chapter dominates, thematically and literary logically speaking, the term κύριος in 1 Cor 1:31 could not refer to any other entity than Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος (1 Cor 1:10; 1 Cor 1:30). Although not as distinctive as in 1 Cor 1:31, 2 Cor 10:17 would share such a sentiment. The *theos*-concept in chapter two remains unchanged; with this term the Hebrew deity proper is called to memory for Paul and most probably his audience as well. The explicit κύριος citation in 1 Cor 2:9 and 1 Cor 2:16a could not refer to any other entity than Jesus as the χριστός (1 Cor 2:2 and 1 Cor 2:16b). The term κύριος is clearly referring to a different entity than the term θεός – especially the referent of the term θεός in 1 Cor 2:9.

The term κύριος attested in the explicit citation in 1 Cor 3:20 does not seem to refer to the same entity as the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5. The latter is conceptually closer to the term χριστός (1 Cor 3:1, 11, 23). There is a clear distinction between the referent of the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:5 and the term θεός in 1 Cor 3:6ff. Such a distinction should not be inferred between the term θεός in 1 Cor 3:19 and the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20. The θεός term refers to the Hebrew deity proper, while the term κύριος in 1 Cor 3:20 is a reproduction of the Tetragram, thus the personal Hebrew deity. A similar conclusion could be drawn from 1 Cor

10:26. The term κύριος in the explicit citation does hold the likely potential to be a Greek equivalent for the Tetragram. Moreover, it appears to be plausible that Paul not only used the term but he also adopted the underlying concept, which implies that with the term κύριος Paul intended to call the personal Hebrew deity to mind and not Jesus as the κύριος. The term κύριος in 2 Cor 3:16 and the underlying concept is that of the personal Hebrew deity, the Tetragram, allegorically interpreted as the spirit. The κύριος terms in 2 Cor 3:17-18 thus refers to the same entity, while the mediating character of the term χριστός is again emphasised. The term θεός remains undisputedly a reference to the monotheistic Hebrew deity.

4.3.2 Proposed solution: *A Translation, Transmission and Theological Conceptual Problem*

Finally, the explicit citation assigned to λέγει κύριος poses a few problems. The fact that Paul regarded the explicit citation, taken from Is 28:11ff, as words spoken by κύριος, implies that a.) he had to be influenced by his text *Vorlage* and b.) he considered the term κύριος as a referent for the Tetragram. This is the same entity implied by the phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor 10:36) and κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή (1 Cor 10:37). The translation problem has no impact on Paul's conceptual process in this regard. The content of the 'word', 'that which is spoken'; the 'utterance of language', a 'prophecy', that which is 'commanded', are concepts that were assigned to the term κύριος as in the Tetragram, who is the θεός. Jesus as the χριστός and κύριος appears not relevant for the discussion in chapter 14.