

The Divine Name in the New Testament: Tetragrammaton or Surrogate?

A. Tim Span

 orcid.org/0000-0002-5966-5854

Thesis submitted for the degree *Philosophiae Doctor* in New
Testament at the North-West University

Promoter: Dr Stuart T. Rochester

Co-Promoter: Prof Dr Fika Janse van Rensburg

Graduation: July 2018

Student number: 24726540



Abstract:

George Howard has proposed a theory with far reaching Christological implications. Howard notes that a few pre-Christian LXX/OG manuscripts have the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters or in Greek transliteration. From this Howard argues that the New Testament writers also had access to manuscripts of the LXX/OG with the Divine Name in them and used the Tetragrammaton in their New Testament writings. Howard marshals external and internal evidence to corroborate his theory.

The original shape of the LXX/OG has some relevance to Howard's hypothesis. If the Tetragrammaton is original to the LXX/OG this would have a bearing on the question of whether the New Testament also followed in this pattern. This thesis examines the LXX/OG manuscripts: P. Rylands Gk. 458, P. Fouad Inv. 266, 8HevXIIgr, and pap4QLXXLev^b. Of these, it is found that only pap4QLXXLev^b can be considered a true exemplar of the LXX/OG. The Tetragrammaton appears to be a secondary Hebraizing element in the manuscripts 8HevXIIgr and P. Fouad Inv. 266. There is a lacuna in P. Rylands Gk. 458 which could fit the Tetragrammaton or just as likely κύριος.

In parallel the testimony of the Greek biblical use of surrogates for the Divine Name in Second Temple literature is examined. A distinctive pattern appears in the works of Philo and other writings contemporaneous with the New Testament. Reverence for the Tetragrammaton in Second Temple Judaism expressed itself in avoidance of the Divine Name in spoken and written form. The surrogate κύριος is regularly used as a substitute for the Tetragrammaton.

Howard presents a series of New Testament passages as partial proof that the Tetragrammaton stood in the original manuscripts of the New Testament. According to Howard, with the success of the Gentile mission, understanding of the Tetragrammaton diminished and unknowing second-

century scribes replaced the Divine Name with the substitute κύριος. The result was that passages that applied to YHWH could now be applied to Jesus. The Christological implication is that some honors that belonged to the Lord God were mistakenly ascribed to the Lord Jesus.

The New Testament use of the surrogate κύριος in Old Testament quotations where the Hebrew has the Tetragrammaton follows largely the pattern found in other biblical Second Temple literature. The emerging picture is not an artificial elevation of Jesus through scribal corruption. The use of κύριος in relation to Jesus is early, deliberate, and involving honors of the highest order. Various New Testament examples demonstrate the deliberate referential and titular overlap between the Lord Jesus and the Lord God. The examples that Howard provides as evidence are proven inadequate to support his theory.

This thesis also examines the age and relevance of the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew found in the polemical work *Even Bohan* (אבן בוהן, “The Touchstone”) by Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut and its possible contribution to Howard’s theory.

In the end, this thesis demonstrates that the Christological importance of using κύριος for the Tetragrammaton in relation to Jesus Christ has far-reaching implications.

Keywords:

George Howard, Tetragrammaton, Divine Name, YHWH, Lord, κύριος, *kurios*, *kyrios*, Shem Tob

Opsomming:

George Howard het 'n teorie voorgestel met verreikende Christologiese implikasies. Howard wys daarop dat 'n paar voor-Christelike LXX / OG-manuskripte die Tetragrammaton in Hebreeuse karakters of in Griekse transliterasie bevat. Op grond hiervan argumenteer Howard dat die Nuwe-Testamentiese outeurs ook tot manuskripte van die LXX / OG wat die Goddelike Naam bevat, toegang gehad het, en dat hulle die Tetragrammaton in hulle Nuwe-Testamentiese geskrifte gebruik het. Howard benut eksterne en interne getuienis om sy teorie te begrond.

Die oorspronklike vorm van die LXX / OG het 'n mate van relevansie vir Howard se hipotese. As die Tetragrammaton inderdaad oorspronklik in die LXX / OG was, sou dit 'n implikasie hê vir die vraag of die Nuwe Testament hierdie gebruik nagevolg het. Hierdie proefskrif ondersoek die volgende LXX / OG manuskripte: P. Rylands Gk. 458, P. Fouad Inv. 266, 8 HevXIIgr, en pap4QLXXLev^b. Slegs pap4QLXXLev^b kan egter as 'n egte weergawe van die LXX / OG beskou word. Dit blyk dat die Tetragrammaton in die manuskripte 8 HevXIIgr en P. Fouad Inv. 266 'n sekondêre verhebbreusing is. Daar is 'n lacuna in P. Rylands Gk. 458 wat óf die Tetragrammaton óf κύριος kan wees.

Insgelyks word die getuienis van die Griekse Bybelse gebruik van surrogate vir die Goddelike Naam in die Tweede Tempel-literatuur ondersoek. In die werke van Philo en ander geskrifte kontemporêr met die Nuwe Testament blyk 'n eiesoortige verskynsel. Eerbied vir die Tetragrammaton in Tweede Tempel Judaïsme het tot gevolg die vermyding van die Goddelike Naam in gesproke en geskrewe vorm. Die surrogaat κύριος word gereeld as plaasvervanger vir die Tetragrammaton gebruik.

Howard toon 'n reeks Nuwe-Testamentiese gedeeltes aan as gedeeltelike bewys dat die Tetragrammaton in die oorspronklike manuskripte van die Nuwe Testament was. Volgens Howard het begrip van die Tetragrammaton verminder namate die sending na die Heidene

suksesvol was, en dit het tot gevolg gehad dat onkundige tweede eeuse oorskrywers die Goddelike Naam met κύριος vervang het. Die gevolg was dat gedeeltes wat op YHWH van toepassing was, nou op Jesus toegepas kon word. Die Christologiese implikasie is dat sommige eerbetonings wat op die Here God van toepassing was, verkeerdelik toegeskryf is aan die Here Jesus.

Die Nuwe Testament se gebruik van die surrogaat κύριος in Ou-Testamentiese aanhalings waar die Hebreeus die Tetragrammaton het, volg grootliks dieselfde werkwyse as ander Bybelse Tweede Tempel-literatuur. Wat algaande duidelik word, is dat daar geen sprake is van kunsmatige verheffing van Jesus as gevolg van oorskryffoute nie. Die gebruik van κύριος met verwysing na Jesus is vroeg, berekend en dit behels die hoogste vorms van eerbetoning. Verskeie Nuwe-Testamentiese voorbeelde laat die berekende verwysings- en titeloorvleueling tussen die Here Jesus en die Here God blyk. Daar word aangetoon dat die voorbeelde wat Howard as bewys aanvoer, onvoldoende is om sy teorie te ondersteun.

Laastens ondersoek die proefskrif die ouderdom en relevansie van die Hebreeuse Evangelie van Matteus wat deel uitmaak van die polemiese werk *Even Bohan* (אבן ברוחן, "Die toetssteen") deur Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut, asook dié Evangelie se moontlike bydrae tot Howard se teorie.

Uiteindelik is die gevolgtrekking dat die Christologiese belangrikheid van die gebruik van κύριος vir die Tetragrammaton met verwysing na Jesus Christus verreikende implikasies het.

Sleutelwoorde:

George Howard, Tetragrammaton, Goddelike Naam, YHWH, Here, κύριος, *kurios*, *kyrios*, Shem Tob

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background and State of Research	1
1.2 Problem Statement.....	3
1.3 Aim	4
1.4 Objectives	4
1.5 Central Theoretical Argument	4
1.6 Methodology.....	5
1.7 Schematic Presentation of Research Questions, Objectives, and Methods.....	6
2.0 The Tetragrammaton in LXX/OG Manuscripts	7
2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Pre-Christian LXX/OG Manuscripts	7
2.3 Hebraizing in LXX/OG Manuscripts.....	10
2.4 Conclusion	18
3.0 Attitudes Toward the Divine Name in Second Temple Judaism ..	21
3.1 Introduction.....	21
3.2 Divine Name Avoidance in the LXX/OG	21
3.3 Divine Name Avoidance Among the Rabbis	22
3.4 Divine Name Avoidance in Qumran and Masada.....	24
3.5 Surrogates for the Divine Name in Philo.....	29
3.6 Surrogates for the Divine Name in Josephus.....	35
3.7 Surrogates for the Divine Name in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	36
3.8 Conclusion	39
4.0 The Tetragrammaton in the New Testament	41
4.1 Introduction.....	41
4.2 New Testament Manuscripts and the Tetragrammaton.....	42
4.3 New Testament Quotations and the Apostolic Fathers	47
4.4 The New Testament and the Rabbis	51
4.5 The New Testament and the <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	52

Table of Contents (Continued)

4.6 Conclusion	53
5.0 The Use and Significance of Surrogates for the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament.....	55
5.1 Introduction.....	55
5.2 Maranatha	56
5.2.1 מרָא as a Name for God.....	56
5.2.2 Maranatha in Early Christian Literature.....	58
5.2.3 Maranatha Word Division	58
5.2.4 Maranatha in Devotional Practice	61
5.3 Revised <i>Shema</i>	62
5.3.1 Context.....	63
5.3.2 Corinthian Monotheism.....	64
5.3.3 <i>Shema</i> Redefined	69
5.3.4 Christ and Creation	71
5.3.5 Christological Monotheism	77
5.4 Call on the Name of the Lord	81
5.4.1 Old Testament Background.....	82
5.4.2 New Testament Examples	91
5.4.2.1 Acts	91
5.4.2.1.1 Jesus and the Spirit.....	97
5.4.2.1.2 Jesus on the Divine Throne	98
5.4.2.1.3 Jesus, Salvation, and the Divine Name	101
5.4.2.2 Romans	110
5.4.2.3 1 Corinthians	126
5.4.2.4 2 Timothy	127
5.5 Name above Every Name	128
5.5.1 Pre-existence.....	131
5.5.2 Exaltation.....	142
5.6 YHWH Passages in Paul	150
5.6.1 Boast in the Lord	150

Table of Contents (Continued)

5.6.2 Mind of the Lord.....	158
5.6.3 The Earth is the Lord's	163
5.7 YHWH Passages in the Gospels.....	167
5.7.1 Isaiah 40:3 in Context.....	168
5.7.2 Isaiah 40:3 in the Gospels.....	171
5.8 YHWH Passages in the Rest of the New Testament.....	181
5.8.1 The Goodness of the Lord	182
5.8.2 The Righteous Deliverance of the Lord	189
5.9 Conclusion	195
6.0 Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew	197
6.1 Introduction to Shem-Tob and Hebrew Matthew.....	197
6.2 Dating Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew.....	204
6.3 Conclusion	208
7.0 The Two Lords in the New Testament.....	211
7.1 Introduction.....	211
7.2 Romans 10:16-17.....	211
7.3 Romans 14:10-11.....	214
7.4 1 Corinthians 10:9.....	217
7.5 Jude 5	221
7.5 Conclusion	227
8.0 Conclusion.....	229
9.0 Abbreviations	235
10.0 Bibliography	239

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background and State of Research

In 1977 George Howard published a theory which has exerted some influence in the areas of New Testament and LXX studies (e.g., Howard, 1992c [ABD s.v. “Tetragrammaton in the New Testament”]; Trobisch, 2000). Howard argues that the text of the New Testament has experienced a systematic scribal corruption with far-reaching textual and Christological implications. According to Howard, the writers of the New Testament regularly used the Tetragrammaton in their quotations of the Old Testament. With the progress of the Gentile mission, Christian scribes, unfamiliar with the significance of the Tetragrammaton, rendered the Divine Name with the surrogate κύριος and sometimes θεός. The resultant situation was that now both Lord God and Lord Jesus Christ shared the title κύριος (“Lord”) and in many situations were no longer easily distinguished. The ramifications for Howard are clear: the high Christology of the New Testament was due more to the scribal convention of the first and second centuries than to the original New Testament writings. Even the Christological controversies of the following centuries may have looked quite different if the Tetragrammaton had been used exclusively of the God of Israel and not of Jesus Christ.

Responses to Howard have been for the most part cursory. Albert Pietersma (1984) writes more extensively but not specifically from the perspective of the New Testament. Pietersma argues that the original LXX used κύριος to render the Hebrew Tetragrammaton. Even though the earliest manuscripts of the LXX/OG have some form of the Tetragrammaton inserted into the Greek texts, Pietersma contends that the Tetragrammaton was hardly original but represented the archaizing tendencies of scribes in the Second Temple period. Often researchers who respond to Howard do so by referencing Pietersma’s article (e.g., McDonough, 1999:59-60; Hurtado, 2003:182 n.47).

If, as Pietersma contends, the Divine Name was first rendered with κύριος in the original LXX text, then this strengthens the likelihood that the New Testament use of κύριος is also original but this is not a *fait accompli*. Even with this support from the LXX/OG text, the New Testament writers may have been dependent on LXX/OG texts that used the Tetragrammaton. For this reason, the focus needs to widen to include a fuller spectrum of data. What is needed and is lacking in the evaluation of Howard's thesis is a more comprehensive study of the use of the Divine Name and surrogates in the Second Temple period. Bauckham (1990:296 n. 40), for example, notes the lacuna that exists in the study of the Divine Name and surrogates in the Pseudepigrapha. More research is needed about the literature and writings contemporaneous with the New Testament, how they approach the Divine Name and their use of surrogates.

Since Howard deals mainly with the New Testament text and its transmission, the bulk of the inquiry will deal with that subject area. Little has been written on the specific New Testament examples which Howard suggests originally contained the Tetragrammaton. Howard marshals both external and internal evidence to support the Tetragrammaton hypothesis. The testimony of the New Testament manuscript tradition is of primary importance. Some scholars will rest only on the testimony of the extant New Testament manuscripts to settle the issue of the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament. However, much more can be brought to bear on this question from the internal New Testament evidence as well. In the extant manuscripts of the New Testament, κύριος is a key term and is used frequently when referring to the Divine Name. It would be a fruitful inquiry to carry out a thorough investigation of the use of this term and its place in New Testament Christology.

Howard has also made a unique contribution to knowledge with his publication of a little-known Hebrew version of Matthew preserved in the medieval Hebrew treatise *Even Bohan* ("Touchstone") by fourteenth

century Jewish polemicist Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut. In a number of articles (1986a, 1986b, 1986c, 1988a, 1988b, 1989, 1992a, 1992b, 1994, 1998, 1999) and a critical edition (1987, 1995), Howard claims that Shem-Tob's Matthew contains readings that reach back to the earliest centuries of the Christian era. Of special interest for this study is the use of the Divine Name in abbreviated form found in Shem-Tob's Gospel. If Howard is correct in his analysis, Shem-Tob's Matthew may contain very early and weighty evidence in the Divine Name discussion.

1.2 Problem Statement

How valid is George Howard's claim that the Tetragrammaton was used in the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament and what is the nature and significance of the use of the Divine Name or its surrogates in the New Testament?

Questions arising from this research problem:

- a. Is there substantial evidence that the LXX/OG originally contained the Tetragrammaton in written or phonetic form, or was the addition of the Tetragrammaton part of a Hebraising tendency among scribes?
- b. Was there a tendency to use surrogates like κύριος for the Divine Name in Second Temple Judaism? Could this account for the New Testament usage?
- c. What is the evidence that the New Testament originally contained references to the Tetragrammaton?
- d. What is the evidence that the New Testament authors originally used a surrogate like κύριος for the Divine Name?
- e. Does the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, preserved in the work of Shem-Tob, furnish evidence that the canonical writer originally used the Tetragrammaton?

- f. What is the significance of the New Testament use of κύριος when referring to YHWH and Jesus? How does the overlapping use of κύριος contribute to the high Christology of earliest Christianity?

1.3 Aim

The central aim of this study is to establish the validity of George Howard's thesis that the Tetragrammaton was originally used in the New Testament manuscripts and to elucidate the significance of the findings for New Testament Christology.

1.4 Objectives

The objectives of this project are:

- a. To investigate the scribal habits of the early LXX copyists in regard to the Divine Name.
- b. To investigate the attitudes toward the Divine Name in Second Temple Judaism and toward the use of surrogates.
- c. To investigate the use of the Divine Name in the New Testament.
- d. To investigate the use of κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name in the New Testament.
- e. To investigate the claim that Shem-Tob's Matthew furnishes evidence that the canonical writer originally used the Tetragrammaton.
- f. To investigate the New Testament use of κύριος with reference to YHWH and to Jesus.

1.5 Central Theoretical Argument

The central theoretical argument of this study is that likely the surrogate κύριος and not the Tetragrammaton originally rendered the Divine Name in the New Testament and that this phenomenon may have

great significance for the Christology of the New Testament. The use of κύριος for both Lords creates a conceptual and titular overlap between the Lord Jesus Christ and the Lord God of Israel—and this may have been by design.

1.6 Methodology

This study is being done from within the Protestant tradition and specifically from within the Evangelical branch. I agree with the major creeds of historic Christianity such as the Apostles Creed and the Nicene Creed and the basic tenants of the Reformation, *inter alia*: *sola scriptura* and *sola fide*. It is understood that all scripture is “God-breathed” (2 Tim. 3:16) and as such is a record of God’s revelation both through the written Word and living Word. I endorse the basic “perspicuity of Scripture” but without suggesting that the meaning of those ancient texts are effortlessly understood. There is a sense in which our knowledge is provisional yet sufficient. There are “two horizons” of understanding and the prepared reader must understand first what the text meant to its author before any meaningful application is made.

In general the methodology to be used follows from the tools of grammatical-historical exegesis (Martin, 1977:222) and philology. Much of the inquiry will involve extensive analysis and interpretation of the relevant literature available in print and in digital form.

1.7 Schematic Presentation of Research Questions, Objectives, and Methods

Research Question	Aim and Objective	Method
Is there substantial evidence that the LXX/OG originally contained the Tetragrammaton in written or phonetic form, or was the addition of the Tetragrammaton part of a Hebraising tendency among scribes?	To investigate the scribal habits of the early LXX/OG copyists in regard to the Divine Name.	Text critical observation and philological analysis.
Was there a tendency to use surrogates like κύριος for the Divine Name in Second Temple Judaism? Could this account for the New Testament usage?	To investigate the attitudes toward the Divine Name in Second Temple Judaism and toward the use of surrogates.	Historical and textual analysis of available literature.
What is the evidence that the New Testament originally contained references to the Tetragrammaton?	To investigate the use of the Divine Name in the New Testament.	Text critical observation and philological analysis.
What is the evidence that the New Testament authors originally used a surrogate like κύριος for the Divine Name?	To investigate the use of κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name in the New Testament.	Philological analysis and grammatical-historical exegesis.
Does the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew preserved in the work of Shem-Tob furnish evidence that the canonical writer originally used the Tetragrammaton?	To investigate the claim that Shem-Tob's Matthew furnishes evidence that the canonical writer originally used the Tetragrammaton.	Historical and textual analysis of available literature.
What is the significance of the New Testament use of κύριος when referring to YHWH and Jesus? How does the overlapping use of κύριος contribute to the high Christology of earliest Christianity?	To investigate the New Testament use of κύριος with reference to YHWH and to Jesus.	Philological analysis and grammatical-historical exegesis with theological application.

2.0 The Tetragrammaton in LXX/OG Manuscripts

2.1 Introduction

Manuscript discoveries in the Judean Desert and in Egypt in the last century have stimulated renewed discussion since the last quarter of the previous century about the original shape of the LXX/OG in pre-Christian times. George Howard (1977) examines four significant pre-Christian LXX/OG manuscripts and their unique renderings of the Divine Name. From this he lays the groundwork for his Tetragrammaton thesis.

It is undoubtedly true that the landscape has changed and assumptions drawn from the largely Christian transmission of the LXX must be revisited in light of the latest textual evidence. For Howard (1977), the testimony is clear: the earliest witnesses have some form of the Divine Name in them, and this new reality must inform LXX studies on the use of the Divine Name in the Second Temple period. If the New Testament writers had access to Greek Old Testament manuscripts with the Divine Name in them, it is not impossible that the Tetragrammaton was originally preserved in the New Testament documents as well.

2.2 Pre-Christian LXX/OG Manuscripts

I will introduce the LXX/OG manuscripts in the order in which Howard treats them. The first manuscript is also the oldest extant LXX/OG text: P. Rylands Gk. 458. This papyrus manuscript from the John Rylands Library contains Greek portions from Deuteronomy 23-28. In total, there are some 100 words or parts of words (Wevers, 1977b:241). C.H. Roberts (1936:24) dated the manuscript to the second century BC. There is some question why this manuscript appears in the treatment of the Divine Name when there are no instances of the Tetragrammaton in the surviving fragments. There is a lacuna at Deuteronomy 26:18 where κύριος is found in the latter LXX codices as a surrogate for the Divine

Name. Judging from the size of the lacuna, Roberts conjectured that the missing word would have been about the size of κύριος in overall length. It is Paul Kahle (1959:222) who adds that the size of the gap would fit the Tetragrammaton written in Hebrew characters equally well. Kahle has seen the Tetragrammaton in other manuscripts and surmises that this manuscript written by Jews for Jews would have likely rendered the Divine Name in this way. Thus Kahle uses the testimony of other manuscripts to conjecture that the Divine Name was written without a surrogate in this manuscript. This conclusion presupposes more than the evidence requires. The only thing that can be determined is that the lacuna is too large for a *nomen sacrum* like $\overline{\text{KTC}}$ but could easily have contained κύριος written in full. In the end, I agree with Albert Pietersma (1984:92) that this manuscript without instances of the Divine Name should not be used to argue for an original Tetragrammaton in the LXX/OG.

Another manuscript of great significance for the study of the LXX/OG is P. Fouad Inv. 266. This papyrus roll consists of three manuscripts, namely, 942, 847 and 848, and it is only 848 which contains the Divine Name written in Hebrew (Aramaic) characters. MS 848 is dated to the first century BC (Wevers, 1978:64) and contains substantial portions of text from Deuteronomy 17-33. In total there are thirty-one instances of the Tetragrammaton written in square Hebrew script in the surviving fragments (Metzger, 1981:34). Aly and Koenen (1980:5-6) describes the scribal process in which the Tetragrammaton was added: "...the original scribe left a blank equal to 5-6 letter widths (i.e. about the size of κύριος written in full) and marked it by a high dot at its beginning. A second scribe filled in the Hebrew letters. They cover only the middle of the blank, usually the space of 2½ - 3 letters."

In 1952 fragments of a leather roll of the Twelve Minor Prophets in Greek were discovered in a cave in Naḥal Ḥever in the Judean Desert. C. H. Roberts in conversation with P. Kahle (1956:113) dates the manuscript

8HevXIIgr to between 50 BC and AD 50. In contrast to P. Fouad Inv. 266, the Tetragrammaton is here preserved in paleo-Hebrew characters. According to Tov (1990:12), MS 8HevXIIgr was written by two different scribes: A and B. There are twenty-four examples of the Tetragrammaton fully or partially preserved from hand A and four from hand B (Tov 1990:12). In P. Fouad Inv. 266, it is likely that a second scribe wrote the Divine Name in Aramaic script signalled by a raised dot and a blank space in the manuscript (Aly & Koenen, 1980:5-6). In 8HevXIIgr, however, the same hand that wrote the Greek text also wrote the paleo-Hebrew text without interruption, probably from left to right. This way of writing the Tetragrammaton is not unheard of: the scribe of POxy 3522 wrote the Tetragrammaton from left to right creating a ligature between the initial *yod* and the following Greek letter. Here there is also continuous movement between the *yod* and the following Greek text (Tov, 1990:12).

From Qumran Cave 4 various fragments of biblical manuscripts were discovered and among them one (pap4QLXXLev^b) is noteworthy because of its unique representation of the Tetragrammaton. MS pap4QLXXLev^b dates to the first century BC (Parsons, 1992:10-11) and preserves text from Leviticus 1-5. In total there are two instances of the Divine Name not in Aramaic or paleo-Hebrew script but in Greek as **ΙΑΩ**. In this way the Divine Name was likely transliterated or rendered phonetically. There is a difficulty in rendering the final η in Greek as Williams (1936:267) explains: “[I]t is almost impossible to represent ‘H’ in Greek save by a rough breathing, which is not of much use at the end of a word.” This “trigram” is found in Diodorus Siculus (*Hist.* I, 94) and in onomastic notes on Ezekiel 1:2 and 11:1 in the sixth century parchment of the prophets, Codex Marchalianus (Shaw, 2002:26).

These Greek manuscripts are among the oldest extant testimonies to the LXX/OG and deserve priority in any discussion about the rendering of the Divine Name in pre-Christian times. Howard (1977:65) draws a firm

conclusion from the evidence: “From these findings we can now say with almost absolute certainty that the divine name, יהוה, was not rendered by κύριος in the pre-Christian Greek Bible, as so often has been thought.”

2.3 Hebraizing in LXX/OG Manuscripts

Not all scholars agree with Howard’s conclusion. In particular, Albert Pietersma (1984) argues against the assumption that the older is necessarily the better and that it has *de facto* more claim to being original. Pietersma (1984:88-91) claims that, in reality, the two manuscripts (P. Fouad Inv. 266 and 8HevXIIgr) treated above both evidence Hebraizing corrections and that the Tetragrammaton in the manuscripts is simply evidence of later revision of the text in the direction of the consonantal proto-Masoretic text. For Pietersma (1984), the internal evidence points to κύριος as the original LXX/OG reading and all others are the product of archaizing tendencies already present in Second Temple Judaism.

It is this claim that I would like to explore more fully in an effort to determine if there is evidence of Hebraizing in these manuscripts and also what value can be assigned to the use of the Divine Name transliteration in pap4QLXXLev^b. Since there is no evidence that P. Rylands Gk. 458 preserved the Tetragrammaton, I will begin with the manuscript that is least likely to represent the original LXX/OG: 8HevXIIgr. For comparison, I use Ziegler’s (1984) reconstructed text. A few examples *inter alia* will demonstrate the author/editor’s (hereafter R) tendencies toward the proto-Masoretic text. In Jonah 2:7, the Lexham translators give the following translation of the Greek: “I went down into the earth where its bars are eternal barriers” (Lexham English LXX). Ziegler’s LXX text reads as follows: κατέβην εἰς γῆν, ἥς οἱ μοχλοὶ αὐτῆς κάτοχοι αἰώνιοι. Instead of κάτοχοι (“barriers”), R follows the Hebrew: י/דע/ב with κατ’ ἐμοῦ (“against me” [Tov, 1990:134]). The biblical idiom דעב is typically used with verbs

of “shutting...to shut behind or upon” (BDB, s.v. **בַּעַב**). It can also be used as it is here in Jonah 2:7 without a verb: “the earth’s bars were *upon* me (*about* me)” (BDB, s.v. **בַּעַב**). At the end of that verse there is another example of R following the Hebrew idiom. The LXX renders the Hebrew: **לְעוֹלָם** (“for ever”) with **αἰώνιοι** (“*eternal* barriers”) whereas R renders the preposition **לְ** with **εἰς [αἰῶνα]** where **αἰῶνα** is reconstructed (Tov, 1990:134). Finally, the LXX at Jonah 3:3 reads: **καθὼς ἐλάλησε**, which can be translated, “just as... he had spoken.” R gives a more literal translation of the Hebrew of the MT **כַּדְבַר** with **[κατ]ὰ τὸ ῥῆμα** “according to the word...” (Tov, 1990:151).

In a similar way, R also follows the MT in terms of number. In Jonah 2:4 the literal English translation of the LXX is as follows: “You threw me into the depth of the heart of the sea, and rivers surrounded me” (Lexham English LXX). The MT has the singular **נהר** (“river/stream”). HALOT extends the meaning here to “sea-current” (HALOT, s.v. **נְהַר**). Ziegler uses the plural: **καὶ ποταμοί**, but R follows the Hebrew singular with **[καὶ ποταμ]ὸς** (Tov, 1990:135).

This tendency to follow the Hebrew number is evident in other places as well. In Jonah 2:6 the literal English of the LXX reads: “*Water* is poured over me” (Lexham English LXX). This is the translation of the Greek **περιεχύθη μοι ὕδωρ** (Jon 2:6). The word for “water” is plural in Hebrew (**מים**) and R follows the Hebrew plural with **ὕδατα** instead of **ὕδωρ** (Tov, 1990:135). Again in Jonah 3:10, where the LXX renders the Hebrew singular with a plural, **ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν αὐτῶν τῶν πονηρῶν** (“from their evil ways”), R follows the number of the Hebrew construction:

ם/כרר/מ literally: ἀπὸ τῆς [ὁδο]ῦ αὐτ[ῶν] [τ]ῆς πονηρ[ᾶς] “from their *evil way*” (Tov, 1990:135).

In addition, there are examples of omissions in R that reflect the MT against the LXX. In Jonah 2:3, the LXX has: Ἐβόησα ἐν θλίψει μου πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεόν μου, καὶ εἰσήκουσέ μου (Göttingen LXX): “I cried out in my distress to the Lord, my God, and he heard me” (Lexham English LXX). Instead R omits τὸν θεόν μου corresponding to its absence in the MT (Tov, 1990:148). In Jonah 3:8, R omits λέγοντες reflecting the absence in the MT (Tov, 1990:148). The seemingly redundant wording of the MT at Jonah 3:9 is not reproduced in the LXX rendering: Τίς οἶδεν εἰ μετανοήσει ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἐξ ὀργῆς θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀπολώμεθα; “Who knows whether God will reconsider and turn back from his fierce anger so that we will not perish?” (Lexham English LXX). In this verse the LXX does not translate both instances of the verb שׁוּב in the MT. R, however, renders שׁוּב with ἐπι[σ]τ[ρέψει], and later in the verse the second occurrence is rendered with the same Greek verb again (Tov, 1990:148).

Sometimes R follows the vocalization of the MT against the LXX. In Jonah 2:6, it is evident that the LXX translates the Hebrew with the vowel pointing: ἡῖς instead of the Hebrew הַיַּם. The former can be rendered “end” (HALOT, s.v. הַיַּם) so that the LXX ἄβυσσος ἐκύκλωσέ με ἐσχάτη can be translated: “the abyss surrounds me to the last.” By contrast הַיַּם refers to a “reed”—that is a “water plant” (HALOT, s.v. הַיַּם). This is the meaning of the MT and R shows familiarity with that sense in the doublet: [ἐσχά]τη ἔλος (Tov, 1990:151). Furthermore, in Jonah 4:2, the MT Hebrew is pointed: יְבַרְכֵּי meaning “my word” whereas the LXX renders this

with the same consonantal word but pointed differently: ״דְּבָרַי׳ in the plural, “my words.” R follows the singular reflected in the MT with ὁ λόγος μου (Tov, 1990:151).

These examples—and more could be added—give support to the idea that 8HevXIIgr may be a product of a Hebraizing recension of the LXX/OG towards the consonantal proto-Masoretic text. I agree with Pietersma (1984:89) that this text is not a true exemplar of the LXX, and that the paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton is likely secondary. Just as Aquila attempted to bring the LXX in conformity to the official Rabbinic or Masoretic text, so this is a pre-Christian example of the attempt to rework the Greek Bible toward the early Masoretic text.

The other manuscript that has the Hebrew Tetragrammaton in the Greek text is MS P. Fouad Inv. 266. Pietersma (1984:90) claims that MS P. Fouad Inv. 266 also has revisions toward the MT Hebrew text. Certainly for Pietersma, the presence of the Hebrew Tetragrammaton in a Greek manuscript further solidifies the claim that this manuscript represents an attempt to bring the LXX in line with the proto-Masoretic text. While the corrections toward the Hebrew text are fairly numerous and distinct in 8HevXIIgr, the revisionary work in P. Fouad Inv. 266 is less obvious. In fact, P. Fouad Inv. 266 also has stylistic corrections that show that the scribe was not slavishly bound to the Hebrew idiom like the scribe of 8HevXIIgr. For example, the writer of P. Fouad Inv. 266 omits genitive pronouns, σου at Deuteronomy 17:5, 18:5 (2), 24:10, 28:65, and αὐτοῦ at 19:5,6,11 (presumably) to moderate the liberal use of pronouns in Hebrew in contrast to Greek (Kilpatrick, 1971:223).

Wevers (1978) discusses a few instances where there may be direct influences of the proto-MT. In Deuteronomy 19:10 the LXX uses two negatives in a sentence to capture the meaning of the Hebrew:

<p>LXX (Göttingen): καὶ οὐκ ἐκχυθήσεται αἷμα ἀναίτιον ἐν τῇ γῆ σου, ἧ κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι ἐν κλήρῳ, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐν σοὶ αἵματι ἔνοχος</p>	<p>LXX (English): “and innocent blood shall not be shed in your land, which the Lord your God is giving you as a portion, and there shall not be in you <i>one</i> guilty of bloodshed” (Lexham English LXX)</p>	<p>BHS: ולא ישפך דם נקי בקרב ארצך אשר יהוה אלהיך נתן לך נחלה והיה עליך דמים</p>
--	--	---

In the Hebrew there is only one negative in the verse and the final clause והיה עליך דמים is also negated by the initial ולא. This construction in Hebrew is difficult but not impossible (Wevers, 1978:70). The LXX correctly reflects the first negative and the implied second negative with two negatives; 848 on the other hand omits the second negative probably under influence of the Hebrew (Wevers, 1978:69-70).

In Deuteronomy 20:20, the MT stipulates that trees that do not bear fruit may be cut down and used in the construction of a bulwark.

MT: רק עץ אשר תדע כי לא עץ מאכל הוא

LXX (Göttingen): ἀλλὰ ξύλον, ὃ ἐπίσταται ὅτι οὐ καρπόβρωτόν ἐστιν

The LXX translator does not repeat the two instances of עץ (“tree”) since it is obvious from the adjective καρπόβρωτόν (“with edible fruit”) that a tree is understood. 848 follows the Hebrew and has a second instance of ξύλο[v] (“tree”). This is similar to the reading in codices UF of Phil II 97 which have “ου ξυλον βρωσεως εστιν αυτο” (Göttingen LXX Apparatus). In 848, the reconstructed text places the second ξύλο[v] before the negative. Wevers (1978:70) notes that later in the verse the article τόν modifying πόλεμον must have been missing; this conjecture is based on the size of the lacuna, προ[. . . .]εμον which should likely be read as προς σε πολεμον. This may reflect the lack of article in the base text of the MT: מלחמה (“war”) more literally (also 72 C’ s 318 28 646 [Göttingen LXX]).

There is likely influence from the MT on the writer of 848 in the translation of Deuteronomy 22:9b. For the phrase ותבואת הכרם (“and the yield of the vineyard”) the LXX renders this with μετὰ τοῦ γενήματος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνός (“with the yield of the vineyard” [Göttingen LXX]). For μετὰ τοῦ γενήματος, 848 reads και το γενη[μα] (“and the yield...”) which more literally renders the Hebrew construction of the MT (Wevers, 1978:70).

There are a few other examples where there may be direct influence from the Hebrew in the text of 848 but the degree of certainty is less. In Deuteronomy 31:16 the text of 848 is quite poorly preserved but what does survive is some fragmentary text and the final two letters of the last pronoun in the verse: [αυτ]ωι. Unless this is simply a scribal error it may reflect the influence of the Hebrew which is singular here. Later in the chapter at verse 27, 848 adds the Tetragrammaton to the text: [τ]α προς יהוה τον θεον in line with the Hebrew: עם־יהוה (Wevers, 1978:71).

It is apparent that 848 has some corrections towards the consonantal text of the MT but they are much less obvious than the ones discussed in 8ḤevXIIgr. Pietersma (1984:90) is confident that the Tetragrammaton in this text is secondary and represents a “foreign intrusion into LXX tradition like the other hebraizing corrections it contains”. Tov (2003:112) supports the conclusion that all Greek texts that used the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters reflect “early revisions.” Pietersma (1984:89-91) cites little actual evidence from 848, but the examples I have examined above address this deficit to some degree.

The Church Father Origen makes a comment that deserves some attention here. He states that “in the more accurate copies (of the LXX/OG), the (divine) name is found in Hebrew characters not in the ones of today but in the most ancient”¹ (*Selecta in Psalmos 2.2*, Migne, *PG*

¹ Καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων Ἑβραίοις χαρακτηρῶσι κεῖται τὸ ὄνομα, Ἑβραϊκοῖς δὲ οὐ τοῖς νῦν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀρχαιοτάτοις.

12.1104; parenthetical clarifications mine). Jerome also observes: “The name of God, the tetragrammaton, we find in particular Greek scrolls still today in old characters”² (*Prologus galeatus*, Migne, *PL* 28.594-595; English: Rösel, 2007:415). Origen and Jerome both confirm that the Tetragrammaton was found in Hebrew characters in some Greek manuscripts. Some see this as a reference to Aquila whose translation Origen preserved in his Hexapla. What is surprising is the claim that these are found in what are judged the “more accurate copies.” What does this suggest about the possible place of the Tetragrammaton in the original LXX? As far as Origen’s testimony goes, Pietersma (1984:88) contends:

But in light of his allsurpassing regard for the *hebraica veritas* and his colossal undertaking to attain it, is not this precisely what one would have expected, and is it any wonder 1) that Origen fondly and wishfully judged the tetragram to be ‘more accurate’ and hence presumably original, and 2) that he therefore incorporated it in his Hexapla?

Origen was “antiquity’s great hebraizer” (Pietersma, 1984:85), and it is not surprising to find this kind of appreciation for manuscripts that brought him closer, in his estimation, to the Hebrew original.

The final manuscript which Howard (1977:65) notes and which I have introduced above is pap4QLXXLev^b stands out as worthy of special consideration. This papyrus roll dates to the first century BC (Parsons, 1992:10-11) and largely follows the LXX/OG with only a few idiosyncratic readings (Miller, 2001:244). In a number of places, pap4QLXXLev^b has readings that agree with the LXX/OG against the MT. Concerning its faithfulness to the LXX/OG, Pietersma (1984:91) maintains that “the genuinely Septuagintal credentials of 4QLXXLev^b are well-nigh impeccable.” In contrast to the manuscripts treated thus far, the Divine

² Nomen Domini tetragrammaton in quibusdam Graecis voluminibus usque hodie antiquis expressum litteris invenimur.

Name is rendered not with Hebrew characters but rather with the Greek: **ΙΑΩ**. This phonetic rendering of the Tetragrammaton stands alone in Greek biblical manuscripts of this early period.

Pietersma (1984:91) does not raise the same objections to pap4QLXXLev^b as he does to 8HevXIIgr and P. Fouad Inv. 266 and his silence in this regard is telling. For Pietersma this manuscript is an oddity, and he has not found its place in the transmission history of the LXX. Other scholars like Emanuel Tov (2003:112-114) follow the lead of Skehan (1980:28-31) and others in arguing that **ΙΑΩ** is most likely the original LXX rendering of the Divine Name. Using the criterion of Hebraization as an indicator of the likelihood that the Hebrew Tetragrammaton both in Aramaic and ancient scripts was a secondary addition, pap4QLXXLev^b with its transliteration is clearly an exception to this rule.

The trigram, YHW, is not unheard of in Judaism. It is noteworthy that among the Elephantine Papyri of the fifth century BC, יהו is used almost exclusively for the Tetragrammaton (Edge, 1995:287-288). Where the trigram is most common is in early onomastica where it is used to explain the theophoric elements in Jewish names (Shaw, 2002:44). The Greek **ΙΑΩ** in Codex Marchalianus of the sixth-century is a part of onomastic notes in the margins at Ezekiel 1:2 and 11:1. Shaw (2002:44) concludes that the existence of these Jewish onomastica where **ΙΑΩ** is employed is an early confirmation that the trigram was the original LXX/OG rendering of the Divine Name.

If **ΙΑΩ** was original then there is still a conspicuous lack of discussion about this unique rendering in Second Temple Judaism. To be sure, this form of the Divine Name is used frequently in Greco-Egyptian magical texts (Martinez, 1991:79-80) and was adopted later by the Gnostics (Metzger, 1981:35). If **ΙΑΩ** was original in the LXX/OG, it is understandable that it was replaced by the Hebrew four-lettered

Tetragrammaton by conservative elements within Judaism wanting to return to the Pentateuchal rendering of the Divine Name.

In addition to the lack of biblical texts having **IAΩ** for the Divine Name, there is silence on how the trigram would be integrated into the rest of the book of Leviticus. Leviticus is the only place where this variant has been found, and this is surprising since Leviticus in the LXX also contains the strictest statement on the use of the Tetragrammaton. In Leviticus 24:16, the MT reads: “And he that *blasphemes* (בִּקְבַּל) the name of Yahweh (יהוה) shall surely be put to death.” The LXX, however, takes this even further in its translation: “But he that *names* (ὀνομάζων) the name of the Lord let him die the death” (Brenton English LXX). In the LXX, the admonition forbids even pronouncing the Divine Name. If **IAΩ** was extant as the rendering of the Hebrew Tetragrammaton, our text at Leviticus 24:16 would have read, “He who names the name **IAΩ**, let him die the death.” I agree with Rösel (2007:418), that this would seem like a “self-contradiction.”

2.4 Conclusion

In the end, if **IAΩ** is the original form of the Tetragrammaton in the LXX/OG as the manuscript evidence seems to suggest, I can see why at the same time as pap4QLXXLev^b we also find Hebraizing manuscripts like 8HevXIIgr and to some extent P. Fouad Inv. 266 which return to the original four-lettered form of the Tetragrammaton. That the original LXX/OG had a form of the Divine Name leans on the slim testimony of pap4QLXXLev^b which is not without its own problems. Using the criterion of Hebraization to determine where the Tetragrammaton is a secondary revision, only pap4QLXXLev^b remains as a true exemplar of the LXX/OG. Howard (1977:63-65) rests his conclusion about the use of the Tetragrammaton in the original LXX/OG on four manuscripts. I, however, agree only with the testimony of pap4QLXXLev^b as evidence of an

original trigram. The paucity of testimony regarding the trigram may reflect a short duration in which the original form of the LXX/OG dominated. In the next chapter, I will explore another early response to the use of the Divine Name in Second Temple Judaism in the rise of surrogates for the Tetragrammaton and how this relates to the question of the place of the Divine Name in the New Testament.

3.0 Attitudes Toward the Divine Name in Second Temple Judaism

3.1 Introduction

The manuscripts that Howard (1977) examines and which I have reviewed in the previous chapter are of central importance as external evidence for the use of the Divine Name in pre-Christian times. From his conclusion that all extant pre-Christian LXX/OG manuscripts had some form of the Divine Name in them, Howard (1977:77) then makes a critical move in arguing that the New Testament writers also used such manuscripts containing Tetragrammata. A fuller picture of the evidence begs treatment here. The pre-Christian manuscript pap4QLXXLev^b is demonstrably the best candidate for the original LXX/OG rendering of the Divine Name. But, as was explained previously, the primacy of this rendering may have been short-lived and may have given way to Hebraizing manuscripts. This, however, was not the only reaction toward the use of the Divine Name during that time. Deep reverence for the Divine Name evidenced in Second Temple Judaism also resulted in the use of surrogates. Most of the New Testament was penned in this environment, which deserves our attention in this chapter.

3.2 Divine Name Avoidance in the LXX/OG

What seems clear in the Second Temple Period is that there was a growing reservation about the use of the Divine Name in its pentateuchal form. In Leviticus 18:21 where the MT has “you shall not profane the name of your God” (שם אלהיך), the LXX increases the solemnity of this command with “you shall not profane the *holy* name” (τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἅγιον: Göttingen LXX). As was discussed above, the LXX at Leviticus 24:16 makes the pronunciation of the Divine Name a capital offense: “But he that *names* (ὀνομάζων) the name of the Lord let him die the death” (Göttingen LXX). Targum Onkelos confirms this sense in its translation. The Gemara

preserves both the MT sense of blasphemy and the stricter sense found in the LXX/OG (Cohon, 1951:592). Philo knows this interpretation as well. Commenting on the execution of a blasphemer, Philo (*De Vita Mosis*, 2:203) quotes Leviticus 24:15-16 (LXX): “Whoever curses God shall be guilty of sin, and whoever names (ὀνομάσῃ) the name of the Lord shall die” (Yonge, 1995:509). Philo (*De Vita Mosis*, 2:206) later clarifies the import of this passage: “But if any one were, I will not say to blaspheme against the Lord of gods and men, but were even to dare to utter his name unseasonably, he must endure the punishment of death” (Yonge, 1995:509). In *Legatio ad Gaium* (353), Philo relates an episode in which Gaius profaned the Divine Name: “And then, stretching up his hands to heaven, he uttered an ejaculation which it was impious to hear, much more would it be so to repeat it literally” (Yonge, 1995:789). For Philo, the literal repetition of the Divine Name spoken “unseasonably” was reason enough to demand the ultimate punishment.

3.3 Divine Name Avoidance Among the Rabbis

In rabbinic *halakhah*, the pronunciation of the Divine Name was forbidden everywhere except within the cultic sphere in the Temple. The tractate b. Sotah (7:6; 37B-38A) stipulates: “In the sanctuary one says the Name as it is written, but in the provinces, with a euphemism” (Neusner, 2011, 11a:181; cf. b. Yoma 7.1, 69B). In tractate b. Sanhedrin (11.1; 90A), Abba Saul includes among the reprobate him who “pronounces the divine Name as it is spelled out” (Neusner, 2011, 16:477). There is some confusion about who actually spoke the Divine Name in the Temple. Some suggest that the Divine Name was used by the ordinary priests in the priestly blessing in the sanctuary (b. Sotah 7:6; 37B-38A), others claim that only the high priest could utter the Tetragrammaton on the Day of Atonement (b. Tamid 3:8; 30A). Reisel (1957:71) argues for the latter view: “The High Priest continued to use the original pronunciation on the

Day of Atonement, but reduced its sonority. Eventually, after the destruction of the Second Temple, this pronunciation lost its audibility altogether.” There is also some debate as to when this took effect. Most agree that by the death of the venerated High Priest Simeon the Just (200 BC) efforts were put in place to severely restrict the use of the Divine Name in the cultic realm (Schiffman, 1983:134).

For the ordinary Jews, the rabbis had built a wall around them to prevent the profanation of the Divine Name. In tractate b. Pesahim 3.7, 50A, regarding the proper reading of the Tetragrammaton, Rabbi Abina states: “Said the Holy One, blessed be he, ‘It is not in the way that I am written that I am to be read. My name is written *Yod He* (i.e., יהוה) but is read *Aleph Daleth* (i.e., אדני)” (Neusner, 2011, 4:220; Parke-Taylor, 1975:9 n. 48; parenthetical clarifications mine). In the same section, Rabbi Nahman bar Isaac reflects on the passage in Zechariah 14:9: “in that day the Lord will be *the only* one, and His name *the only* one” (NASV). How is it that YHWH’s name will be one at some future date: “Not like this world is the world to come. In this world, while his name is written *Yod He* (i.e., יהוה), it is read with *Aleph Lamed* (i.e., אלהים). But in the world to come, it shall be one: it will be written *Yod He* and read *Yod He*” (Neusner, 2011, 4:219; Hebrew letter names and parenthetical clarifications mine). In the MT, the oldest *Kethib-Qere* is the substitution of אדני for the Tetragrammaton recognized as a *Qere-perpetuum*. Another way that the Divine Name was referred to is by using the Aramaic “the Name” (שְׁמָא). In Codex Leningrad, dated to 1008/1009 and the basis of the BHS printed edition, the Tetragrammaton is pointed for the most part as יהוהִ indicating that the Aramaic *Qere* (שְׁמָא) was to be read instead. Parke-Taylor

(1975:86-87) claims that God's name was invoked in this way already in the Second Temple period.

It is interesting that the rabbis found justification for the concealment of the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton in Exodus 3:15. The passage reads as follows: "God ... said to Moses, 'Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, 'YHWH (יהוה) the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you.' This is My name forever (לעלם), and this is My memorial-name to all generations'" (NASV; YHWH substituted for 'The LORD'; parenthetical clarifications mine). According to the rabbis, the prepositional phrase translated as "forever" (לעלם) is written defectively and could be vocalized also as "to conceal, to hide" giving the passage an entirely different meaning (e.g., b. Qiddushin 4:1, 71A). Using this play on words, the rabbis taught that the Tetragrammaton must be kept silent (Cohon, 1951:583; Furuli, 1999:176). With this kind of motivation, the use of surrogates became the accepted way of referring to the Divine Name in Second Temple Judaism.

3.4 Divine Name Avoidance in Qumran and Masada

In the literature discovered at Qumran, the Divine Name was held in highest honor and like the rabbis the sectarians used various devices to avoid any profanation of the Sacred Name. The following text from 1QS 6:27-7:2 deals directly with the misuse of the Divine Name among the sect's followers: "Whoever enunciates the Name (which is) honored above all ... whether blaspheming, or overwhelmed by misfortune or for any other reason ... or reading a book, or blessing, will be excluded and shall not go back to the Community council" (Martínez, 1996:11). In CD 15:1 there is a regulation for swearing that exceeds that of b. Pesahim 3.7, 50A: "[He will not sw]ear by the Aleph and the Lamed ('EL=God) nor by the Aleph and the Daleth ('Adonai=The Lord)..." (Martínez, 1996:39). Here

the restriction includes a prohibition against swearing using surrogates. The sectarian's awe surrounding the Divine Name is not unmatched in larger Judaism but did reach an extreme at times, comparatively speaking.

What is distinct is the community's use of אל as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton. This substitution is found frequently in the sectarian writings (*pesharim*, *hodayot*, prayers, blessings and rules) (Tov 2004:239). Tov (2004:239) provides a few examples: "in 4QpPs^b (4Q173) 5₄, אל replaces ליהוה of MT... Likewise, in 4QHos^b (4Q167) 2₆; 7-9₂; 16₃, אל probably replaces יהוה , in the latter case probably in a biblical quotation (Hos 8:13)." Examples can be multiplied in 1QS and 1QH^a as well. What is unique is that the scribes at Qumran often use the Tetragrammaton more freely in biblical quotations but not in the accompanying commentary. This pattern is seen in biblical commentaries such as 1QpHab, 1QpZeph etc. In 1QpHab 10:6-7 (=Habakkuk 2:13), the quotation or *lemma* uses the Tetragrammaton but in the following commentary we find אל :

Quotation:

Behold, it is not from YHWH (יהוה) of hosts the people have laboured for fire.

Commentary (10:9-13):

The interpretation of the matter ... they will come into the judgments of fire those who reviled and defied the chosen ones of God (אל) (Howard, 1977:66).

Again the same pattern is noticeable in 1QpHab 11:10 (=Habakkuk 2:16):

Quotation:

The cup of the right hand of YHWH (יהוה) will surround you.

Commentary (11:12-15):

Its interpretation ... and the cup of the wrath of [G]od (אל) will confound him (Howard, 1977:67).

Parry (1997:440 n. 9) notes also the substitution of אלהים for the Tetragrammaton on 6 occasions in 11QtgJob.

In addition to the use of אל and אלהים for the Divine Name, the sectarians at Qumran also followed the pattern of mainstream Judaism with the use of the surrogate אדני. One manuscript, 1QIsa^a, is particularly interesting not so much in supporting the idea of the avoidance of the Divine Name but rather for the confusion of אדני and יהוה. According to Byington (1957:59; cf. Burrows, 1949:31) dictation has likely produced the following variants in 1QIsa^a:

Where MT has אדני without יהוה, 1Q[Isa^a] has יהוה at 6:11, 7:14, 9:7, 21:16, 28:2. At 3:17 1Q[Isa^a] has אדוני marked by apparently athetizing dots and יהוה written above it. At 3:18, 1Q[Isa^a] has יהוה similarly athetized by dots and אדוני written above ... Where MT has יהוה אדני, 1Q[Isa^a] omits אדני, 49:22, 52:4, 61:1. 1Q[Isa^a] has יהוה with אדוני written above it, 28:16, 30:15, 65:13 (bracketed clarifications and verse format mine).

This manuscript, dated to the second century BC (Van der Kooij, 1992:195), gives evidence that the Tetragrammaton was in fact read using the surrogate אדני. In 1QH 7:28 אדני replaces the Tetragrammaton in the text of Exodus 15:11. Likewise the Tetragrammaton is replaced with אדני in Psalm 129:4 and Psalm 130:1 in MS 11QPs^a. Again in 4Q408, where the text has the blessing ברוך יהוה, the scribe has inserted a correction above the text with אדני אתה (McDonough, 1999:70). Steudel (1994:316) dates 4Q408 to the Hasmonean Period.

The surrogate אדני for the Tetragrammaton appears in the document Sirach. There is an overlap between the Hebrew MS B from the Cairo Geniza and the much more ancient discovery of the Ben Sira scroll from

Masada. The Masada scroll dates to ca. 100 - 75 BC. In 42:16 and 43:5 in the Geniza document, the Tetragrammaton is written as a triple *Yod*.

However, the Masada Scroll has אֲדֹנִי. The Masada scroll also has אֲדֹנִי in 42:15, 17 where MS B has אֱלֹהִים. Likewise, the Masada scroll has אֲדֹנִי at 43:10 where MS B has אֱל. In these cases it is likely that MS B from the Cairo Geniza represents the original text and the Masada scroll is an early attempt to surrogate the Divine Name with אֲדֹנִי (Howard, 1977:68-69).

In other places in the Dead Sea Scrolls, scribes substituted four dots for the Divine Name. In the quotation of Isaiah 40:3 as found in 1QS 8:14 four dots replace the Tetragrammaton: “As it is written, ‘Prepare in the wilderness the way of **** make straight in the desert a path for our God’” (Howard, 1977:67; asterisks for dots). The same quotation also occurs in 4QTanḥūmîm (4Q176) where the Divine Name appears also as a sequence of four dots. Tov (1996:359) has noted the four dot substitution for the Divine Name in 4QSam^c (frg. 1, line 3; 3, line 7) and in the supralinear corrections in 1QIsa^a col. 33, 7 (Isa 40:7) and col. 35, 15 (Isa 42:6). At times dots were used to signify to the reader that the Tetragrammaton was written by mistake. For example in 11QPs^a the Tetragrammaton written in paleo-Hebrew has dots above and below; this was to indicate that the Tetragrammaton was “cancelled ... from reading, but not from existence” (Siegel, 1971:162). As was mentioned above, cancellation dots were used in 1QIsa^a 3:17 in which אֲדֹנִי has five dots below it and יהוה written above it (Byington, 1957:59; Howard, 1977:67). The veneration of the Divine Name was so high that methods such as these were put in place to prevent erasure of the sacred text. In the case of the four dots instead of the Divine Name, the dots were likely an aid to the reader: the Tetragrammaton should not be read as it was written (Tov, 2004:218-219).

Another method used to protect the Divine Name from ordinary use was the employment of paleo-Hebrew characters. In the Dead Sea Scrolls there are a number of documents written entirely in paleo-Hebrew characters. In other documents, the Tetragrammaton was written in paleo-Hebrew characters while the rest of the text was written using Aramaic square script. Wolters (1995:87) notes 145 instances of the Tetragrammaton in 11QPs^a written in the more ancient script. The use of this script is doubtlessly to set the Tetragrammaton off as a text requiring special care in reading and under no circumstances could it be erased. It is interesting that in 11QPs^a the scribe even distinguished between the Divine Name and the attached non-sacred prepositional prefix. Siegel (1971:161-162) finds twelve cases where the prepositional prefix (-ש, -ל, -ב, -מ) is written in Aramaic script while the joined Tetragrammaton is written in the archaic alphabet. In 11QPs^a twenty-eight words were erased but never the Tetragrammaton, which in two places was marked by athetizing dots above and below (col. XVI, 7; XXI, 2) (Tov, 1996:361).

Another method for avoiding the Tetragrammaton used at Qumran involves the substitution of pronouns. In CD 9:5, a quotation from Nahum 1:2 reads “He takes vengeance against his adversaries and keeps a grudge against his enemies.” In the MT at Nahum 1:2, however, the Tetragrammaton is used: “Yahweh (יהוה) takes vengeance against his adversaries...” The author/scribe of CD changes the subject to the pronoun הוה removing the Tetragrammaton from the quotation with the result that no antecedent exists to which the pronoun refers (Parry, 1997:439-440). In 1QS 8:13: the writer introduces the quotation from Isaiah 40:3 with the elongated pronoun הוהא: “To go into the wilderness to prepare there the way of Him (הוהא)” (Howard, 1977:68; McDonough, 1999:68). In this

case the pronoun may be a substitute for God or the Tetragrammaton (Howard, 1977:68).

In addition to the surrogate use of pronouns for the Divine Name there are times when the writers paraphrased Scripture in order to avoid the use of the Tetragrammaton. In the MT at Isaiah 7:17, the Tetragrammaton serves as the subject: “YHWH will bring upon you...” but in CD 7:10-11, the writer omits the Tetragrammaton with the phrase: “[T]here will come days upon you...” (Parry, 1997:443).

3.5 Surrogates for the Divine Name in Philo

Another writer of considerable importance for the use of the Divine Name and surrogates in Second Temple Judaism is Philo (c. 30 BC – c. AD 45). Philo’s Bible is the source of some discussion over the years. Two points have been made about Philo which deserve our attention: (1) Philo’s writings have been preserved largely by Christians, (2) Philo’s Bible quotations and commentary have been noticeably altered in a number of aspects that reflect a Hebraizing tendency. The basic question then is: Can we trust Philo’s Bible? This question concerns more ancient writings than just Philo.

There is no question that Christian scribes had a hand in corrupting the material they transmitted. In the inferior manuscripts GFHP of *De Somniis* (1.219) the text reads: ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας (“The great high priest of the confession”) (PhiloGk, 3:252 n. 9). Royse (1991:173-174) correctly points out that the variant τῆς ὁμολογίας is probably taken from Hebrews 3:1. The New Testament passage speaks of Jesus as ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν. Manuscripts MA preserve only ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς (PhiloGk, 3:252). Fortunately a certain portion of the manuscript tradition was unaffected and thus the transmission history can be explained.

It is a difficult task to determine the accuracy of any given manuscript. Howard's (1977) argument that the New Testament manuscript tradition has concealed a universal cover-up could be applied to Philo as well. Philo has been preserved almost exclusively through the efforts of Christians. Should we treat the ubiquitous use of κύριος as evidence of Christians adapting an original Tetragrammaton toward the prevailing LXX/OG text? Like the New Testament, we simply do not have manuscripts that confirm an earlier reading than κύριος. Furthermore, biblical quotations and commentary are weaved together, making it exceedingly difficult for a scribe to change all the references to the Divine Name using κύριος instead. The task would be monumental and the expected result would be a variegated tradition where some manuscripts have the Divine Name and others κύριος. When I look at the evidence for the use of the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament (cf. Chapter 4), I will discuss the corollaries of this argument more fully.

In *De Mutatione Nominum* it is clear that Philo uses and understands κύριος as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton. In the context of Exodus 3:14-15, Philo claims that God has allowed himself to be named as “Lord” (κύριος). At the burning bush, Moses is told that God's self-designation is “ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν” (*Mut.* 11: PhiloGk, 3:158). This is in fact not a proper name at all because, as Philo continues to explain, “It is my nature to be, not to be described by name” (*Mut.* 11: Yonge, 1995:342). In the biblical account that follows God then reveals the Tetragrammaton and the duration of its use: “This is My name forever, and this is My memorial-name to all generations” (Exod 3:15, NASV). Philo uses the same qualifiers to describe the use of “Lord” (κύριος); he refers to “Lord” as the “everlasting name” (ὄνομα αἰώνιον, *Mut.* 12: Yonge, 1995:342; PhiloGk, 3:158) and a “memorial” (μνημόσυνον, *Mut.* 12: Yonge, 1995:342; PhiloGk, 3:158). Philo goes on to weave into his biblical exposition the meaning of the word

“Lord” (κύριος). In *Mut.* 15, Philo explains the significance of the choice of the word “Lord” (κύριος): “the appellation Lord belongs to authority and sovereignty” (Yonge, 1995:342) (ἡ γὰρ κύριος πρόσρησις ἀρχῆς καὶ βασιλείας ἐστί [PhiloGk, 3:159]). Philo continues to weave his exposition around the word “Lord” (κύριος) using other phrases that bring out its significance: “authority and governing power” (ἀρχὴν καὶ ἡγεμονίαν, *Mut.* 17: Yonge, 1995:342; PhiloGk, 3:160), “ruler” (ἄρχων, *Mut.* 18: Yonge, 1995:342; PhiloGk, 3:160) and “master” (δεσπότης, δεσπότην, *Mut.* 19, 21: Yonge, 1995:342, 343; PhiloGk, 3:160).

Philo also comments explicitly on the etymologies of κύριος and θεός. In *Her.* 23, Philo explains the root of the word κύριος: “for the title lord, *kyrios*, is derived from the word *kyros* authority” (κύριος μὲν γὰρ παρὰ τὸ κῦρος [PhiloGk, 3:7; Yonge, 1995:278]). In *Legum Allegoriarum* 1.95 Philo explains the significance of the compound κύριος ὁ θεός in Genesis: “For the Lord God commanded that if man obeyed his recommendations, he should be thought worthy of receiving benefits from God; but if he rejected his warnings, he should then be cast out to destruction by the Lord, as his Master and one who had authority over him” (Yonge, 1995:35). Philo claims that it is as κύριος that a third of mankind know God. They experience him as the “governing authority” (τὴν ἀρχικὴν, ἣ καλεῖται κύριος [*De Abrahamo*, 1:124; PhiloGk, 4:28]). Philo (*De Vita Mosis*, 2:99) shows the distinction between the two titles for God:

But I myself should say, that what is here represented under a figure are the two most ancient and supreme powers of the divine God, namely, his creative and his kingly power; and his creative power is called God; according to which he arranged, and created, and adorned this universe, and his kingly power is called Lord, by which he rules over the beings whom he has created, and governs them with justice and firmness (Yonge, 1995:499).

Again Philo looks to the meaning of God’s title as κύριος: “...the royal power is the Lord, for it is fitting that the Creator should lord it over and

govern the creature” (Yonge, 1995:499) (ἡ δὲ βασιλικὴ κύριος, θέμις γὰρ ἄρχειν καὶ κρατεῖν τὸ πεποιηκὸς τοῦ γενομένου [*De Abrahamo*, 1:121: PhiloGk, 4:28]). It is clear from these passages that Philo uses the word κύριος with intentionality as a surrogate for the Divine Name.

This is not to say that Philo’s text comes to us without any scribal interference. That Philo has suffered some scribal corruption is evident in a number of passages. The modifications by and large fit within the classification of Hebraizations. There are a number of modifications of biblical *lemmata* towards the text of Aquila. The interpolator was likely a Jew as can be seen from his modifications. In *De Somniis*, there are a number of passages where the scribe changed the introductory formula to be more in line with rabbinical thought. In tractate b. Sanhedrin 99A, it is taught: “And even if he had said, ‘The entire Torah comes from heaven, except for this one verse, which the Holy One, blessed be he, did not say, but which Moses said on his own,’ such a one falls under the verse, ‘Because he has despised the word’” (Neusner, 2011, 16:531). The following are a number of places where the interpolator has changed the introductory formula from human origin, “Moses said...” to formulae that signify the divine origin, like “the sacred word says”:

Philo (MSS)	Interpolator (MSS)
<i>Somn.</i> 1:77: λέγεται...πολλαχῶς κατὰ Μωσῆν (Frequently it is said according to Moses) (MA: PhiloGk, 3:221 n. 15)	λέγεται...πολλαχῶς κατὰ τὸν ἱερόν λόγον (Frequently it is said according to the sacred word) (GFHP: PhiloGk, 3:221)
<i>Somn.</i> 1.81: φησὶ Μωσῆς (Moses says...) (MA: PhiloGk, 3:222 n. 10)	φησὶν ὁ ἱερός λόγος (The sacred word says...) (GFHP: PhiloGk, 3:222)
<i>Somn.</i> 1.124: γνώριμος ἐστὶ Μωυσέως (he is a disciple of Moses...) (MA: PhiloGk, 3:231 n. 15)	γνώριμος τοῦ ἱεροῦ λόγου (disciple of the sacred word...) (GFHP: PhiloGk, 3:231)
<i>Somn.</i> 1.229: διὸ καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ παρόντι...εἰπὼν (Wherefore also Moses in the passage at hand ...saying) (MA: PhiloGk, 3:253-254 n. 26)	διὸ καὶ ὁ ἱερός λόγος... (Wherefore also the sacred word...) (GFHPN: PhiloGk, 3:253)

<i>Somn.</i> 1.245: διὸ καὶ Μωϋσῆς φησιν ἄντικρυς (Wherefore also Moses says explicitly...) (MA: PhiloGk, 3:256 n. 21)	διὸ καὶ φησιν ἄντικρυς ὁ ἱερός λόγος (Wherefore also the sacred word says explicitly...) (GFHP: PhiloGk, 3:256)
*Based on Kraft, 2005	

What is significant in these and the other scribal modifications is that they fit the pattern of Hebraizations. The interpolator does not seem to have Christian interests but rather brings the text more in line with rabbinic Judaism. This is an important distinction to be made because there is a hesitancy among scholars to trust Philo's Bible on account of the scribal corruptions. A Hebraizing scribe would likely not change an original Tetragrammaton to κύριος—especially in the *lemmata*. In fact, it is significant that the Hebraizer left κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name. One might have expected the *lemmata* to have been changed to the Pentateuchal rendering of the Tetragrammaton. For this reason, I contend that the text of Philo when viewed critically gives valuable evidence of the use of κύριος around the time of the New Testament.

In the extant Philonic manuscripts there are numerous quotations from the Old Testament. I have selected a sampling of quotations from Deuteronomy which contain the Tetragrammaton in the corresponding passage in the MT:

Philo	Göttingen LXX
Παιδεύσει σε κύριος ὁ θεός, ὡς εἴ τις παιδεύσει ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ (<i>Somn.</i> , 1:237: PhiloGk, 3:255)	ἐτροφοφόρησέν σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου, ὡς εἴ τις τροφοφορήσαι ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ (Deut 1:31)
The Lord God shall instruct you, like as if a man instructs his son (<i>Somn.</i> , 1:237: Yonge, 1995:386)	The Lord your God nourished you [in the same way] a man would nourish his son... (Deut 1:31, Lexham English LXX with modifications)

In the MT the Tetragrammaton is used in the corresponding passage in Hebrew. Here Philo or his source uses κύριος to render the Divine Name. Rather than τροφοφορήσει (*v.l.* τροποφορήσει), Philo uses a more common word παιδεύσει (Ryle, 1895:246).

In *De Mutatione Nominum* 1:23, the same phrase: κύριος ὁ θεός occurs in two quotations: τελείων δὲ ἀμφοτέρων, κύριος ὁμοῦ καὶ θεός, ὡς ἐν δέκα λόγοις: "ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός σου" καὶ ἑτέρωθι: "κύριος ὁ θεός τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν" (And in the case of those who are perfect, he is both at the same time, both Lord and God; as we read in the ten commandments, "I am the Lord thy God." And in another passage it is written, "The Lord God of our fathers") (*Mut.* 1:23: PhiloGk, 3:161; Yonge, 1995:343).

Philo	Göttingen LXX
ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός σου (I am the Lord your God) (<i>Mut.</i> 1:23, Exod 20:2)	Ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεός σου (I am the Lord your God) (Exod 20:2)
κύριος ὁ θεός τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν (The Lord God of your fathers) (<i>Mut.</i> 1:23, Deut 4:1)	κύριος ὁ θεός τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν (The Lord God of your fathers) (Deut 4:1)

In both quotations (Exod 20:2 and Deut 4:1) the Hebrew *Vorlage* uses the Tetragrammaton. Again Philo or his source renders the Divine Name with κύριος. The text in *De Fuga et Inventione* 1:56 uses the phrase κύριος ὁ θεός in a similar way:

Philo	Göttingen LXX
οἱ προσκείμενοι κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ, ζήτε πάντες ἐν τῇ σήμερον (<i>Fug.</i> 1:56: PhiloGk, 3:122)	ὕμεις δὲ οἱ προσκείμενοι κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν ζήτε πάντες ἐν τῇ σήμερον (Deut 4:4)
You who kept close to the Lord God are all alive today (<i>Fug.</i> 1:56)	But you who kept close to the Lord your God are all alive today (Deut 4:4, Lexham English LXX)

These examples are only a few of many quotations where Philo uses the surrogate κύριος in place of the Divine Name. In this way, Philo and/or his source give us datable testimony to the use of κύριος as a surrogate at the turn of the era.

The uniform testimony of the Philonic manuscript tradition with regards to the use of κύριος shows that Philo may have had access to Greek LXX/OG manuscripts that already used κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name. The fact that there are no examples in Philo of the use of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters or in transliterated form makes it likely that by the turn of the era copies of the LXX/OG existed which used κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name and Philo is a major witness to their existence.

3.6 Surrogates for the Divine Name in Josephus

In contrast to Philo, Josephus uses κύριος only in one place to render the Tetragrammaton:

Josephus	Göttingen LXX
καὶ γὰρ Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης τοῦτο προεῖπεν ἔσται θυσιαστήριον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πολλὰ δὲ προεφήτευσεν ἄλλα τοιαῦτα διὰ τὸν τόπον (<i>Ant.</i> 13:68: Marcus, 1943:258, 260)	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσται θυσιαστήριον τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγυπτίων (Isa 19:19)
For this indeed is what the prophet Isaiah foretold, ‘There shall be an altar in Egypt to the Lord God,’ and many other such things did he prophesy concerning this place (<i>Ant.</i> 13:68: Marcus 1943:259, 261)	On that day there will be an altar to the Lord in the region of the Egyptians (Isa 19:19: Lexham English LXX)

The quotation from Josephus loosely translates the LXX/OG, adding τῷ θεῷ to the LXX/OG κυρίῳ. In other places, Josephus prefers the Greek word δεσπότης as an equivalent for Yahweh (Capes, 1990:70) a term the LXX translators avoided. The term δεσπότης substitutes twice for יהוה in

the Pentateuch: Genesis 15:2 and 15:8 (Fischer, 1958:136). I think that Capes (1990:70-71) is correct to suggest that this tendency to avoid κύριος may stem from Josephus' political relationships to high-ranking Roman officials including Vespasian and Titus. The emperor's cult was using the acclamation 'Caesar is κύριος' and he may have felt some reluctance to use the same title for YHWH.

The frequent use of κύριος in Philo contrasts with its rare use in Josephus in reference to YHWH. What is interesting is the fact that Christian scribes did not bring Josephus' Old Testament quotations to more accurately follow the LXX/OG of the day by replacing δεσπότης with κύριος. It is certainly the case with Josephus as with all ancient writers that scribes have taken some liberties with the received text—and Christian scribes are not exempt. One thinks of the famous *Testimonium Flavianum* in *Ant.* 18:63-64 in the passage about Jesus as an example of Christian tampering. But what is even more noteworthy is the restraint of most scribes in transmitting the text before them. Especially when there are parallel texts with differing variants there can be well-founded optimism in recovering the primitive text by using the tools of textual criticism.

3.7 Surrogates for the Divine Name in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

In the Greek portions of the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha, κύριος is used frequently as a title for God. The difficulty for the interpreter is in determining when κύριος is used as a surrogate for the Divine Name. In the *Testament of Job*, a Jewish work dated somewhere from the first century BC to the first century AD (Spittler, 1983:829), there is a clear quotation of canonical Job 1:21:

Testament of Job	Göttingen LXX
Ὁ κύριος ἔδωκεν, ὁ κύριος ἀφείλατο· ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ ἔδοξεν, οὕτως καὶ ἐγένετο· εἶη τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου εὐλογημένον (Testament of Job 19:4: Kraft <i>et al.</i> , 1974:42)	ὁ κύριος ἔδωκεν, ὁ κύριος ἀφείλατο· ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ ἔδοξεν, οὕτως ἐγένετο· εἶη τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου εὐλογημένον (Job 1:21b)
The Lord gave, the Lord took away. As it seemed good to the Lord, so it has also happened. Blessed be the name of the Lord (Testament of Job 19:4: Spittler, 1983:847)	The Lord gave; the Lord took away. As it seemed good to the Lord, so it has also happened. Blessed be the name of the Lord (Job 1:21b: Lexham English LXX with modifications)

The text of Job 1:21 is shorter in the MT: יהוה נתן ויהוה לקח יהי שם יהוה מברך so that the LXX renders the first, second and fourth sentences but adds the third. It is clear, however, that the LXX translator has used κύριος to render the Tetragrammaton three times. Later in the *Testament of Job* (42:1) there is another example of κύριος used in this way:

Testament of Job	Göttingen LXX
Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παύσασθαι αὐτὸν ἀναφανείς μοι ὁ κύριος διὰ λαίλαπος καὶ νεφῶν εἶπεν (Testament of Job 42:1: Kraft <i>et al.</i> , 1974:74)	Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παύσασθαι Ἐλιοῦν τῆς λέξεως εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ Ἰὼβ διὰ λαίλαπος καὶ νεφῶν (Job 38:1)
And after he stopped, there appeared to me through a tempest and clouds the Lord (Testament of Job 42:1: Kraft <i>et al.</i> , 1974:75)	And after Elihu stopped speaking, the Lord spoke to Job through a whirlwind and clouds (Job 38:1: Lexham English LXX)

Again the LXX adds to what is found in the MT but the use of κύριος in the *Testament of Job* is clearly based on the LXX text which in turn translates the Tetragrammaton in the Hebrew text.

In the fragmentary texts from the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus, who wrote in the second century BC, there is a passage that includes some literary dependence on the LXX:

Now Moses indicates this also in our Law when he speaks thus: ‘God brought you out of Egypt with a mighty hand,’ and again he says that God said to him, ‘I will send forth my hand and I will strike the Egyptians.’ And with respect to the death which came upon the cattle and the others he speaks to the king of the Egyptians, saying, ‘*Behold, the hand of the Lord shall be upon your cattle and a great death shall be upon all that are in the fields,*’ so that it is necessary that the hands be explained as the power of God. For it is possible for people speaking metaphorically to consider that the entire strength of human beings and their active powers are in their hands (Fragment 2:8: A. Collins, 1983:838, italics mine).

The text is dependent in different places on the LXX/OG of Exodus and the quotation that concerns the Tetragrammaton compares to the LXX/OG as follows:

Fragments of Aristobulus	Göttingen LXX
Ἴδου χεῖρ κυρίου ἐπέσται ἐν τοῖς κτήνεσί σου καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις θάνατος μέγας (Fragment 2:8: Holladay, 1995: 138)	ἴδου χεῖρ κυρίου ἔσται ἐν τοῖς κτήνεσίν σου τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις, ἔν τε τοῖς ἵπποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑποζυγίοις καὶ ἐν ταῖς καμήλοις καὶ βουσὶν καὶ προβάτοις, θάνατος μέγας σφόδρα (Exod 9:3)
Behold, the hand of the Lord shall be upon your cattle and a great death shall be upon all that are in the fields (2:8: A. Collins, 1983:838)	Behold, the hand of the Lord will be upon your cattle in the fields, on the horses and on the beasts of burden and on the camels and oxen and the sheep, a death exceedingly great (Exod 9:3: Lexham English LXX with modifications)

The Hebrew text of Exodus 9:3 translated by the LXX uses the Tetragrammaton and κύριος is its surrogate. Now it should be noted that our only source for this passage in the second fragment of Aristobulus is Eusebius. In *Praeparatio Evangelica* (8.9.38 - 8.10.17) Eusebius transmits the second fragment where our passage is found. The same concerns over scribal corruption are pertinent and some caution is necessary in assessing the value of this quotation.

Another work that shares features with Aristobulus is the *Letter of Aristeas*. Both refer to the translation of the Pentateuch made under Ptolemy Philadelphus and Demetrius Phalereus (A. Collins, 1983:835). Aristeas prefaces his allusion to Deuteronomy 7:18-19 with the words: “So we are exhorted through scripture also by the one who says thus.” The allusion follows with, “You shall truly remember the Lord, who did great and wonderful deeds in you” (μνεία μνησθήση κυρίου τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἔν σοι τὰ μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστά [Aristeas, 1:155]; Greek: Fitzmyer, 1979:122; English based on Shutt, 1983:23). The κύριος in this passage is found also in the LXX as a translation for the Tetragrammaton.

3.8 Conclusion

From these findings, it is possible to partially envision the environment in which the New Testament was written. Among the rabbis and also among the covenanters at Qumran there was a reluctance to using the Divine Name, mostly in speech but also in writing. After the death of Simon the Just (200 BC) it was common to use surrogates for the Divine Name in the liturgy, in reading the *Qere* for the Tetragrammaton in Scripture, and in sectarian literature. For Howard (1977) what stands out in the Second Temple period is the existence of LXX/OG manuscripts containing the Tetragrammaton in transliteration or in actual Hebrew characters. Yet from the testimonies of Philo, Josephus, and the Pseudepigrapha, it is the use of κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name that also demands attention. Especially from the ubiquitous use of κύριος in Philo and from certain works in the Pseudepigrapha, I contend that in addition to the LXX/OG manuscripts containing the Tetragrammaton, there was also a version of the LXX/OG which used κύριος as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton extant in part in Philo and in other early Jewish writers. A version that used surrogates for the Divine Name was likely available to the

New Testament writers as well and may better explain the New Testament usage (hereafter LXX^{κύριος}).

In the next chapter, I will examine the use of the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament and conclusions that derive from our continuing investigation.

4.0 The Tetragrammaton in the New Testament

4.1 Introduction

Howard (1977) has succeeded in demonstrating that the Tetragrammaton was used in three pre-Christian LXX/OG manuscripts: P. Fouad Inv. 266, 8HevXIIgr, and pap4QLXXLev^b. Howard claims that the New Testament writers would have used manuscripts like these in their citations of the Old Testament, and it would be natural for them to continue the practice of preserving the Divine Name in Hebrew or its phonetic equivalent. However, we have also seen that the use of surrogates for the Divine Name was evident in various Second Temple writings contemporary with the New Testament itself. It is the New Testament manuscript evidence itself to which I now turn. Howard (1977) examines a number of New Testament passages where he contends that the removal of the Tetragrammaton gave rise to a number of variants in the textual history of the New Testament. In Chapter Seven I will discuss each of these and the evidence Howard uses to make his case. In this chapter, however, I will deal with a number of global issues concerning the evidence for the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament. Is there any manuscript evidence that the Tetragrammaton was actually used in the New Testament? What should we look for in the textual history of the New Testament as evidence that the Tetragrammaton was used originally? Did the New Testament writers continue the practice of their contemporaries by using surrogates for the Tetragrammaton?

For Howard (1977), the second century AD was a period of confusion regarding the use of the Tetragrammaton in the LXX and in the New Testament. Concerning the use of the Divine Name, Howard (1977:77) writes:

But when it was removed from the Greek OT, it was also removed from the quotations of the OT in the NT. Thus somewhere around the beginning of the second century the use of surrogates must have crowded out the Tetragram in both Testaments. Before long the

divine name was lost to the Gentile church altogether ... The original purpose of the surrogates themselves was soon forgotten and this in turn gave rise to a host of abbreviated *nomina sacra* which were connected with the Tetragram in no way at all.

In this chapter I will give special attention to the manuscript evidence we have from the first and second centuries to determine if there is confirmation of Howard's thesis.

4.2 New Testament Manuscripts and the Tetragrammaton

There are some 5,700 New Testament manuscripts in Greek, from fragmentary scraps to complete codices of the New Testament text (Bowman & Komoszewski, 2007:159). Not one of these manuscripts contains the Divine Name in quotations of the Old Testament. Howard knows this but apparently has not sufficiently weighted the manuscript evidence against his Tetragrammaton hypothesis. The number of documents supporting the New Testament is legion, and it is not the case that the text is so obscure or poorly attested that conjectural emendation is our only recourse. What we have is a plethora of manuscript evidence and much of it is early.

If the rise of surrogates in the New Testament was a second century scribal phenomenon, we should expect a number of manuscript realities: we would expect that of the extant manuscripts there would be manuscripts which have the Tetragrammaton or a Greek equivalent. In a period of confusion, it would be expected that some manuscripts would evidence the Tetragrammaton and some with surrogates in its place. It would not be unreasonable to expect that there would be multiplied variants in the places where the Tetragrammaton once stood and was replaced. What we do not find in the earliest literature of the church is any discussion of the Tetragrammaton's removal. The church fathers are silent on the issue of the Tetragrammaton's original place and the implications that this would have for Christology and doctrine. Nor is the environment in which the

New Testament was penned and disseminated conducive to Howard's thesis. From the extant witnesses, there is no evidence of autocratic control of the process of early manuscript copying. The early church was dispersed by severe persecution and hardly had the means to coercively control the production of manuscripts. If the autographs had the Divine Name as Howard argues, the reality of persecution would have made it nearly impossible to manage the location of all New Testament manuscripts. There appears to be no censure of scribes who appealed to the earliest copies in the search for the original text of the New Testament. Nor is there evidence that manuscripts containing the Divine Name were destroyed. The geographic diversity of manuscript families from all over the Mediterranean world attests to the rapid spread of the Christian message and its manuscripts. If, on the other hand, the Tetragrammaton manuscripts simply disappeared without a trace and were replaced without a word, the lack of evidence for this is almost beyond belief (Lundquist, 1998:73).

What we do have in the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament is the use of surrogates for the Divine Name in quotations of the Old Testament. Howard (1977:77) argues that the process in which the Tetragrammaton was dropped and replaced by surrogates occurred into the second century. However, the earliest witnesses to the New Testament may be from the first century or very early into the second century. Kim (1988:254) argues that $\mathfrak{P}46$ (P. Beatty II + P. Mich. 222) has strong resemblances to other manuscripts from the last quarter of the first century and was likely written some time before the reign of Domitian. Comfort and Barrett (1999:196) make a case for the dating of $\mathfrak{P}46$ and $\mathfrak{P}66$ (P. Bodmer II + Inv. Nr. 4274/4298) to the early second century:

In the final analysis, $\mathfrak{P}46$ belongs to the second century and probably belongs to the early part of that century, especially when we consider its undeniable comparability with P. Oxy. 211 (ca. 100), P. Oxy. 2337 (late first century), and the second hand of P. Oxy. 841

(ca. 120-130). This also suggests that P46 and P66 must be from the same era because P46 is similar to P. Oxy. 841 (second scribe), and P66 is similar to P. Oxy. 841 (first scribe), and the two scribes were contemporaries. Thus, it is my opinion that P46 belongs to an era after A.D. 81-96 ... perhaps the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98-117) or, more likely, the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117-138).

The scribe of P46 used an early, excellent exemplar. The scribe was a professional, as can be seen from *stichoi* notations at the end of Romans, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Philippians. The *stichoi* were used by scribes to indicate the number of lines copied in determining the appropriate pay (Comfort & Barrett, 1999:197).

What we have in P46 and P66 are very early New Testament manuscripts that do not contain the Tetragrammaton in quotations from the Old Testament. Rather, in the examples which follow, the term κύριος is used as a surrogate for the Divine Name. In Romans 10:13, the text of P46 includes a *nomen sacrum* for κύριος in a quotation from the Old Testament:

P46	Romans 10:13
<p>πας] γαρ ος εαν επικαλεσηται το ονομα κυ σωθησεται (Comfort & Barrett, 2001, P46, Rom 10:13)</p>	<p>Everyone] who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved</p>

In this passage Paul is quoting Joel 2:32, which in Hebrew (Joel 3:5) includes the Tetragrammaton:

Joel 3:5 (MT: BHS)	Joel 2:32
<p>והיה כל אשר יקרא בשם יהוה ימלט</p>	<p>And it shall happen that all who call on the name of the Lord will be delivered.</p>

This passage is dealt with in detail in Chapter 5 below. In John 1:23, P66 also uses the surrogate κύριος in a quote from the Old Testament:

ⲡ66	John 1:23
<p>εφη εγω φωνη βοωντος εν τη ερημω ευθυναται³ την οδον κ̅υ̅ καθως ειπεν ησαΐας ο προφητης (Comfort & Barrett, 2001, ⲡ66, John 1:23)</p>	<p>He said, “I am a voice of one calling in the desert, ‘Make straight the way of the Lord,’ as Isaiah the prophet said” (based on NASV)</p>

Here the quotation is taken from Isaiah 40:3 and the *nomen sacrum* of the surrogate κύριος stands in place of the Tetragrammaton. The significance of these quotations using the surrogate κύριος should be recognized. In two manuscripts that may date to the early second century or even to the later first century we have evidence of the use of surrogates for the Divine Name. The result is that this second century phenomenon of scribes no longer understanding the use of the Tetragrammaton in reference to God has to have occurred very early—possibly as early as the end of the first century. It is unlikely that the collective consciousness of the early church entirely forgot the meaning of the Tetragrammaton shortly after the time of the apostles and their immediate successors.

Another text-critical phenomenon I would expect is a cross-pollination of New Testament variants. The situation that Howard (1977) describes, where the meaning of the Tetragrammaton is lost to Gentile scribes, would likely breed a certain type of variant we have seen elsewhere. Jerome in his Letter to Marcellus (Epistle 25: *Ad Marcellam*) discusses the ten names of God and the ninth is “the Tetragrammaton, which is regarded as ἀνεκφώνητον, i.e. inexpressible, [and] is written in these letters: *yod, he, waw, he*, which leads certain people who do not understand it to read it as *PIPI* because of the similarity of its elements, when they find it in Greek letters” (Rösel, 2007:415 n. 6). In this case, the scribe rendered the Tetragrammaton according to how it looks using Greek characters instead of Hebrew. In the following century, Evagrius mentions

³ Orthographic variant: CNTTS John 1:23.

the tradition that on the breastplate of the High Priest was inscribed the name ΠΙΠΙ (Metzger, 1981:35 n. 73). The ΠΙΠΙ variant is also found in certain Hexaplaric manuscripts, for example, Q, 86, 88, 234^{margin}, 264 (Tov, 2004:220). In the Syro-Hexapla of Paul of Tella in 2 Kings 18:6 (and elsewhere) we find the Syriac equivalent of the word “Lord” (MARYA) in the text, but ΠΙΠΙ is found in the margin. In Isaiah 1:2, we find MARYA in the text and YHYH in the margin (Furuli, 1999:189). While ΠΙΠΙ roughly resembles the shape of the Hebrew characters of the Divine Name, the Trigram **IAU** renders the Tetragrammaton phonetically, and it would not be surprising to see manuscripts using that transcription as well. One would expect these kinds of variants to be prevalent in our New Testament manuscripts if, as Howard maintains, the scribes no longer understood the place of the Tetragrammaton. The situation in the New Testament manuscripts is in fact just the opposite: the uniform testimony of the manuscript tradition supports the use of the Greek surrogate κύριος where the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX^{κύριος} has the Divine Name.

The LXX/OG comingling of renderings of the Tetragrammaton is also present in Aquila. In 1897, F. C. Burkitt published a number of fragments of Aquila from the Cairo Geniza, one of which calls for special attention. Aquila preserves the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters in a number of places in these fragments from Kings but in 4 Kingdoms 23:24 at the end of the line where the Tetragrammaton was expected we find **ΚΥ** (Burkitt, 1897:8; fol. 2v, col. a, line 15). This is further confirmation that Jews also used κύριος as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton. However, if Howard was correct about the second century confusion regarding the use of the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament manuscripts, I would expect this kind of scribal comingling to be found in the New Testament manuscript tradition as well. The actual situation is far different: the New Testament manuscripts uniformly use

κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name and there is no trace of an original Tetragrammaton in Hebrew or Greek characters.

Finally, there is one type of variant that we have encountered at Qumran in the process of verbal dictation. In 1QIsa^a the scribe regularly confuses אֲדֹנָי and יהוה. According to Byington (1957:59; cf. Burrows, 1949:31) dictation has likely produced the variants in 1QIsa^a. This manuscript gives evidence that the Tetragrammaton was in fact read using the surrogate אֲדֹנָי. We would expect something similar if the Tetragrammaton was written in the New Testament but was read using the *Qere* κύριος.

4.3 New Testament Quotations and the Apostolic Fathers

1 Clement is probably the oldest Christian writing we have outside of the New Testament. Eusebius lists Clement of Rome as the third bishop of Rome during the reign of Domitian: “In the second year of Titus’s reign Linus, Bishop of Rome, after holding his office for twelve years yielded it to Anencletus. Titus was succeeded by his brother Domitian ... In the twelfth year of the same principate Anencletus, after twelve years as Bishop of Rome, was succeeded by Clement” (*Hist. eccl.* 3.13.1 - 3.15.1; Williamson, 1966:124). Scholarly consensus dates 1 Clement to circa AD 95-96. A number of factors support this date. In the beginning of the epistle, Clement refers to “sudden and repeated misfortunes and setbacks we have experienced” (1 Clement 1:1; Ehrman, 2003, 1:35). This may correspond to the persecution of the Christian Church in Rome during the reign of Domitian (AD 81-96). In the fifth chapter, the deaths of the apostles are said to be within “our own generation” (1 Clement 5:1; Ehrman, 2003, 1:43). Yet, there does seem to be some distance implied between the time of the apostles and the present time of writing. Clement refers to the Church of Corinth as “the ancient (ἀρχαίαν) church of the Corinthians” (1 Clement 47:6; Ehrman, 2003, 1:120, 121). Likewise, in 1

Clement 63:3, the author speaks of the long spiritual history of the emissaries sent to deliver the letter to the Corinthians: “And we have sent faithful and temperate men who have lived blamelessly among us from youth to old age” (1 Clement 63:3; Ehrman, 2003, 1:149). In Chapters 42-44, there is mention of those appointed by the apostles and also those appointed by their successors: “Thus we do not think it right to remove from the ministry those who were appointed by them [the apostles] or, afterwards, by other reputable men” (1 Clement 44:3; Ehrman, 2003, 1:114-115). Although most recently Thomas Herron (Herron, 2008) has suggested an earlier date, perhaps even before AD 70, the above evidence better supports the traditional date of AD 95-96.

1 Clement and the Epistle of Barnabas stand out in relation to the other writings of the Apostolic Fathers in their extensive use of the Old Testament. What is pertinent for our purposes is a select few quotations where Clement appears to be quoting or alluding to what was later considered the New Testament, especially where the New Testament passage was in turn quoting the LXX^{κύριος} where in the Hebrew the Tetragrammaton was used. If Howard (1977) is correct that the Tetragrammaton was used in the New Testament then it can be reasonably expected that we may have some evidence in other first century writings that depend on both the LXX^{κύριος} and what was later considered the New Testament.

In 1 Clement 13:1, there is a long quotation from Jeremiah 9:23-24 but with evidence that Clement had 1 Corinthians 1:31 (cf. 2 Cor 10:17) in mind as he was quoting. Clement writes: “For the Holy Spirit says, ‘The one who is wise should not boast about his wisdom, nor the one who is strong about his strength, nor the one who is wealthy about his wealth; instead, the one who boasts should boast about the Lord, seeking after him and doing what is just and right’” (1 Clement 13:1; Ehrman, 2003, 1:57). The relevant clause for comparison is as follows:

1 Clement 13:1	1 Corinthians 1:31	Jeremiah 9:24	1 Kingdoms 2.10
ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω, τοῦ ἐκζητεῖν αὐτόν (Ehrman, 2003, 1:56)	ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω (NA28)	ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος (Göttingen LXX)	ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον (Rahlfs LXX, 1935)
let him who boasts, boast about the Lord, seeking after him (Ehrman, 2003, 1:57)	let him who boasts, boast in the Lord	let him who boasts, boast in this: that he understands and knows that I am the Lord (Lexham LXX)	let him who boasts, boast in this: that he understands and knows the Lord

In the MT of Jeremiah 9:23 (24), the Tetragrammaton is used and in as far as the passage in 1 Corinthians 1:31 is based on Jeremiah, it could be expected according to Howard's approach that the New Testament writer would have preserved the Tetragrammaton in his quotation, but Clement shows no knowledge of a Tetragrammaton in his underlying text.

In another passage Clement quotes from the LXX^{κύριος} but shows that he knows the passage in its New Testament context. The passage in 1 Clement 50:6 follows the LXX^{κύριος} in Psalm 31(32) which is also cited in Romans 4:7-8:

1 Clement 50:6	Romans 4:7-8	Psalms 31(32):1,2
Μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἀμαρτίαι· μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὐ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἀμαρτίαν, οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος (Ehrman, 2003, 1:124)	μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἀμαρτίαι· μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὐ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἀμαρτίαν (NA28)	Μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι, καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἀμαρτίαι· μακάριος ἀνὴρ, οὐ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἀμαρτίαν, οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος (Göttingen LXX)

<p>Blessed are those whose lawless acts are forgiven and whose sins have been covered over. Blessed is the man whose sin the Lord does not take into account and in whose mouth is found no deceit. (Ehrman, 2003, 1:125)</p>	<p>Blessed are those whose lawless deeds have been forgiven, and whose sins have been covered. Blessed is the man whose sin the Lord will not take into account. (NASV)</p>	<p>Blessed are they whose lawless acts are forgiven and whose sins were covered up. Blessed is the man whose sin the Lord will never reckon, nor is there guile in his mouth. (Lexham English LXX)</p>
---	---	--

We see that Clement is dependent on the longer citation from the LXX^{κύριος} because he includes the last clause not found in Romans: οὐδέ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος, but in the next sentence it is apparent that Clement was influenced by the passage in Romans. In the next verse in Romans (4:9), Paul asks: “Is this blessing then on the circumcised, or on the uncircumcised also?” (NASV; NA28: Ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν;). The response in Clement follows: “This blessing comes to those who have been chosen by God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Clement 50:7; Ehrman, 2003, 1:125; οὗτος ὁ μακαρισμὸς ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκλελεγμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, Ehrman, 2003, 1:124). Hagner (1973:218) correctly observes the connection: “This interesting parallel, occurring immediately after the same OT citation, shows either that the citation itself was suggested by Rom. 4.7f., or that in the actual process of citing Ps. 31.1f., Clement recalled Paul’s use of the citation and the words which immediately follow it.” In fact, the final sentence in Clement summarizes Paul’s argument in the rest of Romans 4 (Grant & Graham, 1965:82). For our purposes, it is important to understand that if the New Testament regularly preserved the Tetragrammaton in its quotes from the Old Testament as Howard argues, Clement gives no evidence that he knows something of it.

4.4 The New Testament and the Rabbis

There is a passage in the Tosefta that discusses what should be done with the books of heretics when they contain the Divine Name. The text of Tosefta Shabbat 13:5 reads:

The *gilyonim* and the books of the *minim* they do not save from a fire. But they are allowed to burn where they are, they and references to the Divine Name which are in them. R. Yosé the Galilean says, ‘On ordinary days, one cuts out the references to the Divine Name which are in them and stores them away, and the rest burns.’ Said R. Tarfon, ‘May I bury my sons, if such things come into my hands and I do not burn them, and even the references to the Divine Name which are in them. And if someone was running after me, I should go into a temple of idolatry, but I should not go into their houses [of worship]. For idolaters do not recognize the Divinity in denying him, but these recognize the Divinity and deny him. And about them Scripture states, *Behind the door and the doorpost you have set up your symbol [for deserting me, you have uncovered your bed]* (Is. 57:8).’ Said R. Ishmael, ‘Now if to bring peace between a man and his wife, the Omnipresent declared that a scroll written in a state of sanctification should be blotted out by water, the books of the *minim*, which bring enmity between Israel and their Father who is in heaven, all the more so should be blotted out, they and the references to the Divine Name in them. And concerning them has Scripture stated, *Do I not hate them that hate thee, O Lord? And do I not loathe them that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred, I count them my enemies* (Ps. 139:21-22) (Neusner, 2002, 1:405; *gilyonim* untranslated).

In this passage *gilyonim* is a disputed term: Neusner (2002) and others take it as a reference to the Gospels. The books of the *minim* would include the Gospels and any other heretical works. This interpretation could be used to strengthen the argument by Howard that the Gospels originally contained the Tetragrammaton (cf. Furuli, 1999:190). Alternatively, *gilyonim* can refer to the marginalia of a manuscript. In that case, the Tosefta is referring to the whole manuscript including both the text and margins. The books of the *minim* could include the Torah scrolls of the heretics. If the sense of Gospel is taken as the preferred meaning here, it is not certain which Gospels are in view: the Gospel of the Nazarenes, Gospel of the Ebionites,

Gospel of the Hebrews, or the orthodox Christian Gospels (Sanders, 1993:65). The search for a Semitic *Vorlage* to the Christian Gospels is a recurring idea in the history of the Church. In Chapter Six I will revisit the early church tradition of a Hebrew Matthew and its claim to antiquity.

4.5 The New Testament and the *Nomina Sacra*

It could be argued that just as the *nomina sacra* were used without recorded discussion about their origin and significance in like manner the Tetragrammaton disappeared without discussion in the second century. It should be noted that the practice of using abbreviated forms, though used extensively within Christian copying, did have roots in Jewish and Greek practices contemporaneous with the New Testament. There was also some history in Greek circles of contracting certain proper names and titles (Brown, 1970:16). The Tetragrammaton, whether in Hebrew characters within a Greek manuscript, contracted double *yods* with a line through them, or with gold lettering, served to set the Divine Name off as a sacred name within the surrounding text. There does seem to be some evidence that the practice of using contraction or suspension in writing certain words started as a way of showing reverence when the referent was Jesus or God. For example, in P46, Ιησους is regularly used in its *nomen sacrum* form when speaking about the Jesus of Christian worship, but uses the *plene* form when speaking of other persons called Jesus: e.g., Jesus called Justus (Col 4:11), or Joshua (Heb 4:8). Similarly, when 2 Corinthians 11:4 refers to “another Jesus” the word “Jesus” is written in full. In 1 Corinthians 8:4-6, the parallel treatment of terms is worth reproducing:

P46	1 Cor. 8:4-6
<p>περι της βρωσεως ουν των ειδωλοθυτων οίδαμεν οτι ουδεν ειδωλον εν κοσμω και οτι ουδεις θς ει μη εις</p> <p>⁵και γαρ ειπερ εισιν λεγομενοι θεοι ειτε εν ουρανω ειτε επι γης ωσπερ πολλοι εισιν θεοι και κυριοι πολλοι ⁶ημειν εις θς και ο πρ εξ ου τα παντα και ημεις εις αυτον και [εις κς ιης χρς δι ου τα παντα και ημεις δι αυτου</p> <p>(Comfort & Barrett, 2001, P46, 1 Cor 8:4-6)</p>	<p>Therefore concerning the eating of things sacrificed to idols, we know that there is no such thing as an idol in the world, and that there is no God but one. For even if there are so-called gods whether in heaven or on earth, as indeed there are many gods and many lords, [yet] for us there is <i>but</i> one God and Father, from whom are all things and we <i>exist</i> for Him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we <i>exist</i> through Him.</p> <p>(1 Cor 8:4-6, NASV with manuscript specific modifications)</p>

In like manner, the scribe of P66 regularly treats Θεος as a *nomen sacrum* when referring to God the Father, but uses the *plene* form when referring to other deities. Judging from the early second century dates for these manuscripts, there was a pattern in place of reverencing Jesus and God soon after the apostles (whole paragraph: Hurtado, 2006:129-130).

As we will see in later chapters, to change the reference from Christ to God can change the entire meaning of the text. There are distinct Christological implications when the Tetragrammaton is reintroduced to passages of Scripture. The difference between the introduction of contracted and suspended abbreviations is a topic worthy of investigation but this differs by order of magnitude from removing the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament manuscripts.

4.6 Conclusion

The earliest New Testament manuscripts uniformly support the use of the surrogate κύριος in place of the Tetragrammaton when the underlying Hebrew quotation contains the Divine Name. Howard (1977) has much to accomplish in his arguments without the support of actual

New Testament manuscripts that contain the Divine Name or its Greek equivalent. For Howard (1977) the second century was the period in which scribes increasingly abandoned the use of the Tetragrammaton in favor of surrogates. However, in early papyri like P46 and P66 dated to the early second century (see Kim [1988] on a first century date for P46), there is no evidence that the Tetragrammaton was used in these manuscripts. The situation is the same with 1 Clement. In this earliest of Christian manuscripts, there is no use of the Divine Name in quotations from the Old Testament directly or through a New Testament citation.

In the New Testament, we would expect that the manuscript tradition would supply evidence of the author's original intent vis-à-vis the Tetragrammaton. The cross-pollination of variants, some having the Tetragrammaton, others without and possibly some combinations of both, are not found in the New Testament manuscript tradition. Nor do we find the ΠΠΠΠ variant which has appeared in places where the scribes lacked an understanding of the Tetragrammaton. Finally, there is a fundamental difference when comparing the silent introduction of *nomina sacra* to a silent disuse of the Tetragrammaton. The difference is significant: the *nomina sacra* do not change the referent in the text in the same way that removing the Tetragrammaton would.

In the next chapter I will explore a primitive Aramaic text preserved in the First Epistle to the Corinthians and its significance in the early history of the divine title "Lord."

5.0 The Use and Significance of Surrogates for the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament

5.1 Introduction

While Howard (1977) has expanded our understanding of the place of the Tetragrammaton in Second Temple Judaism, he has not yet proven that the Tetragrammaton was used by New Testament writers in their quotations from the Old Testament. The New Testament manuscript tradition supplies no examples of manuscripts where the Tetragrammaton is preserved in quotations from the Old Testament. Instead the practice of using the surrogate κύριος for the Divine Name is attested in various Second Temple writings and in the New Testament. According to Howard (1977), the high Christology of the New Testament was probably artificially increased by scribal confusion that resulted when the Tetragrammaton was no longer understood and κύριος took its place. Therefore, Howard's thesis implies that at least some of the high honors reserved for YHWH were now incorrectly applied to Jesus Christ. This argument of Howard will be evaluated below.

This chapter examines a number of New Testament passages that contain the surrogate κύριος when the Hebrew underlying text uses the Tetragrammaton. The goal of this section is the fuller understanding of the use and significance of κύριος as a title and as a surrogate for the Divine Name in the New Testament and the implications for Christology. Part of this inquiry will involve investigating related terms and passages that will more fully contribute to a broader understanding of the Christological title "Lord."

5.2 Maranatha

In Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, the apostle concludes the epistle with the untranslated Aramaic expression "Maranatha" (μαράνα θά: NA28, 1 Cor 16:22). The most likely word division renders the phrase as either an indicative or an imperative: "Our Lord has come" or "Our Lord, come" respectively. An examination of this phrase recalls the earliest strata of the Christian tradition and may yield valuable information on the title "Lord" and the relationship of the Aramaic noun to κύριος as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton and as a most common Christological title.

5.2.1 מרא as a Name for God

There are different ways to parse the Aramaic phrase written in *scriptio continua* in the oldest extant manuscripts. However, what is the same in all of them is the subject: "Lord" (מרא). In the Aramaic section of Daniel, God is referred to as "Lord of kings" (מרא מלכין: BHS, Dan 2:47) and in Daniel 5:23 as "Lord of heaven" (מרא-שמיא: BHS). Most often מרא is used in construct state or in suffixal form in the available examples referring to God. However, in the Aramaic *Genesis Apocryphon* found in Cave 1 (1Q20) at Qumran, the absolute state is used of God: "Blessed (are) you, O God Most High, my Lord, for all ages! For you are Lord (מררה⁴) and Sovereign over all!" (1QapGen 20.12-13; Fitzmyer, 2004:100, 101). Later in the same context the word occurs again in the absolute state in the confession: "[Y]ou are Lord (מררה) of all the kings of the earth (לכול מלכי) (ארעא) (1QapGen 20.15; Fitzmyer, 2004:100, 101). This example is not as clearly absolute as the one above since the phrase that follows acts like a genitive (Capes, 1990:76 n. 69). In 11QtgJob 24:6-7 the Aramaic text is

⁴ v.l. esp. DSS; HALOT s.v. מרא

fragmentary, but it is discernable that the absolute form of מרא is used in reference to God and in parallel with the usual word for God, אלהא (Fitzmyer, 1979:124). In the MT and in LXX/OG, the corresponding sentences read:

11QtgJob 24:6-7	MT Job 34:12	LXX/OG Job 34:12
הכען צדא אלהא/ישקר ומרא [יעות דינא] (Fitzmyer, 1979:124)	אף־אמנם אל לא־ירשיע ושדי לא־יעות משפט (BHS)	οἷη δὲ τὸν κύριον ἄτοπα ποιήσῃν; ἢ ὁ παντοκράτωρ ταράξει κρίσιν; (Göttingen LXX)
Now will God really prove faithless and [will] the Lord [distort judgment]? (Fitzmyer, 1979:124)	Surely, God will not act wickedly, And the Almighty will not pervert justice. (NASV)	But should one think that the Lord does wrong? Or that the Almighty shall pervert justice? (Lexham English LXX)

In Job 34:12, מרא translates שדי which the LXX/OG renders with παντοκράτωρ. There is one case in 1QapGen 21.2 that is worthy of special attention since it stands as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton:

1QapGen 21.2	MT Gen. 13:4	LXX/OG Gen. 13:4
וקרית תמן בשם מרה עלמיא (Machiela, 2009:78)	ויקרא שם אברם בשם יהוה (BHS)	καὶ ἐπεκαλέσατο ἐκεῖ Ἀβράμ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου (Göttingen LXX)
and I called there on the name of the Lord of the Ages (Machiela, 2009:78)	and there Abram called on the name of YHWH	and there Abram called upon the name of the Lord

Here we have the intersection of various traditions that will prove valuable in the understanding of surrogates for the Divine Name. In Palestinian Aramaic there is some evidence that מרא was used in reference to God, at

times in the absolute sense, and in the last instance above it was used as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton.

5.2.2 Maranatha in Early Christian Literature

In 1 Corinthians 16:22, as Paul concludes the letter with a greeting written in his own hand, we find the sole instance of the Aramaic “Maranatha” in the New Testament:

1 Cor 16:21-24	1 Cor 16:21-24
<p>Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ Παύλου. εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα. μαράνα θά. ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μεθ’ ὑμῶν. ἡ ἀγάπη μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. (NA28)</p>	<p>The greeting is in my own hand, Paul. If anyone does not love the Lord, he is to be accursed. Maranatha. The grace of the Lord Jesus be with you. My love be with you all in Christ Jesus. (NASV)</p>

The significance of this untranslated invocation at the conclusion of what is certainly Paul’s most Hellenistic letter is striking (Fitzmyer, 1979:124). This statement is likely a tradition received from the Aramaic church and routinized so that translation in Greek circles was not necessary. This artifact of tradition gives us a glimpse into the earliest traditions of the church. Because of the disjointed concluding phrases it is difficult to determine whether “Maranatha” goes with what is before and/or with what is following but more can be determined when the Aramaic is properly translated.

5.2.3 Maranatha Word Division

In determining the sense of the phrase μαράνα θά, it is necessary to make some judgments about word division and to determine what the translated Aramaic phrase means. What seems clear in the Aramaic is the subject with the possessive suffix: “Our Lord.” There are two possible forms and either is possible: מְרַנָּא or מְרַן (Davis, 1996:137). In older

Aramaic, the first person plural suffix is אָנָּ, and later in the period the unstressed אֵ shortens leaving אָ (Davis, 1996:137). The sense of אָנָּ or אָ is the same, with the translation “Our Lord.” The verbal form that follows is not as straightforward. A number of possible renderings have been put forward over the years, but two that are worthy of consideration are the perfect and the imperative of the verb אָתָּ (“to come, to go”)—both are linguistically possible. The pointing for the perfect would likely be as follows: אָתָּ אָנָּ. Church fathers like John Chrysostom, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, John of Damascus, Oecumenius, and Theophylact interpret it in this way. This understanding is also preserved in the Peshitta and in one fifth century Coptic translation of the *Didache* (Fitzmyer, 1981:225). The phrase could read in at least two possible ways, reflecting the indicative form: a. “Our Lord has come” (in the incarnation) or b. “Our Lord is now present” (in the believing community) (Kuhn, 1964:469-470). The latter works well with the preceding phrase in 1 Corinthians 16:22 in the context of church discipline: “If anyone does not love the Lord, he is to be accursed (ἀνάθεμα)” (NASV, NA28). In Matthew 18:20, Jesus promises his presence when two or three are gathered in his name: “For where two or three have gathered together in My name, I am there in their midst” (Matt 18:20, NASV). The context in Matthew suggests that the circumstance for the gathering of believers is regarding church discipline (Matt 18:15-20). Christ is present among believers when church discipline is exercised.

On the other hand, the imperative form is also possible: אָתָּ אָנָּ or אָתָּ אָנָּ, “Our Lord, come” (Kuhn, 1964:467). Most modern interpreters understand it in this way, and the Greek word division in the NA28 reflects this understanding: μαράνα θά. The perspective then is eschatological, and this works well in the context of the preceding anathema: “If anyone does

not love the Lord, he is to be accursed” (1 Cor 16:22, NASV; NA28: εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα). Support for the imperatival form can also be found in Revelation 22:20 where the promise of Jesus’ return: “Yes, I am coming quickly” (NASV) is met with the response of the faithful: “Amen. Come, Lord Jesus” (NASV; NA28: Ἀμήν, ἔρχου κύριε Ἰησοῦ). This closing statement is roughly the Greek translation of the Maranatha phrase in 1 Corinthians 16:22. This kind of eschatological statement fits well in the ending of the epistle and at the end of the Apocalypse.

In the *Didache*, a manual of church order from the first century or early second, the Maranatha phrase is used in a similar way:

<i>Didache</i> 10:6	<i>Didache</i> 10:6
<p>ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος. Ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαβίδ. εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοεῖτω· μαρὰν ἀθά· ἀμήν. (Ehrman, 2003, 1:432)</p>	<p>May grace come and this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If anyone is holy, let him come; if any one is not, let him repent. Maranatha! Amen. (Ehrman, 2003, 1:433)</p>

The context of this passage is the Eucharist at the end of a prayer concluding the communal meal. The imperatival sense of the “Our Lord, come” is probably the preferred sense here because, like the passage at the end of Revelation, both speak about the *parousia*. The prayer for the church anticipates the consummation of all things: “Remember your church, O Lord; save it from all evil, and perfect it in your love. And gather it from the four winds into your kingdom, which you prepared for it ... May grace come and this world pass away” (*Didache* 10:5-6; Ehrman, 2003, 1:433). In 1 Corinthians 11:26 in Paul’s instructions about the Lord’s Supper, there is an eschatological thrust as well: “For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until He comes” (NASV).

Another reason for choosing the imperatival form of the Aramaic expression has to do with New Testament usage of similar Semitic words. Cullmann (1963:209) argues that liturgical confessions are always translated into Greek in the New Testament, but certain terms of prayer (i.e., “Abba” [ἄββᾶ], “Hosanna” [ὡσαννά], and “Amen” [ἀμήν]) are left untranslated. In the Eucharistic prayer in the *Didache* where the term “Maranatha” is found, “Hosanna” is also used: “Hosanna to the God of David” (Ὠσαννά τῷ θεῷ Δαβίδ) followed by a concluding “Amen” (ἀμήν) (*Didache*, 10:6; Ehrman, 2003, 1:432, 433).

5.2.4 Maranatha in Devotional Practice

This artifact of Christian tradition may very well contain the earliest Christological confession. It is likely that “Maranatha” derives from the cultic life of the Aramaic church. If we take μαράνα θά as imperatival, the phrase invariably serves as a prayer or invocation formula. Paul regularly uses liturgical expressions to begin or conclude his epistles (Hurtado, 2003:173). This invocation fits well in the context in the *Didache* (10:6), our earliest extant manual of worship, and in the conclusion found in the Book of Revelation (22:20).

The Maranatha phrase was more than a polite appeal like “Come, sir” or “Our rabbi, come.” We have seen the use of מר in reference to God, and here in the context of prayer, the divinity of Jesus is certainly implied. As Bruce (1968:32) claims: “Maranatha is a testimony to the place which the exalted and expected Christ had in the worship of the most primitive church.” 1 Corinthians 16:22 offers a prime example of directly addressing Jesus Christ in prayer without an ultimate reference to the Father (Naganoolil, 2006:9). Jesus was the object of cultic worship in the earliest period of the Christian movement. The absolute usage of “the Lord” as a Christological title can be traced back to the primitive Aramaic-speaking church (Naganoolil, 2006:7). Bruce (1968:23) goes even farther:

“Every shade of meaning which a Greek-speaking Christian gave to κύριος could be given by an Aramaic-speaking Christian to *mar*.” It should, however, be remembered that the evidence is sparse on the Aramaic side of the equation. What we do have in the Maranatha statement is an instance of shared vocabulary that stems from the earliest period of the church. Howard (1977), as referred to at the beginning of this chapter, has failed to recognize the significance of the very early date by which the Aramaic and Greek-speaking churches acclaimed Jesus as “Lord.” This is partial proof that the high honors paid to Jesus Christ began in the primitive church and not with the putative confusion of the Gentile scribes in rendering the Tetragrammaton.

In the next section, I will explore the use and significance of the Christological title κύριος in Paul’s New Testament adaptation of the *Shema*.

5.3 Revised *Shema*

In the investigation of New Testament surrogates for the Divine Name one important passage could easily be overlooked. Enveloped in a section dealing with eating food sacrificed to idols is a passage (1 Cor 8:1-13) that has great significance to our inquiry as an early Pauline Christological statement and as a link between the Jewish *Shema* and first-century Christian reflection on the Divine identity. In this passage Old and New Testaments converge in the person of Jesus Christ; the means by which this is accomplished is, in part, by the linking of the word κύριος as a Christological title and as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton. Here again it is clear how the overlapping use of κύριος is not the work of uninformed scribes dealing with the disuse of the Tetragrammaton but rather is another testimony that the high Christology of the New Testament writers was both early and deliberate.

5.3.1 Context

Similar to the hymn in Philippians 2:5-11, the passage in 1 Corinthians 8:1-13 contains important theological and Christological truths, though these are subservient to the ethical thrust of the passages. In Philippians 2 Paul's concern is for the exercise of humility as patterned after the example of Christ. What follows in Philippians is a hymn which recounts in poetic form the unique person and work of Jesus Christ. Volumes have been written quarrying the riches of this Christological goldmine. It seems almost anti-climactic after reading the Philippians hymn to direct the reader back to the theme at hand. In some ways, the situation is similar in 1 Corinthians 8:4-6. What Paul pens here is certainly a surprise theologically, and the reader will surely be forgiven for stopping midway in the argument to take in the Christological import of the passage.

In 1 Corinthians 8:1-13 and 10:14-11:1 Paul deals with the issue of eating food sacrificed to idols, whether in the marketplace or specifically in pagan temples. Although Paul agrees in part with the Corinthians' monotheism and their view of idols, it is the arrogant exercise of their freedom which Paul takes exception to. Paul begins this section (1 Cor 8:1) with *περὶ δέ* ("now concerning"; cf. 7:1, 25; 12:1; 16:1, 12) which indicates that this topic was not new but likely one which the Corinthians had broached in previous correspondence. 1 Corinthians 8:1 recalls the longer form in 7:1, *Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε* ("Now concerning the things about which you wrote"). The task of reconstructing the Corinthian statements is made more difficult without the benefit of quotation marks. A degree of uncertainty accompanies these reconstructions.

Paul appears to sidestep his readers' position by introducing the primacy of love as a principle in ethical matters. "Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up" (1 Cor 8:1, NIV; NA28: *ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ*). The Corinthians likely had written about their knowledge and how it justified their actions. Paul is quick to introduce a criterion that puts

the whole discussion in a different perspective which will become the measuring rod to judge the correctness of their actions.

5.3.2 Corinthian Monotheism

In 1 Corinthians 8:4 Paul resumes what he has begun in verse 1: Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων (NA28; NASV: “Therefore concerning the eating of things sacrificed to idols”). Here Paul deals with the content of the Corinthians’ knowledge and uses the collective “we” to indicate where he has some agreement with them. The two propositions where Paul has some agreement are as follows: οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς (1 Cor 8:4, NA28; NRSV: “we know that ‘no idol in the world really exists,’ and that ‘there is no God but one’”). The quotation marks in the NRSV suggest that these two statements were supplied by the Corinthians themselves. Giblin (1975:530) supports this position with a detailed analysis of the Greek syntax of the two statements made by the Corinthians:

οἶδαμεν in vs. 4b is followed by καὶ ὅτι (vs. 4c) after a first ὅτι (vs. 4b), and both conjunctions introduce ... parallel clauses (the nominal sentences οὐδὲν κτλ. and οὐδεὶς κτλ.). In passages where he expresses simply his own ideas, Paul generally employs only one ὅτι and introduces a correlative clause, if there is one, by καὶ alone, not by καὶ ὅτι. On the other hand, when he is quoting a known passage (like the kerygmatic formulation in 1 Cor 15:3b-4), he repeats ὅτι after καὶ (ὅτι ... καὶ ὅτι), as he does here.

This gives weight to the idea that both clauses were quoted by Paul from earlier Corinthian correspondence.

In the first clause there are a number of reasons for translating the οὐδὲν as an attributive adjective as the NRSV does: “we know that ‘no idol in the world really exists’” (1 Cor 8:4, NRSV; NA28: οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ). In the second clause, οὐδεὶς is necessarily rendered as an attributive: καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς (1 Cor 8:4, NA28; NRSV: “and that ‘there is no God but one’”). It makes sense, therefore, to translate the

first οὐδὲν in like manner as an attributive. Rainbow (1987:140-141) argues for the attributive sense here and supplies a number of supporting reasons. The word order is more readily rendered with the attributive—although the predicative use is not impossible (1987:140). If Paul wanted to prevent his readers from taking οὐδὲν attributively he could have supplied the copulative ἐστίν which would have required the predicative use (1987:140). If the predicative use were correct the following phrase ἐν κόσμῳ (“in the world”) would be a pleonasm: “an idol is nothing—in the world” (1987:140-141). With the attributive use, the phrase “in the world” suggests the sphere in which the negative statement about idols holds true (1987:141). However, it is equally possible that the anarthrous ἐν κόσμῳ could convey the idea of “reality” rather than a physical location (Thiselton, 2000:630; cf. Giblin 1975:531).

The second clause which in all likelihood was cited back from the Corinthians is unambiguously monotheistic: καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς (1 Cor 8:4, NA28; NRSV: “and that ‘there is no God but one’”). The use of the term ‘idol’ as a reference to false gods coupled with this monotheistic formula puts Paul squarely in line with Jewish thought.

Numerous examples from Jewish literature express the oneness of God:

To you it was shown that you might know that YHWH, he is God; there is no other besides him (Deut 4:35, NASV; YHWH substituted).

Know therefore today, and take it to your heart, that YHWH, he is God in heaven above and on the earth below; there is no other (Deut 4:39, NASV; YHWH substituted).

Thus says YHWH, the King of Israel and his Redeemer, YHWH of hosts: ‘I am the first and I am the last, and there is no God besides me’ (Isa 44:6, NASV; YHWH substituted).

For there is no god besides you who has concern for everything (Wis 12:13, Lexham English LXX).

For there is no other besides the Lord, neither in heaven, nor on the earth, nor in the deepest places, nor in the one foundation (2 Enoch 47:3, Andersen 1983, 1:174).

With this statement (1 Cor 8:4b) and the anti-idolatry statement immediately preceding, the Corinthians have built their case: since the gods represented by idols have no real existence in the world because there is only one God, eating food sacrificed to idols whether in the marketplace or in pagan temples is of no consequence. Paul now affirms what is correct and qualifies what is not.

Discussions regarding idols in Jewish thought and in Paul have two streams of interpretation. First, some hold that idols are really “nothings;” this tradition is found in passages in Second Isaiah, Wisdom 13-15 and in Philo. The following passages illustrate this position:

No one recalls, nor is there knowledge or understanding to say, ‘I have burned half of it in the fire and also have baked bread over its coals. I roast meat and eat *it*. Then I make the rest of it into an abomination, I fall down before a block of wood!’ (Isa 44:19, NASV).

When praying for his possessions and marriages and children, he is not ashamed, though addressing the lifeless thing, and he appeals to what is weak regarding his health. He entreats what is dead about life; he asks what is ignorant for help, what cannot take a step about a journey, for gain and production and success of his hands; from the thing whose hands are most powerless, he asks for strength! (Wis 13:17–19, Lexham English LXX).

The other stream in Jewish thought sees idol worship as the worship of demons:

And they served their carved idols,
and it became to them as a stumbling block.
And they sacrificed their sons
and their daughters to the demons,
and they poured out innocent blood,
blood of their sons and daughters,
whom they sacrificed to the carved idols of Canaan;

and the land was polluted with the murders
(Ps 105:36–38, Lexham English LXX).

(And those) who worship stones, and those who carve images of gold and of silver and of wood and of clay, and those who worship evil spirits and demons, and all kinds of idols not according to knowledge, they shall get no manner of help in them (1 Enoch 99:7: Isaac, 1983, 1:80).

Separate yourself from the gentiles,
and do not eat with them,
and do not become associates of theirs.
Because their deeds are defiled,
and all of their ways are contaminated, and despicable, and abominable. They slaughter their sacrifices to the dead, and to the demons they bow down
(Jubilees 22:16-17, Wintermute, 1983, 2:98).

Within the Pauline literature both positions are found. In 1 Corinthians 8:4 Paul agrees with the Corinthians that “there is no idol in the world.” Later Paul adds the idea that behind idols or false gods there are cosmic powers and participation in pagan religion puts the person in danger of idolatry. In 1 Corinthians 10 Paul elaborates on what is at stake for the Christian participating in pagan rituals:

What do I mean then? That a thing sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything? *No*, but *I say* that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God; and I do not want you to become sharers in demons. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons (1 Cor 10:19–21, NASV).

Yeo (1995:189) shows how Paul straddles both traditions in his thought while the ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ Corinthians have focused only on one perspective or the other: “Paul believes in both the vanity and the power of the idol because of apocalyptic tension and ambiguity in his thought. But the ‘strong’ and the ‘weak’ hold merely to the vanity or the power of the idol respectively.”

Already in 1 Corinthians 8:5 Paul is beginning to set up his later arguments and connect with them the two views of idols as “nothings” or as conjuring demons. In Greek 8:5–6 together form a single sentence in which the protasis deals with what is true for pagans and the apodosis with what is true for Christians:

For even if there are so-called gods, whether in heaven or on earth (as indeed there are many “gods” and many “lords”), yet for us there is but one God, the Father, from whom all things came and for whom we live; and there is but one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom all things came and through whom we live (1 Cor 8:5–6, NIV).

The single sentence is an *anacoluthon* in Greek having some awkwardness grammatically.⁵ The “for” (γάρ) connects what follows and further develops the monotheistic propositions in 8:4. The “gods” are “so-called” (λεγόμενοι θεοί, 1 Cor 8:5, NA28) which only contrasts further with the one God who only and truly possesses divinity. Fee (1987:372) explains the sense in which the pagan gods are referred to: “They are ‘so-called’ because they do not have existence in the form their worshippers believe them to have.” In 8:5 Paul recognizes the subjective reality that the “gods” possess in the minds of those who reverence them. They do not exist objectively but they are real in the minds of the weak, who still see them as powerful beings able to affect those who associate with them.

In Galatians 4:8 Paul also refers to “gods” (θεοί) in the plural. In that passage Paul characterizes them as “those which by nature are no gods” (NASV, NA28: τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς). Rainbow (1987:142) gives this description of the “gods”: “These beings, however powerful they are objectively, lack that divine essence (φύσις) by virtue of which God alone can be and act as God.” Paul has not shut the door on the discussion

⁵ Thiselton (2000:631) correctly argues: “Since the introductory καὶ γὰρ εἶπερ at the beginning of v. 5 gives to v. 5 the status of a protasis of a conditional, or perhaps the condition for a concessive, the first word in v. 6, ἀλλ’ strictly interrupts the syntax as if v. 5 had already functioned as a main clause. The awkwardness is avoided in P46, B, 33, and Irenaeus by omitting the ἀλλ’. However, most writers consider this an early ‘tidying’ of what is strictly an anacoluthon. The sense remains clear enough, even if the syntax is not smooth”.

about lesser cosmic beings, but when placed against the background of the one true God, all others fail to measure up.

In 1 Corinthians 8:5 Paul introduces a second category of divine beings with the introduction of κύριοι πολλοί (“many lords”) which in the following verse contrast with the singular “Lord” (κύριος). Fee (1987:373) contends that the divine beings which are worshipped in pagan religion are variously called “gods” and at other times are called “lords”:

The two terms ‘gods’ and ‘lords’ ... reflect the two basic forms of Greco-Roman religion as it has been modified by the coming of the Oriental cults. The ‘gods’ designate the traditional deities, who are regularly given this appellation in the literature but are seldom referred to as *kyrioi* (‘lords’). The term *kyrios*, on the other hand, is the normal title for the deities of the mystery cults.

Rainbow (1987:157) suggests that the terms “gods” and “lords” were to some extent synonymous; evidence from papyri and inscriptions from the period confirm this:

High gods given the title κύριος included Isis and Sarapis, Osiris, Jupiter Heliopolitanus, and, in Syria, Zeus. Olympian deities for the most part continued to be called θεοί, but in various places local usage might apply the term κύριοι to such Olympians as Apollo, Artemis, Athena, and Hermes, as well as to the highly venerated Greek gods Asklepios, Chronos, and Dionysos.

Paul does not seem to distinguish “gods” and “lords” for both appear to be an expansion of the category of “so-called gods.” Paul is opening up the term “so-called gods” to include both categories of false gods. This is the situation on the pagan side of the equation. Paul will do something similar on the believers’ side as well.

5.3.3 *Shema* Redefined

In the apodosis of the sentence beginning in 8:5, Paul directs his attention toward what is true for Christians. The strong adversative and pronoun ἀλλ’ ἡμῖν (“but for us”) signal a shift in focus from what is true

for pagans to what is true theologically for believers. Waaler (2008:395, adapted) lays out the structure of the passage:

ἀλλ' ἡμῖν but for us			
o-x		εἷς θεὸς one God	ὁ πατήρ the Father
	a	ἐξ οὗ from whom	
	b		τὰ πάντα all things
	b		καὶ ἡμεῖς and we
	a	εἰς αὐτόν for him	
o-y		καὶ εἷς κύριος and one Lord	Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Jesus Christ
	a	δι' οὗ through whom	
	b		τὰ πάντα all things
	b		καὶ ἡμεῖς and we
	a	δι' αὐτοῦ through him	

The internal symmetry suggests the closest possible relation between the “one God, the Father,” and the “one Lord, Jesus Christ.” It is also important to note the contrast with what comes before this in the passage. The “so-called gods” are expanded to include “many gods” and “many lords.” Similarly the phrase in 8:4, “there is no God but one” is expanded in 8:6 to include the “one God, the Father” and the “one Lord, Jesus Christ.”

The language Paul uses to place the one God and the one Lord in the Divine identity has its roots in monotheistic Jewish thought. What Paul says in 1 Corinthians 8:4-6 can be seen as a Christian restatement of the *Shema*.

Deut 6:4 (MT): שמע ישראל יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד

Deut 6:4 (LXX): Ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ· κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν.

Hear, O Israel! The Lord, our God, the Lord is one.

Jews at this time would have understood the “one Lord” as an echo of the *Shema* especially in the context of “one God.” The surprise in the passage is that Paul identifies the “one Lord” as the historical figure Jesus Christ (Bowman & Komoszewski, 2007:166). The Tetragrammaton stands behind the double reference to κύριος in the LXX^{κύριος} *Shema*, and this connection to the Lord Jesus Christ carries with it the highest honors reserved only for YHWH. Redefining the *Shema* in Christological terms has produced “a sort of christological monotheism” (Wright, 1991:129). DeLacey (1982:200-201) highlights the implications of Paul’s reformulation: “It is hard to conceive of a clearer means by which Paul could indicate both that he was aligning Jesus with the *kyrios* of the LXX and that he was doing so within a thoroughly Jewish framework of thought.”

5.3.4 Christ and Creation

Most scholars hold that in 1 Corinthians 8:6b there is a very early reference to the pre-existence of Christ as the mediator of creation. This view has been challenged by Murphy-O’Connor (1978) in his article “1 Cor viii, 6—Cosmology or Soteriology?” Murphy-O’Connor (1978:265) reveals his interpretation in a paraphrase of 1 Corinthians 8:6: “From God come all things which enable us to return to him. All these things are given through Christ and in him we go to the Father.”

Murphy-O’Connor (1978:264) argues that the passage composes a single movement. From this assumption, Murphy-O’Connor (1978:264) goes on to suggest that this movement can only be cosmic or salvific, it cannot be both. This antithesis is not valid. It is Murphy-O’Connor’s language about multiple movements as “radical shifts in perspective”

(1978:264) that sounds extreme but in reality the shifts from cosmic to salvific are within the realm of possibility.

Murphy-O'Connor builds his argument that the passage must be salvific on the literary form used here. He regards the passage in 1 Corinthians 8:6 as a "baptismal acclamation" (1978:257, 259). He (1978:258) goes on to situate this acclamation in the exclamation of the worshipping community:

...the *Sitz im Leben* of Christian acclamations was the liturgical assembly. It was on such occasions that Christians were found grouped together, and there the saving power of God in Christ was experienced most intensely. The acclamation *kyrios Iêsous* (1 Cor., xii, 3) is commonly interpreted as an ecstatic cry expressive of the surging enthusiasm of the assembly.

The simple statement: "Jesus is Lord" (1 Cor 12:3) has the terseness that more likely would have found its origin in the worship of the believing community, but the passage in 1 Corinthians 8:6 is different. Rainbow (1987:150) argues that the passage is better treated as a confession:

However the material in 8.6 might have originated, moreover, in its present context it is surely not acclamatory. It is written by Paul, not spoken by a worshipping community; its setting is an epistle, not a worship service; it is a group of propositions responding to theoretical assertions of the Corinthian church, not a response to the sensed divine power or presence.

If this passage is not an acclamation, Murphy-O'Connor also fails in his secondary argument that cosmology introduces "an abstract and theoretical element which is not in keeping with the nature of the literary form" (1978:258).

Murphy-O'Connor argues that the double reference to τὰ πάντα ("all things") must be constrained by the context it occurs in: "It means 'all things' within a given framework, and it derives its specific meaning from the context in which it is found" (1978:259-260). From that point of view, it should be mentioned that Paul has used terms in 8:4 that encompass the

whole of the created world: ἐν κόσμῳ (“there is no idol *in the world*”, italics mine) and in like manner: εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς (1 Cor 8:5, NA28; NASV: “whether in heaven or on the earth”). These terms are the same ones used in the creation narrative: ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ (Gen 2:1; Göttingen LXX). In using these terms, Paul is also covering all of the created order. Moreover, the author of Genesis collects all of the creation that was created with the term τὰ πάντα: καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα, ὅσα ἐποίησεν, καὶ ἰδοὺ καλὰ λίαν (Gen 1:31, Göttingen LXX; “and God saw *all things* which he made, and behold they were very good”, italics mine). Paul’s description sweeps from one end of the created order to the other.

In another passage also dealing with the eating of food sacrificed to idols, Paul backs his argument about the suitability of such eating with a quote from Psalm 24:1: “for the earth is the Lord’s (κυρίου), and all it contains” (1 Cor 10:26, NASV). In the next verse in Psalm 24, there is reference to God’s work in creation: “He laid the foundation of it upon the sea. Upon rivers he prepared it” (Ps 23:2 Lexham English LXX [Ps 24:2 MT]). The Psalmist builds upon the proposition of God the Creator. Later in the Psalm God is referred to as Savior: “This one will receive a blessing from the Lord (κυρίου) and mercy from God, his savior” (Ps 23:5 Lexham English LXX).

One passage that Murphy-O’Connor dismisses is worthy of further examination. Murphy-O’Connor (1978:262) considers Colossians 1:15-20 as too late to be of help in 1 Corinthians. I do not share that position; I accept the Pauline authorship of Colossians. Even putting aside the questions of authorship and date, Murphy-O’Connor doubts that these passages have any cosmological emphasis. However, in the two stanzas of Colossians 1:15-20, Redmond (2004:292) has illustrated the dual emphasis of Christ’s activity in creation and redemption:

Christ and Creation	Christ and Redemption
1:15-18a	1:18b-20
who is the image of the invisible God (15)	who is the beginning (18)
firstborn over all creation (15)	firstborn from the dead (18)
all things created in him, through him, for him (16)	to reconcile all things to him (20)
all things, the things in the heavens and upon the earth (16)	all things to him, whether the things on the earth or in the heavens (20)
he is before all things, and all things exist in him (17)	he may be first in all things, and all the fullness was pleased to dwell in him (18, 19)

(adapted from Redmond, 2004:292).

There is significant symmetry in comparing Christ's work in creation and in redemption. Colossians 1:16 begins with an explicit statement about Christ's work in creation: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (NA28; NASV: "For by him all things were created"). Again Paul uses the broad term τὰ πάντα to describe the scope of creation. As in 1 Corinthians 8, Paul uses paired terms to spell out what "all things" contain: ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Col 1:16, NA28; NASV: "in the heavens and on earth"); τὰ ὄρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα (Col 1:16, NA28; NASV: "visible and invisible"); εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι (Col 1:16, NA28; NASV: "whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities"). In chiasmic fashion, Paul reiterates and expands his opening with τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται (Col 1:16, NA28; NASV: "all things have been created through him and for him"). Paul has set the limits of Christ's work in creation to include everything that exists. Colossians 1:17 delineates the scope of Christ's continuing work with creation: αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν (NA28; NASV: "He is before all things, and in him all things hold together"). Everything that exists relies on Christ's sustaining work. There is no mistake: Paul has argued persuasively in this passage for the pre-existence of Christ in his role in creation. Some of the same language carries over into the stanza on

Christ's work in redemption. The recurrent phrase τὰ πάντα is used for the scope of Christ's work of redemption: δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν (Col 1:20, NA28; NASV: "through him to reconcile all things to himself"). Paul again defines the scope of "all things" to include εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (1 Cor 1:20, NA28; NASV: "whether things on earth or things in heaven").

In Colossians 1:15-20, Paul gives substantial attention to Christ's role in creation and redemption. This is further evidence that a shift from cosmic to salvific (*contra* Murphy-O'Connor [1978:264]) is certainly possible in Paul. Redmond (2004:295) is correct in asserting that the Reformation's focus on justification by faith should not overshadow every other theme in Paul. Gibbs (1971:113) contends that both creation and redemption in Colossians 1:15-20 are spheres of Christ's Lordship:

In spite of a strong theological presupposition by some, there is no evidence which says that strophe 1 must be interpreted by strophe 2, or that creation must be interpreted by redemption. Again in this hymn, rather, creation and redemption are both there under Christ's lordship, neither is subordinated to the other, and both are related to one another only through that lordship.

Although Pauline soteriology is a major emphasis in the New Testament, the parallel passages in Colossians 1:15-20 and 1 Corinthians 8:6 also demonstrate the role of the pre-existent Christ in the creation of all things.

Paul is not the only New Testament writer to deal with Jesus' role in creation. In Hebrews 1:2 the role of the Son in creation is declared: ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας (NA28; NASV: "whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the world"). In 1:10 (Ps 101:26 LXX [Ps 102:26 MT]), the Son is again acknowledged for his work in creation: σὺ κατ' ἀρχάς, κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσιν οἱ οὐρανοί (Heb 1:10, NA28; NASV: "You, Lord, in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of your hands"). The scope of creation is opened

up by the familiar pair of opposites, τὴν γῆν ... οἱ οὐρανοί, which are also used in Colossians 1:16, 20 and in 1 Corinthians 8:5. Christ was active not only in creating but also in sustaining what he had made: φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ (Heb 1:3, NA28; NASV: “upholds all things by the word of his power”) (cf. Col 1:17). In the first chapter of Hebrews the superiority of the Son is emphasized, and one of the ways that this is achieved is through making clear his role in creation.

As in Hebrews, the writer of the Gospel of John begins his work with highest statements about the deity of Christ. The Logos was instrumental in creation and John has used familiar terms to describe this act: πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν (John 1:3, NA28; NASV: “All things came into being through him, and apart from him nothing came into being that has come into being”). Although it lacks the article, πάντα is used here to indicate the scope of the Christ’s work in creation. The latter part of 1:3 reiterates the first part in the negative: “and apart from him nothing came into being that has come into being.” The pre-existence of the Logos is already made sure in the first two verses: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God (John 1:1-2, NASV). In 1:10 John uses the term ὁ κόσμος (“the world”) to indicate the extent of creation through the Logos: ὁ κόσμος δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (John 1:10, NA28; NASV: “the world was made through him”).

While different authors expressed the work of Christ in the act of creation in different ways, there is also significant overlap in terms and concepts:

	1 Cor 8:6	Col 1:16	Heb 1:2-3	John 1:3	John 1:10
Preposition	δι'	ἐν, δι'	δι'	δι'	δι'
Verb	(none)	κτίζω	ποιέω	γίνομαι	γίνομαι
Pronoun	οὗ	αὐτῷ, αὐτοῦ	οὗ	αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ
Antecedent of the Pronoun	εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός	τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (v. 13)	ἐν υἱῷ	ὁ λόγος	ὁ λόγος or τὸ φῶς
Subject or Object	τὰ πάντα	τὰ πάντα	τοῦς αἰῶνας	πάντα	ὁ κόσμος

(Redmond, 2004:302).

It is worth mentioning that all of the passages that deal with Christ's role in creation use διὰ with the genitive to express the agency of Christ in creation. The use of ἐν with the dative carries the same sense of agency. Redmond (2004:302) draws out the implications of these creational passages:

The verbal similarities of these passages suggest at least the possibility of a common source. Several writers recognize the similarity of at least some of these passages; few recognize all four. If there is an underlying source—whether hymnic, poetic, liturgical, or catechetical—then a source antedating 1 Corinthians would be early indeed. 'Agent of creation' may be an important part of the very early Christian understanding of Jesus.

The pre-existence of Christ in his role as the instrumental cause of creation offers major support for the doctrine of the deity of Christ.

5.3.5 Christological Monotheism

There are other passages that seem to differ in their use of prepositional phrases to describe the relationship of God and of Christ vis-à-vis creation and redemption. In the doxology of Romans 11:36 it is God who is the referent: ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν (NA28; NASV: "For from him and through him and to him are all things. To him be the glory forever. Amen").

The first and third phrases parallel 1 Corinthians 8:6:

Preposition	Rom 11:36	Referent	1 Cor 8:6	Referent
ἐκ	ἐξ αὐτοῦ ... τὰ πάντα	God	ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα	God
διὰ	δι' αὐτοῦ ... τὰ πάντα	God	δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα	Christ (κύριος)
εἰς	εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα	God	ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν	God

It is noteworthy that, in the passage in Romans, God is the one “through [whom] ... are all things” (Rom 11:36, NASV; NA28: δι' αὐτοῦ ... τὰ πάντα). In the parallel passage in 1 Corinthians 8:6 the same preposition is used to describe Christ's (κύριος) role in creation. By way of contrast, in Colossians 1:16 Jesus is the one for whom all creation exists: τὰ πάντα ... καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται (NA28; NASV: “all things have been created ... for him”). Outside of Paul, the author of Hebrews states about God that “through whom are all things” (Heb 2:10, NASV; NA28: δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα). From this it is apparent that certain of these prepositions are at times used interchangeably in reference to God and to Christ. The result is not confusion, but rather is an example of the interdependence of God and Christ language. Waaler (2008:437) identifies the various places of theological overlap between God and the Lord Jesus Christ in 1 Corinthians:

Jesus ... enters into the theological structures associated with Yahweh. The OT speaks of Yahweh as the Rock, Paul about Jesus as the Rock. The Jews spoke of one God, Paul of one Lord Jesus Christ alongside God. The Jews spoke of love towards Yahweh, Paul about love towards Christ as well. The Jews feared the wrath of God, Paul warns against the wrath of the Lord. The Jews described God as creator and saviour, Paul describes Jesus as taking part in creation and salvation.

From the present inquiry it has become clear how Paul (or his source) redefines the *Shema* incorporating Jesus Christ into the Divine identity and in the context of the same sentence acknowledges Jesus Christ at the

creation of all things and ascribes to him pre-existence with God. It is imperative to understand the implications for the Divine identity: “If it is true that Paul uses God-language in order to interpret and ‘define’ Christ, it is also true that language about Christ in turn redefines the identity of God” (Richardson, 1994:307). Rainbow (1987:159) is correct in his understanding of the high honors ascribed to Christ in this passage: “In this particular context, redolent of the language of monotheism, κύριος must be given its loftiest connotation of deity.” What was said in the *Shema* about YHWH is now applied to the Lord Jesus Christ.

In the fourth century, a Trinitarian version of this Binitarian statement (1 Cor 8:6) was used. Gregory of Nazianzus quotes the Trinitarian rendering:

Oration 39, On the Holy Lights	
For us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things (Oration 39.12; Daley, 2006:133).	Ἡμῖν δὲ, εἷς Θεὸς ὁ Πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἓν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα (PG, 36:348).

A longer addition to 1 Corinthians 8:6 is found in a few manuscripts: 0142, 234, 460, 618; these also add a final member: καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ, “and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things, and we in him” (Metzger, 1994:491). Gregory uses this passage as biblical evidence for the deity of the three persons of the Trinity. The addition of the Holy Spirit likely goes beyond Paul in this case, but it is not without support from other passages in 1 Corinthians. In 1 Corinthians 12:4-6 Paul includes the three members of the Divine identity: “Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are varieties of ministries, and the same Lord. There are varieties of effects, but the same God who works all things in all persons” (1 Cor 12:4-6, NASV). It is essential to note the

titles given to the persons of the Godhead: “the same Spirit (τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα) ... the same Lord (ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος) ... the same God (ὁ αὐτὸς θεὸς)” (1 Cor 12:4-6, NA28). This places the Lord Jesus Christ together with the Holy Spirit in receipt of the highest honors reserved for God. In fact, Paul has just finished asserting that “no one can say, ‘Jesus is Lord,’ except by the Holy Spirit” (1 Cor 12:3, NASV; NA28: οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν· Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, εἰ μὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ). In this context, the casual meaning of κύριος as “sir” is not in view here. Anyone could by his own volition say that Jesus is “sir” or “master”; both senses are common as earthly appellatives. The first part of the sentence gives some indication that simple human designations are not intended. Paul solemnly declares: “no one speaking by the Spirit of God says, ‘Jesus is accursed’” (1 Cor 12:3, NASV; NA28: οὐδεὶς ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ λαλῶν λέγει· Ἄνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς). Whoever declares that Jesus is *anathema* (ἀνάθεμα) has put himself outside of the community of faith. At the close of the epistle Paul again uses the same curse (ἀνάθεμα) to demonstrate the seriousness of rejecting Jesus as Lord: “If anyone does not love the Lord, let him be accursed. Maranatha” (1 Cor 16:22, NASV; NA28: εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα. μαράνα θά). Again Jesus is given reverence that only God was afforded.

In the end, Paul has redefined the *Shema* to include Jesus Christ in the Divine identity. The statement: “there is no God but one” is expanded to include “one God, the Father,” and “one Lord, Jesus Christ.” To the Jew with some familiarity with the *Qere* of the MT *Shema* or the LXX^{κύριος} *Shema*, the language of “one God” and “one Lord” would bring to mind the language of the *Shema*. For Christ to share the title of κύριος in the LXX^{κύριος} *Shema* was an honor reserved for YHWH alone. The notion that Christ was involved in the creation of the world only serves to strengthen the case for the deity of Christ and firmly aligns him with the Divine

κύριος of the LXX^{κύριος}. To suggest as Howard (1977) does that at least some of the high honors applied to Jesus were the result of the confusion of later scribes in dealing with the decline in understanding of the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament is to disregard the available evidence. If, as some claim, 1 Corinthians 8:6 is based on some earlier tradition whether from Paul or another source, then the passage is very early indeed. Placing Christ in the Divine identity was not a later mistake but rather was intentional and supported by the earliest witnesses.

In the next section, I will explore the common phrase “call upon the name of the Lord” and see how Old and New Testaments intersect in the use of the Divine Name surrogate, κύριος.

5.4 Call on the Name of the Lord

A picture is beginning to emerge from the biblical data presented to this point: Paul uses the word “Lord” (κύριος, מר) in reference to Jesus often with the fullest implications of deity. The presence of the untranslated Aramaic expression “Maranatha” (μαράνα θά, NA28) in an early epistle of Paul (1 Cor 16:22) suggests that the custom of addressing Jesus as “Lord” in a way that equalled what was said of YHWH began in the earliest Palestinian church and not in scribal error of the second century as Howard (1977) suggests. What I found from the same epistle in the revised *Shema* demonstrates that the Divine identity early on included “one God, the Father” and “one Lord, Jesus Christ” (1 Cor 8:6). The focus of this section centers on the recurrent expression “call on the name of the Lord” used *mutatis mutandis* in the Old and New Testaments. I want to establish whether κύριος in this context was employed as a surrogate for the Divine Name appropriate only to YHWH but at the same time deliberately referring to Jesus Christ. The implication of Howard’s (1977) thesis that the Tetragrammaton was used in the New Testament and not distinctly with regards to Jesus Christ will be further evaluated below. I

want to establish whether the use of the surrogate κύριος for Jesus in the context of “calling on the name of the Lord” was early, intentional and involving honors of the highest order.

5.4.1 Old Testament Background

To properly understand the meaning and significance of the expression “call on the name of the Lord” (קרא בשם יהוה) with its variations, it is necessary to explore the Old Testament occurrences of this phrase. In their lexicon, Koehler and Baumgartner provide the English translational equivalents of קרא as “to call on, shout to a deity” (HALOT, s.v. קרא). In the MT the phrase קרא בשם יהוה is often translated in two ways: 1) “to call on the name of YHWH” and 2) “to proclaim the name of YHWH” (HALOT, s.v. קרא). To be sure, there is some overlap between these two concepts. Strazicich (2007:290) distinguishes six categories to classify the different scriptural uses:

1) “Proclamational”: in reply to Moses’ request to see the glory of God, part of the response was YHWH’s self-proclamation of his name: “I myself will make all my goodness pass before you, and will proclaim the name of YHWH (קראתי בשם יהוה) before you” (Exod 33:19, based on NASV, BHS). To this could be added Exodus 34:5 where God again proclaims his sacred name to Moses: “YHWH descended in the cloud and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of YHWH (יקרא בשם יהוה)” (based on ESV, BHS). Allen (2002:50) prefers the idea of proclamation in his translation of Psalm 105:1 (= 1 Chron 16:8): “Give thanks to Yahweh; proclaim his name (הודו ליהוה קראו בשמו [BHS]); make known his actions among the peoples.” Various English Bible versions render this Hebrew verse with “call upon his name” (i.e., NASV, ESV, cf. NIV). Both senses could be used here and each fits the context. In Isaiah 12:4 there is a

similar association of invocation and proclamation: “Give thanks to YHWH, call upon his name (הוֹדוּ לַיהוָה קְרְאוּ בְשֵׁמוֹ), make known his deeds among the peoples, proclaim that his name is exalted” (Isa 12:4, based on ESV, BHS).

2) “Prayer of complaint”: the psalmist recalls how he cried out to YHWH in crisis: “Then I called on the name of YHWH (בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה אֶקְרָא): ‘O YHWH, I pray, deliver my soul!’” (Ps 116:4, based on ESV, BHS).

3) “Praise and thanksgiving”: in response to divine rescue, the psalmist offers a thank offering: “I will lift up the cup of salvation and call on the name of YHWH (בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה אֶקְרָא)” (Ps 116:13, based on ESV, BHS).

Again later in the same psalm, the psalmist uses similar words, the repetition of which underscores the emphasis in declaring his thanks: “I will offer to you the sacrifice of thanksgiving and call on the name of YHWH (בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה אֶקְרָא)” (Ps 116:17, based on ESV, BHS). In both verses, the thank offering is followed by an identical solemn vow, promised while in distress, now offered publicly among the faithful: “I will pay my vows to YHWH in the presence of all his people” (Ps 116:14, 18, based on ESV, BHS).

4) “Cultic worship”: in Genesis 12:8, 13:4 and 26:25, “calling on the name of YHWH” was accompanied by altar building: “And there he [Abram] built an altar to YHWH and called upon the name of YHWH (קָרָא בְשֵׁם יְהוָה)” (Gen 12:8, based on ESV, BHS). In Isaiah 12:4 above, we found that “calling on the name of the Lord” is an activity that fits properly within the context of worship. The accompanying religious activities include giving thanks, singing and shouting for joy, exalting YHWH in his greatness, proclaiming his actions on behalf of his people to fellow worshippers but also to the surrounding nations. Davis (1996:104) correctly asserts: “from the outset, the biblical narrative associates this

phrase with the heart of Israel's religion." The eschatological purification of the nations will be accompanied by "calling on the name of YHWH": "For at that time I will change the speech of the peoples to a pure speech, that all of them may call upon the name of YHWH (לקרא בלם בשם יהוה) and serve him with one accord" (Zeph 3:9, based on ESV, BHS).

5) "Eschatological deliverance": Joel 2:28-32 (3:1-5 MT/LXX) is a passage which carries great significance in various New Testament passages and which will be discussed in greater detail below. The crucial verse in Joel that forms the basis for the LXX^{κύριος} quotation used by various New Testament writers is as follows: "And it shall come to pass that everyone who calls on the name of YHWH shall be saved (והיה כל אשר יקרא בשם) (יהוה ימלט)" (Joel 2:32 [3:5], based on ESV, BHS).

6) "Healing": Naaman the Syrian commander received instructions from Elisha the prophet, communicated to him through his servant, to wash seven times in the Jordan. Angry at the suggestion and the indirect way in which he was approached, Naaman revealed his expectation of the prophet: "Behold, I thought that he would surely come out to me and stand and call upon the name of YHWH his God (קרא בשם יהוה אלהיו) and wave his hand over the place and cure the leper" (2 Kings 5:11, based on ESV, BHS).

For those who worship YHWH, "calling on the name of YHWH" is a core designation. The surrounding nations hostile to Israel are described as "peoples that call not on your name (משפחות אשר בשמך לא קראו)" (Jer 10:25, based on ESV, BHS; cf. Ps 79:6). Davis (1996:106) clarifies the significance of "calling on the name of YHWH" to the Old Testament believer: "'calling on the name of the Lord' was an activity indicative of one's inclusion in the people of God." In the same way, Strazicich (2007:296) explains: "Naming the deity is the confessional sign that shows one's intimate relationship to that deity." "Calling on the name of the

Lord” was a sign of covenant participation and at the same time a public declaration of allegiance to YHWH—even in the midst of a hostile environment: e.g., Psalm 105:1; Isaiah 12:4; Zechariah 13:9 (Stuart, 1987:261).

For the most part there is little difference between “calling on the name of YHWH” and “calling on YHWH.” In a number of places, the “name (of YHWH)” is used in synonymous parallelism with a name for God, the Tetragrammaton, or a suitable pronoun. Solomon refers to the habitation of YHWH in two parallel ways that demonstrate the interchangeability of YHWH and his name: “I have indeed built you an exalted house, a place for *you* to dwell in forever” (1 Kings 8:13 [ESV], italics added). Later in the same passage, he states: “I have built the house for the *name of YHWH*, the God of Israel” (1 Kings 8:20, based on ESV, BHS, italics added). In the consecration of Solomon’s temple, God places his name there as a lasting commitment: “And YHWH said to him, ‘I have heard your prayer and your plea, which you have made before me. I have consecrated this house that you have built, by putting my name there forever’” (1 Kings 9:3, based on ESV, BHS). In addition, Davis (1996:111) supplies a number of references where the biblical writer uses language regarding the “name of YHWH” which normally would be used in reference to persons: “one fears (Ps. 61.5[6]; 102.15[16], and Isa. 59.19), sings praises to (Ps. 7.17; 18.49[50], and 44.8[9], gives thanks to (Ps. 44.8[9]; 122.4 and 1 Chron. 16.35), loves (Ps. 5.11[12]; 69.37[36], and Isa. 56.6), and finds protection in the ‘name of the LORD’ (Ps. 20.1[2]).”

Using the word “name” (שם) in distinction to YHWH may indicate something subtle that should not be overlooked. While the examples above suggest that the “name” (שם) of YHWH is never completely separated from his person, distinguishing between YHWH’s name and person may give expression to God’s immanence in a more tangible way. The “name”

of YHWH suggests God's presence with his people. For Solomon there was a tension between the immanence and transcendence of YHWH in localizing the presence of God in the earthly temple: "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you; how much less this house that I have built!" (1 Kings 8:27, ESV). Yet he prays that YHWH will be present and responsive to his people when they worship at the temple: "that your eyes may be open night and day toward this house, the place of which you have said, 'My name shall be there,' that you may listen to the prayer that your servant offers toward this place" (1 Kings 8:29, ESV). In response YHWH promises his presence and his favor: "My eyes and my heart will be there for all time" (1 Kings 9:3, ESV). Buckwalter (1996:179) summarizes this usage of the "name" (שם) of YHWH: "The divine name guarantees God's presence to people in its totality, without compromising God's sovereign transcendence." YHWH makes himself known in the "name." It is the aspect of YHWH which he chooses to disclose to man (Bietenhard, 1968, 5:257). In the New Testament, Jesus is Immanuel, "God with us"—the presence and immanence of YHWH in the flesh.

The LXX κύριος typically translates קרא בשם יהוה with ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ("to call on the name of the Lord": Gen 4:26; 13:4; 26:25; Jer 10:25; Zeph 3:9; Zech 13:9; Ps 78:6; 104:1; 114:4; 115:4; Joel 3:5). There are a few variations to this translation. In Genesis 12:8, the Hebrew phrase קרא בשם יהוה (BHS) is rendered with a preposition plus dative, but with a similar meaning: ἐπεκαλέσατο ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου ("[Abram] called on the name of the Lord" [Göttingen LXX; Lexham English LXX]). In Exodus 33:19, קראתי בשם יהוה (BHS) is rendered in Greek using ἐπί with the dative but with the simple verb: καλέσω ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου κύριος ἐναντίον σου ("I will proclaim my name, the Lord, before you")

[Göttingen LXX]). In Exodus 34:5, **יְקַרְא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה** is translated into Greek with the simple dative without the preposition: ἐκάλεσεν τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου (“he called out in the name of the Lord” [Göttingen LXX; Lexham English LXX]). Elijah calls on the name of the Lord in the contest with the prophets of Baal: ἐγὼ ἐπικαλέσομαι ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ μου (“I will call on the name of the Lord my God” [3 Kgdms 18:24, Rahlfs LXX, Lexham English LXX]); the translated Hebrew is: **אִקְרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה** (1 Kings 18:24, BHS). In contrast to the MT, the LXX like the Syriac and certain Vulgate manuscripts add the explicative “my God” (τοῦ θεοῦ μου) (DeVries, 2003:224). These different translation equivalents could be subsumed under the instrumental sense of the inseparable preposition **בְּ**. In our context, “It becomes the means by which the invocation is made” (Strazicich, 2007:293; BDB s.v. **בְּ**, p. 90 “to call *with* the name—in diff. senses, acc. to the context, viz. to *proclaim* ... to *invoke*”). The Greek prepositions ἐπί, ἐν, or the simple dative by itself, can all reflect this sense. When the preposition is part of the compound verb ἐπικαλέω, the inseparable preposition **בְּ** is taken as marking the object of the verb (Davis, 1996:106-107).

In the LXX, the verb ἐπικαλεῖσθαι is frequently found in the middle voice when used for invoking God. Davis (1996:107) counts 114 occurrences of the verb ἐπικαλεῖσθαι in the middle voice, and of these all but 11 are used for invoking God or another deity. Although ἐπικαλεῖσθαι is found in Greek usage in reference to deity (v. LSJ, s.v. ἐπικαλέω), the language is more typically Jewish (Dunn, 1988:610). The verb ἐπικαλεῖσθαι when used in the more general sense of “to call upon the Lord” expands the list of references considerably. Dunn (1988:610) provides a valuable partial list of LXX and pseudepigraphical references: 1) “‘to call upon the Lord’ (Deut 4:7; 1 Sam 12:17–18; 2 Sam 22:4, 7; etc.;

Pss 4:1; 14:4; 18:3, 6; etc.; Isa 55:6; Lam 3:57; Jud 6:21; 8:17; 9:4; 2 Macc 3:22, 31; 4:37; 7:37; 8:2; 12:6; etc.; *Pss. Sol.* 2.36; 9:6; *T. Jud.* 24.6; *T. Dan* 5.11; 6.3); 2) ‘to call upon the name of the Lord’: (Gen 4:26; 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; etc.; Isa 64:7; Jer 10:25; Lam 3:55; Joel 2:32 [LXX 3:5]; Zeph 3:9; Zech 13:9; Jud 16:2).” In Greek as in Hebrew, there is overlap in meaning between “calling on the Lord” and “calling on the *name* of the Lord.”

When one reads the list of passages where calling on (the name of) the Lord occurs it is worth noting how often the writer is in a dire situation. “Calling on (the name of) the Lord” frequently is a prayer for deliverance from peril. A selection of verses from the Psalms (English: Lexham English LXX; Greek: Göttingen LXX) illustrate this:

Psalm 17(18):7: “And when I was distressed, I called upon the Lord (ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με ἐπεκαλεσάμην τὸν κύριον), and to my God I cried aloud. He heard my voice from his holy temple, and my crying before him will enter into his ears.”

Psalm 49(50):15: “Call upon me in the day of tribulation ἐπικάλεσαί με ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεως), and I will deliver you (ἐξελοῦμαι σε), and you will glorify me.”

Psalm 80(81):8(7): “In affliction you called upon me, and I saved you” (Ἐν θλίψει ἐπεκαλέσω με, καὶ ἐρρυσάμην σε).

Psalm 90(91):15: “He will call upon me, and I will listen to him. I am with him in affliction, and I will deliver and honor him” (ἐπικαλέσεταιί με, καὶ εἰσακούσομαι αὐτοῦ, μετ’ αὐτοῦ εἶμι ἐν θλίψει καὶ ἐξελοῦμαι καὶ δοξάσω αὐτόν).

Psalm 114(116):3-4: “The labor pangs of death surrounded me. The dangers of Hades found me. I found affliction and pain (θλίψιν καὶ ὀδύνην εὖρον). And I called upon the name of the Lord, ‘O Lord, rescue my soul’” (τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἐπεκαλεσάμην ὦ κύριε, ῥῦσαι τὴν ψυχὴν μου).

Psalm 117(118):5: “In affliction I called upon the Lord (ἐν θλίψει ἐπεκαλεσάμην τὸν κύριον), and he heard me, bringing me into broad spaces.”

Psalm 144(145):18-19: “The Lord is near to all those who call upon him, to all those who call upon him in truthfulness (ἐγγὺς κύριος πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις αὐτόν, πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις αὐτόν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ). He will do the will of those who fear him, and he will hear their prayers, and he will save them” (σώσει αὐτούς).

Although these LXX quotations are not quoted directly in the discussion below, there is ample evidence from the early church of the influence of the wording of the Psalter on Christian expression and exhortation (Van Unnik, 1984:544-545).

The above is preparation for the New Testament use of Joel 2:28-32 (3:1-5). This passage is quoted from or alluded to in a number of different places in the New Testament (Matt 24:29; Mark 13:24-25; Luke 21:25; Acts 2:17-21, 39; 9:14, 21; 21:9; 22:16; Rom 10:13; 1 Cor 1:2; 2 Tim 2:22; Tit 3:6; Rev 6:12). The Old Testament use of the phrase “to call on the name of the Lord” is foundational to a proper understanding of what in the New Testament will become a self-designation of Christians and a basis for the high Christology of the New Testament. Before this, it would be worthwhile to have some understanding of the context in Joel—the passage that is directly referenced by Paul and others in relation to Jesus.

In Joel the recent invasion of locusts and resulting drought devastates the land and serves as a harbinger for the eschatological “day of YHWH” (Joel 1:15 etc). The phrase “day of YHWH” (יום יהוה [MT]; ἡμέρα κυρίου [LXX^{κύριος}]) is found five times in Joel: 1:15; 2:1, 11, 31 (3:4); 3:14 (4:14), and in each case it is a day of judgment and destruction. This day is near, and the proper response of the faithful is wholehearted repentance: “‘Yet even now,’ declares YHWH, ‘return to me with all your heart, with fasting, with weeping, and with mourning; and rend your hearts and not your garments’” (Joel 2:12–13, based on ESV, BHS). This call to repentance includes everyone, from old to young (1:2-3), drunkards (1:5), farmers and vine growers (1:11) and even priests (1:13)—this was a national crisis involving all levels of society. What happens next is a matter of interpretation. The Hebrew of Joel 2:18 is translated in two ways by translators. The NASV and NIV render the *wav* consecutives and imperfects as future: “Then YHWH will be zealous (וִיקנָא) for his land and

will have pity (וַיַּחַמֵּל) on his people” (based on NASV, BHS). The ESV and LXX, on the other hand, read these verbal constructions as past tenses using aorists in the translation: “And the Lord was zealous (ἐζήλωσε) for his land, and he spared (ἐφείσατο) his people” (Lexham English LXX, Göttingen LXX). After true repentance, God brings physical deliverance and spiritual blessings either as a promise of future deliverance or a statement of past action. The passage which is quoted almost in full in Peter’s Pentecost speech in Acts 2:17-21 and which will occupy our discussion of the New Testament references to “calling on the name of the Lord” is as follows:

And it shall come to pass afterward,
that I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh;
your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,
your old men shall dream dreams,
and your young men shall see visions.
Even on the male and female servants
in those days I will pour out my Spirit.
And I will show wonders in the heavens and on the earth, blood and
fire and columns of smoke. The sun shall be turned to darkness, and
the moon to blood, before the great and awesome day of YHWH
comes. And it shall come to pass that everyone who **calls on the
name of YHWH** shall be saved. For in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem
there shall be those who escape, as YHWH has said, and among the
survivors shall be those whom **YHWH calls** (Joel 2:28-32 [3:1-5],
based on ESV, BHS).

This passage can be separated into three sections, each introduced with a converted perfect. In the first section (2:28-29 [3:1-2]), YHWH promises an outpouring of the Spirit. The section is bracketed with the two identical promises of the Spirit: אֲשַׁפּוּךְ אֶת רוּחִי (ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου [BHS, Göttingen LXX]). Just as the call to repentance included all strata of society, so the bestowing of the Spirit encompasses “all flesh” (כָּל בֶּשָׂר; πᾶσαν σάρκα) irrespective of age, sex, and social standing. In the second section (2:30-31 [3:3-4]), Joel again returns to the dreadful day of YHWH.

Here he foretells the heavenly portents which will accompany this terrible day. For the penitent there is a way of escape. The final section (2:32 [3:5]) contains an *inclusio* with the idea of “calling”: “And it shall come to pass that everyone who calls on (אָרָא; ἐπικαλέσεται) the name of YHWH (κυρίου) shall be saved ... and among the survivors shall be those whom YHWH (κύριος) calls (אָרָא; προσκέκληται)” (based on ESV, BHS, Göttingen LXX). There is a vital connection between those whom YHWH calls and those who call on his name (whole paragraph: Treier, 1997:15).

5.4.2 New Testament Examples

5.4.2.1 Acts

The phrase “call upon the name of the Lord” is used in the New Testament as well. I will demonstrate that the surrogate κύριος is used in place of the Tetragrammaton in reference to Jesus and with it comes all the high honors belonging to YHWH. The κύριος Christology of Acts continues what began in Luke’s Gospel and securely assigns to Jesus Christ the prerogatives of God. A case could be made that in the Gospels there are times when the vocative κύριε carries the sense of “sir” with no associations of deity. However, after the resurrection, when Jesus is referred to as ὁ κύριος, there are present all the connotations of deity—especially when this refers to his present rather than his past status (France, 1982:29). Before making a sharp distinction between pre-resurrection and post-resurrection occurrences of κύριος in reference to Jesus, each Gospel occurrence should be studied in its place not only in the immediate but also the wider interpretive context. Since each of the Gospels was written after the resurrection and therefore inherently has a post-resurrection perspective, there is a case to be made that many of the Gospel instances of κύριος carry more weight than at first thought. The use of κύριος will occupy us further in the section below pertaining to the Gospels. Here, I

will make some summary statements about the Lukan narratives found in the Gospel and in Acts. Luke's high Christology is evident from the first chapters of his Gospel. From the first Jesus is both Lord and Christ.

Elizabeth refers to the baby that Mary carries as κύριος: "Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb! And why is this granted to me that the mother of my Lord (τοῦ κυρίου μου) should come to me?" (Luke 1:42-43, ESV, NA28). The angels proclaim to the shepherds in heavenly chorus the birth of the one who is both Lord and Christ: "Fear not, for behold, I bring you good news of great joy that will be for all the people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord" (σωτήρ ὃς ἐστὶν χριστὸς κύριος) (Luke 2:10-11, ESV, NA28).

In the end of the Gospel of Luke, Jesus is referred to as κύριος in announcement of the resurrection: "The Lord (ὁ κύριος) has risen indeed, and has appeared to Simon!" (Luke 24:34, ESV, NA28). When Jesus shows himself to the disciples, he commands them to stay in Jerusalem to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit: "And behold, I am sending the promise of my Father upon you. But stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high" (Luke 24:49, ESV). It carries great significance that Jesus himself promises the disciples the gift of the Holy Spirit which he would pour out on Pentecost. Before the Gospel closes with Jesus' ascension, he blesses them and Luke records that the disciples "worshipped him" (προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν [Luke 24:52, NA28]).

In Acts Luke picks up where he left off in the Gospel. The first address to Jesus by the apostles is prefaced with κύριε (Acts 1:6, NA28). Luke continues his high Christology as Jesus promises the gift of the Holy Spirit as requisite to the success of the disciples in fulfilling *his* mission: "But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth" (Acts 1:8, ESV). The mission of God is Christ's

mission, and Christ is the focus and supplier of the resources necessary for its consummate completion.

From the same idea as “calling on the name of the Lord” is prayer to Jesus. In the first chapter of Acts, Luke recounts the appointment of an apostle to replace Judas, the betrayer. In Acts 1:24-25, the believers pray for guidance in selecting a successor for Judas: “You, Lord (κύριε), who know the hearts of all, show which one of these two you have chosen to take the place in this ministry and apostleship from which Judas turned aside to go to his own place” (ESV, NA28). There are a number of considerations that should be evaluated in determining the referent of κύριε in 1:24. In Acts 15:8, God is the one “who knows the heart” (ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεός); likewise, a case could be made that in 1:24 the one “who knows the hearts of all” (καρδιογνώστα πάντων) is also God. However, Bowman & Komoszewski (2007:48) give three weighty reasons for choosing Jesus as the referent of κύριε in 1:24. First, κύριος is frequently used by Luke to refer to Jesus. Of the 207 times that κύριος is used in both volumes, 143 refer to Jesus (67 times in Luke; 76 in Acts) (2007:48, 298n.2). Second, Peter refers to Jesus as ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς in Acts 1:21 immediately prior to the prayer that follows. The ideal candidate for the position of apostle is one who has witnessed Jesus’ ministry: “... one of the men who have accompanied us during all the time that the Lord Jesus (ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς) went in and out among us” (Acts 1:21, ESV, NA28). This use of ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς likely picks up the same phrase used in the Gospel in Luke 24:3 for the resurrected Jesus: “they did not find the body of the Lord Jesus” (τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ) (ESV, NA28). Third, it was Jesus who had chosen the disciples—even Paul, after the resurrection. The prayer to the “Lord” (κύριε) here was for direction in selecting a new apostle: “show which one of these two you have chosen” (ἐξελέξω) (Acts 1:24, ESV, NA28). At the beginning of the same chapter, the same verb

and idea are present of Jesus choosing his disciples: “after he had given commands through the Holy Spirit to the apostles whom he had chosen” (ἐξελέξατο) (Acts 1:2, ESV, NA28) (also Bruce, 1986b:80). In the Gospel of Luke, the same verb is used to recount how Jesus chose his disciples: “he called his disciples and chose (ἐκλεξάμενος) from them twelve, whom he named apostles ...” (Luke 6:13, ESV, NA28). When Ananias’ prayer is answered regarding Jesus’ selection of Paul, a related noun is used to describe his “choice”: “But the Lord (ὁ κύριος) said to him, ‘Go, for he is a chosen (ἐκλογῆς) instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel’” (Acts 9:15, ESV, NA28) (2007:48; also Green, 2001:187-188).

In the beginning of Acts, Luke opens his second volume as he closed his first with a high estimation of Jesus Christ as Lord. The κύριος Christology of Acts opens with prayer to Jesus and an acknowledgement that Jesus holds the divine right to select his disciples for his mission. Rowe (2007:53) describes the message of Luke-Acts as a story of how Jesus is κύριος:

In Acts Jesus is κύριος in his heavenly life even as he was κύριος in his earthly life in the Gospel. To be sure, there is a difference in location (earth/heaven), but there is unity in identity. For Luke, the one who was in Mary’s womb, lived, died, and was raised is at every point along this continuum ὁ κύριος.

From the beginning of Acts, Luke’s Christology builds quickly to a climax and applies the divine prerogatives of YHWH to Jesus Christ, the Lord. Luke skillfully builds a case for Christ as Lord intentionally and unreservedly, and this challenges the implications of Howard’s (1977) thesis that the high Christology of the New Testament was artificially inflated through the putative confusion of second century scribes over the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament.

From the selection of Matthias to replace Judas, Luke moves directly into the pouring out of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. Peter’s speech to the

crowd addresses the phenomenon of glossolalia and locates this period in salvation history. What is happening was foretold by the prophet Joel.

What follows is an extensive quotation from Joel 2:28-32 (3:1-5). The first two verses address the pouring of the Holy Spirit:

And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; even on my male servants and female servants in those days I will pour out my Spirit, and they shall prophesy (Acts 2:17-18, ESV).

The resurrection had inaugurated the “last days,” and the descent of God’s Spirit was an integral manifestation of this democratization of the Holy Spirit. Certainly the Jerusalem disciples on whom the Spirit fell were the first of many beneficiaries and do not constitute “all flesh.” Seen in this way, the cosmic disturbances that Joel records and which Luke includes were not displayed in full on Pentecost but would be future preludes to the “great and glorious day of the Lord” (Acts 2:20, NASV). The phenomena that accompanied Jesus’ death on the cross could be seen as the initial throes of the last days (cf. Bruce, 1986b:90). A thorough discussion of the cosmic signs in Joel and in Acts is beyond the scope of this thesis. What concerns us most is the climax of the quote from Joel as recorded by Luke: “And it shall come to pass that everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved” (καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται [Acts 2:21, ESV, NA28]).

The LXX^{κύριος} renders the Tetragrammaton with κυρίου in Joel 2:32 (3:5), and what remains is to determine the referent of the surrogate and the significance of that assignment. At first glance it would not be unreasonable to suggest that God is the referent in Acts 2:21. God is called κύριος in places in the immediate context. In the quotation from Psalm 16:8-11 (Acts 2:25-28), κύριον is likely God, and the same is true of the first κύριος in the quotation from Psalm 110:1 (Acts 2:34-35). Peter

concludes his speech with an allusion to Joel 2:32 (3:5) in Acts 2:39: “For the promise is for you and for your children and for all who are far off, everyone whom the Lord our God (κύριος ὁ θεός) calls to himself” (ESV, NA28). Joel 2:32b (3:5b) concludes with a reference to “[those] whom the Lord has summoned” (οὓς κύριος προσκέκληται [Lexham English LXX; Göttingen LXX]). Peter’s concluding remark brings the reader’s focus back to the Joel quotation at the beginning of Peter’s speech also establishing the central importance of Joel 2:32 (3:5) to the whole of Peter’s address.

However, there are factors in favor of understanding κύριος in Acts 2:21 (Joel 2:32 [3:5]) as referring to Jesus. My examination of the prayer addressed to Jesus in Acts 1:24-25, where I argued that κύριε is best seen as referring to the Lord Jesus, is relevant here. This prayer forms the immediately preceding context to Peter’s Pentecost speech. The reasons that were argued above in favor of considering Jesus as the one addressed in prayer also can be used to support the argument that the κύριος in Acts 2:21 (Joel 2:32 [3:5]) is also Jesus.

The most compelling reasons for seeing Jesus as the referent to the κύριος statement in Acts 2:21 (Joel 2:32 [3:5]) come from a close examination of Peter’s sermon. Following the Joel quotation, Peter immediately begins an explanation that focuses on Jesus (Acts 2:22-36) and his relation to what was happening at Pentecost. The signs and wonders that Jesus performed were proof that the Messiah had come (Acts 2:22), and contrary to Jewish messianic expectations, Peter contends that the tragic end that Jesus faced in the crucifixion was according to God’s purpose and plan (Acts 2:23). However, the story did not end at the cross, but Peter builds a case that Jesus was raised from the dead and received from God honors appropriate only to God himself. Jesus was exalted to God’s right hand and poured out the promised Holy Spirit which he himself received from the Father. The conclusion to Peter’s exegesis of Joel 2:28-

32 (3:1-5), Psalm 16:8-11, and Psalm 110:1 places Jesus at the heart of God’s plan: “Let all the house of Israel therefore know for certain that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified” (Acts 2:36, ESV). Jesus is exalted to God’s right hand, he receives God’s name, and exercises prerogatives appropriate to God alone.

To fully understand the significance of Jesus’ place in the Pentecost sermon, his heavenly exaltation and reign as God’s co-regent, and the importance of κύριος Christology in the early Church, a thorough treatment of the main points in Peter’s exegesis is requisite. Peter’s statement in Acts 2:36 is prefaced with the subordinate conjunction “therefore” (οὖν) to show that the preceding section is now summarized and concluded. The two titles in 2:36, “Lord” (κύριος) and “Christ” (Χριστός) relate back to the scriptural citations referenced. Nevertheless, the title “Lord” (κύριος) is the primary title, and its place in the first and emphatic position (κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ χριστὸν) suggests its importance (Bock, 2007:136). The term “Lord” (κύριος) is picked up first from Joel 2:32 (3:5) and then validated in the quotation from Psalm 110:1. The display of signs and wonders and the resurrection from the dead certify that this “Lord” is also the promised Christ. Bock (2007:136) underscores the significance of κύριος in Peter’s argument: “The term ‘Lord’ in this context shows in particular Jesus’ Lordship over salvation and the distribution of salvation’s benefits.” The enthronement of Jesus at God’s right hand, the seat of preeminent glory, and his role as the dispenser of the Holy Spirit make Jesus the recipient of the title κύριος in the fullest sense of deity.

5.4.2.1.1 Jesus and the Spirit

In Joel’s prophecy recorded in Acts 2:17, God says “I will pour out my Spirit” (ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου [ESV, NA28]), while a few verses later with the same verb it is Jesus who has “poured out” (ἐξέχεεν) the promised Holy Spirit (Acts 2:33). This was not a sudden change of the

divine plan but was anticipated already in Luke 24:49: “I am sending forth the promise of my Father upon you” (NASV). In Acts Jesus’ correlation to the Spirit is tantamount to speaking of his exalted status. There is interchangeableness between God’s Spirit and the Spirit of Jesus. The Holy Spirit is referred to as the “Spirit of the Lord” (Acts 5:9, ESV) and similarly the “Spirit of Jesus” (Acts 16:7, ESV). This is common to the other New Testament writers as well. Paul speaks of the Spirit of God and restates his point using the Spirit of Jesus in the same verse: “You, however, are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you. Anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him” (Rom 8:9, ESV). To no human is the Spirit ever coupled: nowhere do we read of the Spirit of Paul or Peter’s Spirit. This interchangeableness of God’s Spirit and the Spirit of Jesus certainly argues strongly for the full divinity of Christ (whole paragraph, Buckwalter, 1996:188).

5.4.2.1.2 Jesus on the Divine Throne

In Peter’s speech the resurrection is proof of the success of God’s mission through Jesus. The mention of the exaltation of Jesus to God’s right hand is preceded by Peter’s reference to Jesus as the Davidic successor. Peter claims that David spoke prophetically about the promise of the messianic king on David’s throne: “Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that he would set one of his descendants on his throne, he foresaw and spoke about the resurrection of the Christ, that he was not abandoned to Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption” (Acts 2:30–32, ESV). In consequence of Christ’s death on the cross and his resurrection from the dead, God has exalted him to a position of honor that no human can rightfully attain (Acts 2:33). The Davidic royal Son was expected to occupy his earthly throne in Jerusalem, but Peter places the Messiah-King on the heavenly throne beside God. The Greek phrase τῆ δειξίᾳ ... τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 2:33, NA28) could refer to the means by

which God raised him or the locale to which the Father placed him: “at/to the right hand of God” (BDF§199); the latter is probably intended here but the former is possible. The quotation of Psalm 110:1 in Acts 2:34-35 has a precedent already in Luke 20:42-43. This was an important proof-text in early Christian preaching. Bauckham (2008b:152ff) addresses the honor of Christ sharing the throne of God and builds a solid argument that sharing the throne of God in a permanent way was not possible without compromising the tenets of monotheism. No human or intermediary could sit permanently at God’s side, sharing his glory and prerogatives. The spectacle at Pentecost testifies to the outworking of God’s plan for Jesus: “What the crowd at Pentecost could see and hear were signs of Jesus’ exaltation to the situation of absolute glory, power, and authority in the universe. As the dispenser of the Spirit, he was now acting with ‘the Father’, sharing fully in his heavenly rule” (Peterson, 2009:151).

The right hand of God is a place of divine favor, but it is also the means by which he secures salvation. Throughout the Old Testament there is repeated mention of God’s right hand. Moses and the people of Israel sang about the accomplishments of YHWH’s right hand against the Egyptians after crossing the Red Sea: “Your right hand, O YHWH, glorious in power, your right hand, O YHWH, shatters the enemy” (Exod 15:6, based on ESV, BHS). David recounts the source of his success: “You have given me the shield of your salvation, and your right hand supported me” (Ps 18:35, ESV). The psalmist describes the victories against Israel’s enemies as a sovereign act of God: “for not by their own sword did they win the land, nor did their own arm save them, but your right hand and your arm, and the light of your face, for you delighted in them” (Ps 44:3, ESV). The righteousness of YHWH is tied to the accomplishments of his right hand. God’s actions work out his self-revelation to the nations: “Oh sing to YHWH a new song, for he has done marvelous things! His right hand and his holy arm have worked salvation for him. YHWH has made

known his salvation; he has revealed his righteousness in the sight of the nations” (Ps 98:1–2, based on ESV, BHS).

In the New Testament, the right hand of God is the place of preeminent glory and is reserved only for God’s anointed. In the crucifixion scene, the chief priests and elders examine Jesus and ask if he is the Christ. Jesus discloses his heavenly role and destination: “But from now on the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God” (Luke 22:69, ESV). Jesus’ accusers reveal their understanding of this high honor by following with the question: “Are you the Son of God, then?” (Luke 22:70, ESV). Jesus replies in the affirmative, sealing his conviction and fate. Paul speaks of Jesus’ death, resurrection and present activity as grounds for the non-condemnation of God’s elect: “Christ Jesus is the one who died—more than that, who was raised—who is at the right hand of God, who indeed is interceding for us” (Rom 8:34, ESV).

Repeatedly the New Testament associates the resurrection with the divine enthronement and prerogatives of deity. In Ephesians 1:19-23, the author expands on the superlative rewards and responsibilities that the right hand position of God entails:

[A]ccording to the working of his great might that he worked in Christ when he raised him from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and above every name that is named, not only in this age but also in the one to come. And he put all things under his feet and gave him as head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who fills all in all (ESV).

It is important to note that the regency of Christ at God’s right hand also involves Christ surpassing “every name that is named” (ὑπεράνω ... παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου [Eph 1:21, ESV, NA28]). This is additional confirmation that the permanent position at God’s right hand was only appropriate to Jesus Christ and involved sharing in the duties and honors of God himself.

In the sections below, in both Acts and Philippians, I will deal with the name that Christ is awarded for his atoning work in salvation.

5.4.2.1.3 Jesus, Salvation, and the Divine Name

What has become clear is that Jesus, who shares God's immediate presence by virtue of his death and who distributes the benefits of salvation, is the referent of the climax of the Joel quote in Acts 2:21. Bock (1987:185) summarizes this well: "Jesus shares God's presence, God's task, God's authority, and therefore he can share God's name." The use of κύριος from Joel is the vehicle by which Jesus shares the Divine Name, YHWH. This assignment was unheard of in Judaism and presented a radical transformation of the Divine identity. What we have from Luke is a deliberate appropriation of the κύριος predicate to link Old and New Testaments in the person and work of Jesus Christ. If Howard (1977) was correct in his assertion that the New Testament writers would have used the Tetragrammaton in their writings, this was not the case here. To "preserve" the Tetragrammaton in Acts 2:21 (Joel 2:32 [3:5]) would only serve to steer the reader away from the point that Luke is making—namely, that Jesus shares the Divine Name and mediates the benefits of YHWH. This is one place where κύριος as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton is central to the author's argument. I agree with Van Unnik (1984:542) that this verse and its astonishing claim "sets the tune for the whole book [of Acts]". Buckwalter (1996:185) goes further in his suggestion: "Acts 2:21... may indicate the intended conceptual background for all the uses of κύριος associated with Jesus in Luke-Acts (except, perhaps for some of the vocative ones)."

What follows in Acts builds clearly on the foundation of Peter's speech and only serves to strengthen the assertion that "all who call on the name of the Lord will be saved" (Acts 2:21). Peter announces salvation in Jesus' name to the Jerusalem listeners and provides practical application for the respondents: "And Peter said to them, 'Repent and be baptized

every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit” (Acts 2:38, ESV). Peter and John in their defense before the Sanhedrin make the claim that salvation is offered in Jesus’ name only: “And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:12, ESV). This is an astonishing claim, especially for anyone instructed in Judaism. Salvation is entirely a work of YHWH, and the Old Testament is not reticent to proclaim this: “I, I am YHWH, and besides me there is no savior” (Isa 43:11, based on ESV, BHS). It is interesting that in spite of such exclusive statements from the Old Testament, Peter, in his speech at the home of Cornelius, explains that the Old Testament prophets are properly read as foretelling salvation in Jesus: “To him all the prophets bear witness that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name” (Acts 10:43, ESV). This is not a novel idea but rather from the earliest birth announcement Jesus was already declared to be Savior: “For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord” (σωτήρ ὃς ἐστὶν χριστὸς κύριος [Luke 2:11, ESV, NA28]). Highlighting the significance of the statements in Acts 2:21 and 4:12, Buckwalter (1996:191) concludes, “Luke considers Yahweh and Jesus as functionally, if not essentially, equivalent in work and nature” (cf. Johnson, 1961:77).

Believers in Jesus Christ were first called Christians in Antioch (Acts 11:26; cf. 26:28; 1 Pet 4:16); this title encapsulated the object of their devotion and remains the functional name of believers. However, these followers of Christ were known also as those “who call on the name of Jesus/the Lord.” This functional description is found elsewhere in Acts (e.g., 9:14, 21; 22:16) and in other places in the New Testament. Davis (1996:128) explains that this description “was the single most striking factor in describing this group.” Below I will deal with some of the places in the Pauline corpus where this description is used to refer to the believers

in Jesus Christ. Calling on the name of the Lord is what marks a true believer and this initial step of salvation carries a lifelong identity which Acts 2:21 testifies to.

In other contexts, Jesus' name is relied on as the source of authority and power for acts of service and worship, further confirming that salvation's benefits are mediated by and focused on the risen Lord. Peter heals in Jesus' name; to the crippled beggar at the temple gate, Peter declares: "I have no silver and gold, but what I do have I give to you. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk!" (Acts 3:6, ESV; cf. 4:30). New followers to the faith were baptized in Jesus' name (Acts 8:16; 10:48; 19:5). Baptism in the Great Commission as recorded in Matthew is in the name of the Triune God: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt 28:19, ESV). In Acts 8:16, however, the early converts to the message proclaimed by Philip were baptized in the name of the "Lord Jesus" only. However, these believers did not know of the Holy Spirit, yet their baptism was not defective. Peter and John placed their hands on these believers and they received the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:17). The reception of the Holy Spirit preceded baptism in Jesus' name in the case of Cornelius' household (Acts 10:47-48). Concerning the baptism of John which anticipated the baptism in Jesus' name, the disciples in Ephesus who had been baptized by John were also subsequently baptized in the "name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 19:5, ESV). Although some early converts did not know of the Holy Spirit, their baptism into the Lord Jesus was sufficient and a further testimony of the Christocentric focus of the early church.

Luke describes how Paul's early ministry focused on Jesus, and how he spoke courageously in the name of Jesus (Acts 9:27-28). It is said that Barnabas and Paul "risked their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 15:26, ESV). Early on it became clear that what the Jews and religious figures found most offensive was the apparently idolatrous focus

on the name of Jesus and his central place in the new religious movement. In their censure of the apostles' preaching, the Sanhedrin leaders make known the heart of their objection: "So they called them and charged them not to speak or teach at all in the name of Jesus" (Acts 4:18, ESV). In the encounter with the religious rulers in Acts 5, the same demand is made again. After flogging them, they also ordered them not to "speak in the name of Jesus" (Acts 5:40, ESV). Instead of complying with these orders, Luke records, "Then they left the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the name" (Acts 5:41, ESV). The name of Jesus was synonymous with the early church's identity. While making his defence before King Agrippa, Paul recounts how he persecuted the followers of the new movement. He describes his opposition as being against "the name of Jesus of Nazareth" (Acts 26:9, ESV). The exalted Lord is the *raison d'être* of the early Christian movement and his death, resurrection and exaltation certify that he is the rightful bearer of all that possession of God's name involves.

Intimately connected with "calling on the name of the Lord" is the act of prayer to Jesus. There are two events in Acts, Stephen's martyrdom (Acts 7:54-60) and Saul's conversion (Acts 9:1-19; 22:3-21; 26:1-23), where Jesus' Lordship is seen most explicitly; these strongly point to the conclusion that early on Jesus received honors and executed tasks appropriate only to YHWH. Howard (1977) would have scholars believe that the high Christology of the New Testament was artificially inflated by second century scribes who confused the roles and honors of Jesus with those of YHWH through their ambiguous use of the Divine Name surrogate, κύριος. Instead, our investigation leads us to a different conclusion: the application of the Divine Name through the use of the surrogate κύριος is intentional and shapes the content of Luke's early Christian narrative. In the stories of Stephen's martyrdom and the commissioning of Paul, it is the risen and exalted Jesus that is referred to as

“Lord,” and the supreme importance of this address is made possible by the use of κύριος in its highest sense which the quote from Joel 2:32 (3:5) made demonstrable.

In response to Stephen’s speech to the Sanhedrin, the group as a whole dragged him out of the city and began to stone him to death. Doubtlessly the vision that Stephen related to the angry crowd amounted to blasphemy: “But he, full of the Holy Spirit, gazed into heaven and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God. And he said, ‘Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God’” (Acts 7:55–56, ESV). This ties into the Divine enthronement in Peter’s speech where Jesus is granted the position of power and honor at the right hand of the Father in recognition of all that he had done in securing salvation and its rewards (Acts 2:33; cf. 5:31). This vision of the heavenly throne and the glory of God with the Son of Man in the position of supreme honor seals Stephen’s fate. Luke records the dying prayer of Stephen: “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit” (κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου [Acts 7:59, ESV, NA28]). This prayer to Jesus, the exalted Lord, is reminiscent of Jesus’ prayer to the Father at the moment of his death: “Then Jesus, calling out with a loud voice, said, ‘Father, into your hands I commit my spirit!’” (πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου [Luke 23:46, ESV, NA28]). Jesus’ words are based on Psalm 31:5: “Into your hand I commit my spirit; you have redeemed me, O YHWH, faithful God” (κύριε ὁ θεὸς: Ps 30:6, Göttingen LXX) (based on ESV, BHS). I agree with Bowman & Komoszewski (2007:49) that for Stephen to call out to Jesus at the point of death has great importance: “The significance of this act of invoking Jesus is only heightened by the occasion: the heavenly being on whom one calls at the moment of death for spiritual repose is quite simply one’s God.” The one who emboldened Stephen by his Spirit to preach fearlessly in the face of death is now the one he calls on to receive his spirit. If the allusion to Jesus’ final words

was missed, the dying words of Stephen make the necessary connection: “And falling to his knees he cried out with a loud voice, ‘Lord, do not hold this sin against them’ (κύριε, μὴ στήσης αὐτοῖς ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν). And when he had said this, he fell asleep” (Acts 7:60, ESV, NA28). Luke records similar words of forgiveness on Jesus’ lips: “And Jesus said, ‘Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do’” (πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν [Luke 23:34, ESV, NA28]). This logion is absent in a number of early and diverse witnesses: \mathfrak{P}^{75} \aleph^1 B D* W Θ 070 it^a syr^s cop^{sa} (Comfort, 2008:239). This request for forgiveness was likely not part of the original Gospel of Luke, but Metzger (1994:154) suggests that it “bears self-evident tokens of its dominical origin.” It has certainly become a part of the Gospel tradition and was likely added early by an unknown copyist. In some ways Jesus has assumed the role of the Father in receiving the spirit of the faithful at death (Paschke, 2013:50). This is not to eclipse the role of the Father in the Divine identity but rather embodies the co-regency of Christ as the Divine agent of God’s salvation. It is noteworthy that prefacing the prayer of Stephen, Luke uses the same Greek verb (ἐπικαλούμενον) that is used in the quote from Joel 2:32 (3:5) in Acts 2:21. Stephen is visible proof that what Joel foretold and Peter preached is true: “All who call on the name of the Lord will be saved” (Acts 2:21; Joel 2:32 [3:5]). Jesus as the bearer of the Divine Name receives his servant into glory, the ultimate realization of YHWH’s plan of salvation. Jesus is the object of prayer and worship, and there is no doubt that the Jewish leaders understood the import of Stephen’s last words.

Consenting to Stephen’s death, Saul begins to persecute the early followers of Christ. Stephen called on the risen Lord to receive his spirit; Saul is met by the same Lord on his way to Damascus. The voice from heaven stops Saul in his path: “Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me? (Acts 9:4, ESV). Saul responds with “Who are you, Lord” (τίς εἶ, κύριε

[Acts 9:5, ESV, NA28]). Saul may or may not have invested κύριε with great reverence, but Luke probably did. This is a continuation of the κύριος Christology that Luke has consistently portrayed. The heavenly response that follows shows who the speaker is: “I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting. But rise and enter the city, and you will be told what you are to do” (Acts 9:5–6, ESV). Jesus is the one that Saul is persecuting; the risen Lord is fully identified with the early Christian movement. Just as those who call on the name of Jesus are distinguished by that fact, so the church is seen as an extension of Christ’s reign (cf. 1 Cor 12:27; Eph 1:22). Christ, the risen Lord, is the focal point of the new movement, and as such he reveals himself and his will in accordance with his plan. Ananias also receives instruction from Jesus in a vision. Throughout Jesus is referred to as κύριος, and in this narrative the title is one of devotion and reverence on the lips of Ananias. It is significant that Ananias refers to the early believers as those “who call on your name” (ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομά σου [Acts 9:14, ESV, NA28]). The Jerusalem believers continue the practice that was begun in Acts 2:21 and 2:38 (Davis, 1996:128). In Acts 22:16, Paul defends himself to a hostile crowd in Jerusalem and relates his conversion experience. Paul recounts how Ananias urged him in his first steps of faith: “And now why do you delay? Get up, be baptized, and have your sins washed away, calling on his name” (ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ [Acts 22:16, NRSV, NA28]). The final clause is of interest here: “calling on his name” (ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ); Paul himself invoked the name of the risen Lord in his conversion experience. Calling on the name of the risen Lord encapsulates the conversion experience and brings to mind Peter’s sermon in Acts 2. The repetition of this crucial phrase here and also in other places in the Pauline corpus (e.g., Rom 10:13; 1 Cor 1:2; 2 Tim 2:22) shows that the quote from Joel applied to Jesus had a definitive character in shaping the new religious movement. Its occurrence in Acts and elsewhere

in the New Testament shows that this was not an isolated reference but was rooted firmly in the soul of the early Christian church. For Jews the reaction is unmistakable: this formula repeatedly used in the Old Testament of YHWH is now being used of Jesus. Jesus, who bears the name of YHWH, is the proper recipient of prayer, and the prerogatives of God rightfully belong to him as well. It is not surprising that the message of the early Christians evoked strong responses. Many believed, but others saw a contradiction that put Jesus on par with God. For Jesus to sit permanently in God's presence, administer the Holy Spirit, receive prayer for forgiveness, and even share God's most holy name was blatant idolatry. The degree of persecution of the early Church is further confirmation of the extent to which the idea of Jesus as the equal to God was promoted.

In two conversion passages in Acts 9 and 26, Paul receives instruction from the risen Lord and it is striking just how Christocentric these plans are. In Jesus' instructions to Ananias for Paul, the focus is on Jesus' name and his plan: "But the Lord said to him, 'Go, for he is an instrument whom *I* have chosen to bring *my* name before Gentiles and kings and before the people of Israel; *I myself* will show him how much he must suffer for the sake of *my* name'" (Acts 9:15–16, NRSV; first person pronouns italicized). Jesus chose Paul; Paul would bear Jesus' name; and ultimately suffer for that name. In Paul's defense before King Agrippa he relates what Jesus said to him on his way to Damascus. Here again, Jesus speaks of *his* plan, *his* name, and *his* salvation:

"*I* am Jesus whom you are persecuting. But get up and stand on your feet; for *I* have appeared to you for this purpose, to appoint you to serve and testify to the things in which you have seen *me* and to those in which *I* will appear to you. *I* will rescue you from your people and from the Gentiles—to whom *I* am sending you to open their eyes so that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, so that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those who are sanctified by faith in *me*" (Acts 26:15–18, NRSV; first person pronouns italicized).

Although it is true that Jesus mediates God’s plan of salvation, it is significant that here in Acts Jesus acts in his own accord, and the text is largely in the first person. Certainly I have been selective in the book of Acts in finding passages where Jesus speaks of his own name, mission, and salvation. The point is not to diminish the role of the Father but to show the extent to which the Father has glorified his Son by sharing the functions and rewards of deity—even entrusting him with his most holy name. Through the agency of the surrogate, κύριος, which stands in for the Tetragrammaton in the LXX^{κύριος}, Jesus is proclaimed in possession of God’s ineffable name. Jesus is “Lord of all” (οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος [Acts 10:36, ESV, NA28]) and all who call on his name will be saved (Acts 2:21).

Before leaving Acts and dealing with the Pauline usage of Joel 2:32 (3:5), it is important to determine where in the history of the early church did the use of κύριος for the Divine Name in reference to Jesus take root. Certainly in Acts, the placement of Joel 2:32 (3:5) on the lips of Peter in his sermon at Pentecost could not be more strategic. This statement is the climax of the extended quotation from Joel, and the rest of the book of Acts is an outworking of the implications of this new reality. Some, however, doubt the historicity of the speeches in Acts. In his book, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, Richard Longenecker (1975:81-82) gives cogent advice regarding the nature of the speeches in Acts:

All of the speeches in Acts must of necessity be paraphrastic in their present form, for certainly the original delivery contained more detail of argument and more illustrative material than presently included—as poor Eutychus undoubtedly could testify.

Stenographic reports they are not ... But the recognition of a styling which produces speeches of others compatible with the narrative in which they are found should not be interpreted as a necessary declaration of either inaccuracy of reporting or a lack of traditional material, since one author is responsible for the literary form of the whole.

What we have from Luke's pen is likely the main points of Peter's sermon with a certain amount of detail removed. The subsequent references and allusions in Acts (e.g., 9:14, 21; 22:16) and in Paul (e.g., 1 Cor 1:2; Rom 10:13; 2 Tim 2:22) to the quote from Joel ("all who call on the name of the Lord will be saved" [Joel 2:32 (3:5); Acts 2:21]), whether in an instruction on salvation or as the distinguishing mark of being a Christian, demonstrate that this is something that early on found its way into Christian jargon, and Peter as spokesman for the group is the likely source. He may have spoken in Aramaic or quoted the passage in Greek—each language as has become clear in the previous sections has ample vocabulary to express the word "Lord." Peter's listeners, as well as Luke's readers, would likely have been familiar with this quote and the original referent of the κύριος/מְרַמ statement. For this reason, I maintain that a reasonable starting date for the practice of referring to Jesus with a surrogate for the Divine Name is at Pentecost, and only an examination of the Gospels in the section below will decide if this date should be placed back even further. The conclusion of our study thus far challenges the implications of Howard's (1977) work that the high honors that Jesus received were artificially elevated through scribal error in confusion over the translation of the Tetragrammaton. In Acts there is little doubt that Jesus is "Lord" in the fullest sense of deity. The Christology of Acts is Christocentric and from the start claims that the risen Lord in securing salvation and its benefits shares the Divine Name and all that this entails.

5.4.2.2 Romans

In Romans 10:13, Paul quotes from Joel 2:32 (3:5) in his treatment of Israel and the Gospel. The quotation is the same as that found in Acts 2:21: "everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved" (πᾶς ... ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται [Rom 10:13, ESV, NA28]). Since this LXX^{κύριος} quotation includes a reference to the

Tetragrammaton in the Hebrew *Vorlage*, Howard (1977) would have us consider that the Divine Name was likely in the earliest LXX/OG manuscripts which presumably Paul used, and as such he would have retained the Divine Name in his citation of Joel 2:32 (3:5). According to Howard's (1977) proposal, יהוה in some form would have been found in the place where κυρίου appears in our Greek text. If the Divine Name is the authentic reading here, the referent is not Jesus Christ but YHWH. The implication for exegesis is obvious: Jesus is not referred to in this citation and any honor received from the passage belongs rightfully to the Father and not to Jesus. In response to this, my task is twofold: first, to determine which reading has the greatest claim to authenticity, and second, to enquire about the Christological implications of this determination.

The manuscripts of the letter to the Romans are unanimous in support of the authenticity of κυρίου in Romans 10:13. There is no manuscript support for the Tetragrammaton here. Howard (1977) knows this but would add that when the Tetragrammaton in the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament fell into the hands of second century scribes, who had no knowledge of the Tetragrammaton, κύριος was substituted instead. Now passages such as Romans 10:13, through the κύριος substitution, are not necessarily appropriate only to the Lord God but may refer to the Lord Christ. The implications for Christology would be that the honors properly belonging to YHWH are now mistakenly applied to Jesus through the κύριος exchange. A detailed examination of the immediate context and the internal constraints of the passage will determine the identity of the "Lord" in Romans 10:13 and the suitability of each reading.

Dunn (1988:517) characterizes Romans 9-11 as dealing with "the outworking of the Gospel in relation to Israel." Paul contrasts the righteousness that is through the works of the law with the righteousness that comes by faith. Paul raises the question: "What shall we say, then?"

That Gentiles who did not pursue righteousness have attained it, that is, a righteousness that is by faith; but that Israel who pursued a law that would lead to righteousness did not succeed in reaching that law” (Rom 9:30–31, ESV). Paul then answers his own question about Israel’s failure: “Why? Because they did not pursue it by faith, but as if it were based on works” (Rom 9:32, ESV). In a composite quotation from Isaiah (28:16; 8:14), Paul locates the heart of the problem for the Jews: “Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offense; and whoever believes in him will not be put to shame” (ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνηθήσεται [Rom 9:33, ESV, NA28]). What or who is this “stumbling stone”? (τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος [Rom 9:32, ESV, NA28]). In all likelihood, the stumbling stone is Jesus Christ. Paul uses similar language in 1 Corinthians 1:23 in referring to Christ: “...we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling block (σκάνδαλον) to Jews” (1 Cor 1:23, ESV, NA28). The word “stumbling block” (σκάνδαλον) is reminiscent of the word used in the composite quotation in Romans 9:33: “rock of offense” (πέτραν σκανδάλου). This idea of Christ as a “stumbling stone” is not unique in the New Testament. In 1 Peter 2:6-8 Christ is referred to as the “cornerstone” for believers, integral to the “spiritual house” (2:5) God is building, but for unbelievers he is an obstacle: “a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offense” (λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου [1 Pet 2:8, ESV, NA28]). The passage in Peter uses both Isaiah passages (Isa 28:16; 8:14) with the addition of Psalm 118:22 for further explanation of the dual role of the cornerstone. Jesus Christ was rejected by his own people but was accepted by those who put their trust in him: he is both the “cornerstone” and the “stumbling stone.” Further confirmation for identifying Jesus as the “stumbling stone” is found later in the same context of our passage in Romans (10:11): “Everyone who believes in him will not be put to shame” (πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνηθήσεται [ESV, NA28]). This is the

second half of the Isaiah citation quoted in Romans 9:33, and the exegesis below will confirm that the referent here is also Christ (Capes, 1994:123-124).

The Christological import of referring to Christ as a “stumbling stone” is evident when looking at the greater context of Isaiah 8:14, the second of the merged passages in Romans 9:33. In Isaiah 8:14, the stone imagery is used of YHWH: “And he will become a sanctuary and a stone of offense and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel, a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem” (Isa 8:14, ESV). The LXX rendering brings out the contrast between the two uses of the stone: “And if you trust in him, he will become a sanctuary for you, and you will not encounter him as an obstacle of stone (λίθου προσκόμματι) or like a fall from a rock. But the houses of Jacob are in a snare, and those who sit in Jerusalem are in a pit” (Isa 8:14, Lexham English LXX; Göttingen LXX). If Paul intersects YHWH and Jesus in the “stumbling stone” of Isaiah 8:14, the implications for Paul’s Christology are clear: “At the level of exegesis [Paul] brings Christ into intimate relation to YHWH and posits Christ in an eschatological role which scripture reserves for God” (Capes, 1994:124). Romans 9:30-33 is a preface to the larger unit which includes Romans 10:13, and the association of Christ with YHWH in the Isaiah citation is a contextual consideration in determining the referent of Romans 10:13 and the Christological significance of that conclusion.

The section in Romans 10:1-13 is a unit with bookends in the subject of “salvation.” Paul’s desire for his fellow countrymen is for their “salvation” (σωτηρίαν [Rom 10:1, NA28]). At the other end of the section, Paul concludes with his quote from Joel 2:32 (3:5): “everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved” (πᾶς ... ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται [Rom 10:13, ESV, NA28]). This emphasis on salvation is picked up in 10:9: “if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved

(σωθήση [ESV, NA28]). Again in the next verse (10:10), salvation is the common element: “for with the heart a person believes, resulting in righteousness, and with the mouth he confesses, resulting in salvation” (σωτηρίαν [NASV, NA28]). Salvation is the thread that weaves through this section and finds its climax in the quote from Joel 2:32 (3:5).

Paul continues to contrast *law*-righteousness and *faith*-righteousness; the latter is from God, the former is not. God’s righteousness is found in Christ and is appropriated by faith. In 10:4 Paul makes a startling claim: “For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone who believes” (τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι [ESV, NA28]). Much ink has been spilled on the subject of Christ as the τέλος of the law, whether this means “termination, cessation” or “goal, outcome” (cf. BDAG, s.v. τέλος). Regardless of how one proceeds on this question, the main point in this context is that Christ is the object of belief, and faith in him with its imparted righteousness is the central focus of Paul’s exposition in the coming verses. Paul contrasts the righteousness that comes from the law (Lev 18:5) with the righteousness that is by faith, by means of a reworking of Deuteronomy 30:13, 14. The conclusion is that the nearness of the “word” in Christ has been available foremost to the Jews. The passages in Deuteronomy 30:13, 14 originally applied to the commandment of the law but Paul now uses them in relation to Christ. The exegesis here may appear strained but Moo (1996:653) brings out the necessary connection between the “word” in the Old and New Testaments:

The best explanation for Paul’s use of the Deut. 30 text is to think that he finds in this passage an expression of the grace of God in establishing a relationship with his people. As God brought his word near to Israel so they might know and obey him, so God now brings his word ‘near’ to both Jews and Gentiles that they might know him through his Son Jesus Christ and respond in faith and obedience. Because Christ, rather than the law, is now the focus of God’s revelatory word (see 10:4), Paul can ‘replace’ the commandment of Deut. 30:11-14 with Christ.

No heroic feats are required to secure the righteousness that comes through faith in Jesus Christ: “‘The word is near you, in your mouth and in your heart’ (that is, the word of faith that we proclaim)” (Rom 10:8, ESV). Jesus, the “stumbling stone,” is the object of saving faith, and the Jews are derelict in their unbelief. The righteousness that is based on the law is rooted in human effort, and this has never been the equal of faith in God’s plan of salvation in the Old and New Testaments.

Paul continues his exposition of the nearness of the word of faith, which is the Gospel message that has been preached by the early church. The heart of what is involved in receiving the Gospel is summarized in 10:9: “because, if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved” (ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσης ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ πιστεύσης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ [ESV, NA28]). Here Paul is explaining how the word of faith is accessible to the listener. In this way the ὅτι is taken as causal (“because”) in describing how the Gospel is “near”—involving a basic and effectual response. In contrast to this, the NIV and NASV translate the conjunction with “that.” The passage in 10:9 is viewed thus as the content of the “word of faith.” It is probably better to translate the ὅτι as causal to avoid having two content clauses in a row: “that is, the word of faith which we are preaching, that if you confess with your mouth...” (NASV; Moo, 1996:657). Nevertheless, the results are nearly the same, emphasizing what is involved in receiving the available “word of faith.”

At the heart of the early preaching and its response in personal acceptance is the confession that “Jesus is Lord” (κύριον Ἰησοῦν [Rom 10:9, ESV, NA28]). In Greek Paul makes use of a double accusative (v. BDF §157.2, cf. GGBB:187-188) to encapsulate the content of this “word of faith.” In 2 Corinthians 4:5, Paul also uses a double accusative in reference to the Lordship of Christ: “For what we proclaim is not

ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord (Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν κύριον)” (ESV, NA28). This creedal formula with its *Sitz im Leben* in the earliest ministry of the church is foundational to all other Christian statements. In 1 Corinthians 12:3 we have seen the seriousness of this confession and the role of the Holy Spirit in its declaration: “Therefore I want you to understand that no one speaking in the Spirit of God ever says ‘Jesus is accursed!’ and no one can say ‘Jesus is Lord’ (Κύριος Ἰησοῦς) except in the Holy Spirit” (1 Cor 12:3, ESV, NA28). In Philippians 2:11 a longer form of this confession is used and will occupy the investigation in a section below. In Codex Vaticanus (B) the creedal nature of the confession in Romans 10:9 is made more explicit with its reading: ἐὰν ὁμολογήσης τό ῥημα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς (“if you confess with your mouth the word ‘Jesus is Lord’” [Strazicich, 2007:316]). This reading more explicitly defines the “word of faith that we proclaim” (ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν [Rom 10:8, ESV, NA28]) of the previous verse with the basic Gospel message that “Jesus is Lord.” As we have seen in previous sections, Jesus as Lord is a basic idea that has its roots in the earliest Christian confession. Already in Acts, κύριος in reference to Jesus is not a polite form of courtesy but rather is associated with the Divine Name and all that such an association entails. Certainly here there is no mistake that the confession “Jesus is Lord” is at the heart of the Gospel message and constitutes the most basic affirmation of faith. This verse is central in answering the question of who is the referent in the quote from Joel 2:32 (3:5) in Romans 10:13, and as we progress toward that verse it will become increasingly apparent.

Dunn (1988:607) identifies the confession “Jesus is Lord” as a “slogan of identification” functioning much like the Shema in Judaism: “as he who says the Shema identifies himself as belonging to Israel, so he who says κύριον Ἰησοῦν identifies himself as belonging to Jesus.” In the section above on 1 Corinthians 8:6, it was demonstrated that Jesus as the

“one Lord” redefines the Shema and the Divine identity. The idea and confession of Jesus as Lord has permeated every facet of Christian practice from conversion (Acts 2:21; Rom 10:9) to eschatological expectation (1 Cor 16:22). This distinctive statement becomes a core confession in baptism (Acts 2:38 and context), worship (1 Cor 12:3), evangelism (2 Cor 4:5) and exhortation (Col 2:6) (Dunn, 1988:607). Faith in Jesus Christ as Lord is coupled with belief in the historicity and efficacy of the resurrection. Peter’s speech in Acts 2 weaves together Jesus’ Lordship, resurrection and exaltation. The outcome for the believer is eschatological salvation. Cranfield (1979, 2:530), commenting on the guarantee of salvation for those who confess that Jesus is Lord and possess certainty in his death and resurrection, states: “future eschatological salvation reflects its glory back into the present for those who confidently hope for it.” Even without the quote from Joel 2:32 (3:5) in the near context, it is obvious that in Romans 10 this is familiar territory with the Pentecost sermon in Acts 2.

What follows in the next verses is a series of statements each introduced with an explanatory γὰρ (“for”). There is an increasing momentum to the passage, and Rowe (2000:141; γὰρ added) aptly describes the effect: “The use of γὰρ five times within 10:10-13 not only connects the phrases to each other, but also gives the reader a sense of being pulled or drawn toward some expected end:

for (γὰρ) in the heart it is believed...

for (γὰρ) the Scripture says...

for (γὰρ) there is no distinction...

for (γὰρ) the same Lord is Lord of all...

for (γὰρ) all who call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.”

Romans 10:13 is the climax of the section from 9:30-10:13, and the connected statements all have some bearing on deciding the referent of “Lord” (κυρίου) in 10:13 and any significance that can be drawn from this

assignment. I will examine each statement in order to determine the cumulative contextual effect on the Joel 2:32 (3:5) quotation.

The first γὰρ statement in Romans 10:10 points to an explanation of the verbs used in the previous verse: “for with the heart a person believes, resulting in righteousness, and with the mouth he confesses, resulting in salvation” (καρδία γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν [Rom 10:10, NASV, NA28]). The order of the verbs is reversed to form a chiasm with 10:9:

A	ὁμολογήσης (10:9)	confess: mouth
B	πιστεύσης (10:9)	believe: heart
B`	πιστεύεται (10:10)	believe: heart
A`	ὁμολογεῖται (10:10)	confess: mouth

This accounts for the verbs’ reversal and tightly weaves the argument back to the Deuteronomy 30:14 quotation in Romans 10:8: “The word is near you, in your mouth and in your heart” (ESV). Romans 10:10 forms a transition to 10:11-13 stating in a general way what is universalized in the coming three verses (Moo, 1996:658).

The quotation from Isaiah 28:16 in Romans 10:11 is introduced by the second of the five γὰρ statements. If Jesus is the referent of the Isaiah 28:16 citation in Romans 9:33, it is likely that he is the referent here as well. Further evidence is needed to avoid circular reasoning. To be sure, the quotations in Romans 9:33 and 10:11 do not mention Jesus but the pronoun used (ἐπ’ αὐτῷ) in 10:11 finds a likely antecedent in the immediate context. In Romans 10:9, the text states that “God raised him from the dead” (ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν [ESV, NA28]). Certainly the pronoun in 10:9 points to Jesus in the same sentence as its antecedent. Thus the pronouns in 10:9 and 10:11 continue the author’s focus on Jesus. In Romans 10:9-10, Paul defines the content of the “word of faith,” and now in 10:11, he brings the scriptural proof. This ties the passage from

9:33 with what follows and continues the emphasis on salvation that runs through this passage. I agree with Cranfield (1979, 2:531) that οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται (“will not be put to shame” [NA28, ESV]) is the equivalent of δικαιοσύνην/σωτηρίαν (righteousness/salvation).

Immediately after Paul’s first quote from Isaiah 28:16, he follows with his heartfelt desire for his countrymen: “Brethren, my heart’s desire and my prayer to God for them is for their salvation” (εἰς σωτηρίαν [NASV, NA28]). A similar situation occurs in 10:11. Paul has just spoken of “salvation,” and the quote from Isaiah 28:16 follows again directly on its heels, followed by the salvific overtones of Jesus richly blessing those who call on him. Paul picks up the salvation theme repeatedly in Romans 10, and it is likely that οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται refers to eschatological salvation here as well. As will be argued below, the verses that ensue only confirm that conclusion.

In conjunction with the salvation theme that runs through Romans 9:30-10:13, there is a continued widening of effect that Paul achieves with his addition of πᾶς to the quote from Isaiah 28:16, together with other all-encompassing statements. In Romans 10:4 Paul includes everyone in the offer of salvation: “For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone who believes” (τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι [ESV, NA28]). Paul uses inclusive statements about the breadth of salvation right from his programmatic start in Romans 1:16: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes (εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι), to the Jew first and also to the Greek” (ESV, NA28). Paul’s generalized statement in Romans 10:10 continues to emphasize the wide scope of salvation’s recipients: “for with the heart *one believes* (πιστεύεται), resulting in righteousness, and with the mouth *one confesses* (ὁμολογεῖται), resulting in salvation” (based on NASV, NA28; italics

mine). Paul continues what he started in 1:16 (παντί) and 10:4 (παντί), and he continues this widening of the scope of salvation with the same word in 10:11 (πᾶς), 10:12 (πάντων, πάντα) and 10:13 (πᾶς).

The third and fourth of the five γάρ statements draw us that much further toward the author's conclusion in 10:13. In Romans 10:12 Paul brings together the two objectives of his rhetorical argument: "For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord is Lord of all, bestowing his riches on all who call on him" (οὐ γάρ ἐστὶν διαστολή Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἑλλήνου, ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων, πλουτῶν εἰς πάντα τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν [ESV, NA28]). Here Paul binds the universality of the Gospel with the universal Lordship of Jesus. Paul picks up the topic of the universality of salvation as a solution to universal sinfulness: "For there is no distinction (διαστολή): for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom 3:22, ESV, NA28). Just as there is no "distinction" in that both Jew and Gentile are under the curse of sin, so all who believe are joined without "distinction" under the same Lord who mediates God's salvation. From the beginning of Romans, Paul includes both Jews and Gentiles in the scope of salvation. Already in his thesis statement in Romans 1:16, Paul makes it clear that the Gospel has universal application. The fourth γάρ, in tying together the two themes of the universality of the Gospel and the Lordship of Jesus, prepares the reader for the rhetorical conclusion in 10:13. There can be little doubt that the κύριος in 10:12b refers to Jesus: "for the same (Lord) is Lord of all" (ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων [ESV, NA28; parentheses added]). This instance of κύριος follows next after the κύριον Ἰησοῦν of 10:9, and the pronouns used in the preceding verses have their proper antecedent in the person of Jesus. The "same (Lord)" can only be the "Lord" of the immediate context. The Lordship of Jesus has universal breadth that spans all people, and the soteriological ramifications are clear: one Lord, one people, one

method of salvation. Rowe (2000:147-148) draws the necessary connections in his theological assessment: “[I]t is because the Jews and Greeks have the same Lord that there is no distinction between them. That is, because there is *one* Lord (cf. 1 Cor 8:6), there is one human community (παῖς). The theological universality (12b) is the ground of the anthropological universality (12a).”

The supreme claim that Jesus is “Lord of all” is something that Jews would have used without reservation only in reference to YHWH—the bold usage here has significant Christological implications. In Acts 10:36 Jesus is also referred to as “Lord of all” (οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος [ESV, NA28]). Dunn (1988:610) suggests that Paul may be using a Christian formula that had its roots in Hellenistic Jewish usage. In Job 5:8 (LXX) similar words are used of God: “But rather I will implore the Lord, and I will call upon the Lord, the master of all” (οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ ἐγὼ δεηθήσομαι κυρίου, κύριον δὲ τὸν πάντων δεσπότην ἐπικαλέσομαι [Lexham English LXX; Göttingen LXX]). Paul uses language like this in referring to God as “one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all” (εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν [Eph 4:6, ESV, NA28]). Earlier in the letter to the Romans, Paul unifies both Jew and Greek in the salvific purposes of the one God: “Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, since indeed God who will justify the circumcised by faith and the uncircumcised through faith is one” (Rom 3:29–30, NASV). Like the revised Shema in 1 Corinthians 8:6 that included both One God and One Lord, Paul here in Romans 10:12 brings two disparate groups under the One Lord, Jesus Christ. The honors applied to Jesus through the κύριος predicate equal what was proper to God alone.

The language of referring to Jesus as the “same (Lord)” is also found in 1 Corinthians 12:4-6 in connection with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit: “Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties

of service, but the same Lord (ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος); and there are varieties of activities, but it is the same God who empowers them all in everyone” (ESV, NA28). The plurality of different people like different ministries is subsumed under the Lordship of the One Lord.

In this context in Romans 10, the riches that Jesus bestows are likely the benefits of salvation. The context constrains the range of possible options for the statement: “bestowing his riches on all who call on him” (πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν [Rom 10:12, ESV, NA28]). What precedes and what follows make it clear that Jesus’ riches are bound up with eschatological salvation. Universal salvation through the One Lord is what Paul brings to this context in the preceding verses, and the text in the following verse only secures this understanding: “For ‘everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved’” (Rom 10:13, ESV). Paul often uses the language of wealth to convey the abundant resources of God and of Christ (e.g., Rom 2:4; 9:23; 11:33; 1 Cor 1:5; 2 Cor 8:9; Eph 1:7; 2:7; 3:8,16; Phil 4:19; Col 1:27) (Moo, 996:660n.71,72). In Romans 2:4 it is the riches of God’s unmerited kindness that leads to salvation: “Or do you think lightly of the riches of his kindness and tolerance and patience, not knowing that the kindness of God leads you to repentance?” (NASV). Here in Romans 10:12, those who call upon Jesus receive from him the benefits of his grace—the gift of eternal salvation. It is noteworthy that Paul refers to Jesus as the source of riches, and it is the Lord Jesus himself who bestows salvation on those who call on him. Jesus as Lord performs the role of God in dispensing salvation on those who call on him. It is from his abundant resources consequent to his death, resurrection, and exaltation that Jesus can satisfy the request for salvation.

In anticipation of the climax of the rhetorical argument in Romans 10:13, Paul makes use of the significant verb from Joel 2:32 (3:5) “calling upon” (ἐπικαλουμένους) in Romans 10:12b (“bestowing his riches on all who call on him” [πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν (ESV,

NA28])). Anyone familiar with the Old Testament would almost certainly pick up on the allusion to the repeated phrase “call on the name of the Lord” used throughout the Old Testament and most significantly in Joel 2:32 (3:5): “everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved.” This reference to Joel 2:32 (3:5) prepares the reader for the final explanatory γάρ that introduces the direct quote from Joel. This verbal link makes a connection between Romans 10:12 and 13, and only serves to strengthen the unity of this passage.

The final statement in Romans 10:13 brings Paul’s argument about the righteousness that comes by faith in Christ Jesus to a proper culmination. The final quotation from Joel 2:32 (3:5) prefaced with the fifth γάρ in the series brings the argument to its scriptural center: “For ‘everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved’” (πάς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται [Rom 10:13, ESV, NA28]). The exegesis above makes it possible to answer the initial question: who is the referent of the word “Lord” in Romans 10:13, and what are the Christological implications of this assignment? The Joel quotation in Romans 10:13 contains various elements that weave it into the fabric of the preceding context. Romans 10:13 summarizes the argument from 10:9-12 and answers the question of how Jews and Gentiles can be saved. The theme of salvation runs throughout the letter to the Romans and very specifically through Romans 10. Paul mentions salvation in 10:1 (σωτηρίαν) with explicit mention also in 10:9-10 (σωθήσῃ, σωτηρίαν) and finally in 10:13 (σωθήσεται). The research above shows that Paul interprets Isaiah 28:16 Christologically and uses the same motif to contrast the riches of salvation. Paul emphasizes the universal aspect of the salvation available through Christ with the repeated use of πᾶς. Paul started in 1:16 (παντί) with an inclusive statement about salvation; he repeats it in 10:4 (παντί), and continues this broad scope of salvation with the same word in 10:11 (πᾶς), 10:12 (πάντων, πάντα) and 10:13 (πᾶς).

The addition of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in the Isaiah 28:16 quote in Romans 10:11 prepared the way for the universal scope of the scriptural support of Joel 2:32 (3:5).

Perhaps the most shocking conclusion that Paul draws is the identification of Jesus with the Divine Name of YHWH through the $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ predicate.

This conclusion is not premature but is the result of following the sequence of the occurrence of “Lord” throughout the passage from Romans 10:9-13 with the related pronouns ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ [10:9], $\acute{\epsilon}\pi' \alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ [10:11], $\delta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ [10:12a], and $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ [10:12b]) finding an antecedent in the person of Jesus. There is a line of thought that runs straight from the acclamation “Jesus is Lord” (10:9) to the final “Lord” of Joel 2:32 (3:5) through a sequence of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ statements linked with sequential coordinating conjunctions and related third person pronouns.

If there is any doubt that the $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ of Romans 10:13 finds its referent in the Jesus of the immediate context, the following verses (10:14ff) further help to dispel confusion. Paul poses a series of questions that points back to the preceding text: “How then will they call on him in whom they have not believed ($\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\nu}\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$)? And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard?” (Rom 10:14, ESV, NA28). The verb $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ mirrors the same verb in 10:13, and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ joins the text with the dialogue about belief in 10:9ff. The relative pronoun $\delta\acute{\nu}$ can only refer back to 10:13 and its referent, Jesus, the Lord. In 10:18, Paul answers the question about Israel not hearing: “But I ask, have they not heard? Indeed they have, for ‘Their voice has gone out to all the earth, and their words to the ends of the world.’” (ESV). What is the message that has been heard? It is the “word of Christ” ($\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ [Rom 10:17, NA28]). This leaves little doubt that the message about Christ had been preached, and the Jews (and Gentiles) have had ample opportunity to receive the message.

In the end, it is Paul's own argument in Romans 9:30ff that leads to the conclusion that the referent of "Lord" in 10:13 is Jesus. This assignment carries great Christological weight. Paul finds a climax for his argument about the salvation of Jews and Gentiles in a passage that in Hebrew contains the Tetragrammaton and through the κύριος predicate associates the ineffable Name with Jesus. To suggest as Howard (1977) does that the Tetragrammaton likely stood in Paul's quotation of Joel 2:32 (3:5) and that the substitution of κύριος through scribal corruption points away from the author's original intent is without credible support. Romans 10:13 with all of its elements fits the context, and to "return" to the Tetragrammaton has no manuscript support; κύριος in 10:13 follows an unbroken chain of κύριος statements, related pronouns and sequential conjunctions back to the initial confession: "Jesus is Lord" (10:9). The text that has been received in the manuscripts of Romans 10:13 is undoubtedly from the pen of Paul and represents the intention of the author to associate Jesus Christ with the name of YHWH.

Captured in Romans 10:13 is the climax of Paul's elevated Christology. In this verse comes the intersection of Old and New Testaments in the invocation of the Divine κύριος resulting in salvation for all. Jesus is the center of saving faith; he is the "stumbling stone" to the Jews, a role that YHWH has played in the history of Israel. Jesus is "Lord" and this confession is essential in the story of salvation, forming a vital link with his resurrection. From his position of glory, Jesus unites Jew and Gentile as the "Lord of all" who delivers from eschatological shame and bestows the riches of salvation on whoever calls to/on him. It is noteworthy that Jesus himself is called on for salvation, and the use of pronouns makes it clear that he generously gives the gift of salvation from his supply. To invoke the name of the Lord is to invoke the name of YHWH, and only Jesus rightly assumes this role. Paul may not have used the language of the propositional theologian in claiming 'Jesus is YHWH'

but as much as this is accomplished in his reasoning: “His theological medium is instead that of overlap and resonance, such that he creates the overlapping conceptual space wherein this resonating identification occurs” (Rowe, 2000:160). The name of Jesus, the Lord, is bound up with the name of YHWH through the κύριος predicate, and salvation can truly be found in no other. Howard (1977) fails to see how pivotal the YHWH quotation from Joel 2:32 (3:5) is in early Christian belief and practice. The high honors which Jesus Christ receives as a result of κύριος Christology are therefore early, deliberate and well-established in the first century church.

5.4.2.3 1 Corinthians

By the time of Paul, the use of Joel 2:32 (3:5) in reference to Jesus had taken root. Certainly the first Christian sermon recorded in Acts attests to this development and may have had a role to play in its propagation. In 1 Corinthians 1:2-3 Paul begins his epistle with an important declaration about believers: “To the church of God that is in Corinth, to those sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints together with all those who in every place call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours: Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ” (ESV). The identity of believers is bound up with the common Old Testament phrase applied now to Jesus: “all (those) who (in every place) call upon the name of (our) Lord (Jesus Christ)” (πάσιν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ [1 Cor 1:2, ESV (parentheses added), NA28]). The cultic veneration of Jesus through this Old Testament expression has become the distinguishing mark of Christians (Hurtado, 2003:143). It is probable from what follows that in using this phrase Paul had Joel 2:32 (3:5) in mind. In the same context, Paul refers to the Parousia as “the day of our Lord Jesus Christ” (ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ [Χριστοῦ] [1 Cor 1:8, ESV, NA28]). The

Old Testament passage in Joel 2:32 (3:5) is immediately preceded in its context by a reference to the “day of YHWH” (based on Joel 2:31 [3:4], ESV, BHS; cf. Joel: 1:15 et al.), and its use in 1 Corinthians is consistent with Paul’s “referential shift” (Kreitzer, 1987:113ff.) from YHWH to Jesus through the κύριος predicate. The allusion to Joel 2:31 (3:4) in the context of the quote from Joel 2:32 (3:5) makes it likely that Paul’s usage was informed by the Joel passage. This is not the only place that Paul refers to the eschatological day of judgment and reward as the day of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor 5:5; 2 Cor 1:14; Phil 1:6, 10, 2:16; 1 Thess 5:2; 2 Thess 2:2; 2 Tim 1:18) (Bowman & Komoszewski, 2007:163).

5.4.2.4 2 Timothy

There is an example to add that alludes to the Joel 2:32 (3:5) quotation. In 2 Timothy 2:22, the author admonishes Timothy with the words: “So flee youthful passions and pursue righteousness, faith, love, and peace, along with those who call on the Lord from a pure heart” (ESV). The expression: “those who call on the Lord” (τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων τὸν κύριον [2 Tim 2:22, ESV, NA28]) is the equivalent of the longer formula: “call on the name of the Lord.” The two expressions are used interchangeably in Scripture often without a difference in meaning. The connection to Joel 2:32 (3:5) is less obvious with the shorter expression but cumulatively the identification of believers as those who call on the name of the Lord Jesus is further confirmed by Paul’s repeated usage.

In the end, I have argued that the use of the surrogate κύριος for the Tetragrammaton was part of the early Christian mission and testimony about Jesus Christ as Lord. In Acts 2:21 and Romans 10:13, the quotation from Joel 2:32 (3:5) is applied to Jesus in the received form with κύριος in place of the Tetragrammaton. In both cases the writers show that they are aware of the κύριος form and weave it into their arguments. The use of κύριος did not come from scribal mishandling of the Tetragrammaton but

rather from the biblical writers as a profound association of Jesus Christ with the Divine Name of YHWH. The Joel 2:32 (3:5) quotation (“all who call on the name of the Lord”) has become for the New Testament writers a functional description of what constitutes a Christian. To place the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament instances of Joel 2:32 (3:5) as Howard (1977) proposes would violate the biblical arguments and introduce something that distracts from the clear intended meaning of the text. The passages where Joel 2:32 (3:5) is quoted are not passing references with little to exegete, rather, especially in the cases of Acts 2:21 and Romans 10:13, the Joel quote is vital to the author’s argument, and contextual considerations insist on its received form with the surrogate κύριος. The widespread use of Joel 2:32 (3:5) or its scriptural parallels in the Old and New Testaments argues well for its early inception, and its central position in Peter’s Pentecost sermon places it in the earliest development of the Christian movement.

In the next section I will examine the Philippians hymn and the use of κύριος in its exalted statements about Jesus Christ, the Lord.

5.5 Name above Every Name

In the κύριος Christology of the New Testament, one passage stands out as a premier statement about the exalted status of Jesus Christ as κύριος and the road of service and humiliation that warranted his heavenly enthronement. Howard (1978) has written an article on the Philippians Christ hymn, and his conclusions follow the same trend that he established in the earlier article on the Tetragrammaton in the New Testament (1977) which has occupied my study to this point. For Howard (1978), the Christ hymn (Phil 2:6-11) is about the human Christ and does not touch on the pre-existence of Jesus, the starting point of his earthly descent, nor does it involve the same heights of exaltation that many have ascribed to the last movement of the hymn. According to Howard (1978), the Christ hymn

contains two movements instead of three. The earthly ministry of Christ is followed by his earthly exaltation. This is certainly consistent with Howard's earlier article (1977) and reaches a conclusion that is congruent with it: the Christology of the New Testament is a lower Christology, and the Philippians hymn bears witness to this less developed view of Jesus Christ. Howard (1977, 1978) maintains that it is in a second century scribal confusion over the Tetragrammaton that the lines of demarcation between YHWH and Jesus Christ become blurred to the end that the resultant high Christology represents a movement away from the intended meaning of the early New Testament authors. In contrast, I will demonstrate that the Christ hymn has three movements: pre-existence, incarnation, and exaltation. The "name above every name" is the Tetragrammaton delivered through the agency of the κύριος predicate, and the consequent high honors appropriate only to YHWH are now shared with Jesus. The κύριος surrogate is used to underscore the highest commendation of Jesus Christ and his rightful possession of the ineffable name.

The Christ hymn is prefaced in Philippians 2:5 with an ethical exhortation that the Christian should adopt the same selfless attitude that Jesus demonstrated in his life and death. What follows brings that point home but offers so much more theologically:

⁵Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus,
⁶who, because he was in the form of God,
did not regard equality with God
as something to be exploited,
⁷but emptied himself,
taking the form of a slave,
being born in human likeness.
And being found in appearance as a man,
⁸he humbled himself
and became obedient to the point of death—
even death on a cross.

⁹Therefore God highly exalted him

and gave him the name
that is above every name,
¹⁰so that at the name of Jesus
every knee should bow,
in heaven and on earth and under the earth,
¹¹and every tongue should confess
that Jesus Christ is Lord,
to the glory of God the Father”
(Phil 2:5-11, based on NRSV with adaptations).

Christ is pictured here as the “ultimate model for moral action” (Hawthorne, 1983:79), and certainly the hymn demonstrates this but it does so in a way that creates Christological content that exceeds the initial paraenetic concern (Phil 2:1-5).

The amount of secondary literature on this hymn is extensive and the interest generated here is a testimony to its superlative value. The lyrical and rhythmic arrangements argue that our assessment of this piece as a hymn is not without justification. Most scholars agree that this hymn is not Paul’s own composition, and I am in agreement here as well. The comparatively large number of *hapax legomena* and the rare and distinct expressions (see Peerbolte, 2006:195 n.24) make it likely that this composition did not come from Paul’s pen but was appropriated by Paul for its suitability to his purposes. Little is known about its author or its original context but this passage can be examined in the light of Paul’s epistles because, as Hooker (1975:152) states, “even if the material is non-Pauline, we may expect Paul himself to have interpreted it and used it in a Pauline manner.”

To fully understand the “name above every name” (τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα) and how the Tetragrammaton and the κύριος predicate relate Christological significance, it is important to understand the movements in the hymn and in particular the statements that have a bearing on the exalted status of Christ and that form a background to evaluating Howard’s (1978, 1977) theses. Of the three movements of the Christ hymn

(pre-existence, incarnation, exaltation), the first and last are of prime importance to my argument.

5.5.1 Pre-existence

At the head of the passage is the expression ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, which can be rendered as “who, being in the form of God” (Phil 2:6a, NA28). Of critical importance to the passage and the exegesis of the whole hymn is the position one takes on the key word μορφή (cf. Martin, 1997:99). The English word “form” lacks precision, and it is this fact that compels me to use it as a gloss for the equally elusive Greek term μορφή until/if a more proven English translation can be demonstrated. The range of possible translations for μορφή can be plotted on a continuum from “outward appearance” to “essential nature”—each having some claim to authenticity. Howard’s (1978) preference can be plotted on this line as well and forms a foundational element of his whole exegesis; his argument will be examined in turn below.

Part of the difficulty in rendering the term μορφή in the first phrase of the hymn is the paucity of this word in both the New Testament and the LXX. Aside from the parallel use in 2:7: μορφήν δούλου λαβών (“taking the form of a slave”), there are no other New Testament occurrences of the word. In the disputed ending of Mark, μορφή is used to describe the post-resurrection appearance of Jesus to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus: “After these things he appeared in another form (ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ) to two of them, as they were walking into the country” (Mark 16:12, ESV, NA28).

In the LXX, μορφή is equally rare, used only six times (Judg 8:18; Job 4:16; Isa 44:13; Dan 3:19; Tob 1:13; Wis 18:1). In the four canonical instances, a different Hebrew or Aramaic word is translated in each case: תאר (Judg 8:18, Alexandrinus); תמונה (Job 4:16); תבנית (Isa 44:13); צלם (Dan 3:19). Physical appearance is the common element in all of them.

The men killed at Tabor appear as the “form of sons of kings” (ὡς εἶδος μορφή υἱῶν βασιλέων [Rahlfs LXX, Judg 8:18, Alexandrinus]). In Job 4:16 μορφή refers to the shape or form before one’s eyes (μορφή πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν μου [Göttingen LXX]). In Isaiah 44:13 the craftsman sculpts an idol in the shape or form of a man (ὡς μορφήν ἀνδρὸς [Göttingen LXX]). Nebuchadnezzar’s facial expression changed when he was defied—literally the form of his face altered (ἡ μορφή τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἠλλοιώθη [Dan 3:19, Göttingen LXX]). For the two LXX occurrences of μορφή without Hebrew or Aramaic equivalents (Tob 1:13, Wis 18:1), visible form is the common element. The Most High granted Tobit a good appearance before the king (μορφήν ἐνώπιον [Tob 1:13, Göttingen LXX]). The holy ones remain invisible to their enemies—literally their forms could not be seen (μορφήν δὲ οὐχ ὀρῶντες [Wis 18:1, Göttingen LXX]). In each case μορφή is that which can be “perceived by the senses” (Behm, 1967:745). Wong (1986:270-271) claims that the outer form corresponds to something more substantial: “what is revealed outwardly is only a consequence of something inside.” The form in which the risen Lord appeared to Mary Magdalene according to Mark 16:9 and the form he appeared to the two disciples according to Mark 16:12 correspond to a more substantial change than just mere appearance. Both are connected with the “otherness” of the resurrected Lord. Nebuchadnezzar’s face changed “form” corresponding to his changed mood (whole paragraph, Wong, 1986:270-271).

Similar to the biblical examples where μορφή corresponds to something more substantial than mere appearance, instances in Greek literature can be found where outward form is related to inner substance. Sophocles uses μορφή in a way that goes beyond visible form: “But your unhappy fate and mine has taken this away, sending me instead of your dearest form (μορφής) ashes and a useless shadow” (*Electra*, LCL, 1156-

1159). In the *Sibylline Oracles* (II.230) μορφή is equivalent to person: “Then Uriel, the great angel ... will lead all mournful forms (μορφὰς) to judgment” (Collins, 1983:351; Geffcken, 1902, II.230). What is gained by the senses corresponds to and is an expression of the inner substance. The outward is never absent but what is emphasized is the “embodiment of the form” (Braumann, 1971, NIDNTT, 1:705).

This, however, is not the case in all examples in Greek literature. I am not convinced that in each case μορφή connotes something beyond mere appearance, something more substantial. A case can be made that in Philippians 2:6-7, μορφή refers to something more than that which can be gained by sensuous experience, but I am not sure that this is the required meaning for each instance found in biblical and secular literature.

In the language of Greek philosophy, however, μορφή gains a more defined metaphysical meaning. For Plato μορφή comprises something more essential than what is detected by the senses alone. In the *Phaedrus*, Plato represents Socrates as saying: “So it is clear that Thrasymachus, or anyone else who seriously teaches the art of rhetoric, will first describe the soul with perfect accuracy and make us see whether it is one and all alike, or, like the body, of multiform aspect (κατὰ σώματος μορφήν πολυειδές); for this is what we call explaining its nature” (271A, LCL). In Plato μορφή persists even when the outward appearance (εἶδος) changes (Wallace, 1966:22). Describing the role of μορφή in Plato’s philosophy, Martin (1997:101) explains: “μορφή is the impress of the ‘idea’ on the individual. Its meaning is not necessarily that of something which is perceptible.” If the concept is somewhat less developed in Plato, it is in Aristotle that μορφή takes on a fixed meaning, occupying a principal place of importance in his philosophy. Being is composed of two principles: form (μορφή) and matter (ὑλη) (*Metaphysics*, VII, iii, 8, LCL: “The substance [οὐσίαν] ... consists of both ... matter [ὑλης] and form [μορφῆς]”). For Aristotle

matter and form exist in substance as potentiality and actuality, respectively (*Metaphysics*, VIII, vi, 10, LCL). In this way μορφή is not something peripheral but is inseparable from a thing's essence (οὐσία) or nature (φύσις) (Feinberg, 1980:29).

This specialized meaning for μορφή has had a following among biblical scholars as well. Older commentators like Lightfoot (1981[1868]:110) view μορφή as something bound to essence: “Though μορφή is not the same as φύσις or οὐσία, yet the possession of the μορφή involves participation in the οὐσία also: for μορφή implies not the external accidents but the essential attributes.” Some go even further along the continuum of meaning away from the outward appearance towards the substantial. Synge (1951:30) divorces μορφή from anything to do with outward appearance: “Form, then, refers to something other than an outward sign. It refers to the essential, fundamental feature.”

Applied to the passage in Philippians, μορφῆ θεοῦ can be seen then as an unambiguous reference to the “essential nature of God” and as an explicit confirmation of the deity of Christ. The NIV exemplifies this sense in its translation of Philippians 2:6a: “[w]ho, being in very nature God” (ὃς ἐν μορφῆ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, NIV, NA28). The strength of this position is that contextually the sense is also suitable for the second occurrence of μορφή in the parallel expression in 2:7: “taking the very nature of a servant” (μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, NIV, NA28). In terms of meaning, a case can be made that a slave has no observable features that distinguish him from his free counterpart: “for a slave ... is in these respects like a free man. He has the same anatomy, the same limbs, the same shape as a free man. Nor is there necessarily any difference of temperament between the two: servility and obsequiousness were not displayed only by slaves” (Synge, 1951:30). This interpretation of μορφή as essential nature does justice to both occurrences in Philippians 2:6 and 7,

but it is uncertain whether such a specialized meaning from the realm of philosophy was in the mind of the author of the Christ hymn. The common thread joining all the instances of *μορφή* in the LXX and elsewhere in the New Testament is the idea of outward appearance. The suggestion that *μορφή* eclipses the outward may be demanded by the context in Philippians 2:6 and 7 but it is not representative of the more common meaning at the time of the New Testament.

A related interpretation is based on the use of *μορφή* in Hellenistic religious literature. Ernst Käsemann (1968:60) has found parallels to the Christ hymn in *Corpus Hermeticum* I.13f.: “Here, *μορφή* no longer means the individual entity as a formed whole, but a mode of being in a specific direction, such as, for example, being in divine substance and power.” The “mode of being” interpretation rests on the plausibility of the Heavenly Man myth of Gnosticism as a backdrop to the Philippians hymn. Nagata (1981:204-205) underscores the key differences between the Philippians hymn and the redemption account of Gnosticism:

Phil 2:6-11 lacks almost all the Gnostic anthropological motifs of *Corp Herm* I. It speaks of the way of the redeemer. His descent is not the fall. Although his incarnation is described in terms of *δοῦλος* (v. 7), the climax of his humiliated earthly life is expressed by the motif of obedience unto death—a motif that has no place in Gnostic thought.

The heavily criticized Gnostic redeemer myth has not found widespread acceptance among scholars: “it must be considered very questionable whether in the pre-Christian period there had been a complete redeemer myth that was then merely transferred to Jesus” (Pannenberg, 1968:151). It satisfies our requirement of a comparable sense for both uses of *μορφή*, but its reliance on Gnostic speculation takes the same tangent into specialized language like Aristotle’s *μορφή*.

While some find a background in Gnosticism, others have proposed that the proper setting for the Christ hymn lies in the creation story of

Genesis. If so, the Philippians hymn contrasts Christ as the second Adam with the first Adam of creation: what the first Adam lost, the second Adam regained. James Dunn (1989:119) is representative of this position and summarizes the key elements of this approach:

The Christ of Phil. 2:6-11 therefore is the man who undid Adam's wrong: confronted with the same choice, he rejected Adam's sin, but nevertheless freely followed Adam's course as fallen man to the bitter end of death; wherefore God bestowed on him the status not simply that Adam lost, but the status which Adam was intended to come to, God's final prototype, the last Adam.

Howard's (1978) proposal is a variation within the Adamic Christology approach. For Howard (1978) nothing in the Philippians hymn speaks of Christ's pre-existence, and in the end the exaltation of the second Adam goes no further than an earthly exaltation.

Much of the evidence for the Adam/Christ connection in the Philippians hymn is based on the argument that ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ (2:6a) renders κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ("in the image of God") of Genesis 1:27 (NA28; Göttingen LXX). There is certainly some semantic overlap between the two nouns μορφή and εἰκών. Both nouns can be translated by the English words "form" and "appearance" (see BDAG). The steps used to equate μορφή and εἰκών are through the Hebrew word צֶלֶם (and its Aramaic equivalent צִלְמָא). In twenty-six cases, the LXX translates צֶלֶם with εἰκών and only once with μορφή, in Daniel 3:19 (Wong, 1986:269 n.13). For some this is proof that the two words are synonymous. In my judgment, the proportion of translated terms is not something inconsequential, and the logic behind this argument does not carry sufficient weight for its conclusion: 1) the LXX translates צֶלֶם with εἰκών regularly; 2) the LXX translates the Aramaic term צִלְמָא with μορφή once; 3) the two terms, μορφή and εἰκών, are synonymous; 4) Christ "in the form of God" is the equivalent of Adam "in the image of God." This logic is tenuous at best

and fails to explain the LXX translator's preference for one term over against the other. Moreover, Theodotion, who commonly accepts earlier LXX wording, changed μορφή to ὄψις in the one instance where μορφή translates the Aramaic term צלם (Wallace, 1966:21). The difficulty in equating μορφή and εἰκὼν in the creation account of Adam is coupled with the problem of different prepositions being used: κατὰ in Genesis 1:27 and ἐν in Philippians 2:6. In the end, I agree with the conclusion of Glasson (1974:138): "if the writer were intending to make a reference to the Adam story, why was his meaning wrapped up in such an obscure manner?"

The differences between the Philippians hymn and the creation story are not just limited to the contrast in the abovementioned wording around μορφή and εἰκὼν. There are also disparate contextual factors in comparing the two accounts. Vincent (1961:86) capably demonstrates the key differences between the Philippians hymn and the edenic narrative:

According to the narrative in Gen. iii., Satan declared that the eating of the fruit would confer a knowledge which would make the eaters as gods, knowing good and evil; and the woman saw that the tree was to be desired to make one wise. Nothing is said of a desire to be equal with God in the absolute and general sense. The temptation and the desire turned on forbidden knowledge. The words 'as gods' are defined and limited by the words 'knowing good and evil'; and it is nowhere asserted or hinted in Scripture that Adam desired equality with God in the comprehensive sense of that expression. Moreover, if Adam had proved obedient, his reward would not have been equality with God.

In Genesis 3:5 godlikeness in terms of "knowing good and evil" (ESV) is realized in 3:22: "Then YHWH God said, 'Behold, the man has become like one of us in knowing good and evil'" (based on ESV). In the end, too much supporting commentary around the text is necessary to make the parallel hold.

The final criticism of the first Adam/last Adam background to the Christ hymn involves the issue of pre-existence. Howard (1978) endorses

the view that the hymn does not involve pre-existence but only the human existence of Jesus Christ, the last Adam. There is a curious repetition if only human existence is posited in the hymn. The force of the recapitulatory phrase in 2:8(7): “being found in appearance as a man” (καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος [NASV, NA28]) is oddly redundant if the person in question was never anything but a man. The contrast in the hymn between the two major ideas, ‘being in the image of God’ and ‘becoming in the form of a man’, is certainly strange “if it is only between two stages in the career of a human being” (O’Brien, 1991:267). This would be only the “substitution of one sort of humanity for another” (Wright, 1991:92). In the end there are too many incongruities in the Adam/Christ parallel to make this theory indelible to the Philippians Christ hymn.

In keeping with the meaning prevalent in biblical and Greek literature, I hold that the idea of “outward appearance” should not be lost in the semantic circumscription of μορφή. Without a greater context, it is not possible to restrict μορφή exclusively to the specialized sense of “essence,” the meaning found in Aristotle and Hellenistic religious writings. The sense given by Moulton and Milligan (s.v. μορφή, MM) in their lexicon combines both aspects: “μορφή always signifies a form which truly and fully expresses the being which underlies it.” This is a satisfactory definition for the use of μορφή in both uses in Philippians 2:6 and 7. Wong (1986:270) describes the basic relationship between the outward appearance and inward being:

[A]n absolute separation between form and substance, between appearance and nature cannot be made. Thus, when speaking about the form that Jesus revealed outwardly as the μορφή θεοῦ, one has already confessed, that tacitly, that behind this μορφή, there is something inherent in the being of Christ to which this μορφή corresponds.

With regard to the translation of μορφή in the phrase ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, the English: “in the form of God” reflects the sense of the passage adequately.

When we speak of Christ “in the form of God” and do not want to lose the element of the visible, there is an immediate challenge when referring to God, who is spirit and invisible. In the Old and New Testaments, what is visible of YHWH is his divine glory (כבוד יהוה), and Jesus manifests this glory. Johannes Weiss (1959, 2:478) captures this idea well by stating: “Christ was from the beginning no other than the *Kabōd*, the *Doxa*, of God himself, the glory and radiation of his being, which appears almost as an independent hypostasis of God and yet is connected most intimately with God.”

In Hebrews 1:3, the Son mirrors his Father’s glory: “He is the radiance of the glory of God and the exact imprint of his nature” (ESV). The wording in Philippians 2:6 lends itself to the interpretation that Jesus was clothed in the divine glory consistent with his exalted status: “μορφῇ θεοῦ is the garment by which his divine nature may be known” (Behm, 1967:752). Like Philippians 2:6, John 17:5 describes the pre-existent Jesus who shared in his Father’s majesty: “And now, Father, glorify me in your own presence with the glory that I had with you before the world existed” (ESV). The first movement in the Philippians hymn starts with a reference to the high status of Jesus clothed with divine glory, and this only serves to highlight the contrast with the path of emptying himself—even to the point of death. The first Adam/last Adam parallel is a biblical concept but it is not operating here, and Howard’s (1978) two-movement arrangement faces its first challenge here.

The other elements in Philippians 2:6 also serve to underscore the high status of Jesus in the first movement of the hymn. The article in the phrase τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ is anaphoric: it functions to point to something already mentioned (BDF §399.1). This closely associates the two phrases: “being in the form of God” (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων) and “the being equal with God” (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ) so that, in effect, what is said is: this equality

with God is the equivalent of what was just mentioned, namely, “being in the form of God” (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων) (Hawthorne, 1983:84). In this way, the writer brings the two phrases into a “nearly appositional” relationship (Fee, 2007:381).

The interpretation of Philippians 2:6 is also dependent on the clause οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο, especially the translation of the *hapax legomenon* ἀρπαγμός in this context. Roy Hoover (1971:118) argues that ἀρπαγμός in the double accusative with a verb like ἠγέομαι can carry the sense of “something to take advantage of” or, more idiomatically, “as something to use for his own advantage.” In Philippians 2:6 the translation would be: “who, being in the form of God did not consider equality with God something to use for his own advantage.” This is the basis of the NRSV rendering: “as something to be exploited.” At the end of his philological inquiry, Hoover (1971:118) concludes that the ἀρπαγμός statement has a bearing on how we look at the infinitival clause τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ (“the being equal with God”):

[I]t should be observed that this understanding of the ἀρπαγμός statement carries with it the assumption that τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ represents a status which belonged to the pre-existent Christ it is bound up with the idiomatic character of the ἀρπαγμός remark itself: in every instance which I have examined this idiomatic expression refers to something already present and at one’s disposal. The question in such instances is not whether or not one possesses something, but whether or not one chooses to exploit something.

Being equal with God was not an object out of Christ’s reach but was his status by nature, one which he chose not to exploit for his own advantage.

Now it is possible to assemble our findings in order to render Philippians 2:6. I follow Moule (1972:97) in his proposal that the first participle (ὑπάρχων) is causative: “precisely because he was in the form of God.” Moule’s rendering focuses on deity as the reason for Christ’s attitude of selflessness in which he did not exercise the prerogatives of his divine status. Putting it all together we arrive at the following translation:

Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus,
who, because he was in the form of God,
did not regard equality with God
as something to be exploited
(Phil 2:6, adapted from NRSV).

The present participle in 2:6 (ὑπάρχων) stands in temporal contrast to the aorist constructions in 2:7: the main verb “he emptied himself” (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν) and the two supporting participles. In the second participial phrase in 2:7, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος (“being made in the likeness of men” [NA28, NASV]), the aorist participle γενόμενος, which conveys the sense of beginning or becoming whether from birth or creation, further defines what the clause “he emptied himself” (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν) involved. This stands in temporal contrast to the present participle in 2:6: Jesus *always existed* (ὑπάρχων) “in the form of God” but in the incarnation he *came into existence* (γενόμενος) “in the likeness of men” (Hawthorne, 1983:87).

There is little question that the author of the Christ hymn and Paul affirmed the deity of Christ in this opening movement of the hymn. Prior to the incarnation, Christ existed eternally in the “form of God” and even though he possessed the prerogatives of deity he did not use them for his own advantage. Instead he emptied himself. The first movement starts with the transcendent dimension and moves directly in a downward movement. This forms the backdrop to the incarnation and consequent exaltation of Christ. To deprive this hymn of the divine background makes the development flat and adds a strange redundancy to the opening verses (Wong, 1986:280-281). It has been shown that the Genesis account is not the intended setting for this hymn, and μορφή does not render proper equivalence to the term εἰκών (“image”) nor does εἰκών carry the weight of “being equal with God.” In the end, Jesus clothed in the divine glory of deity and equal with God did not consider equality with God as a path to

getting but gave until he was empty (Moule, 1970:272). Accordingly, I contend that Howard's (1978) thesis that the Christ hymn deals only with the human Christ is mistaken, and the overarching conclusion here as elsewhere in this thesis is that the high Christology of the New Testament is early, deliberate, and involving honors of the highest order.

5.5.2 Exaltation

In the third movement of the hymn, the subject changes from Jesus to the Father. After recounting the *kenosis* and the road of humble service that ended with the cross, God now responds decisively to exalt Jesus to the highest place:

Therefore God highly exalted him
and gave him the name
that is above every name,
so that at the name of Jesus
every knee should bow,
in heaven and on earth and under the earth,
and every tongue should confess
that Jesus Christ is Lord,
to the glory of God the Father”
(Phil 2:9-11, based on NRSV with adaptations).

The inferential conjunction *διό* with the intensifying *καί* serve to denote that the “inference is self-evident” (BDAG, s.v. *διό*). The verb *ὑπερύψωσεν* is also a *hapax legomenon*. The active sense of the verb carries the meaning: “raise ... someone to the loftiest height” (BDAG, s.v. *ὑπερυψόω*). In this context, it is likely that *ὑπερύψωσεν* comes with the force of a superlative with Jesus over all creation. The NIV makes this clear in its translation: “Therefore God exalted him to the highest place” (2:9). The rest of the third movement of the hymn makes clear the extent of this exaltation.

Paul is fond of *ὑπέρ* compounds, and the hymn writer's use of *ὑπερύψωσεν* here is well placed. The simple preposition *ὑπέρ* is also found later in the same verse: *τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα* (“the name that is

above every name” [NA28]). Of note is the use of ὑπερυψώω in the LXX κύριος in reference to YHWH: “because you are the Lord Most High (MT 97:9: יהוה עליון [BHS]) over all the earth. You were exalted exceedingly beyond all the gods” (ὅτι σὺ εἶ κύριος ὁ ὑψιστος ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν γῆν, σφόδρα ὑπερυψώθης ὑπὲρ πάντα τοὺς θεούς [Ps 96(97):9, Lexham English LXX; Göttingen LXX; Hawthorne, 1983:91; cf. Phil 2:10: ἐπουρανίων]). Martin (1997:242) underscores the parallel use of the verb with relative force in the context of the Psalm: “It is not the thought that Yahweh is on a step higher than other deities, but that He is unique and in a class apart because He is the incomparable One (Isa. xl. 18, xlv. 7; Jer. x. 6) and immeasurably greater than all idols.” Whether this use of ὑπερυψώω was in the mind of the author of the Christ hymn is not proven, but there is some overlap in context and comparable usage.

The “name above every name” (τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὄνομα) was graciously conferred by God to Jesus in response to his life of obedient service and ultimate sacrifice. Moule (1970:270) argues that the name in question was “Jesus”: “the Philippians passage becomes a Christian comment on the elevation of the name ‘Jesus’ to a position such that it is no longer customary to call another human child by this formerly common name.” The grammar of the passage allows this rendering, but there is probably greater merit to rendering ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ, “at the name of Jesus” as possessive, that is, “at the name *belonging to* Jesus.” The name conferred on Jesus at his exaltation suggests something new, and the name Jesus was his from birth. The name Jesus was a common name and hardly could be considered the superlative name. This is not to diminish the use of the name “Jesus” because in this passage it has great significance in tying the historical person Jesus to the Divine Identity.

In the Jewish milieu of the early Church, there is little doubt that the “name above every name” was the Tetragrammaton. This is the name that

pervades the Old Testament and which was given as a permanent testimony surpassing all other names: “This is my name forever, and thus I am to be remembered throughout all generations” (Exod 3:15, ESV). It is the name of the *Shema*, and its use is singular for Israel (Deut 6:4): “Hear, O Israel: YHWH our God, YHWH is one.” God chose Jerusalem as the only sanctioned place of worship and authority for his name to dwell (Deut 12:5). All Israel was to call on that name in perpetuity. We have seen that the Tetragrammaton was referred to in the New Testament through the agency of the surrogate κύριος, and Jesus is endowed with this highest honor (Fee, 2007:397).

The exaltation of Jesus is something that is depicted in other contexts of the New Testament as well. In Peter’s speech in Acts, God is said to have exalted Jesus to his right hand and made him “Lord and Christ” (Acts 2:33-36). To share the divine throne is an honor reserved for God alone, and the implications are clear that Jesus is exalted to the highest place and shares the prerogatives of deity. In Ephesians 1:19–23, more detail is used to describe the elevation of the risen Christ:

[The divine power at work in believers is like] the working of his great might that he worked in Christ when he raised him from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and above every name that is named (ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου), not only in this age but also in the one to come. And he put all things under his feet and gave him as head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who fills all in all (ESV, NA28).

Gieschen (2003:130) focuses on the implications of this passage in reference to the name that is above every name: “The conclusion that the reader is led to draw is quite obvious: If Christ is enthroned in the heavenly places ‘above every name that is named’, then he must be enthroned on the

divine throne and possess the unique Divine Name that is not ‘named’ by humans.”

The imagery of height is a concept that Philippians 2:9-11 has in common with other New Testament passages that depict the exaltation of Christ. In Ephesians 1:20-23, the exalted Jesus occupies a place in the height of the heavens: “... in the heavenly places, far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and above every name that is named” (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου [ESV, NA28]). In Hebrews 1:3-4, the exaltation of Jesus is described vertically as well: “After making purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, having become as much superior to angels as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs” (ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, τοσοῦτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ’ αὐτοῦς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα [ESV, NA28]). The placement of the Son on the throne of God “on high” is linked to the superiority of the name he inherits. In contrast to the majority who claim that “Son” is the exclusive name given to Jesus in this context, Bauckham (1998:132) argues persuasively that the only name truly superior to any name given to the angels is the Tetragrammaton. In the Philippians passage, the Divine Name mediated through the surrogate κύριος is the name that is above every name, and this superiority of name is exclusively the entitlement of the Son.

Howard (1978:383-384) repeats his former position that the Tetragrammaton was likely found in the New Testament manuscripts, and thus the earliest church was not exposed to the use of κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name. According to him it was the scribes of the second century who removed the New Testament instances of the Tetragrammaton and began the practice of substituting κύριος for the Divine Name. The New Testament manuscripts, however, bear no evidence that the

Tetragrammaton was ever penned in these documents, and our investigation so far has demonstrated that the use of κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name was a much earlier practice. The practice of substitution was a custom with attestation among the earliest Christian writers. Howard (1978:386) agrees that the Tetragrammaton was bestowed on Jesus in his earthly ministry but was not given as his own name but “to wield as an instrument of power in his exercise of lordship.” The connection through the LXX^{κύριος} linking the Tetragrammaton to the surrogate κύριος fails to find confirmation in Howard (1977, 1978) and represents a foremost point of departure for this thesis.

The implications of the Christ hymn only serve to confirm with highest certitude the place of Jesus in the Divine Identity. The investiture of God’s most sacred name comes with the attendant reality that all creation will do homage to the one who carries this name with divine justification. Behind the spectacular scene of all created beings whether heavenly or earthly, living or resurrected dead, acclaiming that Jesus Christ is Lord, there is the Old Testament background to this majestic scene. To the listener having any familiarity with the great monotheistic passages of the Old Testament, the connection to the universal enthronement of YHWH in Isaiah 45 now applied to Jesus Christ would be hard to miss:

Isaiah 45:23 LXX	Philippians 2:10-11
“to me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess to God”	“so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (based on NRSV)
ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα τῷ θεῷ (Göttingen LXX)	ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψη ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς (NA28)

The “Lord” (κύριος) in the greater context of this passage is found in Isaiah 45:18 LXX^{κύριος} and he is YHWH: “Thus says the Lord (MT: יהוה) the one who created heaven” (Οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανόν [Göttingen LXX]), whereas in Philippians 2:11, the “Lord” (κύριος) is Jesus Christ and the prerogatives of deity have now been applied to him in parallel fashion. In view of the fact that Isaiah 45 is the context behind the final movement of the Philippians hymn, it could not have come from a more monotheistic section of Isaiah. In the immediate context, YHWH is the one who has the exclusive claim to deity: “there is no other god besides me, a righteous God and a Savior; there is none besides me. Turn to me and be saved, all the ends of the earth! For I am God, and there is no other” (Isa 45:21-22, ESV). He then continues with the biblical statement behind the Philippians enthronement of Jesus. Elsewhere in the surrounding context in Isaiah, the unity of God is expressed without qualification: “I am YHWH, and there is no other” (Isa 45:18, based on ESV); “I, I am YHWH, and besides me there is no savior” (Isa 43:11, based on ESV); “I am YHWH; that is my name; my glory I give to no other” (Isa 42:8, based on ESV). The immediate and greater contexts are unanimous in declaring YHWH as Israel’s one and only Savior, ruling supreme above all powers, heavenly and otherwise. The Isaiah passage and its enviroing context form one of the strongest affirmations of the unity of God. It is these Isaiah passages, particularly chapters 44-47, to which the Tannaitic rabbis made application in their struggle against the challenges to the exclusive claims of Jewish monotheism (Nagata, 1981:287). Through the medium of the κύριος predicate and the intertextuality of scripture, Jesus is awarded the matchless name—no higher honor could be given.

The outcome of the divine enthronement of Jesus and his possession of the Divine Name through the κύριος predicate results in universal worship: “at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on

earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (Phil 2:10–11, ESV). The word “worship” is not used here but all the ingredients are present. Jesus is highly exalted and given the name YHWH, and all creation bows in universal homage, affirming his possession of the Divine Name and his rightful place in the Divine Identity.

This three-fold division of created reality in unified worship is found in similar fashion in Revelation 5:13: “every creature in heaven and on earth and under the earth and in the sea, and all that is in them” (πάν κτίσμα ὃ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα [ESV, NA28]). The rousing chorus around the throne of God and the Lamb is joined by myriads of heavenly beings in unified chorus: “To him who sits on the throne and to the Lamb be blessing and honor and glory and might forever and ever!” (Rev 5:13, ESV). The only response appropriate for created beings is worship. The exaltation of the Lamb who was slain and the adoration of Jesus who emptied himself to death attest to the ubiquitous acclamation of Jesus by the early Church. Jesus shares in the Divine Identity and shares the divine throne by right. The exaltation in the final movement of the Philippians hymn parallels the universal worship of YHWH and represents the Christological equivalent of Old Testament eschatological monotheism (Bauckham, 1998:132-133).

It is noteworthy that in both Philippians 2:11 and Revelation 5:13 God is not eclipsed nor is he slighted by the worship of Jesus. In Philippians 2:11, the final word on all of this is “to the glory of God the Father.” Similarly in Revelation 5:13-14, worship of the Lamb is given as a part of worship of the Father. Hawthorne (1983:94) summarizes this paradox well:

Jesus does not in any way displace God, or even rival God. As the hymn makes clear, the authority of Jesus Christ is a derived

authority—God exalted him; God enthroned him; God conferred on him the superlative title ... Therefore, whenever and by whomever the confession is made that ‘Jesus is Lord,’ God suffers no embarrassment; rather he is glorified ... for he has planned that this be so.

Howard (1978:378) claims that the final phrase, “to the glory of God the Father” may be taken as an “antiphonal response to be uttered after each strophe or perhaps after each line.” I am not sure that there is evidence in the hymn for this extra measure of safety to preserve the monotheism of primitive Christianity. I think that Howard assumes that the early Church at this stage in its development would have some self-imposed limits on Christological monotheism. This may be true to some extent, but the Christ hymn portrays Christ in all the regality of divine sovereignty appropriate only to YHWH.

My research yields the conclusion that there are three movements in the hymn, not just two. I agree with Feinberg (1980:45) that there is a beautiful symmetry to the hymn: “θεός (2:6) becomes δοῦλος (2:7), and is exalted to κύριος (2:11).” The Christ hymn starts from the high point of divinity and descends to the humblest point of human service and sacrifice and finishes with the height of exaltation and sovereignty. Jesus possesses the Divine Name through the agency of the κύριος predicate. The place of this hymn in early Christian literature strongly argues that already at this early stage κύριος Christology had distinguishing contours. It did not take scribal corruption to elevate Jesus to a superlative status. It was his by right and the earliest witnesses to the Faith attest to this conclusion.

In the next section I will examine other remaining Pauline YHWH passages where Jesus is the understood referent and high honors are applied through the κύριος predicate.

5.6 YHWH Passages in Paul

The remaining passages in Paul that quote the Tetragrammaton through the surrogate κύριος and refer to Jesus are all found in the Corinthian correspondence. The previous sections have accentuated the position of Jesus as the bearer of the Divine Name through the κύριος predicate. The “name above every name” is the Tetragrammaton, and Jesus possesses this superlative honor because of his path of humiliation from the heavenly throne to his life of obedient service culminating in the cross. For Howard (1977) the high honors attributed to Jesus were the work of unknowing scribes who lacked familiarity with the Tetragrammaton, and their mistaken substitution of κύριος only served to corrupt the faithful transmission of the New Testament. By way of contrast, the picture that is emerging in this study is that the high honors paid to Jesus Christ through the κύριος predicate began in the primitive church, and Paul’s writings only further this trend. The remaining YHWH passages in Paul serve to purposely join the Old and New Testaments in applying the honors intended for YHWH to the person of Jesus Christ.

5.6.1 Boast in the Lord

In the first chapter of 1 Corinthians, the apostle Paul redefines expectations regarding the relative worth of worldly wisdom in contrast to the message of the cross. The Corinthians esteemed wisdom, power, and status as the distinguishing marks of true success. Paul turns everything on its head. God’s wisdom appears as foolishness to the wise. The ignominy of the cross is the wisdom of God:

For Jews demand signs and Greeks seek wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men (1 Cor 1:22–25, ESV).

In the divine scheme of things, there is a complete reversal of what constitutes success. In fact, the Corinthians themselves exemplify God's contradiction:

For consider your calling, brothers: not many of you were wise according to worldly standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth. But God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise; God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong; God chose what is low and despised in the world, even things that are not, to bring to nothing things that are ... (1 Cor 1:26-28, ESV).

The message of the cross came to people without social status, power and prestige, who were “nothings” (τὰ μὴ ὄντα, 1 Cor 1:28, NA28) so that in the end all grounds for gaining God's favor are removed, and before the cross of Christ all claims to self-sufficiency are rejected. The purpose clause in 1 Corinthians 1:29 declares the final intent of God in the cross and in salvation: “so that no flesh may boast before God” (ὅπως μὴ καυχῆσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ [NA28]). The next phrase reinforces what was just said: ἐξ αὐτοῦ (“because of him” [1 Cor 1:30, ESV, NA28]). The work of salvation is entirely the initiative of God without which the Corinthians would have remained without hope.

What was stated negatively first of those outside of Christ (1 Cor 1:18-23) then of believers in Christ (1 Cor 1:26-29) is now presented positively: “And because of him you are in Christ Jesus, who became to us wisdom from God, righteousness and sanctification and redemption” (ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ, δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις [1 Cor 1:30, ESV, NA28]). These four qualities: wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption are epitomized in Christ and are imparted to believers in union with him. True wisdom is found in Christ, and Paul's approach represents a paradigm shift from seeking clout and status to receiving Christ's gifts of righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. In Christ the Corinthians

have a new status as righteous, sanctified and redeemed. To boast of these is to boast of Christ without whom the Corinthians would have perished, trusting in their own self-sufficiency (Thiselton, 2000:190-192).

The climax and summary of Paul’s argument takes the form of an Old Testament quotation: “so that, as it is written, ‘Let the one who boasts, boast in the Lord’” (ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται· ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω [1 Cor 1:31, ESV, NA28]). Although Paul introduces the quotation with the formula: καθὼς γέγραπται (“just as it is written”), there are some differences with known Old Testament passages:

1 Corinthians 1:31	Jeremiah 9:23(9:24)	1 Kingdoms 2.10
ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω (NA28)	ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος (Göttingen LXX)	ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον (Rahlfs LXX)
Let the one who boasts, boast in the Lord.	Let the one who boasts, boast in this: that he understands and knows that I am the Lord (Lexham English LXX).	Let the one who boasts, boast in this: that he understands and knows the Lord.

I have quoted a smaller portion of the longer passage in Jeremiah. The complete text is as follows: “‘Rather let the one who boasts boast in this: that he understands and knows that I am the Lord, the one who deals in mercy and judgment and righteousness upon the earth. For my will is in this,’ says the Lord” (ἀλλ’ ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἐν τούτοις τὸ θέλημά μου, λέγει κύριος [Jer 9:23, Lexham English LXX, Göttingen LXX]). There are a few differences in how Paul phrases this Scriptural aphorism. The initial ἀλλ’ ἢ is omitted and ὁ καυχώμενος is brought forward, and Paul has substituted ἐν κυρίῳ for ἐν τούτῳ. I agree with Stanley (1992:187) in his reason for the change in word order: “The shifting of ὁ καυχώμενος to primary position might then

be understood as an attempt to heighten the contrast (after the interruption of v. 30) with the somber conclusion of v. 29, ὅπως μὴ καυχῆσθαι πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.” Finally, it appears that Paul has created a shorthand for the longer Jeremiah quotation and conflated the content into the statement, ἐν κυρίῳ. In Jeremiah, ἐν τούτῳ points to the longer statement of YHWH’s character and deeds: “that he understands and knows that I am the Lord (κύριος, יהוה [MT]), the one who deals in mercy and judgment and righteousness upon the earth” (Jer 9:23 [9:24], Lexham English LXX, Göttingen LXX, BHS). There is evidence that Paul had the larger context of Jeremiah 9:22 (9:23) in mind when he wrote the passage in 1 Corinthians 1:27-28. Paul patterns the rejection of the wise, the strong, and the well-born on the corresponding three recipients in Jeremiah 9:22 (9:23): “This is what the Lord says: ‘Let the wise (ὁ σοφὸς) not boast (μὴ καυχᾶσθω) in his wisdom, and let the strong (ὁ ἰσχυρὸς) not boast (μὴ καυχᾶσθω) in his strength, and let the wealthy (ὁ πλούσιος) not boast (μὴ καυχᾶσθω) in his riches’” (Jer 9:22 [9:23], Lexham English LXX, Göttingen LXX):

	the wise	the strong	the wealthy
1 Corinthians 1:27-28	τοὺς σοφούς	τὰ ἰσχυρά	τὰ ὄντα
Jeremiah 9:22 (9:23)	ὁ σοφὸς	ὁ ἰσχυρὸς	ὁ πλούσιος

The reference to Christ our “righteousness” (δικαιοσύνη) in 1 Corinthians 1:30 may be an echo of Jeremiah 9:23 (9:24): “I am the Lord, the one who deals in mercy and judgment and righteousness (δικαιοσύνην) upon the earth” (Lexham English LXX, Göttingen LXX). These parallels make more certain the likelihood that in his composition Paul had Jeremiah in mind (Ciampa & Rosner, 2007:700; Stanley, 1992:187).

There is evidence that there may be some intertextual echoes of 1 Kingdoms 2:10 behind Paul’s Old Testament quotation as well. The quotation from the Song of Hannah in 1 Kingdoms 2:10 is more succinct

and appears somewhat closer to Paul: “let the one who boasts, boast in this: that he understands and knows the Lord” (ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον [Rahlfs LXX]). Certainly the whole reversal of status in the Song of Hannah rings true in Paul, who has contrasted wisdom and foolishness, strength and weakness, the haves and the have nots. Even the inconsequential among the Corinthians typify God’s choice of the weak and insignificant over the world’s strong and successful. The “nothings” of the world are brought into favor with God through Christ. Hannah praises God for her reversal of fortune in bearing a son and sings about how the Lord humbles the advantaged and exalts the disadvantaged. Even the wording of 1 Kingdoms 2:3 sounds applicable to the Corinthian situation: “Do not boast (μὴ καυχᾶσθε), and do not speak lofty words nor allow big talk to come out of your mouth, because the Lord is a God of knowledge and a God who prepares his own business” (Lexham English LXX, Rahlfs LXX). Rhetoric and worldly philosophy appealed to the Corinthians, but in the end the foolish message of the cross was where the wisdom and power of God resided. For those who trust God, there is a reversal of expectations: the lowly become exalted, and the ones who are exalted and proud in their own success and self-sufficiency are brought low (Ciampa & Rosner, 2007:700).

With Jeremiah 9:23 (9:24) and 1 Kingdoms 2:10 as background to Paul’s quotation in 1 Corinthians 1:31, some things become clearer. In Jeremiah 9:23 (9:24), the Tetragrammaton stands in the MT, and the LXX^{κύριος} uses κύριος as the surrogate for the Divine Name. The expanded quotation in Jeremiah 9:23 (9:24) addresses legitimate boasting as boasting in the character of YHWH (“I am the Lord” [ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος (Göttingen LXX); אֲנִי יְהוָה (BHS)]) and what he has done (“the one who deals in mercy and judgment and righteousness upon the earth” [Lexham English LXX]). In the end, YHWH is the proper object of boasting. If there is boasting, it

must be of YHWH's character and deeds. The passage in Paul is a concise way of stating the same thing. The difference is that it is now a matter of who Jesus is and what he has done ("you are in Christ Jesus, who became to us wisdom from God, righteousness and sanctification and redemption" [1 Cor 1:30, ESV]). Just as YHWH is the ground of all true boasting, so Jesus through the agency of the κύριος predicate is awarded the same high honor. What is true of YHWH is now true of Jesus through the intertextuality of Scripture. To boast unreservedly is only appropriate if the object of boasting is YHWH and now Jesus. Boasting in this way is an aspect of praise. Glorifying in the Lord (i.e., "boasting in the Lord") and giving the Lord glory are two aspects of the same reality.

This idea of boasting or glorifying in Christ is found elsewhere in the Pauline corpus as well. In the immediate context of 1 Corinthians 1, Paul sums up his message: "For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor 2:2, ESV). Jesus is the "Lord of glory" (τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης [1 Cor 2:8, NA28]). In Galatians 6:14, Paul contrasts the inappropriate "boasting in the flesh" of the circumcision group with the rightful object of boasting: "But far be it from me to boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ (Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world" (Gal 6:14, ESV, NA28). Paul consistently redirects believers to Christ. Against those who claim to be the true believers because they adhere to ritual circumcision, Paul rejoins: "For we are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God and glory in Christ Jesus (καυχώμενοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) and put no confidence in the flesh" (Phil 3:3, ESV, NA28).

In addition to the quotation of Jeremiah 9:23 (9:24) in 1 Corinthians 1:31, Paul quotes the same passage in 2 Corinthians 10:17. The only difference is that Paul quotes the passage without the citation formula: καθὼς γέγραπται ("just as it is written") and adds instead the particle δέ.

Other than that, the passage is identical in wording: “Let the one who boasts, boast in the Lord” (Ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω [2 Cor 10:17, ESV, NA28]). There is less in the text to determine the referent of κύριος from the LXX^{κύριος} quotation. However, some of the reasons why κύριος refers to Jesus in 1 Corinthians 1:31 also have application here. In 1 Corinthians 1:31, Jesus is spoken of in the immediate context (1:30), and this proximity makes it likely that Jesus is the κύριος in the Old Testament citation. If Jesus is the referent in 1 Corinthians 1:31, there is likelihood that in a passage about boasting Paul has Christ in mind in 2 Corinthians 10:17 as well. I agree also with Fee (1987:87 n. 42) that in Paul κύριος refers to Jesus unless the context makes it clear otherwise. The passages above from Galatians 6:14 and Philippians 3:3 also show that the idea of boasting in Christ and what he has done has precedent in the Pauline letters.

The final reason that 2 Corinthians 10:17 probably has Christ as a referent is found in the concluding verse that follows the quotation: “For it is not the one who commends himself who is approved, but the one whom the Lord commends” (οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνων, ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν δόκιμος, ἀλλ’ ὃν ὁ κύριος συνίστησιν [2 Cor 10:18, ESV, NA28]). Paul is defending himself against opponents in 2 Corinthians who are encroaching on his field of ministry. Paul’s office and authority as an apostle are frequently stated with reference to the title κύριος as it relates to Jesus:

1 Corinthians 9:1-2	“Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? (Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον). Are not you my workmanship in the Lord? (ἐν κυρίῳ). If to others I am not an apostle, at least I am to you, for you are the seal of my apostleship in the Lord (ἐν κυρίῳ)” (ESV, NA28).
2 Corinthians 10:8	“For even if I boast a little too much of our authority, which the Lord (ὁ κύριος) gave for building you up and not for destroying you, I will not be ashamed” (ESV, NA28).

2 Corinthians 13:10	“For this reason I write these things while I am away from you, that when I come I may not have to be severe in my use of the authority that the Lord (ὁ κύριος) has given me for building up and not for tearing down. (ESV, NA28).
---------------------	--

Paul received his commission from Jesus on the road to Damascus and in the company of Ananias. In that commission, Jesus is referred to as κύριος and Paul was sent to the Gentiles by the same Lord (Acts 9:15). The κύριος title is also found in most introductions to Paul’s letters associated with his relationship to the recipient(s) as apostle and Christ’s representative (Capes, 1990:229-230).

In 1 Corinthians 1:31 Paul uses the Jeremiah 9:23 (9:24) quotation to admonish the Corinthians to boast about Christ’s character and his deeds. In 2 Corinthians 10:17, Paul urges that same restraint. Paul’s opponents were encroaching on his field of ministry among the Corinthians and were boasting about the success of the Gentile mission in this region and beyond as though it were their accomplishment. In contrast, Paul boasts about the Corinthians because they are the work of Christ, and such boasting is within the spirit of Jeremiah 9:23 (9:24). Paul’s opponents commend themselves and measure their success by themselves (2 Cor 10:12). However, Paul insists there are proper limits to boasting: “We do not boast beyond limit in the labors of others. But our hope is that as your faith increases, our area of influence among you may be greatly enlarged, so that we may preach the gospel in lands beyond you, without boasting of work already done in another’s area of influence” (2 Cor 10:15–16, ESV). The Gentile mission was Christ’s ordained sphere of ministry for Paul, and boasting of it was within the proper bounds of boasting. To usurp that ministry and to claim that the success of the Gentile mission in Corinth and elsewhere was the product of human effort alone go beyond what Scripture prescribes.

Through the κύριος predicate Jesus is awarded the high honor that Jeremiah reserved for YHWH. The Corinthian mission was grounded in the character and deeds of Jesus, the Lord. Glorifying in what God has done in Christ is at the core of New Testament worship. YHWH shares his glory with no one, and all boasting beyond who he is and what he has done is vain. Jesus shares the glory with YHWH, and this is evident in the reapplication of Jeremiah 9:23 (9:24) to the New Testament situation.

5.6.2 Mind of the Lord

In Paul's preaching about the foolishness of the cross where God's wisdom is most effectively displayed, the only grounds for boasting are in the character and deeds of the Lord Jesus. Through the message of the cross, God has displayed his divine purpose, and the second chapter of 1 Corinthians deals with the agency by which this purpose is revealed. Those outside of Christ are hindered by their unbelief—they cannot receive the secret things of God: “But we impart a secret and hidden wisdom of God, which God decreed before the ages for our glory” (1 Cor 2:7, ESV). The message of the cross is spiritually discerned, and it is the Spirit who teaches the spiritually receptive the true wisdom of God—a wisdom that is foolishness to those without the Spirit. Paul contrasts two types of individuals: the “spiritual person” (πνευματικός) and the “natural person” (ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος) (1 Cor 2:14-15, NA28). Each operates in his own realm of understanding: “The natural person (ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος) does not accept the things of the Spirit of God, for they are folly to him, and he is not able to understand them because they are spiritually discerned. The spiritual person (πνευματικός) judges all things, but is himself to be judged by no one” (1 Cor 2:14–15, ESV, NA28). The Holy Spirit reveals the very mind of God to those who receive the message of salvation in the cross of Christ. If boasting is legitimate because its focus is on the character and deeds of Christ the Lord (1 Cor 1:31 quoting Jer 9:24 [9:23]), it is the Spirit

of God who makes these known. The demonstration of God’s wisdom in the cross of Christ is part of a larger goal of Christological revelation through the Holy Spirit. In fact, when present gives way to future, God intends to reveal fully what his ultimate purpose is for those who have received the Spirit through the preaching of the cross: “What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man imagined, what God has prepared for those who love him...” (1 Cor 2:9 quoting Isa 64:4).

Paul concludes his immediate discussion in 1 Corinthians 2:6-16 with a quotation that forms a rhetorical question, which the following sentence answers. The conjunction γάρ introduces the quotation from Isaiah 40:13: “For who has understood the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?” (τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν; [1 Cor 2:16, ESV, NA28]). The implied short answer to this question in Paul and in Isaiah is “no one.” The longer answer is “But we have the mind of Christ” (ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν [1 Cor 2:16, ESV, NA28]). There is overlap between the words “mind” (νοῦς) and “s/Spirit” (πνεῦμα). English translations of the Hebrew text of Isaiah 40:13 render the Hebrew phrase יהוה רוח variously. NASV and ESV both render this phrase with “Spirit of the LORD,” while the NIV and NRSV follow with renderings closer to the LXX: “mind of the LORD” or “spirit of the LORD” respectively. Thiselton (2000:275) explains that in 1 Corinthians 2:16 νοῦς is “not an instrument of thought” but rather is a “mode of thought” or “mind-set.” Grammarian A. T. Robertson (1923:724) suggests that the relative pronoun ὃς in the introduction to the result clause denotes a “consecutive idea,” giving support to the English translations that render ὃς with “so as to” (i.e., ESV, NRSV): “For who has understood the mind of the Lord *so as to* instruct him?” (ESV, italics added).

The variant Χριστοῦ (“Christ”) in the statement in 1 Corinthians 2:16b: ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν (“But we have the mind of Christ”

[NA28, ESV]) has the strong support of witnesses \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A C Ψ 048 *al.*⁶ whereas support for the variant κυρίου is less weighty: B D* F G 81 *al.*⁷ (Metzger, 1994:482). It is likely that the variant κυρίου in 2:16b was assimilated to the first κυρίου in 2:16a (νοῦν κυρίου, “mind of the Lord”). Χριστοῦ is the *lectio difficilior*, and this fact together with the stronger manuscript support makes Χριστοῦ the preferred reading. Howard (1977:80) argues that the Tetragrammaton was originally in the LXX/OG quotation in 2:16a, and later scribes changed the Divine Name to κύριος because they failed to recognize the importance of the Hebrew name. Howard suggests that when faced with two undifferentiated phrases “mind of the Lord” (νοῦν κυρίου) resulting from the substitution of κυρίου for the Tetragrammaton, scribes changed the second κυρίου to Χριστοῦ to achieve some distinction. In terms of external evidence, Howard’s proposal lacks manuscript support. There are no manuscripts of 1 Corinthians that have the Tetragrammaton either in Hebrew characters or Greek transliteration. Moreover, the variant κυρίου in 2:16b can be explained adequately as an assimilation corruption. As this thesis demonstrates, the use of κύριος in place of the Divine Name was an early practice with great Christological significance.

The parallel statement “mind of Christ” (νοῦν Χριστοῦ, 2:16b) pertains to the referent of the first phrase “mind of the Lord” (νοῦν κυρίου, 2:16a). The “mind of Christ” reveals to believers the wisdom of God exemplified in the cross: “The change of expression from ‘Lord’ in 16a to ‘Christ’ in 16b binds the true divine wisdom to the crucified Christ” (Jewett, 1971:377). In this way, Paul is furthering his argument from the first chapter about the message of the cross, which is foolishness to those who are perishing but is the power of God for those being saved (1 Cor

⁶ \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A C D¹ L P Ψ 048. 0289^{vid}. 33. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881. 2464 \mathfrak{M} vg sy co; Or Epiph (NA28).

⁷ B D* F G 81 it; Ambst Pel (NA28).

1:18). As was noted above by Fee (1987:87 n. 42), when κύριος is used by Paul it refers to Jesus unless the context makes it clear otherwise. What is said of Christ in this application of Isaiah 40:13 is therefore significant. The salvific plan of God through the cross and all the fullness of what God has in store for believers are available in the “mind of the Christ.” In the context of Isaiah 40:13 LXX, the prophet declares the greatness of God and extols his plan of salvation:

Go up on a high mountain, O bringer of good news to Zion; lift up your voice with strength, O bringer of good tidings to Jerusalem! Lift it up, do not fear! Say to the cities of Judah, “Look; your God! Look; the Lord!” The Lord comes with might, and his arm with power. Look! His wage is with him, and his work before him. Like a shepherd he will tend his flock, and in his arm he will gather the lambs, and he will comfort those with young (Isa 40:9–11, Lexham English LXX).

Isaiah then broadens his praise of the Lord in relation to all of creation:

Who has measured the water in his hand and the heaven in his span and the whole earth with his measure? Who has put the mountains in a balance and the valleys on a scale? Who has known the mind of the Lord, and who has become his counselor? Who will advise him? With whom did he consult, and who advised him? Who ever explained a decision to him? Who has ever shown him a way of understanding? Surely all the peoples are reckoned as a drop from the bucket, and as the tipping of the balance, and they will be considered like spittle (Isa 40:12–15, Lexham English LXX).

The questions in this passage are rhetorical and the implied answer to each is “no one”—the incomparableness of YHWH is the conclusion. It is in this context that our quotation from 40:13 is found. Williams (2001:215) underscores the role of 40:13 in detailing God’s plan of salvation: “Isa. 40:13 functions then as part of a divine counter response to the people’s inability to grasp God’s new salvific activity.” As a result, Isaiah 40:13a could be paraphrased: “Who is able to comprehend the salvific plan of God?” (Williams, 2001:214).

If the “mind of the Lord” and the “mind of Christ” imply content rather than the instrument of revelation, the context of the preceding verses in 1 Corinthians 2:6-15 makes it clear that the Holy Spirit is the one who makes this content comprehensible. This revealed wisdom imparted by the Holy Spirit is never far from the message of the cross which forms its center: “To have the mind of Christ means reciprocally that they have the Spirit and thereby have been let in on the divine mystery” (Capes, 1990:235). Fee (2007:131) argues that in this passage there may be a double referent. In 2:10-11 it is clear that God is the one whose thoughts the Spirit reveals: “For the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God. For who knows a person’s thoughts except the spirit of that person, which is in him? So also no one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God” (ESV). In this way, there is a correspondence between the “mind of the Lord” and the “thoughts of God” (lit. “the things of God” [τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ] 1 Cor 2:11, NA28; EVV: “thoughts of God”). This type of ambiguity in the passage should not be automatically thought of as a failure to discern the intentions of the author but rather may be an allowable ambiguity, if not an intentional one. In this way, “Lord” may be at once the Lord God and also the Lord Jesus—the plan of God for salvation is bound up in the relationship of the Father and the Son. In Romans 11:34, Paul also quotes Isaiah 40:13, this time as part of his doxology to God: “For who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been his counselor?” (ESV). If the clauses in Isaiah 40:13 LXX can be numbered, the quote in Romans 11:34 includes the first and second, while the quote in 1 Corinthians 2:16 involves the first and the third:

1	τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου	Who has known the mind of the Lord
2	καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο	and who has become his counselor?
3	ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν	Who will advise him?

(Isa 40:13, Göttingen LXX; Lexham English LXX; Capes, 1990:232-233).

Thiselton (2000:275) argues that in the context of 1 Corinthians 2:16 Paul may have omitted the second clause because “‘Who has become his adviser?’ (σύμβουλος) is less pointed than the dynamic barb ‘Who should instruct him?’” The substance of Isaiah 40:13 is well represented in each context, and this quotation serves the author’s purpose in each. In Romans 11:34 it is God who is the referent, while in 1 Corinthians 2:16 it is likely applied to Jesus but God may be the double referent. This kind of interplay of shared name and purpose is also evident in Paul’s description of the Holy Spirit. In Romans 8:9 the Spirit is at once the “Spirit,” the “Spirit of God,” and the “Spirit of Christ”: “You, however, are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you. Anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him” (ESV). This kind of overlapping among titles and roles may be present in 1 Corinthians 2:16 if Paul was interacting with the ambiguity of meaning for the Hebrew phrase: רוּחַ יְהוָה (“mind/spirit/Spirit of YHWH”). In this way, the “Lord’s mind” (νοῦν κυρίου) could be taken as a secondary reference to the Holy Spirit. It is through the intertextuality of Scripture that high honors may have been given to Jesus, God, and the Holy Spirit in the same context. In this thesis, it is Jesus who forms the focus where κύριος stands in place of the Tetragrammaton, and the intersection of Old and New Testaments in 1 Corinthians 2:16 brings praise to the holder of that title. Howard (1977) would place some of the high honors to Jesus outside of Paul’s intention, but in 1 Corinthians 2:16, Jesus bears the Divine Name through the agency of the κύριος predicate, and the overlapping of referents only serves to elevate his exalted position.

5.6.3 The Earth is the Lord’s

Paul continues his treatment of food sacrificed to idols in 1 Corinthians 10:23-11:1. In 10:23, Paul contrasts the Corinthians’ position with his principle of concern for others, especially the weak: “‘All things

are lawful,’ but not all things are helpful. ‘All things are lawful,’ but not all things build up” (1 Cor 10:23, ESV). Paul has been holding in tension the two important principles of personal freedom and benefit to others. In the verses following, Paul alternates between each principle in order to give some understanding of the tension between rights and freedoms, on the one hand, and personal responsibility to others, on the other hand. Fee (1987:478) offers a helpful chiasmic breakdown of the section 10:23-33 and shows how each verse contributes to Paul’s principles:

A	10:23-24	The criterion: the good of others
B	10:25-27	Personal freedom with regard to food
C	10:28-29a	The criterion illustrated: freedom curtailed for the sake of another
B`	10:29b-30	Personal freedom defended
A`	10:31-33f	The criterion generalized: that all may be saved.

In B and B`, Paul focuses on the believer’s freedom, particularly with regard to food sacrificed to idols and sold in the marketplace. 1 Corinthians 10:25 establishes the principle: “Eat whatever is sold in the meat market without raising any question on the ground of conscience” (ESV). Paul then offers Psalm 24:1 (23:1) as support of this principle of personal freedom: “For ‘the earth is the Lord’s (יהוה לִ [MT]), and the fullness thereof” (τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς [1 Cor 10:26, ESV, BHS, NA28]). Psalm 24:1 (23:1) is a passage that the rabbis used to support the practice of giving a benediction over the food at meals. The Tosefta (Berakhot, 4:1) admonishes:

One must not taste anything until he has [first] recited a benediction [over it], as Scripture states, *The earth is the Lord’s and all that it contains* (Ps. 24:1). One who derives benefit from this world [by eating its produce] without first having recited a benediction has committed sacrilege [viz., it is as if he ate sanctified Temple

produce, thereby misappropriating God’s property] (Neusner & Sarason, 1986:19).

Paul is certainly in agreement with this because in B` he mentions “giving thanks” which in the immediate context is likely a reference back to his quotation from Psalm 24:1 (23:1): “If I partake with thankfulness, why am I denounced because of that for which I give thanks?” (1 Cor 10:30, ESV). The object of this prayer of thanks is God, as the following verse makes clear: “So, whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God” (1 Cor 10:31, ESV). These factors support the idea that God is the referent of “Lord” (κυρίου) in Paul’s quotation from Psalm 24:1 (23:1; 1 Cor 10:26).

There are, however, a few reasons that Paul may be referring to Jesus as the referent of “Lord” (κυρίου) in 1 Corinthians 10:26 (Ps 24:1 [23:1]). Firstly, Paul started his initial treatment of food sacrificed to idols in 8:1-13, and this passage may contribute to our understanding of the referent in 10:26. Earlier Paul agrees with the Corinthians that “an idol has no real existence” and that “there is no God but one” (1 Cor 8:4, ESV). What follows then is a revision of the *Shema*: “for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist” (ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ [1 Cor 8:6, ESV, NA28]). This remarkable adaptation affirms Jesus as the mediator in creation and redemption and sets him apart as the “one Lord” (εἷς κύριος). Paul’s argument in 10:26 may be still in the shadow of this earlier formulation. Secondly, in the near context of 1 Corinthians 10:26, Paul deals with the related problem of participating in idol worship and its relation to the Lord’s Supper (10:14-22). The “Lord” in 10:21-22 is Jesus: “You cannot drink the cup of the Lord (κυρίου) and the cup of demons. You cannot partake of the table of the Lord (κυρίου) and the table of

demons. Shall we provoke the Lord (κύριον) to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?” (1 Cor 10:21–22, ESV, NA28). In 10:16 Paul ties the elements of the Lord’s Supper to the body and blood of Christ: “The cup of blessing that we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread that we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?” (ESV). This gives added confirmation that κύριος refers to Jesus, and this forms an integral part of Paul’s argument about idol feasts and food sacrificed to idols. This is not the sole reference to κύριος with Jesus as the referent. In the preceding sections Jesus is repeatedly referred to with this Christological title: 1 Corinthians 8:6; 9:1, 5, 14; 10:21. Thirdly, Paul concludes 10:23–11:1 with a reference to Christ: “Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ” (1 Cor 11:1, ESV). This forms a bookend with what precedes it and ties together the Christological content in the area of idol sacrifices. Finally, Fee’s (1987:87 n. 42) claim that κύριος in Paul refers to Jesus unless the context demands otherwise tips the scales in favor of seeing Jesus as the referent in 1 Corinthians 10:26 (whole paragraph, Capes, 1990:242–245).

In the end, 1 Corinthians (and one passage from 2 Corinthians) has provided substantial content to the discussion about the place of the Divine Name and the surrogate κύριος in the New Testament and its place in the Christology of the New Testament. Howard (1977) sees Christological confusion in the pages of the New Testament after the putative scribal corruption arising from the abandonment of the Tetragrammaton during the second century. In contrast, the picture is coming into focus in this thesis that Jesus is the rightful inheritor of the Divine Name through the agency of the κύριος predicate. High honors belong to the holder of this name, and its attestation is early and deliberate, as the Pauline literature confirms.

In the next section I will examine the use of κύριος for the Divine Name in the Gospels, where Jesus is the understood referent, and the contribution this makes to the Christology of the Divine Name in the New Testament.

5.7 YHWH Passages in the Gospels

The canonical Gospels contain a mixture of elements that demonstrate the developing characterization of Jesus as Lord. In terms of titles κύριος is used frequently and variously. Although κύριος is routinely used in the Gospels as a common form of respectful address much like “sir” or “mister” in English, there are other times when much more is implied with the same title. Most of the high uses of κύριος are found in post-resurrection settings where the fullest sense of reverence is unmistakable. However, the gradual recognition of Jesus’ identity is not strictly presented in a linear progression, but rather the Gospel writers all make programmatic statements in the beginning of their manuscripts that lay the foundations for the more developed post-resurrection understanding of the Lordship of Jesus Christ. The Gospel writers invite their readers to follow their developing Christologies woven together with evidences of Deity. John starts with some of the highest statements about Jesus as God, but such indications of the Divine are not absent in the Synoptics either, and the citation of Isaiah 40:3 in the narrative of John the Baptist (Matt 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4) is one such episode. Howard (1977) sees the high Christology of the New Testament as due, in part, to a second-century scribal corruption of the New Testament text resulting from the diminished understanding of the Tetragrammaton and its place in the New Testament. The growing body of evidence in this thesis points elsewhere—it is the earliest records of Christianity that acknowledge the highest position of Jesus Christ and award honors appropriate only to YHWH but given to Jesus nonetheless. Through the agency of the κύριος predicate, Jesus is fully associated with the name and way of YHWH, and the quotation of Isaiah 40:3 in the Baptist narratives furthers this conclusion.

5.7.1 Isaiah 40:3 in Context

In broadest terms, Isaiah 1-39 covers the events leading to the exile of Judah, whereas Isaiah 40-66 deals with events toward the end of exile and also after the return. Isaiah 40:1-11 is a pivotal passage that forms the prologue to the second half of Isaiah, especially to chapters 40-55. The heavy emphasis on judgement in the first half of Isaiah is met with strong words of comfort and eschatological salvation:

- ¹ Comfort, comfort my people, says your God.
- ² Speak tenderly to Jerusalem,
and cry to her
that her warfare is ended,
that her iniquity is pardoned,
that she has received from YHWH's hand
double for all her sins.
- ³ A voice cries:
'In the wilderness prepare the way of YHWH;
make straight in the desert a highway for our God.
- ⁴ Every valley shall be lifted up,
and every mountain and hill be made low;
the uneven ground shall become level,
and the rough places a plain.
- ⁵ And the glory of YHWH shall be revealed,
and all flesh shall see it together,
for the mouth of YHWH has spoken.'
- ⁶ A voice says, 'Cry!'
And I said, 'What shall I cry?'
All flesh is grass,
and all its beauty is like the flower of the field.
- ⁷ The grass withers, the flower fades
when the breath of YHWH blows on it;
surely the people are grass.
- ⁸ The grass withers, the flower fades,
but the word of our God will stand forever.
- ⁹ Go on up to a high mountain,
O Zion, herald of good news;
lift up your voice with strength,
O Jerusalem, herald of good news;
lift it up, fear not;
say to the cities of Judah,
'Behold your God!'

- ¹⁰ Behold, the Lord YHWH comes with might,
and his arm rules for him;
behold, his reward is with him,
and his recompense before him.
- ¹¹ He will tend his flock like a shepherd;
he will gather the lambs in his arms;
he will carry them in his bosom,
and gently lead those that are with young
(Isa 40:1-11, based on ESV, BHS).

What is striking is the fact that Judah's deliverance is bound to the coming of YHWH himself: "Behold, the Lord YHWH comes with might, and his arm rules for him; behold, his reward is with him, and his recompense before him" (Isa 40:10, based on ESV, BHS). YHWH is Israel's king, and his coming brings eschatological salvation. Sins have been pardoned, judgement satisfied. God speaks tenderly to Zion. He will lead them like a shepherd gently gathering the flock in his arms. This drastic change of tone is not without precedent in the first half of Isaiah. The message of YHWH's deliverance was pointed to earlier, and the later passages are fulfillment to the earlier ones (e.g., Isa 2:1-4; 4:2-6; 32:15-20 [Pao & Schnabel, 2007:276]). The coming of YHWH is heralded from the heights, and the good news must be broadcast to his expectant people: "Behold your God!" (Isa 40:9, ESV). The coming of YHWH in deliverance is not the same as the coming of any ordinary dignitary. YHWH comes to rule, and adequate preparation must take place to inaugurate his rule. The way must be prepared for YHWH: "In the wilderness prepare the way of YHWH; make straight in the desert a highway for our God" (Isa 40:3, based on ESV, BHS). The topography of the land yields in expectation to YHWH's coming: "Every valley shall be lifted up, and every mountain and hill be made low; the uneven ground shall become level, and the rough places a plain" (Isa 40:4, ESV). This is essentially a further elaboration of the wilderness preparations in the preceding verse (Isa 40:3). Then YHWH will come in full regalia: "And the glory of YHWH shall be revealed, and

all flesh shall see it together, for the mouth of YHWH has spoken” (Isa 40:5, based on ESV, BHS). This prophecy is certified from the “mouth of YHWH” (Isa 40:5, based on ESV, BHS). If there is any doubt as to the veracity of YHWH’s declaration, the prophet contrasts the fleeting duration and durability of all of God’s creation with the eternal word of God: “All flesh is grass, and all its beauty is like the flower of the field. The grass withers, the flower fades when the breath of YHWH blows on it; surely the people are grass. The grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our God will stand forever” (Isa 40:6-8, based on ESV, BHS).

The “glory of YHWH” which is God’s visible presence will have universal reception: “all flesh shall see it” (Isa 40:5, ESV). This universal application of God’s salvation is part of Isaiah’s global vision. Universal salvation is a perennial theme in Deutero-Isaiah:

He will not grow faint or be discouraged
till he has established justice in the earth;
and the coastlands wait for his law (Isa 42:4, ESV).

It is too light a thing that you should be my servant
to raise up the tribes of Jacob
and to bring back the preserved of Israel;
I will make you as a light for the nations,
that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth
(Isa 49:6, ESV).

YHWH has bared his holy arm
before the eyes of all the nations,
and all the ends of the earth shall see
the salvation of our God
(Isa 52:10, based on ESV, BHS)

Isaiah’s universal vision will find fulfilment in the New Testament, particularly in the coming of the Messianic era.

It has been suggested that a better way to describe the salvation of YHWH prophesied in Isaiah is in terms of a “New Exodus.” Watts (1997:80-81) highlights the Exodus imagery used in Deutero-Isaiah:

It is, therefore, the advent of Yahweh as a mighty warrior that inaugurates the deliverance of his people from their bondage among

the nations (40:10ff; 51:9ff; 52:10ff). As he had once led them through the sea (51:9ff), so Yahweh will accompany them through the waters and the fire (43:1-3), again leading the glorious procession (40:10-11; 42:16; 49:10), being both front and rear guard in the cloud and in the fire (52:12, cf. Ex 13:21f; 14:19f). Yahweh will shepherd them (40:11; cf. Ex 15:13; Pss 77:20; 78:52f) providing food and water (49:9f; cf. 48:21) in a miraculous transformation of the wilderness (43:19; 49:9ff; cf. Ex 17:2-7; Num 20:8), and there will again be a revelation of his glory (40:5; cf. 52:10).

Watts (1997) goes on to claim that this “New Exodus” theme is also at work in the Gospel of Mark.

5.7.2 Isaiah 40:3 in the Gospels

The Isaiah 40:3 quotation is found in the beginning of Mark’s Gospel in a conflation of Exodus 23:30 and Malachi 3:1. Mark introduces the composite quotation and ascribes it to the prophet Isaiah: “As it is written in Isaiah the prophet” (Mark 1:2, ESV):

Mark 1:2	Exodus 23:20	Malachi 3:1
ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου (NA28)	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ἵνα φυλάξῃ σε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (Göttingen LXX)	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου (Göttingen LXX)
Behold, I send my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way (ESV)	Behold, I send my angel before your face, that he may keep you in/on the way (based on Brenton English LXX)	Behold, I send forth my messenger, and he shall survey the way before my face (based on Brenton English LXX)

Manuscripts A W *et al.* contain the variant reading ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (“in the prophets”) which is certainly an attempt to correct the singular

reference to Isaiah in a passage that begins with Malachi (France, 2002:60). In terms of the Malachi elements of the composite citation, Mark’s choice (or his source) of κατασκευάσει (“he will prepare”) apparently renders the MT’s פנה as a *pi’el* whereas the LXX renders the same Hebrew characters as a *qal* in its use of ἐπιβλέψεται (“he will survey”) (Marcus, 1992:13). Even though Malachi 3:1 is widely recognized as the primary text in Mark 1:2, there are elements of Exodus 23:20 in the passage including Mark’s choice of ἀποστέλλω (“I send”) and πρὸ προσώπου σου (“before your face”) that show dependence on the Exodus text. Matthew and Luke agree in their placement of the quotations from Malachi 3:1 and Exodus 23:20 later in separate passages on Jesus’ reference to John the Baptist (Matt 11:10; Luke 7:27), whereas Mark combines the Baptist passages in one conflation of passages with Isaiah 40:3. Mark follows closely to the LXX κύριος in his citation of Isaiah 40:3:

Mark 1:3	Isaiah 40:3 LXX	Isaiah 40:3 MT
φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ (NA28)	φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν (Göttingen LXX)	קול קורא במדבר פנו דרך יהוה ישרו בערבה מסלה לאלהינו (BHS)
The voice of one crying in the wilderness: ‘Prepare the way of the Lord, make...straight his paths’ (based on ESV)	The voice of one crying in the wilderness, ‘Prepare the way of the Lord, make...straight the paths of our God’ (based on Brenton English LXX)	A voice cries: ‘In the wilderness prepare the way of YHWH; make straight in the desert a highway for our God.’ (based on ESV, BHS)

Mark and the other Evangelists follow the LXX in distinction from the MT in connecting the wilderness call to the voice crying (“the voice of one crying in the wilderness” [LXX]) instead of the location of where to

prepare (“In the wilderness prepare” [MT]. Mark (or his source) like the other Evangelists replaces the phrase “of our God” (τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν) with the third person pronoun, “his” (αὐτοῦ). The net result is a closer emphasis on the one being heralded, identifying him with “our God” and redirecting the focus to the central phrase “of the Lord” (Watts, 2007:113, 119). The cumulative force of the pronouns in the composite quotation focuses attention on the one expected. John plays a subordinate role as forerunner, and this only serves to heighten interest in the one his ministry points to. The content of John’s preaching is directed squarely at Jesus: “After me comes he who is mightier than I, the strap of whose sandals I am not worthy to stoop down and untie. I have baptized you with water, but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit” (Mark 1:7–8, ESV). In Peter’s Pentecost sermon in Acts 2:33, one of the great evidences of the exalted status of the resurrected Jesus is his role in dispensing the Holy Spirit. The preaching of John the Baptist is an early prophetic prediction of this reality.

Mark makes it clear that John’s ministry was in preparation for the great coming of the Lord. What was promised in Isaiah 40:3 is the presence of YHWH in eschatological deliverance. By referring to Jesus using the κύριος predicate where the MT has the Tetragrammaton, Jesus is identified with YHWH, and his incarnation is seen as the fulfillment of Isaiah 40:3. Watts (1997:87) demonstrates the significance of the Malachi text in Mark to the ministry and identity of Jesus: “the application of these texts to Jesus suggests that he is to be identified in some way, not so much with ‘the Messiah’, but with none other than the מְלֹאךְ הַבְּרִית and הַאֲדֹנָי of Malachi and, in terms of Isaiah 40:3, the presence of Yahweh himself.” Malachi speaks of two figures: the “Lord” (אֲדֹנָי) and the “angel/messenger of the covenant” (מְלֹאךְ הַבְּרִית) who is likely the one spoken of in Exodus 23:20-21: “Behold, I send an angel (מְלֹאךְ) before you to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place that I have prepared. Pay careful

attention to him and obey his voice; do not rebel against him, for he will not pardon your transgression, for my name is in him” (Exod 23:20–21, ESV, BHS). The act of pardoning transgression is the prerogative of YHWH alone, and so this is no ordinary angel. The angel bears the Name of YHWH, and is in some way indistinguishable from YHWH (“angel of the Lord/YHWH” [מלאך יהוה]: Gen 16:7-13; 22:11-18; Exod 3:2-6 *et al.*). Even though the Gospel writers see John the Baptist as the “messenger” who prepares the way for YHWH, the conflation of passages in the beginning of Mark quickly focuses on the one heralded and associates the coming of Jesus the Lord with the coming of YHWH. There is certainly some reasoned speculation that the “angel/messenger of the covenant” in Malachi 3:1 and the “angel” in Exodus 23:21 who forgives and is indwelt with the Divine Name was an early theophany of the pre-existent Christ, and the use of Exodus 23:20 in Mark 1:2 gives added weight to this view (Kaiser, 1990:446; Smith, 1998:328).

It is likely the case that the composite quotation in the very beginning of Mark’s Gospel serves to set the stage for the entire record of the ministry of Jesus. The cumulative effect of this major Old Testament grouping of texts serves to heighten expectations around Jesus and his identification with the coming of YHWH to his people in eschatological salvation. The way of Jesus is distinct yet inseparable from God. Marcus (1992:40) puts it well: “where Jesus acts, God is acting.” With the coming of Jesus, the coming of YHWH in glory coincides fully.

The quotation of Isaiah 40:3 in the other Synoptic Gospels is verbatim that of Mark and is used in similar fashion in the context of the ministry of John the Baptist. In Matthew, we see the fulfilment of what it means to “Prepare the way of the Lord; make his paths straight” (Matt 3:3, ESV). The preaching of John issued a call for preparations of the heart. John preached a message of repentance evidenced by the confession of sins and portrayed in the ritual of baptism. John proclaimed the anticipatory

nature of his baptism pointing to the baptism by Jesus with the Holy Spirit. Matthew adds a reference of judgment in his exhortation to the religious leaders who came to see him: “You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? ... Even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees. Every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire” (Matt 3:7,10, ESV). Repentance needs to be demonstrated with good works (Matt 3:8), without which there will be loss when the Kingdom is realized fully. Jesus comes to inaugurate the Kingdom of heaven, and his coming precedes judgment: “He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. His winnowing fork is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor and gather his wheat into the barn, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire” (Matt 3:11–12, ESV). Jesus shares the throne and prerogatives of YHWH. The right to execute eschatological judgment on those who fail to heed the Gospel message is appropriate only to YHWH yet belongs rightfully to Jesus.

In the Gospel of Luke, the Evangelist includes the whole of Isaiah 40:3-5 LXX^{κύριος} with some modifications:

Luke 3:4–6	Luke 3:4-6	Isaiah 40:3-5
<p>The voice of one crying in the wilderness: ‘Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.</p> <p>Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall become straight, and the rough places shall become level</p>	<p>φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ· πᾶσα φάραγξ πληρωθήσεται καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινωθήσεται, καὶ ἔσται τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείαν καὶ αἱ τραχεῖαι εἰς ὁδοὺς λείας· καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ</p>	<p>φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν· πᾶσα φάραγξ πληρωθήσεται καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινωθήσεται, καὶ ἔσται πάντα τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείαν καὶ ἡ τραχεῖα εἰς ὁδοὺς λείας⁸. καὶ ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα</p>

⁸ Some mss: εἰς πεδία

ways; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God.’ (ESV)	τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. (NA28)	κυρίου, καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. (Göttingen LXX)
---	---------------------------------	---

The previous discussion about the quotation of Isaiah 40:3 in Mark applies here to the exegesis of Luke 3:4-6. Luke follows the wording of Mark’s citation, and the reader of this thesis is directed above for the changes to the LXX and the MT. Like Mark, Luke shortens “the paths of our God” (τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν) to the shorter, “his paths” (τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ). The result is a greater emphasis on the previous κυρίου (“of the Lord”). In addition to two smaller changes, Luke omits the LXX phrase “and the glory of the Lord shall be seen” (καὶ ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου). The omission can be explained in that the following phrase, “and all flesh shall see the salvation of God” (καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ [NA28, Göttingen LXX]) contains the idea of the missing clause and better expresses the major thrust of salvation in Luke’s writing (Pao & Schnabel, 2007:277).

Luke follows the widened scope of Deutero-Isaiah in including “all flesh” (πᾶσα σὰρξ) in witnessing God’s salvation. This shows that the Isaiah 40:3-5 quotation is programmatic not only in introducing the ministry of John the Baptist and Jesus but also for the greater mission of the early Church to the Gentiles. The quotation from Isaiah 40:3-5 introduces a theme that encompasses both of Luke’s volumes. Even the early Christian movement is identified with the Isaianic quotation with its designation as the “Way” (ὁδός [Acts 9:2; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, 22]). The preparation that is implied in “Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight” is, as in Matthew, an ethical or spiritual preparation. The “preparation” of John the Baptist was earlier expressed in Luke in moral terms: “he will go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of

the just, to make ready for the Lord (κυρίῳ) a people prepared” (Luke 1:17, ESV). Again in Zechariah’s prophecy, the role that John would have would be like that of the Old Testament prophets who preached repentance and God’s salvation: “And you, child, will be called the prophet of the Most High; for you will go before the Lord (κυρίου) to prepare his ways, to give knowledge of salvation to his people in the forgiveness of their sins” (Luke 1:76–77, ESV).

It is important to recognize that from the start Luke begins his Gospel with uses of κύριος where the highest honor is intended. Before his birth, Jesus is already κύριος. Elizabeth and her unborn baby were overcome by the Holy Spirit in the encounter with the expectant Mary:

And when Elizabeth heard the greeting of Mary, the baby leaped in her womb. And Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit, and she exclaimed with a loud cry, ‘Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb! And why is this granted to me that the mother of my Lord (τοῦ κυρίου μου) should come to me?’ (Luke 1:41–43, ESV, NA28).

The heavenly chorus that announced to the shepherds the birth of Jesus also reveals his exalted status: “For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord” (σωτήρ ὃς ἐστὶν χριστὸς κύριος [Luke 2:11, ESV, NA28]). This early exaltation of the earthly Jesus as “Savior ... Christ the Lord” together with his association with the name and way of YHWH in the introduction to John the Baptist’s ministry provide an exegetical key to the rest of the Gospel and the Book of Acts. Peter’s Pentecost sermon finds its high point in this statement: “Let all the house of Israel therefore know for certain that God has made him both Lord and Christ (κύριον ... καὶ χριστὸν), this Jesus whom you crucified” (Acts 2:36, ESV, NA28). Through the agency of the κύριος predicate, Peter applies the passage from Joel 2:32 [3:5] to Jesus and associates the salvation and the name of YHWH with Jesus: “And it shall come to pass that everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved” (καὶ

ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται [Acts 2:21, ESV, NA28]). This certainly supplies evidence to support Rowe's (2007:52) conclusion: "Luke creates a narrative christology in which Jesus' identity as κύριος stands at the center." The name and way of YHWH coincides with Jesus, and he is the only path to salvation: "And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12, ESV). The coming of YHWH in eschatological salvation foretold by Isaiah is realized fully in the person and ministry of Jesus Christ the Lord.

The Gospel of John also quotes Isaiah 40:3 but places it on the lips of John the Baptist. After denying that he is the Christ, Elijah or the Prophet, John the Baptist claims: "I am the voice of one crying out in the wilderness, 'Make straight the way of the Lord' (ἐγὼ φωνῆ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου), as the prophet Isaiah said" (John 1:23, ESV, NA28). "Make straight the way of the Lord" (εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου) appears to be a conflation of the longer statement in the Synoptics: "Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight" (ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ [Mark 1:3; Matt 3:3; Luke 3:4]). The sense here is largely the same as it is in the other Gospels. This quotation is the shortest of the Gospel citations of Isaiah 40:3.

It is not immediately evident who John the Baptist is referring to with "Make straight the way of the Lord" (εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου [John 1:23, ESV, NA28]). If the variant Ἰησοῦς is chosen over κύριος in John 4:1, then the next occurrence of κύριος in reference to Jesus is not until John 4:11. However, it should not be thought that κύριος is a minor title in John. Pryor (1992:57-58) explains that the situation is just the opposite:

[I]t comes as a surprise to learn that no other title of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel occurs with such frequency as does 'Lord'. As a title for and as a form of address to Jesus, *kyrios* is found between 44 and

46 times (depending on textual reading), whereas ‘Son/Son of God’ is found 27 times, ‘Messiah/Christ’ 10 times, and ‘Son of Man’ 13 times.

The prologue in John is centered on the titles for Jesus of “Word” (λόγος) and “God” (θεός), and this seems to eclipse the use of κύριος especially in the beginning of the Fourth Gospel. Nevertheless, the quotation of Isaiah 40:3 on the lips of the Baptist introduces a title that will have frequency and significance in the Gospel narrative. Nor should the terseness of John’s quotation from Isaiah 40:3 diminish its Christological import. The Word who became flesh and who was with God and was God (John 1:1) is also designated through the κύριος predicate with the name and way of YHWH. In John 9:38, there is a noteworthy instance of the reverential use of κύριος that affirms the deity of Jesus. After performing a miracle with a man born blind, Jesus confronts the healed man and reveals who has healed him. The healed man confesses: “‘Lord, I believe,’ and he worshiped him” (πιστεύω, κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ [John 9:38, ESV, NA28]). The only proper response to Jesus the Lord is worship, and the testimony of the man born blind certifies that Jesus is κύριος in the fullest sense of deity.

The Gospel of John begins by acclaiming the Word as God. As a New Testament title “God” (θεός) is usually reserved for the Lord God. However, the prologue begins and ends with the Christological use of “God” (θεός):

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. (Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος [John 1:1, ESV, NA28]).

No one has ever seen God; the only God, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known. (Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο [John 1:18, based on ESV, NA28]).

After referring to Jesus as “God” (θεός) and the “only God”/“only begotten God” (μονογενὴς θεός), the narrative switches to the testimony of John the

Baptist, and to these high Christological titles is added the Divine Name through the agency of the κύριος predicate in John 1:23. At the end of the Fourth Gospel, John weaves together these two traditions in the confession of Thomas. After Thomas demands physical proof that Jesus had risen, Jesus encourages Thomas to confirm his belief by touching the places of injury with his hands: “Then he said to Thomas, ‘Put your finger here, and see my hands; and put out your hand, and place it in my side. Do not disbelieve, but believe’” (John 20:27, ESV). The response of Thomas forms the climax of the Gospel: “Thomas answered and said to Him, ‘My Lord and my God!’” (ἀπεκρίθη Θωμᾶς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου [John 20:28, NASV, NA28]). There is no question that Jesus was the intended referent: “Thomas...said *to him*” (ἀπεκρίθη Θωμᾶς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ [John 20:28, NASV, NA28; emphasis added]). With the prologue, Thomas’ confession forms the corresponding bookend and brings together two major Christological titles for Jesus in a statement of worship and saving belief.

What we have in Thomas’ confession is very much what we found in Romans 10:9-13. Saving faith hangs on two related theological facts: belief in the resurrection and the confession of Jesus as Lord. The confession of Jesus as Lord is bound up with the bedrock truth that “everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved” (πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου [MT: יהוה] σωθήσεται [Rom 10:13, ESV, NA28, BHS]). Jesus is Lord in the deepest sense possible, affirming that the name of YHWH is inextricably connected to Jesus as it is to the Father. The Father has highly exalted his Son with his Name and with the attendant worship which that name demands (Pryor, 1992:64-65).

The testimony of the New Testament confirms the thesis that through the Divine Name surrogate κύριος Jesus embodies the name and way of YHWH. Howard (1977) attributes the high κύριος Christology of

the New Testament to a second century scribal corruption arising from the disuse of the Tetragrammaton. In contrast, this research has shown that the convergence of New and Old Testaments in the κύριος predicate honors Jesus with possession of the Divine Name, and this has been verified with the earliest accounts of Christianity.

In the next section I will examine the other remaining New Testament YHWH passages where Jesus is the understood referent, and high honors are applied through the κύριος predicate.

5.8 YHWH Passages in the Rest of the New Testament

The remaining New Testament κύριος quotations from the Old Testament referring to Jesus where the Tetragrammaton stands in the Hebrew *Vorlage* are found in 1 Peter. In the Petrine tradition, Jesus is awarded highest honors through the Christological application of Old Testament passages about YHWH. Already in the Gospels, Peter has an understanding of Jesus that elevates his teacher from the rank of prophet and spokesman for YHWH to Messiah and Lord. In response to the desertion of followers after some difficult teaching, Jesus questions the disciples' loyalty: "Do you want to go away as well?" In response to Jesus' question, Peter boldly answers: "Lord (κύριε), to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life (ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου), and we have believed, and have come to know, that you are the Holy One of God (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ)" (John 6:67–69, ESV, NA28). In spite of his failure at the arrest of Jesus, the apostle was often intrepid and insightful into the true understanding of Jesus and his exalted status.

According to the book of Acts, the apostle Peter shows this same boldness and clarity about the identity of the Savior. In Peter's speech at Pentecost (Acts 2:21), the apostle quotes Joel 2:32 (3:5 MT) and identifies Jesus with YHWH through the intertextuality of Scripture and the agency of the κύριος surrogate.

It should not come as a surprise that in the first canonical epistle traditionally viewed as penned by Peter, the Old Testament is again tapped for riches on the Divine Identity of Jesus the Lord. Howard (1977) locates at least some of the high honors applied to Jesus through the use of κύριος to a later mistaken scribal development in the history of the textual transmission of the New Testament. Instead, it is my contention that the earliest Christian testimony is consistent in ascribing deity to Jesus through the deliberate association of Jesus with the Divine Name through the κύριος predicate. 1 Peter falls within this tradition and provides additional support to the thesis that the κύριος Christology is deliberate, involving honors of the highest order, and at work in the earliest period of Christianity.

5.8.1 The Goodness of the Lord

The word of the Lord is the agent of regeneration in 1 Peter. Peter speaks about the spiritual rebirth (rebegetting) of believers in these terms: “you have been born again (ἀναγεγεννημένοι), not of perishable seed (σποράς) but of imperishable, through the living and abiding word of God (διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος)” (1 Pet 1:23, ESV, NA28). Peter supports his reference to the “living and abiding word of God” (λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος) with a quotation from Isaiah 40:6-8: “All flesh is like grass and all its glory like the flower of grass. The grass withers, and the flower falls, but the word of the Lord remains forever (τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα)” (1 Pet 1:24–25, ESV, NA28).

This passage has been encountered in the section above on the use of YHWH passages in the Gospels. Isaiah 40 announced the coming of YHWH in eschatological salvation—the Gospel writers applied this to Jesus. What is interesting is the slight change of wording from “word of the Lord” (τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου) where the LXX has “word of our God” (τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν [Isa 40:8, Göttingen LXX]) in its place. Possible

reasons for the switch from “word of our God” to “word of the Lord” could reflect Peter’s source, or possibly, in the Isaiah passage that alternates between “Lord” and “(our) God” (especially 40:3 LXX), Peter’s recall of the exact wording may have been in error (Michaels, 1988:78). However, the strongest explanation is probably in the context itself. Following the quotation from Isaiah 40:6-8, Peter finishes his thought with the statement: “And this word is the good news that was preached to you” (τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς [1 Pet 1:25, ESV, NA28]). In Peter’s mind there is complete continuity between the “word of God/YHWH” and the “word of the Lord/Jesus.” Achtemeier (1996:141) explains that “the substitution of κυρίου ... is motivated by the desire to show that already in Isaiah the coming eternal gospel was announced.” The imperishable seed is the word of God foretold by the Old Testament prophets and most recently heard in the preaching of the Gospel of Christ. In fact, Peter claims that the prophets were intimately motivated and concerned about the things that were happening in Peter’s own generation:

Concerning this salvation, the prophets who prophesied about the grace that was to be yours searched and inquired carefully, inquiring what person or time the Spirit of Christ (πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ) in them was indicating when he predicted the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glories. It was revealed to them that they were serving not themselves but you, in the things that have now been announced to you through those who preached the good news to you by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven (διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ), things into which angels long to look (1 Pet 1:10–12, ESV, NA28).

It was the “Spirit of Christ” (πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ) that was at work in the Old Testament writers. In the same context Peter switches from the “Spirit of Christ” to the “Holy Spirit sent from heaven” (πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ [1 Pet 1:12, ESV, NA28]). For Peter, the power at work in the messages from the Old Testament to the Gospel message in his time is the work of the same pre-existent Lord. In Acts Peter boldly claims: “To

him all the prophets bear witness that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name” (Acts 10:43, ESV). Jesus has the words of eternal life (John 6:68), and Scripture finds its center in the person and work of the Christ. In the Synoptics, Jesus is quoted as saying: “Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away” (ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται [Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33, ESV, NA28; cf. Matt 24:35]). Peter is in complete alignment with this statement of Jesus. The “word of God/the Lord” is “living and abiding,” and it echoes from the prophets to the Gospel preaching in chorus. In this first chapter of the epistle, Peter already establishes his Christological underpinnings.

With the transition between the “word of God” (λόγου θεοῦ) and the “word of the Lord” (τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου), Peter also anticipates the YHWH quotation/allusion in 1 Peter 2:3 applied to Jesus. The passage that follows 1 Peter 1:22-25 urges continued growth based on the word of the Lord:

So (οὖν) put away all malice and all deceit and hypocrisy and envy and all slander. Like newborn infants, long for the pure spiritual milk, that by it you may grow up into salvation—since you have tasted that the Lord is good (ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ ἀύξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν, εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος [1 Pet 2:1-3, based on ESV, NA28]).

The conjunction οὖν connects the arguments before and after 2:1 and draws further inferences with what was argued in 1:22-25 (Achtmeier, 1996:144). The word of the Lord is the agent of rebirth in 1:22-25, and in 2:1-3 the apostle urges drawing on this same resource to sustain them in continued spiritual growth. In 2:1-3, the main clause is governed by the imperative: ἐπιποθήσατε which is commonly translated as “long for, desire” (BDAG, s.v. ἐπιποθέω). The goal of longing for “pure spiritual milk” (τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα) is spiritual growth: “that by it you may grow up into salvation” (1 Pet 2:2, ESV). The NASV renders the verse

with “long for the pure milk of the word” (1 Pet 2:2, NASV). This likely rests on translating λογικόν according to its etymological relationship to the word λόγος. I believe that using etymological arguments is a last resort, and the sense of “spiritual” fits the context equally well and should be used instead. However, even if “pure spiritual milk” is the better translation, the contextual link with 1:22-25 in grammar (2:1: οὖν) and content ([re]begetting, seed, infants, milk) strongly argues that the “pure spiritual milk” is the “word of the Lord” present in both the written Scriptures and in the preaching of the Gospel.

The motivation for craving pure spiritual milk is found in the final clause in 2:3: “since you have tasted that the Lord is good” (εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος [NA28]). The quotation/allusion is from Psalm 34:8 (33[34]:9): “Taste and see that the Lord is good. Blessed is the man who hopes in him” (γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος [MT: הוה] · μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἐλπίζει ἐπ’ αὐτόν [Ps 33:9 (34:9), Lexham English LXX, Göttingen LXX, BHS]). Two obvious changes have occurred in Peter’s appropriation of the first half of this passage. The mood of “taste” (γεύσασθε) changes from imperative to indicative. The verb is preceded by εἰ in a first class condition, indicating what is real in the author’s mind and warranting the translation “since.”⁹ The aorist tense suggests that the tasting has happened in the past. The second imperative καὶ ἴδετε (“and see”) is dropped likely because of Peter’s choice of the “milk” metaphor involving the sense of taste and not of sight (Jobes, 2002:9).

The first step in growth toward salvation was this initial taste of the pure spiritual milk of the word of the Lord in conversion. This justifies the aorist indicative and signifies the first increment in growing spiritually. The word of the Lord through Scripture and the apostolic *kerygma* was instrumental in the believer’s first experience of Christ in faith. The scribe

⁹ A number of mss (א² C P Ψ 5. 33^{vid}. 81. 307. 436. 442. 642. 1175. 1243. 1448. 1611. 1739. 1852. 2344. 2492 Byz 1 vg^{cl.wv}; Cyr [NA28]) use the more emphatic εἴπερ (“if indeed”).

who penned $\mathfrak{P}72$ added ἐπιστεύσατε after ἐγεύσασθε and changed “the Lord is good” to “Christ is the Lord” (ει γευσασθε επιστευσατε οτι Χριστος ο κυριος [“if in tasting you believed that Christ is the Lord”] (Comfort, 2008:740). This makes explicit what is implied metaphorically about “tasting” in relation to conversion. The Psalmist connects “tasting” with “putting hope in” in the second half of the verse in Psalm 34:8 (33[34]:9): “Blessed is the man who hopes in Him” (μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἐλπίζει ἐπ’ αὐτόν [Ps 33:9, Lexham English LXX, Göttingen LXX]). For the believers in Asia Minor, they had put their trust in the Lord for salvation but also for deliverance in the face of suffering for Christ.

The figure of taste in relation to the (word of the) Lord is found in other contexts as well. The Psalmist compares the words of YHWH to the pleasures of taste: “How sweet are your words to my taste, sweeter than honey to my mouth!” (Ps 119:103, ESV). In the *Odes of Solomon*, a rich metaphor involving taste is expressed: “A cup of milk was offered me, and I drank it in the sweetness of the Lord’s kindness” (Ode 19:1, Charlesworth, 1983:752; Stevick, 1988:710 for the references).

The adjective χρηστός is often used of God in the LXX Psalms. Jobes (2002:8) has collected a number of supporting references where χρηστός refers “to God (LXX Pss 24:8; 33:9; 85:5; 99:5; 105:1; 106:1; 118:68; 135:1; 144:9), to God’s name (LXX Ps 51:11), to God’s mercy (LXX Pss 68:17; 108:21), and to God’s Law (LXX Ps 118:39).” In Greek there is little scribal difference between χρηστός (“good”) and Χριστός (“Christ”). There are a number of manuscripts ($\mathfrak{P}72$ 33. 442. 642. 1243. 1611. 1735. 1852. 2344 Byz^{pt} sa^{mss} bo [NA28]) that read Χριστός instead of χρηστός in 1 Peter 2:3. The result would be: “since you have tasted that Christ is the Lord.” To the first century hearer, the two words written with one letter difference would have been pronounced identically (Stevick, 1988:709). That the scribes considered a reference to Jesus as contextually appropriate is partial proof that Jesus is the referent of κύριος in 1 Peter

2:3. Achtemeier (1996:148) claims that Peter reflects the early church practice of using κύριος in reference to Jesus as the default association. Furthermore, the following verse in 1 Peter 2:4 makes it certain that Jesus is denoted in the quotation/allusion in 1 Peter 2:3. Peter continues directly after 2:3 with the words: “As you come to him (πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι), a living stone rejected by men but in the sight of God chosen and precious” (1 Pet 2:4, ESV, NA28). The relative pronoun in the prepositional phrase πρὸς ὃν finds its antecedent in the previous verse with the reference to κύριος. In 1 Peter 2:3 a direct reference to YHWH is now applied to Jesus through the κύριος predicate. Not only is the word of YHWH identified with the word of the Lord Jesus, but those who have experienced the goodness of the Lord Jesus in conversion have experienced YHWH himself. Peter has highly exalted the name and worth of Jesus the Lord through the use of the κύριος surrogate for the Divine Name.

The ‘stone’ passage with its succession of Old Testament quotations only serves to confirm that the κύριος in 1 Peter 2:3 is identified with YHWH. For Peter, believers are “living stones” (λίθοι ζῶντες [1 Pet 2:5, NA28]) built on the cornerstone of Christ, the most prominent “living stone” (λίθον ζῶντα [1 Pet 2:4, NA28]). In the Old Testament YHWH is often referred as the “stone/rock” (e.g., Deut 32:4; 2 Sam 23:3; Isa 26:4; 30:29; Pss 19:15; 62:3, 7). Peter quotes three ‘stone’ passages and applies them to Jesus, first positively in relation to those who believe in him then negatively in relation to those who reject him:

Positive:

Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone (λίθον), a cornerstone chosen and precious, and whoever believes in him will not be put to shame (1 Pet 2:6, ESV, NA28; quoting Isa 28:16).

Negative:

The stone (λίθος) that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone (1 Pet 2:7, ESV, NA28; quoting Ps 118:22).

A stone (λίθος) of stumbling, and a rock of offense (1 Pet 2:8, ESV, NA28; quoting Isa 8:14).

According to Acts the apostle Peter quotes Psalm 118:22 before the Sanhedrin: “This Jesus (lit. οὗτός) is the stone (λίθος) that was rejected by you, the builders, which has become the cornerstone. And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:11–12, ESV, NA28). In the Gospels, Jesus identifies himself with the stone the builders rejected and presents himself as the cornerstone (Mark 12:10-11; Matt 21:42-44; Luke 20:17-18; cf. Rom 9:32-33; Eph 2:20-22). In the last of the Scriptures supporting the ‘stone’ imagery in 1 Peter 2 with reference to Jesus, Peter quotes from a passage where in the greater context of Isaiah the connection to YHWH is made explicit. YHWH is the ‘stone’ that Israel rejected:

Do not call conspiracy all that this people calls conspiracy, and do not fear what they fear, nor be in dread. But YHWH of hosts (MT: יהוה צבאות), him you shall honor as holy. Let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he will become a sanctuary and a stone of offense and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel, a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many shall stumble on it. They shall fall and be broken; they shall be snared and taken (Isa 8:12–15, based on ESV, BHS).

Peter now applies this YHWH passage without apology or hesitation to Jesus, and the implication is that Jesus is fully identified with YHWH and to reject him is to reject YHWH himself. Bowman and Komoszewski (2007:168) draw out the implications for the YHWH quotation/allusion in 1 Peter 2:3: “When Peter applies to Jesus, then, the description ‘a stone of offense and a rock of stumbling’ (1 Pet 2:8 ESV), he confirms that when he called Jesus the ‘Lord’ in verse 3, he was indeed referring to him as the LORD (YHWH).” The near context of the ‘stone’ passage from Isaiah 8 finds an application in 1 Peter 3:14-15, and significantly it is on the heels of another YHWH quotation from Psalm 34 (33). In the end, Jesus is the

eschatological fulfilment of the ‘stone’ passages of the Old Testament, and experience of his goodness is the experience of YHWH himself, and these certainties in turn form a foundation for righteous living in 1 Peter (Williams, 2007:37)—Christology in 1 Peter becomes the foundation for paraenesis.

5.8.2 The Righteous Deliverance of the Lord

In 1 Peter 2:3, Peter quotes/alludes to Psalm 34:8 (33[34]:9) and applies this YHWH passage to Jesus the Lord through the κύριος predicate. Psalm 34 (33) is well-suited to Peter’s argument. In the superscription to this acrostic psalm, authorship is ascribed to David, and his experience with Abimelech forms the background to the psalm: “A Psalm of David when he feigned madness before Abimelech, who drove him away and he departed” (Ps 34:title, NASV). The story is recorded in 1 Samuel 21:10-15, where David flees from Saul and goes to Achish (Abimelech), the king of Gath. In an effort to secure his safety David pretends to be insane and in this way avoids death at Achish’s hands. This psalm reflects David’s account of deliverance from trouble through YHWH’s care: “I sought YHWH, and he answered me and delivered me from all my fears ... This poor man cried, and YHWH heard him and saved him out of all his troubles” (Ps 34:4, 6, based on ESV, BHS).

The Christians in Asia Minor whom Peter addresses are in a situation similar to David’s. They are alienated and oppressed because of their association with Christ. Peter preaches the eventual deliverance of God’s faithful people in the face of suffering. Peter, like David, bridges the problem of the righteous sufferer and the surety of YHWH’s deliverance. David identifies himself as the just sufferer: “Many are the afflictions of the righteous, but YHWH delivers him out of them all” (Ps 34:19, based on ESV, BHS). Similarly Peter commends the righteous in the face of persecution: “But even if you should suffer for righteousness’ sake, you

will be blessed” (1 Pet 3:14, ESV). Divine deliverance is around the corner: “Beloved, do not be surprised at the fiery trial when it comes upon you to test you, as though something strange were happening to you. But rejoice insofar as you share Christ’s sufferings, that you may also rejoice and be glad when his glory is revealed” (1 Pet 4:12–13, ESV). The goodness of the Lord was their experience in conversion, and they will experience it in full at the *parousia*.

As difficult as it may be, Peter admonishes the believers in Asia Minor to righteous living even in the face of alienation and persecution. After addressing wives and husbands in proper relating, Peter widens his scope more generally: “Finally, all of you, have unity of mind, sympathy, brotherly love, a tender heart, and a humble mind. Do not repay evil for evil or reviling for reviling, but on the contrary, bless, for to this you were called, that you may obtain a blessing” (1 Pet 3:8–9, ESV). Again Peter looks to Psalm 34 (33) (verses 12-16 [13-17]) for his support, this time in an extended quotation:

Whoever desires to love life
and see good days,
let him keep his tongue from evil
and his lips from speaking deceit;
let him turn away from evil and do good;
let him seek peace and pursue it.
For the eyes of the Lord are on the righteous,
and his ears are open to their prayer.
But the face of the Lord is against those who do evil
(1 Pet 3:10–12, ESV).

Structurally the quotation follows 1 Peter 3:8-9 as a chiasm. Christensen (2015:341) builds on the work of Richard Bauckham to reveal the chiastic design:

A: 3:8 Exhortation toward peaceful living
B: 3:9a Manner of living, turning from evil
C: 3:9b Manner of living, blessing with speech
D: 3:9c Theological motivation, inheriting the blessing
D': 3:10a Theological motivation, 'to love life and see good days'
C': 3:10b Manner of living, not retaliating with speech
B': 3:11a Manner of living, turning from evil
A': 3:11b Exhortation toward peaceful living

The theological motivation is to “obtain a blessing” (1 Pet 3:9, ESV) and to “love life and see good days” (1 Pet 3:10, ESV). The goodness of the Lord was experienced in conversion through the experience of the regenerative word of the Lord. Now there is continued blessing in righteous living even in the face of opposition. In the final verse of Peter’s extended quotation, the argument finds its high point in the ever vigilant and responsive assistance of the risen Lord: “For the eyes of the Lord (κυρίου) are on the righteous, and his ears are open to their prayer. But the face of the Lord (κυρίου) is against those who do evil” (1 Pet 3:12, ESV, NA28). The same Lord experienced in conversion will sustain the righteous in righteous living. The hope of the Christian rests in the ever present help of the Lord and his assurance that evil will not go unpunished.

In the MT the Tetragrammaton is present twice in the underlying text where the LXX^{κύριος} has two instances of κυρίου in Greek. Jesus is the referent of the κύριος quotation in Psalm 34:8 (33[34]:9) quoted by Peter in 1 Peter 2:3, and this provides partial support for the referent assignment in the quotation from the same psalm in 1 Peter 3:12 (Ps 34:15-16 [33(34):16-17]). YHWH is the one who exercises vigilance over his people and to whom David directed his request for deliverance. For Peter’s readers, Jesus is the source of blessing and reprimand. Through the agency of the κύριος predicate, Jesus is identified with YHWH. The risen Lord will reward the righteous for their godly behavior and will punish those who do

not heed his admonition. To experience Jesus in conversion and spiritual development is to experience YHWH himself.

The supposition that Jesus is the referent of the κύριος occurrences in 1 Peter 3:12 rests on another foundation as well. In the section above, we have seen the use of Psalm 34 (33) and Isaiah 8 in related context. This same pairing is at work here as well and is insightful into the identity of the referent of the two occurrences of κύριος in the YHWH quotation in 1 Peter 3:12. The verses that follow are joined with a καί that draws a conclusion based on the quotation in 1 Peter 3:12 and as such probably should be translated with “then” or “and so” (Michaels, 1988:185; BDF §442.2). The resultant question is: “And so who is there to harm you if you are zealous for what is good?” (1 Pet 3:13, based on ESV). The answer picks up the blessing promised in the preceding verses and in the quotation in 3:10-12. Peter assures his readers of the Lord’s reward for unjust suffering: “But even if you should suffer for righteousness’ sake, you will be blessed” (1 Pet 3:14, ESV). The risen Lord’s ever-present vigilance over the righteous and the unrighteous provides the answer to the problem of the righteous sufferer. The text that follows further grounds the problem of the righteous who suffer in the assurance of Christ’s protection:

Isaiah 8:12-13 LXX	1 Peter 3:14-15
But do not fear its [i.e. this people’s] fear, neither be troubled	But do not fear their fear nor be troubled;
revere as holy the Lord himself...	but revere as holy Christ the Lord...
τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆτε οὐδὲ μὴ ταραχθῆτε· κύριον αὐτὸν ἀγιάσατε (Göttingen LXX)	τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε, κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε (NA28)

The major difference in Peter’s rendering is the substitution of Χριστόν (“Christ”) for αὐτόν (“himself”). The replacement brings Jesus into focus and directs attention to him as the divine deliverer and object of devotion.

The hearers of Isaiah 8:12-13 in Judah were reminded that YHWH was to be their confidence and courage in the face of the combined threat

of Aram and Israel. The people were to fear YHWH: “But YHWH of hosts, him you shall honor as holy. Let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he will become a sanctuary (for you)” (Isa 8:13-14, based on ESV, BHS). Those who oppose YHWH will encounter him as an impediment: “a stone of offense and a rock of stumbling” (Isa 8:14, ESV). We have seen in the ‘stone’ passages above how Jesus is identified with YHWH and functions in this regard. Peter applies the YHWH passage in Isaiah 8:14 to Jesus in 1 Peter 2:8 calling the Lord “a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offense” (ESV). The admonition in 1 Peter 3:14-15 concerns the response of the heart to adversity: do not fear but reverence the Lord your deliverer.

In rendering the Greek of κύριον τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε, most English translations have either translated the construction as predicative or appositional (Jobes, 2005:229). The result is similar: “revere as holy Christ as Lord” (predicative) or “revere as holy the Lord Christ” (appositional) or more idiomatically “revere Christ the Lord as holy” (appositional). Carson (2007a:1038) argues that the verb ἀγιάζω is not used for “revering X as Y.” As a result, the best translation is probably appositional: “revere Christ the Lord as holy.”

In the MT the text of Isaiah 8:13 has the Divine Name using the common expression: “YHWH of hosts” (יהוה צבאות). The LXX^{κύριος} renders this with the single word κύριος. Howard (1977:81) suggests that the Tetragrammaton was initially in Peter’s quotation of Isaiah 8:13, and the variant Χριστόν was secondary in the history of transmission. Howard (1977:80-81) argues that the variant θεόν was original, and Peter’s text read: “יהוה δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἀγιάσατε.” According to Howard (1977:81) when the scribes of the second century no longer understood the place of the Tetragrammaton, they would have rendered the Divine Name with κύριος with the resultant translation: κύριον δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἀγιάσατε (“revere as holy

the Lord God”). Howard (1977:81) argues that without the Tetragrammaton “the way was cleared for Χριστόν.” To propose that a scribe would have changed the familiar expression (κύριον τὸν θεόν: “the Lord God”) to the less familiar expression (κύριον τὸν Χριστόν: “the Lord Christ”) is not likely (Metzger, 1994:622). In fact, the more difficult reading in NA28 is probably original: κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστόν ἁγιάσατε (“revere Christ the Lord as holy”). The manuscript support for the NA28 reading is strong and diverse: Ϟ⁷² Ⲙ A B C Ψ 33. 1175. 1243. 1611. 1739. 1852 latt sy co; Cl. The reading with θεόν is supported by the Textus Receptus, later uncials (K L P) and most minuscules (Metzger, 1994:622). In the end, Χριστόν is better attested, and the tendency would have been for the scribe to conform his text to the wording of Isaiah 8:13 with the “Lord God” over the “Lord Christ” (Comfort, 2008:746). The reading with the Tetragrammaton has no manuscript support, and Howard’s (1977:80-81) argument about the history of transmission in 1 Peter 3:15 fails to be convincing.

In the end, Jesus is identified with YHWH in 1 Peter 3:15 through the κύριος predicate. This in turn provides likelihood that the immediately preceding quotation in 1 Peter 3:12 from Psalm 34:15-16 (33[34]:16-17) has Jesus as the referent of the two instances of κύριος. The ever-watchful eye of the risen Lord provides security in the face of adversity. Instead of fearing the trial they were undergoing, the believers were called to show grace in the face of opposition and revere Christ the Lord as holy. The connection to YHWH in the passages that use κύριος for the Tetragrammaton only serves to heighten the position of Jesus the Lord. The goodness of YHWH is realized in the experience of the word of the Lord in conversion. There is continuity between the word of YHWH in the Old Testament and the word of the Lord Jesus in the Gospel message. The watchful eye of the risen Lord over the righteous in their trials brings the

same vigilance that comes from YHWH himself. Focus on fear is replaced with reverence for Christ the Lord and dependency on his provision. The experience of the same Lord in conversion will sustain them in continued growth and perseverance.

For Howard (1977:80-81) the Divine Name was present in the manuscript(s) that the apostle Peter used to cite from the Old Testament. The documentary and transcriptional support for this hypothesis is weak. Much stronger is the evidence that the apostle Peter copied from manuscripts where κύριος was used as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton. In 1 Peter 2:3, the grammar and content of the next verse (2:4) make it sure that Peter had Jesus as κύριος in mind in his quotation. To add the Tetragrammaton here would violate the context. The suggestion that 1 Peter 3:15 had the Divine Name runs counter to the manuscript evidence and transcriptional probabilities. For Peter, the high Christological import of assigning the Divine Name to Jesus through the agency of the κύριος predicate is assured and brings further evidence to the conclusion that the κύριος Christology of the New Testament was early, deliberate, and involved honors of the highest order.

5.9 Conclusion

The evidence from the New Testament that the word κύριος stood in the place of the Divine Name in various passages where the referent is Jesus provides support to the overall conclusion that the Christology of the New Testament rests in part on the foundation of a deliberate referential and titular overlap between the Lord Jesus and the Lord God. A number of passages that referred to YHWH in the Old Testament are applied without apology to the Lord Jesus in the New Testament. The implication from Howard's (1977) thesis that the estimation of Jesus was artificially inflated through the mishandling of the Tetragrammaton in the scribal transmission of the New Testament lacks support from the New Testament itself. The

high place of κύριος Christology in the New Testament was not the result of incompetent scribes but was purposely formulated by various New Testament authors to ascribe the full implications of deity to Jesus the Lord.

In the next chapter, I will evaluate Howard's (1986a, 1986b, 1986c, 1987, 1988a, 1988b, 1989, 1992a, 1992b, 1994, 1995, 1998, 1999) work on the Hebrew version of Matthew as found in the medieval Hebrew treatise *Even Bohan* ("Touchstone") compiled by the fourteenth-century Jewish polemicist Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut with a view to determining the likelihood that the Tetragrammaton was original to the canonical Gospel of Matthew.

6.0 Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew

6.1 Introduction to Shem-Tob and Hebrew Matthew

There are no extant manuscripts of canonical Matthew, in Greek or in any of the languages of the early versions, that contain the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters or a phonetic equivalent in any Old Testament quotation containing the Divine Name. Our inquiry has covered the surviving manuscripts and any scribal confusion over the Tetragrammaton whether from ignorance or intention has only yielded the uniform testimony that the New Testament writers used a surrogate for the Divine Name like κύριος, either from their copies of the LXX or substituted as a matter of convention. The New Testament transcription and documentary evidence yields no support for Howard's (1977) thesis that the text of the New Testament contained the Divine Name.

In Chapter 5 I discussed the high honors attributed to Jesus in the use of κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Isaiah 40:3 quoted in Matthew 3:3 and applied to Jesus. This surrogate use of κύριος is uniform across the canonical Gospels, and the force of the manuscript tradition forms firm support for the wording of the received text.

However, if the net is thrown wider, there is an ancient tradition and a modern discovery that might challenge our work on Matthew to some extent. In the ancient church there has surfaced from time to time a tradition that the Gospel of Matthew was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic. The church historian Eusebius attributes the following quote to Papias (ca. A.D. 60–130), bishop of Hierapolis: “Matthew collected the oracles in the Hebrew language, and each interpreted them as best he could” (Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραϊδί διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἡρμήνευσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος [*Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16 (LCL)]). This quotation has intrigued the minds of scholars ever since. The

quotation is not alone, for there are scattered references to a Hebrew Matthew among other ancient Christian writers, e.g.: Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 3.1.1), Origen (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25.4), Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.24.6; 3.25.5; 3.27.4), Epiphanius (*Pan.* 29.9.4; 30.3.7; 30.13.2-8; 30.22.4) and Jerome (*Comm. Matt.* 12.13; *Epist.* 20.5; *Pelag.* 3.2; *Vir. ill.* 3) (for a complete list see Edwards, 2009:1-96, 263-291). Two questions arise in the wording of Papias: first, is Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ (“in the Hebrew language”) a reference to Hebrew or Aramaic? Second, does the phrase τὰ λόγια (“the oracles”) refer to dominical sayings or sections or to the entire Gospel?

Even the age of the Papias saying has not prevented scholars (e.g., Kümmel, 1975:120-121) from dismissing the entire matter as a conjecture based on an early tradition about Matthew. Interestingly Eusebius earlier gives disparaging remarks about the depth of insight of Papias in matters of eschatology: “For he was a man of very little intelligence, as is clear from his books” (*Hist. eccl.* 3.39.13). Yet it is Papias’ great antiquity that causes one to pause at his interesting claim. Various church fathers quote small sections from this supposed Semitic Gospel. Jerome claims to have known of a copy housed in the library of Caesarea (*Pelag.* 3.2). At times there is uncertainty how Semitic Matthew relates to other documents like the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel of the Nazoraeans, the Gospel of the Ebionites, the Gospel of the Apostles, or to a purported translational antecedent to the Greek canonical Gospel of Matthew (Howard, 1995:159).

Howard (1986a, 1986b, 1986c, 1987, 1988a, 1988b, 1989, 1992a, 1992b, 1994, 1995, 1998, 1999) has made a significant contribution to the discussion of a Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. Contained in a Jewish polemical work *Even Bohan* (אבן בוהן, “The Touchstone”) written by Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut, a Castilian Jew of the fourteenth century, is a complete Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, the earliest complete Hebrew Gospel

extant. Shem-Tob was a native of Tudela in Navarre and a man of considerable accomplishment as a physician, businessman, and rabbi with expertise in rabbinics and Jewish and Christian thought (Garshowitz, 1993:297). His treatise *Even Bohan* was completed in 1380 with later revisions in 1385 and 1405 adding another five books to the initial twelve (Howard, 1986c:17). The transmission history is somewhat complicated, with two major recensions each having a different ordering to the books. The Hebrew Gospel of Matthew is contained in recension A as book 12 and book 13 in recension B.

Even Bohan has survived in a number of 15th to 17th century manuscripts written in various scripts. The nature of *Even Bohan* is a polemical defence of Judaism and a critique of Christianity at a time when there was considerable effort by the Catholic Church to convert Jews to Christianity. To date, there is no complete critical edition of *Even Bohan* except for Libby Garshowitz's Hebrew transcription of books 2-10 from MS Plutei 2.17 (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana) in her 1974 Ph.D. dissertation. José-Vicente Niclós (1997) has published book 1 with a Spanish translation. It was not until Howard's publication of book 12 (13) that the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew was published in a collated edition with an English translation. Howard has removed the 58 annotations of Shem-Tob that were placed throughout the Gospel and published the remaining Hebrew text in two editions (1987, 1995). The resultant text is not an eclectic text but a combination of two primary manuscripts with a critical apparatus referencing other significant manuscript readings. The two primary manuscripts are:

British Library MS Add. 26,964 for Matthew 1:1–23:22.

Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America MS 2426 (=Marx 16) for Matthew 23:23–28:20.

In total Howard uses 9 manuscripts of varying length and quality. Howard has chosen the two manuscripts mentioned above to represent book 12 (13) and provide the basis for his English translation.

Shem-Tob intended to copy the four Gospels to be used in his polemic against Christianity. For whatever reason, only Matthew survives. Shem-Tob provides the reason for including Matthew in a treatise against Christianity:

I intended to complement this, my treatise, which I have entitled *Even Boḥan*, by transcribing (להעתיק) the gospels, even though they belong to the books which are absolutely forbidden for us to read lest the unexperienced students come under their sway. Nevertheless, I wanted to transcribe (and critique) them for two reasons:

The first is (that I wanted) to answer the Christians from them, but specifically the apostates ... who talk about their faith, yet who do not know a thing about it. They interpret passages of our Holy Torah regarding (their faith) contrary to the truth and contrary to their (own) faith. And through this (endeavor), praise will come to the Jew who debates with them and catches them in their own trap.

The second reason is (that I wanted) to show to the leaders of our exalted faith the shortcomings of those books [that is, the gospels] and the errors contained in them” (MS Plutei 2.17, f. 134r in Ochs, 2013:216-217).

Matthew is singled out as the first and foremost among the Gospels, and in the end of the chapter Shem-Tob states his intention to follow with the Gospel of Mark; however, this is not extant (MS Plutei 2.17, f. 134r, f. 162r in Ochs, 2013:217).

Interspersed throughout the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew are 58 polemical comments pertaining to the issues stemming from the Gospel text. A question that arises pertains to the role Shem-Tob may have played in the composition of the Hebrew Gospel he includes. Most scholars would agree that Shem-Tob did not author the Hebrew Matthew in his work but transmitted what he received. In one instance, Shem-Tob disputes the reading “Ephratah” as it appeared in his manuscript: “He erred (here) because it is not (written that way), (it is) thus (only) in our books. It

is also not in Jerome's translation" (Ochs 2013:225). Shem-Tob likely transmitted his received text from an earlier hand.

Without a doubt Hebrew Matthew as found in *Even Bohan* is a distinctive Gospel with plenty of unique readings. Howard has capitalized on this fact and written a number of articles (1986a, 1986b, 1986c, 1988a, 1988b, 1989, 1992a, 1992b, 1994, 1998, 1999) and two critical editions (1987, 1995) of this text explaining its textual intricacies. Although Howard has written his supposition about the age of the *Vorlage* of the Hebrew Matthew in *Even Bohan* in different ways he generally considers the original Hebrew Gospel found after removal of scribal layers of corruption to be a document of great antiquity. In one of his first articles, Howard (1986c:17) states:

Although the debate has been extended and widespread, no one has ever claimed, however, to have found an original canonical Gospel in either Aramaic or Hebrew. I now make that claim, though with some qualification. I found it embedded in a 14th-century Hebrew treatise written by a rabbi named Shem-Tob Ben Shaprut, which means 'the good name, son of Shaprut.' The treatise is called *Even Bohan*, 'the Touchstone.'

Later in the same article Howard (1986c:20) claims: "Moreover, the kind of Hebrew in which it was written is just what one would expect of a document composed in the first century A.D. and preserved by Jews during the Middle Ages." The style of Hebrew Matthew is varied: what is preserved is "written in biblical Hebrew with a healthy mixture of mishnaic Hebrew and later rabbinic vocabulary and idiom. It also reflects changes by medieval Jewish scribes who, among other things, attempted to make it read more like the Greek" (Howard, 1986c:23). At times Howard only goes as far as to regard the *Vorlage* of Hebrew Matthew as predating the fourteenth century by a number of centuries, and at other times he is forthright in claiming that the philologically excavated layer is a document of the first or second century. Howard makes it clear that Hebrew Matthew is not a translation from Greek nor is the canonical Gospel a translation

from Hebrew Matthew—both are original compositions sharing similarities in that they rely on the same traditional material.

What is distinctive in Hebrew Matthew is its Jewish flavor. (Howard, 1988a:118) argues for the age of Hebrew Matthew because of dependencies in a number of Jewish works:

[T]he Talmud, the *Book of Nestor* (sixth-ninth centuries), the *Milhamoth HaShem* by Jacob ben Reuben (1170 CE), *Sepher Joseph Hamekane* by Rabbi Joseph ben Nathan Official (thirteenth century), and the *Nizzahon Vetus* (thirteenth century). It also shows a relationship to, and may have been a source for the medieval antigospel known as *Tol'doth Yeshu* (sixth-tenth centuries).

What is interesting is that Howard sees the common material in these ancient Jewish writings as reflecting a certain chronological order. According to him, Hebrew Matthew came first and was appropriated in at least some of these writings as a source; later in the transmission of Hebrew Matthew the scribes at times perpetuated or developed the ancient tradition they copied in line with these Jewish texts. The *Tol'doth Yeshu* is an example which Howard (1988b:67) sees operating as both recipient and source of the traditions found in Hebrew Matthew: “[I]t is possible that the *Tol'doth Yeshu* influenced the transmission of the Hebrew Matthew even if the Hebrew Matthew originally was an earlier source for the *Tol'doth Yeshu*.” Certainly finding influences of various ancient sources available to a medieval Jewish author points to a medieval age of the document. Then to suggest that these documents contained primitive traditions that they themselves either incorporated or polemicized against is an ambitious position to prove. Nevertheless, the traditions shared with these various Jewish works and the frequent use of puns, alliterations, and word connections in the Hebrew text suggest that Hebrew Matthew was composed by a Jewish author well-versed in Jewish and Christian exegesis. It was probably written by a Jewish convert to Christianity.

One of the surest signs that Hebrew Matthew was not composed by Shem-Tob is the use of the Divine Name throughout the text. We do not find the full Hebrew characters but the Divine Name marker: "ה which presumably is an abbreviated form of יהוה ("The Name"). The abbreviated form is found 19 times in the text and at 28:9 it is written in full. This representation is found most in places where the Greek text has κύριος and in two places where Greek reads θεός (21:22 mss, 22:31). In three places there is no equivalent in the Greek text (Howard, 1999:92). The abbreviated form was not only placed in positions where the Tetragrammaton was used in the underlying quotation but also in places where the author felt it was contextually suitable.

It is certainly clear that no Jew writing in opposition to Christianity would have provided the Divine Name in a heretical document. Instead one would find something like *Adonai* as a translation equivalent: "The conclusion that seems inescapable is that Shem-Tob found the Divine Name already in his gospel text, having received it from an earlier generation of Jewish tradents. He *permitted* the Divine Name to remain in the text perhaps because he was unsure himself about what to do with it" (Howard, 1995:231). The conclusion is likely that the author was not Shem-Tob but a Jewish Christian author with a respect for the Divine Name.

It is also clear that the Hebrew Matthew in Shem-Tob is not a descendent or ancestor of the Hebrew Gospel(s) of Matthew referenced in the early church fathers like Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius and Jerome. Howard (1986a:225) has compared the fragments preserved in the church fathers with the readings found in Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew and found that little or no textual relationship exists between them.

6.2 Dating Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew

No one would debate that Hebrew Matthew preserved in *Even Bohan* contains a number of interesting readings. Frequently Howard supports his selected reading with the idea that the reading(s) found were lost in antiquity and thus not available to Shem-Tob in the fourteenth century. Howard (1995:234) lists a number of ancient sources with common readings found in Hebrew Matthew: "These include Q, Codex Sinaiticus, the Old Syriac version, and the Coptic Gospel of Thomas. Shem-Tob hardly had access to these sources." The conclusion then is certain in Howard's mind, that the most primitive substratum of Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew was in existence at the time these ancient documents were in use and accessible to the author of the Shem-Tob Hebrew Matthew type text.

In his analysis of variants, Howard (1995:204) has found some twenty-two agreements between Hebrew Matthew and the Gospel of Thomas. Thomas was likely written in the first or second century and was lost in antiquity only to be discovered as part of Codex II of the Gnostic library at Nag Hammadi, Egypt, in 1945. The implication for Howard (1995:205) is obvious: "It is highly unlikely that Shem-Tob had direct contact with the Gospel of Thomas. The agreements of his Matthew with Thomas, therefore, must be traced to the early centuries of the Christian era."

Howard (1995:194-195) has also found an impressive list of agreements with Old Syriac witnesses. These witnesses were purportedly lost in antiquity only to be found in the nineteenth century, and by Howard's logic they force us to acknowledge that the Shem-Tob type text of Hebrew Matthew existed in the early centuries of the Christian era when the Syriac witnesses were available either as sources or inheritors. Howard (1995:191 n.24) surveyed critical apparatuses of many editions of the New Testament to find, in many cases, no intervening witnesses that would form

a transmission route to the Hebrew Matthew as found in *Even Bohan* of the fourteenth century.

Without the evidence of Petersen (1989, 1998a, 1998b) Howard's argument is quite persuasive. However, of the agreements between Hebrew Matthew and the Gospel of Thomas, a surprising number are also found in the Liège Harmony, a Middle Dutch harmony of the Gospels. The Liège Harmony dates to about the thirteenth century and is part of the Middle Dutch Gospel harmonies. Of the 22 unique readings from the Gospel of Thomas which Howard matched with Hebrew Matthew, half are found in the Liège Harmony. Using Howard's (1995:204) list, parallels are found in the Gospel of Thomas, Shem-Tob, and in the Liège Harmony:

Matt 19:30: "and the last first": omit: Thomas 4; Shem-Tob MS A; Liège:353

Matt 13:48: "fisherman/fishermen": Thomas 8; Shem-Tob; Liège:180- 181

Matt 13:48: "chose": Thomas 8; Shem-Tob; Liège:181

Matt 7:3: "see" (2x): Thomas 26; Shem-Tob; Liège:82-83

Matt 5:15: "in a hidden place": Thomas 33; Shem-Tob; Liège:67

Matt 5:15: "he puts/they put": Thomas 33; Shem-Tob; Liège:67

Matt 9:16: (explicit contrast between 'old' and 'new'): Thomas 47; Shem-Tob; Liège:125-126

Matt 13:29: "to them": Thomas 57; Shem-Tob; Liège:169

Matt 8:20: "of the air" omit: Thomas 86; Shem-Tob; Liège:110

Matt 8:20: "have" (2x): Thomas 86; Shem-Tob; Liège:110

Matt 8:20: "his (head)": Thomas 86; Shem-Tob; Liège:111

(Howard, 1995:204; Petersen, 1998a:39-44; Thomas: *Evangelium Thomae Copticum*, 1996; Plooiij, 1929-1970).

In three articles, Petersen lists out a significant number of parallels between the various sources that Howard presents as evidence of the antiquity and textual uniqueness of Hebrew Matthew. Isolating Howard's readings from the Gospel of the Thomas, the Old Syriac, the Old Latin and the Gospel of John, there are a total of 66 unique readings. These readings are from diverse languages: Coptic, Syriac, Latin, and Greek, but incredibly almost

half (30 to 34 readings)¹⁰ are all found in a single source, the Middle Dutch Liège Harmony (Petersen, 1998a:79). The amount of agreement suggests a textual relationship between Hebrew Matthew and the Liège Harmony. With the degree of connection between Hebrew Matthew and the Liège Harmony, it would be beneficial to trace the transmission route of the Liège Harmony to determine a possible source for the unique readings in Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew. Petersen (1998b:496) explains the Latin ancestry of the Dutch harmony:

The *Vorlage* of the Middle Dutch tradition lies within the *Latin* harmonized tradition ... This is explicitly stated in the *prefatio* of the Liège Harmony ... The Latin harmonized tradition (extant in over a score of manuscripts, including *Codex Fuldensis* [F] and the Latin column of the bilingual *Codex Sangallensis* [Σ] fathered not just the Middle Dutch tradition, but also vernacular harmonies in *Old High German* (OHG; the other column in *Codex Sangallensis*) and in two Middle Italian dialects (*Venetian* and *Tuscan*), as well as in *Old French*.

The conclusion that the Latin harmony tradition lies behind the Liège Harmony is confirmed not only in the declaration in the preface but also by the many Latinisms and the frequent Old Latin readings (Petersen, 1998a:32).

When applying this to the parallels between Hebrew Matthew and the Gospel of Thomas, a possible transmission lineage becomes evident. There is a definite textual relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and Tatian's Diatessaron (see Quispel, 1975). It is through the Diatessaron that many harmonized readings entered the Eastern and Western textual transmission streams. The Western vernacular Gospel harmonies are descendants of the Latin harmonized Gospel tradition. On the basis of the overlap between the Liège Harmony and Hebrew Matthew a possible

¹⁰ The Liège parallels with the Hebrew Gospel pointed out by Petersen (1998a:79) are as follows: Gospel of Thomas: 11 out of 22 readings; Old Latin: 6 out of 12 readings; Old Syriac: 4 out of 14 readings; Gospel of John: 9 out of 18. Howard (1999:32-37) shows the weakness in some of Petersen's examples. Petersen (1998a:100) mentions having found 62 agreements between Hebrew Matthew and the Liège Harmony. I'm not sure how his previous tally relates to this one.

connection is made between ancient witnesses lost in antiquity but perpetuated through the textual transmission of the ancestors in the Western harmonized Gospel tradition.

On the basis of his evidence, Petersen (1998b:511 + n. 56) concludes:

[T]he *Vorlage* of Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew was a medieval Latin manuscript of the separate gospels, whose text had been profoundly influenced by the same harmonized gospel tradition found in the Middle Dutch family of harmonies ... This solution not only accounts for the parallels with the Liège Harmony, but also explains many of Shem-Tob's distinctive features: the harmonizations, 'Semitisms', and parallels with the *Gospel of Thomas*, the *Pseudo-Clementines*, and the *Vetus Syra*. All of these features are common to the entire Western harmonized gospel tradition, and have been noted in the literature for decades.

This explains much of Howard's diverse agreements between Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew and various ancient texts such as the Gospel of Thomas, the Old Latin, and the Old Syriac versions. The Western harmonized Gospel tradition including the Liège Harmony, which has textual affinity with the Hebrew Matthew, is probably the most profitable place to begin to understand the textual transmission history of the *Vorlage* of Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew.

Assigning a date to the *Vorlage* of Hebrew Matthew is very difficult to do. Howard claims to have "linguistically excavated" (Howard, 1986c: 23) the later elements from the original elements to arrive at a primitive substratum. Despite his occasional tentativeness, he dates this earliest Hebrew Matthew to the first or second century. The difficulty here is that certain primitive elements are privileged and the rest are judged to be later scribal developments. Someone else could favor another textual layer and explain what Howard considers "primitive" as sources used by the later writer or even an archaizing of certain data for the appearance of age. The frequent use of the *wav-consecutive* in Hebrew Matthew could fit this description. Without corroborating evidence from other sources, an accurate dating of Hebrew Matthew remains a crux.

Nevertheless, working with the evidence available and especially the testimony of the Liège Harmony, Petersen (1998a:110) places the Latin *Vorlage* of the Liège Harmony and Hebrew Matthew to the period 900 to 1300. Petersen (1998a:110) argues against a date earlier than 900:

Earlier than 900 is unlikely, because of the uniqueness of many of the readings (which are restricted to Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew and the Liège Harmony), and their high-medieval character (the glosses). (Put differently: if this Latin *Vorlage* were much earlier, then these distinctive readings would be much more widespread with the Western harmony tradition.)

Petersen is not alone in assigning a medieval date to the writing of Hebrew Matthew. Horbury (1997:737-738) argues that beginning in the fourth and fifth centuries, Jewish use of Hebrew began to increase, and Hebrew Matthew's dependence on *Tol'doth Yeshu* and Jewish polemic suggests a medieval period of composition.

The likelihood that a Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew type text was written in the first century is slim. It appears that the lost Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew/Aramaic mentioned in Papias and the early church fathers remains unverified, and is not further elucidated by the Hebrew Matthew as found in *Even Bohan*. If further evidence surfaces in the future, a re-examination of the evidence would be in order.

6.3 Conclusion

The use of the Tetragrammaton in canonical Matthew is no further proven by the existence of Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew. In the end, I side with the majority of scholars who maintain that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Greek and was not a translation from Hebrew or Aramaic. I contend that Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew, like other medieval Hebrew Gospels which have the Tetragrammaton in them, is not reflecting an ancient Hebrew Matthew that contained the Divine Name but rather is employing interpretive substitution and not direct translation of a first century Hebrew *Vorlage*.

In the next and final chapter, I will explore the remaining four New Testament passages with their textual variants that Howard presents as philological evidence that the Tetragrammaton was originally contained in the New Testament.

7.0 The Two Lords in the New Testament

7.1 Introduction

The final chapter of this thesis explores the remaining passages that Howard (1977) uses to defend his position that the Tetragrammaton was present in the New Testament autographs. These passages (with the possible exception of Romans 14:10-11) are all a step removed from the original notion that the Divine Name was used in New Testament quotations of the Old Testament in places where the Hebrew uses the Tetragrammaton. In Romans 10:16-17; 14:10-11; 1 Corinthians 10:9 and Jude 5, there are no sure instances of the Tetragrammaton in the underlying Hebrew text. These are contextual statements where κύριος is reasoned to be YHWH, the Lord God of Israel; these are not translations of the Divine Name but determinations that “Lord/YHWH” is argued to be the contextual equivalent. In each of the passages, Howard (1977) argues for a particular variant in a text-critical unit on the basis of his supposition that the Tetragrammaton was originally present in the passage and later removed by second-century scribes who did not recognize the Divine Name. The manuscript evidence and transcriptional possibilities will be examined to determine if this secondary evidence can be used to defend Howard’s (1977) hypothesis. Other applicable conclusions about New Testament κύριος Christology will also be explored.

7.2 Romans 10:16-17

In chapter 5 we determined that Romans 10:13 involved ascribing highest honors to Jesus through the use of κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name. Through a series of conjunctions (γάρ) and repeated and consistent Christological use of κύριος, Paul delivers the climax to his argument in Romans 10:9-13: “For ‘everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved’” (πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται [Rom 10:13, ESV, NA28]). This YHWH passage is applied to

Jesus, and the consequent honors are transferred. There is a “referential shift” (Kreitzer, 1987:113) from God to Jesus through the κύριος predicate. To insert the Tetragrammaton in this passage would violate the flow and sequence of Paul’s argument.

With this understanding we continue to a later point in the passage to determine the likelihood that the Tetragrammaton was used in the quotation of Isaiah 53:1 in Romans 10:16. In the verses following 10:13, Paul unpacks in reverse order what is involved in “calling on the name of the Lord”:

How then will they call on him in whom they have not believed?
And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard?
And how are they to hear without someone preaching? And how are they to preach unless they are sent? As it is written, ‘How beautiful are the feet of those who preach the good news!’ (Rom 10:14-15, ESV).

Through a series of rhetorical questions, Paul is asking if the ingredients of true faith have been met in the mission to Israel. Paul punctuates the argument with the central statement in 10:16: “But they have not all obeyed the gospel” (Ἄλλ’ οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ [ESV, NA28]). Paul weaves together saving belief and obedience earlier in Romans 1:5, where he refers to the “obedience of faith” (ὑπακοήν πίστεως, [ESV, NA28] also 16:26; cf. 6:16-17; 15:18; 16:19). Paul continues with the quotation from Isaiah 53:1: “For Isaiah says, ‘Lord, who has believed what he has heard from us?’” (Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει· κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; [Rom 10:16, ESV, NA28]). The one thing that was missing in the spread of the gospel to the Jews was saving faith as an appropriate response to the proclamation of the good news. The quote from Isaiah 53:1 underscores the necessity of saving belief (ἐπίστευσεν) in the equation of faith. Saving belief is what is involved in “calling on the name of the Lord” (10:13). Israel heard the message from commissioned preachers

from God, but they did not accept and internalize the message with a humble response of acceptance (Moo, 1996:662).

Howard (1977:78-79) claims that originally the Tetragrammaton stood in the place of the vocative: κύριε (Rom 10:16). The LXX has κύριε but there is no equivalent in Hebrew: “Who has believed our message?” (מַיִן אֲמַן שָׁמַעְתֶּם [Isa 53:1, NASV, BHS]). Howard (1977:78-79) argues that the translation variant in the next verse shows that Paul used the Tetragrammaton, and careless scribes later changed it to the vocative κύριε. In Romans 10:17, Paul continues his argument from 10:15 with the words: “So faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ/God” (ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ/θεοῦ [ESV with variant, NA28 with variant]). According to Howard (1977:79), “word of God” (ῥήματος θεοῦ) is original, and when the Tetragrammaton was changed to κύριε, this provided the opportunity for scribes to change the “word of God” (ῥήματος θεοῦ) to the “word of Christ” (ῥήματος Χριστοῦ).

This evaluation fails on a number of crucial issues. The external evidence points decidedly towards the variant “word of Christ” (ῥήματος Χριστοῦ). It has early and diverse support: $\mathfrak{P}^{46\text{vid}}$ \aleph^* B C D* 81 1739 Old Latin vg cop^{sa, bo, fay} goth arm *et al.* After examining $\mathfrak{P}^{46\text{vid}}$, Comfort (2008:460) confirms that $\mathfrak{P}^{46\text{vid}}$ is in fact a *nomen sacrum* for “Christ.” The variant “word of God” (ῥήματος θεοῦ) is supported by \aleph^c A D^{b, c} K P Ψ 33 614 1241 Byz Lect syr^{p, h} *et al.* If the Tetragrammaton were in the text of Romans 10:16, there would be no reason for a scribe to change the common “word of God” (ῥήματος θεοῦ: Luke 3:2; John 3:34; Eph 6:17; Heb 6:5; 11:3), which would fit the context either way, to the less familiar “word of Christ” (ῥήματος Χριστοῦ) found only here. A few manuscripts have only ῥήματος (G it^g Ambrosiaster Hilary Pelagius). This was likely

caused by carelessness and does not pose a challenge to the received text. Therefore on external and internal grounds the translation variant “word of Christ” (ῥήματος Χριστοῦ) has the best claim to authenticity. The Tetragrammaton does not occur in any New Testament manuscript of Romans, and Howard’s (1977:78-79) argument fails to offer variant support (Metzger, 1994:463-464).

In the “word of Christ” Paul has returned to the earlier category in Romans 10:8 of the “word of faith.” Seifrid (2007:662-663) captures the subtleties of Paul’s argument:

The expressions ‘word of faith’ and ‘word of Christ’ are thus complementary descriptions of the gospel, the former underscoring the call to faith that is inherent to God’s work in Christ, the latter underscoring the unchanging content of that address. . . . Paul interweaves them in an inverted pattern in his argument, speaking of the ‘word of faith’ where he describes the content of the gospel, and speaking of the ‘word of Christ’ where he describes its proclamation. He thus conveys the understanding that the act of faith and the object of faith are inseparable. The apostolic mission to both Israel and the nations is ultimately grounded in the message of Christ, who is the promised righteousness of God and the goal of the law.

There is an identification between what was proclaimed in the Old Testament and the message of Christ in the New Testament—the one who is “Lord” is the proper recipient of saving faith.

7.3 Romans 14:10-11

In Romans 14 Paul addresses the weak and the strong in their relationship to each other and to the Lord. The attitudes of each are similar and involve an affront to the one who has saved them: “Let not the one who eats despise the one who abstains, and let not the one who abstains pass judgment on the one who eats, for God has welcomed him” (Rom 14:3, ESV). Whether the issue is food (14:2-3, 6) or special days (14:5-6), both parties are guilty of passing judgment on the other when in reality both are accepted by Christ and both are responsible to their Master: “It is

before his own master that he stands or falls. And he will be upheld, for the Lord is able to make him stand” (Rom 14:4, ESV). Each answers to the Lord, and as such, only he has the right to judge. Paul poses the question and supplies the answer: “Why do you pass judgment on your brother? Or you, why do you despise your brother? For we will all stand before the judgment seat of God/Christ” (πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ/Χριστοῦ [Rom 14:10, ESV with variant, NA28 with variant]). The answer is supported with a quotation from Isaiah 45:23: “As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God” (ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ [Rom 14:11, ESV, NA28]). Paul then summarizes his position and the quotation from Scripture with his conclusion: “So then each of us will give an account of himself to God” (Rom 14:12, ESV).

Behind this passage are textual issues that must be resolved in order to gain an understanding of the author’s intent. Howard (1977:79-80) provides a solution to the textual variation in 14:10 with his own understanding of the place of the Tetragrammaton in the early transmission history of the New Testament. In Romans 14:10, the manuscripts differ on the reading of the “judgment seat of God/Christ” (βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ/Χριστοῦ [ESV with variant; NA28 with variant]). Howard (1977:79-80) postulates that the Tetragrammaton once stood where κύριος now stands in the quotation from Isaiah 45:23. Paul replaces the LXX formula in Isaiah 45:23: “By myself I swear” (κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ὀμνύω [Isa 45:23, Göttingen LXX]) with a more familiar expression: “As I live, says the Lord” (ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος [Rom 14:11, ESV, NA28; cf. Num 14:28; Isa 49:18; Jer 22:24; Ezek 5:11; 14:16; 16:48; 17:16; 18:3; 20:31, 33; Zeph 2:9]). Howard (1977:79) suggests that Paul took the introductory phrase from Isaiah 49:18, but the phrase is common enough and could be a conflation of biblical ideas (cf. Stanley, 1992:177). According to Howard (1977:79-80),

when the Tetragrammaton fell into disuse and scribes replaced the Divine Name with κύριος this opened the way for textual variation in the transmission of Romans 14:10: “judgment seat of God/Christ” (βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ/Χριστοῦ). The reading with Χριστοῦ would be a way of clarifying the referent of κύριος in the scriptural quotation.

The textual evidence in this case favors the θεοῦ reading. The external evidence for θεοῦ is stronger (⋈* A B C* D G 1739 cop *et al.*) than the manuscript support for the reading Χριστοῦ (⋈^c C² Ψ 048 0209 33 ℞ *et al.*). In this case, I agree with Howard (1977:79-80) on the authenticity of the reading with θεοῦ but for differing reasons. The reading with Χριστοῦ is likely under the influence of 2 Corinthians 5:10: “For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ” (τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [ESV, NA28]; Metzger, 1994:469). Furthermore, Romans 14:1-9 is dominated by the Christological use of κύριος, and a scribe could have rendered the phrase under the influence of the context and especially the import of 14:9: “For to this end Christ died and lived again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living” (ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ [ESV, NA28]). A case can be made that the referent of the κύριος in the biblical quotation in 14:11 was in fact Jesus Christ. However, in view of the external evidence and the immediate context of the quotation (14:10-12), I still view κύριος as a reference to God and not to Christ. The suggestion that the Tetragrammaton stood in the autograph of Romans is without tangible evidence. The use of κύριος lends itself to God and to Jesus, and scribe(s) likely operated under this uncertainty.

Whether or not one favors Jesus as the referent of κύριος in Paul’s Isaiah quotation or God, high honors are nevertheless ascribed to Jesus in the immediate context. The switch from a passage heavily dominated by κύριος in reference to Jesus to a climax with God as the referent is not

beyond the scope of New Testament Christology. We have seen time and again how what is true of the Lord God is also true of the Lord Jesus. Therefore, it is not unusual that Paul speaks of the pre-eminence over the dead and the living as a prerogative of the risen Lord (14:9) and in the next verse speaks of the judgment seat of God (14:10). The Divine Identity includes the reign of Christ and God, and judgment is a divine prerogative of both. This is also why Paul can use Isaiah 45:23 of God in Romans 14:11 and of Jesus in Philippians 2:10-11 without contradiction. The passage in Philippians 2:10-11 speaks in the most exalted terms of the Lordship of Christ but concludes with the glorification of God, the Father. This is similar to the situation in Romans 14 where both Christ and God are referenced with the κύριος title, and for New Testament Christology, the Lordship of Christ is essentially the Lordship of God/YHWH.

7.4 1 Corinthians 10:9

Paul uses the exodus and wilderness experiences of historic Israel to create a typological comparison between the people of God in Israel and, by analogy, the Corinthian church. In 1 Corinthians 10:11 Paul explains his use of Old Testament history in contemporary application: “Now these things happened to them as an example (τυπικῶς), but they were written down for our instruction, on whom the end of the ages has come” (ESV, NA28). Earlier in the passage Paul had spoken of the continuing application of Israel’s history in similar terms: “Now these things took place as examples (τύποι) for us, that we might not desire evil as they did” (1 Cor 10:6, ESV, NA28).

In the beginning of 1 Corinthians 10, Paul uses “all” (πάντες) five times in speaking of the spiritual blessings experienced by Israel, describing them in sacramental terms:

For I do not want you to be unaware, brothers, that our fathers were all (πάντες) under the cloud, and all (πάντες) passed through the sea, and all (πάντες) were baptized (ἐβαπτίσθησαν) into Moses in the

cloud and in the sea, and all (πάντες) ate the same spiritual food (τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν βρῶμα ἔφαγον), and all (πάντες) drank the same spiritual drink (τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα) (1 Cor 10:1-4, ESV, NA28).

The repeated use of “all” (πάντες) and sacramental terms creates a link between the Israelites and the Corinthians as the people of God. This will provide the foundation for Paul to compare the exodus and wilderness experiences with the experiences of his contemporaries.

The source of the spiritual blessings experienced by Israel and the believers in Corinth was Christ: “For they drank from the spiritual Rock that followed them, and the Rock was Christ” (ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός [1 Cor 10:4, ESV, NA28]). Despite all these advantages, the Israelites of the exodus generation were destroyed in the wilderness. The sins of idolatry and sexual immorality were common to both the Israelites and the Corinthians, and Paul issues a strong warning that history could repeat itself if the Corinthians do not change course.

In the middle of his comparisons of historic Israel and the Corinthians on the issues of idolatry (10:7) and sexual immorality (10:8), Paul enumerates the divine punishments that fell on Israel because of disobedience: “twenty-three thousand fell in a single day” (1 Cor 10:8, ESV); “were destroyed by serpents” (1 Cor 10:9, ESV); “were destroyed by the Destroyer” (1 Cor 10:10, ESV). The same could happen to the Corinthians if the warning is not heeded.

It is in this passage that Howard (1977:81) isolates a text-critical unit as partial proof that the Tetragrammaton was in the autograph of 1 Corinthians. In Paul’s third Old Testament example, he states: “We must not put Christ/the Lord/God to the test (μηδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστόν/κύριον/θεόν), as some of them did and were destroyed by serpents” (1 Cor 10:9, ESV with variants, NA28 with variants). The narrative behind this

verse is found in Numbers 21:4-9, where the Israelites incited YHWH: “And the people spoke against God and against Moses, ‘Why have you brought us up out of Egypt to die in the wilderness? For there is no food and no water, and we loathe this worthless food’” (Num 21:5, ESV). The Israelites complained about God’s provision of manna, and as a result they were bitten by “fiery serpents” (Num 21:6), and many people died in the incident. The verb “test” (ἐκπειράζω) does not occur here but is present as recollection of this event in Psalm 78:18: “They tested (ἐξεπίρασαν [Ps 77:18, Göttingen LXX]) God in their heart by demanding the food they craved” (ESV; cf. Exod 17:2-3,7; Deut 6:16; Ps 106:14).

Howard (1977:81) argues that originally the Tetragrammaton stood in 1 Corinthians 10:9, and unknowing scribes later changed it to κύριον or θεόν. The variant Χριστόν was a later scribal interpretation to resolve the identity of the figure that was tested. The difficulties with this explanation of the textual history of 1 Corinthians 10:9 are similar to the problems encountered above with Howard’s logic about the unique transmission history of the passage.

The variants Χριστόν/κύριον/θεόν have differing manuscript support. The first variant “Christ” (Χριστόν) has early and diverse support (P⁴⁶ D F G K L Ψ 630. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881 M latt sy co; Ir^{lat} Or^{1739mg}) attested by “the oldest Greek manuscript (P⁴⁶) as well as by a wide diversity of early patristic and versional witnesses (Irenaeus in Gaul, Ephraem in Edessa, Clement in Alexandria, Origen in Palestine, as well as by the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Syriac, Sahidic and Bohairic)” (Metzger, 1994:494). The evidence for κύριον (B C P 33. 104. 326. 365. 1175. 2464 sy^{hmg}) has substantial Egyptian support and some versional support. However, the evidence for κύριον does not outweigh the support for Χριστόν as Osburn (1981a:201) explains:

[T]he Egyptian versions, corroborated by the particularly noteworthy evidence of Clement, P⁴⁶, and 1739, readily demonstrate that it was

probably not the original Egyptian reading. Furthermore, it was not the dominant Palestinian reading, since Origen and the other Fathers in that vicinity based christological arguments on the reading Χριστόν.

The evidence for θεόν has the least manuscript support (A 81) and does not fare better on internal grounds either.

The variant that can best explain the origin of the other witnesses is Χριστόν. The readings κύριον and θεόν are an accommodation to the LXX in Numbers 21:5-6; Deuteronomy 6:16 and Psalm 77(78):18. In these passages it was YHWH who was put to the test, and the variant θεόν reflects this understanding. The reading θεόν is an understandable scribal accommodation to avoid the difficulty of seeing Christ as the one tested in the wilderness experiences of Israel. The reading κύριον is ambiguous enough to reflect either God or Christ. Χριστόν is the more difficult reading, and the others are accommodations to avoid the more difficult aspect of the pre-existent Christ tested by the Israelites in the wilderness experiences.

Howard (1977:81) argues for the authenticity of the Tetragrammaton here evidenced by the later variants θεόν or κύριον in 10:9 which arose because of the putative scribal confusion over an original Tetragrammaton in the text. There are no manuscripts of 1 Corinthians with the Tetragrammaton in them. The Tetragrammaton thesis fails on both external as well as internal evidence. Χριστόν is the harder reading; the variants θεόν and κύριον are less difficult. It is unlikely that a scribe would clarify an Old Testament reference with a reading that is more difficult, and the testimony of the manuscripts add to this conclusion.

Some might object that the reading Χριστόν is too difficult and as such should be rejected. However, the reference in 10:4 to Christ as the Rock that followed the Israelites and provided spiritual sustenance already places Christ in the context of the wilderness journeys. The reading

Χριστόν is within the realm of possibility and has a good claim to authenticity. The spiritual Rock that followed Israel was Christ, so here Paul weaves old and new narratives together Christologically (Fee, 1987:457).

It is significant for New Testament Christology that what was thought of as pertaining to YHWH alone is now applied to Christ. YHWH is spoken of as a Rock (צור) to the people of Israel (Deut 32:4, 15, 18, 30, 31). In fact where the Hebrew refers to the Rock in Deuteronomy 32, the LXX renders this with θεός. In Paul, Christ is the sustaining Rock which followed ancient Israel (1 Cor 10:4). YHWH is the one who was tested in the wilderness rebellions, but for Paul, Christ was tested. YHWH sustained his people with spiritual and physical supply; Christ is the one who cares for his people and provides for their needs. Judgment for sin is proper to YHWH but is the prerogative of Jesus. Paul ends his discussion of participation in pagan rituals with the warning: “Shall we provoke the Lord (κύριον) to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?” (1 Cor 10:22, ESV, NA28). Just as YHWH is a jealous God, so the Lord Jesus can be provoked to jealousy with serious consequences. The identification of Christ with YHWH finds its expression in the intertextuality of Scripture. Κύριος Christology is complemented in this passage with additional overlapping attributes for Jesus and God.

7.5 Jude 5

The final passage in our investigation of Howard’s (1977) candidates for the original Tetragrammaton is also the most difficult, but a thorough exegesis of the passage has promising results for our evaluation of Howard’s (1977) thesis.

Jude begins his short letter expressing his wish to discuss their “common salvation” (Jude 3) but the situation dictates a different topic. Jude describes the sin of his opponents and the magnitude of their

disobedience: “For certain people have crept in unnoticed who long ago were designated for this condemnation, ungodly people, who pervert the grace of our God into sensuality and deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ” (Jude 4, ESV). Jude treats these corrupting individuals with the utmost seriousness, equating their disobedience as a rejection of Christ. Like 1 Corinthians 10:1-13, Jude links Old Testament themes with New and interprets them Christologically. The historical experiences of Israel, the fallen angels, and the judgment of Sodom and Gomorrah serve as warnings to the recipients of the letter of Jude.

Howard (1977:81-82) claims that in Jude 5 the Tetragrammaton once stood and scribal misuse caused the multiplication of variants. Although the verse has other textual issues, the one “who saved a people out of the land of Egypt” (Jude 5, ESV) is our main concern:

Now I want to remind you, although you once fully knew it, that Jesus/the Lord/God, who saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe” (Υπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ὑμᾶς ἅπαξ πάντα ὅτι Ἰησοῦς/[ὁ] κύριος/ ὁ θεός λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σῶσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν [Jude 5, ESV with variants, NA28 with variants]).

The external evidence for the main variants Ἰησοῦς/[ὁ] κύριος/ ὁ θεός is divided. Bartholomä (2008:148) argues that the earliest and strongest reading is Ἰησοῦς:

[Ἰησοῦς] has the significantly strongest support from the more reliable manuscripts of the primary Alexandrian text. It is found in important and early Alexandrian uncials (A B) as well as in a significant number of important minuscules (33 81 322 323 1241 1739 1881). Moreover, [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς is witnessed as early as the mid-third century (Origen^{1739mg}). This, together with the strong support from many early Alexandrian manuscripts suggests that [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς is the earlier reading.

The external evidence for [ὁ] κύριος is weaker (C* [Ⲛ Ψ omit ὁ] syr^h) and ὁ θεός is weaker still (C² vg^{ms}) (Comfort, 2008:802). The unique reading θεὸς Χριστός from Ⲡ⁷² is a curiosity especially due to its age. However,

there are no other traces of this variant in the rest of the manuscript tradition.

The better attestation of Ἰησοῦς is acknowledged by the UBS Editorial Committee in the second edition of the *Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, but the majority of the members (Metzger and Wikgren dissenting) felt the reading Ἰησοῦς was “difficult to the point of impossibility” and explained the unusual variant as “transcriptional oversight” with the *nomen sacrum* $\overline{\text{ΚC}}$ taken for $\overline{\text{IC}}$ (Metzger, 1994:657). Evidently, opinions have changed from NA27 to NA28 with Ἰησοῦς in the printed text of the latter, and I support the choice of Ἰησοῦς as the variant that warrants the most compelling explanation of the external and internal evidence.

The general tendency of scribes is not to change the text in a direction that is more difficult. Certainly Ἰησοῦς is the more difficult reading, especially in light of the apparent anachronism of placing Jesus in the exodus and wilderness experiences. However, I agree with Osburn (1981b:112) that in view of the similar situation in 1 Corinthians 10:4, 9 and Hebrews 11:26, there is no reason that the reference to Jesus could not stand on its own. Justin Martyr in the second century in his *Dialogue with Trypho* uses this language of Jesus: “Jesus, who led your fathers out of Egypt” (Ἰησοῦν, τὸν καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγαγόντα [*Dial* 120.3 ANF1; Bobichon, 2003:506]). Jude prefers the fuller Ἰησοῦς Χριστός when referring to Jesus (Jude 4, 17, 21, 25) but with such a small amount of text, it is difficult to be dogmatic about Jude’s apparent style. For scribes the tendency would be to replace Ἰησοῦς, which places emphasis on the man Jesus, with the more ambiguous κύριος or the more theologically defensible θεός. Therefore, Howard’s (1977:82) suggestion that θεός or κύριος gave way to a scribal correction in the direction of

Ἰησοῦς is implausible considering the tendency of scribes to make a passage easier to understand rather than more difficult.

Some scholars have argued that κύριος is original based on a supposed Joshua-Jesus typology. The Greek Ἰησοῦς is the correct translation of the Hebrew name Joshua (e.g., Acts 7:45, Heb 4:8). According to Bauckham (1990:309) and following him, Landon (1996:73), a scribe influenced by the Joshua-Jesus typology, which was popular in the second century, read the first part of the verse: "...who saved a people out of the land of Egypt" (... λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας) and inserted Ἰησοῦς but failed to read the next lines. This conjecture fails on a number of accounts. It can be said that Joshua led the people of Israel from Egypt but the following clause cannot be ascribed to Joshua: "afterward destroyed those who did not believe" (Jude 5, ESV). Grammatically the subject of ἀπώλεσεν ("destroyed") is also the subject τετήρηκεν ("kept") in the next verse. If it is inappropriate to refer to Joshua as the one who "destroyed those who did not believe," it is even more so to suggest that Joshua punished fallen angels: "And the angels who did not stay within their own position of authority, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept (τετήρηκεν) in eternal chains under gloomy darkness until the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6, ESV, NA28). I agree with Bartholomä's (2008:154) evaluation of this idea:

Though this is a possible conjecture, it seems unlikely that a scribe mindful enough to think about such a typology would miss the inappropriateness of his interpolation. Further, it is not probable that an orthodox scribe who understood κύριος as a reference to Christ would downgrade the reference to a Joshua-Jesus typology, thus representing a lower Christology.

The movement from "our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ" to a Christologically weaker Joshua-Jesus typology in the next verse is contextually unlikely and poses problems in the context.

In its context the reading Ἰησοῦς supports a high Christology. In the preceding verse, Jesus is referred to as “our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ” (τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν [Jude 4, ESV, NA28]). It is a significant coupling of titles when Jesus is both

δεσπότην (“Master”) and κύριον (“Lord”). The exalted status of κύριος as a Christological title is becoming increasingly clear in this thesis, and in this phrase it suffers no loss. The title δεσπότης (“Master”) is often used of God (Luke 2:29; Acts 4:24; Rev 6:10; 1 Clem 7:5; 8:2; 9:4; 11:1 *et al.*). Some manuscripts (P Ψ Maj syr) insert θεόν instead to differentiate God as δεσπότην from the Lord Jesus Christ. However, the reading above is better attested in the manuscript tradition, and it is likely that a scribe added θεόν in conformity to customary usage. In the parallel text 2 Peter 2:1, the author uses δεσπότης with reference to Jesus and likely understood Jude 4 in that way: “... even denying the Master (δεσπότην) who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction” (2 Peter 2:1, ESV, NA28). Bauckham (1990:307) highlights the significance of using δεσπότης and κύριος of Jesus in the same textual unit:

[I]t becomes likely that the double expression δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν has the same kind of divine overtone as κύριος in verse 14: Jesus’ lordship is the eschatological lordship of God. This is virtually necessitated by μόνον, which in a Jewish religious context could not fail to suggest the special Jewish insistence on the unique lordship of God.

The effect of multiplying titles brings with it an exalted sense to the word unit. What is customarily said of God is now said of Jesus. This sets the tone for the verses that follow Jude 4.

The false teachers in Jude have denied their Master and Lord, and the Old Testament and Pseudepigraphical stories underscore the seriousness of their offence and the plight of those who fall under Christ’s judgment, past and present. Jesus is the eschatological judge and deliverer. Jesus was at work among the Old Testament people of God. He saved the

Israelites out of Egypt and destroyed those who did not believe. The same is said of Christ in 1 Corinthians 10 where the Israelites “tested” Christ and judgment fell on the guilty but deliverance was promised to the faithful. In Jude judgment is attributed to Jesus as well. The false teachers in Jude are guilty of offending their Sovereign and Lord and should expect to receive punishment similar to that assigned to those who disobeyed in previous ages. In 1 Corinthians 10 and in Jude, the pre-existence of Jesus is presupposed, and his right to judge is assumed. Jesus is the eschatological judge who judges people and angels alike. The fallen angels “he has kept in eternal chains under gloomy darkness until the judgment of the great day” (Jude 6, ESV). For the believer, Jesus is the source of eschatological mercy. In Jude 1, believers are “kept for Jesus Christ” (Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις [ESV, NA28]) and in Jude 21 are “waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ that leads to eternal life” (προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον [ESV, NA28]).

The term κύριος has an important place in the book of Jude. Jude uses κύριος four times combined with “Jesus Christ” (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός) in Jude 4, 17, 21, and 25, once in reference to God in Jude 9, and also in the quotation from 1 Enoch 1:9 in Jude 14 where “Lord” is certainly an interpretive substitution to render the quotation Christologically: “Behold, the Lord comes with ten thousands of his holy ones” (ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ [ESV, NA28]). The passage in 1 Enoch is based on Deuteronomy 33:2 where YHWH is the one who is coming as the eschatological judge: “YHWH came from Sinai and dawned from Seir upon us; he shone forth from Mount Paran; he came from the ten thousands of holy ones, with flaming fire at his right hand” (Deut 33:2, based on ESV, BHS). In Jude 14, there is a “referential shift” from God to Jesus in the use of the κύριος predicate. It is Jesus who convenes “the divine court coming for final judgment” (Carson, 2007b:1078). Jesus has the final right to judge and reward, a responsibility worthy only of YHWH. Reflecting on

the biblical texts that were likely the source of 1 Enoch's wording about the coming of God and used by Jude in relation to Jesus, Bauckham (1990:289-290) concludes: "All these texts [Deut 33:2; Isa 40:10, 66:15-16; Mic 1:3-4; Zech 14:5b] refer to the coming of Yahweh ... It looks as though Jude's κύριος, added to the text of 1 Enoch 1:9 by analogy with these other texts represents the Tetragrammaton." When Jesus comes as the eschatological judge, it is not as a trusted deputy without any real power, he comes as YHWH the incarnate Lord.

7.5 Conclusion

In the four passages that Howard (1977:78-80, 81-82) presents as indicators of the original Tetragrammaton in the New Testament, the evidence fails to convince. The manuscript tradition of the New Testament yields no solid evidence of the Divine Name in its transmission history. In Romans 10:17 the "word of Christ" (ῥήματος Χριστοῦ) is the more difficult reading and has the most claim to authenticity. I agree with Howard (1977:79-80) in Romans 14:10 on his choice of "judgment seat of God" (βῆματι τοῦ θεοῦ) not for the reasons presented but for the combined testimony of the manuscript tradition and internal considerations. In 1 Corinthians 10:9 and Jude 5, Howard suggests that κύριος or θεός was the scribes' choice in rendering the original Tetragrammaton. Howard (1977:81-82) fails to appreciate the scribal tendency to simplify what is difficult. The reading "Christ" (Χριστόν) in 1 Corinthians 10:9 and "Jesus" (Ἰησοῦς) in Jude 5 are the more difficult and combined with manuscript attestation are also the best candidates for the original reading in their respective contexts. The Tetragrammaton argument finds little support in the various passages Howard (1977:78-80, 81-82) presents and does nothing to raise the original Tetragrammaton thesis from the realm of conjecture.

8.0 Conclusion

Howard has underscored the place of the Tetragrammaton in the transmission of the pre-Christian LXX/OG. He examines four significant pre-Christian LXX/OG manuscripts and their distinctive renderings of the Divine Name. Only one of these manuscripts can be considered a true exemplar of the LXX/OG. The pre-Christian manuscript pap4QLXXLev^b is demonstrably the best candidate for the original LXX/OG rendering of the Divine Name. Using the criterion of Hebraization to determine where the Tetragrammaton is a secondary revision, only pap4QLXXLev^b remains as a true exemplar of the LXX/OG. Howard rests his conclusion about the use of the Tetragrammaton in the original LXX/OG on four manuscripts. I, however, agree only with the testimony of pap4QLXXLev^b as evidence of an original trigram.

Howard makes a decision in the logic of his argument that warrants special consideration. Howard has shown that the Tetragrammaton was present in a few pre-Christian manuscripts, but he then suggested that manuscripts of the LXX/OG with the Divine Name were available and used by the New Testament writers. Therefore in Howard's estimation the Tetragrammaton is original to the New Testament and only in the scribal mishandling of the Tetragrammaton in the second century did surrogates like κύριος enter the text of the New Testament where the Divine Name stood.

What Howard has failed to recognize is the parallel movement towards surrogates in the Second Temple period. From the testimonies of Philo, Josephus, and the Pseudepigrapha, it is the use of κύριος as a surrogate for the Divine Name that merits attention. We have seen that the use of surrogates for the Divine Name was evident in various Second Temple writings contemporary with the New Testament itself. The combined testimony of these Second Temple writings with the evidence of the New Testament demonstrates that there was also a version of the

LXX/OG which used κύριος as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton extant in these early writings.

The New Testament manuscript tradition bears no documentary evidence of the use of the Tetragrammaton whether in Hebrew characters or in phonetic equivalent. In early papyri like P⁴⁶ and P⁶⁶ dated to the early second century (possibly a first century date for P⁴⁶), there is no evidence that the Tetragrammaton was used in these manuscripts. The situation is the same with New Testament citations in 1 Clement. The New Testament manuscript tradition supplies no examples of manuscripts where the Tetragrammaton is preserved in quotations from the Old Testament. Howard marshals external and internal evidence that the New Testament bears evidences of an original Tetragrammaton. In the end, each of these passages fails to support Howard's Tetragrammaton thesis.

According to Howard, the high Christology of the New Testament was probably artificially increased by scribal confusion that resulted when the Tetragrammaton was no longer understood and κύριος took its place. Now passages that contained the Divine Name were replaced with the surrogate κύριος and left with an overlapping referent. The title κύριος was then used both of the Lord Jesus and the Lord God. Passages pertaining to YHWH, the Lord, were mistakenly applied to Jesus, contrary to the authors' intentions.

However, the testimony of the New Testament manuscript tradition is supported by the content of the writings themselves. The presence of the untranslated Aramaic expression "Maranatha" (μαράνα θά) in an early epistle of Paul (1 Cor 16:22) suggests that the custom of addressing Jesus as "Lord" in a way that equalled what was said of YHWH began in the earliest Palestinian church and not in scribal error of the second century as Howard suggests. Howard has failed to recognize the significance of the very early date by which the Aramaic and Greek-speaking churches acclaimed Jesus as "Lord." This is partial proof that the high honors paid

to Jesus Christ began in the primitive church and not with the putative confusion of the Gentile scribes in rendering the Tetragrammaton.

The main body of the thesis considered evidence from the documents that compose the New Testament. In various passages, Old and New Testaments converge in the person of Jesus Christ by the linking of the word κύριος as a Christological title and as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton. The emerging picture of the κύριος Christology was one that ascribed the full implications of deity to Jesus Christ at a very early date. The high Christology of the New Testament was not the result of scribal corruption. Rather the New Testament from its earliest history endorsed a Christology that was both early and deliberate, and ascribed honors of the highest order.

Jesus received the “name that is above every name” (Phil 2:9) which is certainly the Tetragrammaton, present in the text through the κύριος predicate (Phil 2:11). In 1 Corinthians 8:4-6, Paul redefines the *Shema* to include Jesus Christ in the Divine identity. The statement: “there is no God but one” is expanded to include “one God, the Father,” and “one Lord, Jesus Christ.” Placing Christ in the Divine identity was not a later mistake but rather was intentional and supported by the earliest witnesses. In Acts 2:21 and Romans 10:13, the quotation from Joel 2:32 (3:5) (“everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved”) is applied to Jesus in the received form with κύριος in place of the Tetragrammaton. In both cases the writers show that they are aware of the κύριος form and weave it into their arguments. The passages where Joel 2:32 (3:5) is quoted are not incidental references involving marginal ideas, rather, especially in the cases of Acts 2:21 and Romans 10:13, the Joel quote is vital to the author’s argument, and contextual considerations insist on its received form with the surrogate κύριος. The κύριος surrogate is used to highlight the highest commendation of Jesus Christ and his rightful possession of the ineffable Name. It was not scribal corruption that elevated Jesus to a superlative

status. It was his by right and the earliest witnesses to the Faith attest to this conclusion.

The situation is consistent across the spectrum of New Testament writings. The picture has come into focus that Jesus is the rightful inheritor of the Divine Name through the agency of the κύριος predicate. High honors belong to the holder of this Name, and its attestation is early and deliberate. What was reserved for YHWH alone is applied to Jesus. Jesus is Lord in the deepest sense possible, affirming that the name of YHWH is inextricably connected to Jesus as it is to the Father. The Father has highly exalted his Son with his Name and with the attendant devotion which that Name demands. The evidence from the New Testament that the word κύριος stood in the place of the Divine Name in various passages where the referent is Jesus provides support to the overall conclusion that the Christology of the New Testament rests in part on the foundation of a deliberate referential and titular overlap between the Lord Jesus and the Lord God. The implication from Howard's thesis that the estimation of Jesus was artificially inflated through the mishandling of the Tetragrammaton in the scribal transmission of the New Testament lacks support from the New Testament itself.

Furthermore, the evidence from the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew found in the polemical treatise of Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut also fails to support Howard's Tetragrammaton thesis. I have demonstrated that Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew, like other medieval Hebrew Gospels which have the Tetragrammaton in them, is not reflecting an ancient Hebrew Matthew that contained the Divine Name but rather is employing interpretive substitution and not a direct translation of a first century Hebrew *Vorlage*. The composition is likely medieval and fails to be a factor in the development of the Gospel tradition of the New Testament.

The step in logic from pre-Christian manuscripts containing the Tetragrammaton to the New Testament containing the Divine Name is the

8.0 Conclusion

weakest link in Howard's argument. There is no solid evidence at this juncture and the absence undermines the validity of the original New Testament Tetragrammaton argument. Instead the New Testament weaves together Old and New Testaments into a focused κύριος Christology that taps into the heart of the New Testament. Jesus is Lord in the highest sense possible, an honor reserved for YHWH alone, but applied without apology to Jesus.

9.0 Abbreviations

- ABD. Freedman, David Noel et al. *eds.* 1992. The Anchor Bible Dictionary. 6 Vols. New York: Doubleday.
- Adv. Haer.* Irenaeus. Against Heresies.
- ANF1. Roberts, Alexander, Donaldson, James, & Coxe, A. Cleveland. *eds.* The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus. Vol. 1. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Company, 1885.
- Ant.* Josephus. Jewish Antiquities.
- BDAG. Bauer, Walter, Danker, Frederick W., Arndt, William F., & Gingrich, F. W. 2000. A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- BDB. Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., & Briggs, Charles A. *eds.* 1996. The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- BDF. Blass, F., & Debrunner, A. *eds.* 1961. A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- BHS. Elliger, K. et al. *eds.* 1977. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Brenton English LXX. Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee. 1870. The Septuagint version of the Old Testament: English translation. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons.
- CNTTS. H. Milton Haggard Center for New Testament Textual Studies. 2010. The Center for New Testament Textual Studies: NT Critical Apparatus. New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary (Electronic database).
- Comm. Matt.* Jerome. Commentary on Matthew.
- DSS. Dead Sea Scrolls.
- Epist.* Jerome. Epistulae.
- ESV. 2016. The Holy Bible: English Standard Version. Wheaton: Standard Bible Society.
- EVV. English Bible Versions.
- Fug.* Philo. De Fuga et Inventione.
- Göttingen LXX. Wevers, John William, et al. *eds.* 1967-2008. Göttingen Septuagint. 24 Vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- GGBB. Wallace, Daniel B. 1996. Greek grammar beyond the basics: an exegetical syntax of the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

- HALOT. Koehler, L., Baumgartner, W., Richardson, M. E. J., & Stamm, J. J. 1994-2000. The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Hist. eccl.* Eusebius. *Historia Ecclesiastica*.
- LCL. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Lexham English LXX. Brannan, R., Penner, K. M., Loken, I., Aubrey, M., & Hoogendyk, I. eds. 2012. The Lexham English Septuagint. Bellingham, WA: Lexham.
- LSJ. Liddell, Henry George, Scott, Robert, Jones, Henry Stuart, & McKenzie, Roderick. eds. 1996. 9th ed. A Greek-English lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon.
- LXX. The Septuagint.
- LXX^{κύριος}. The version(s) of the Septuagint that witnesses such as the New Testament, Philo, and other Second Temple documents attest to where the Tetragrammaton is replaced with a Greek surrogate such as κύριος.
- MM. Moulton, James Hope, & Milligan, George. 1963. The vocabulary of the Greek Testament: illustrated from the papyri and other non-literary sources. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- MT. The Masoretic Text.
- Mut.* Philo. *De Mutatione Nominum*.
- NASV. 1995. New American Standard Bible: 1995 update. LaHabra, CA: The Lockman Foundation.
- NA27. Aland, K. et al. eds. 1993. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- NA28. Aland, K. et al. eds. 2012. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- NIDNTT. Brown, Colin. ed. 1971. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 3 Vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- NIV. 1984. *The Holy Bible: New International Version*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- NRSV. 1989. *The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.
- OG. Old Greek
- Pan.* Epiphanius. *Panarion*.
- Pelag.* Jerome. *Dialogus Adversus Pelagianos*.
- PG. Migne, J. P. 1857-1866. *Patrologia Graeca*.
- PhiloGk. Cohn, L., & Wendland, P. eds. 1896-1915. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. 6 Vols. Berlin: G. Reimer.
- PL. Migne, J. P. 1841-1855. *Patrologia Latina*.

9.0 Abbreviations

Rahlfs LXX. Rahlfs, Alfred. *ed.* 1935. Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes, 2 vols., Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt.

Somn. Philo. De Somniis.

TDNT. Kittel, Gerhard, & Friedrich, Gerhard. *eds.* 1964-1976. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 Vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Thomas. 1996. Evangelium Thomae Copticum. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Vir. ill. Jerome. De Viris Illustribus.

v.l. Varia Lectio

10.0 Bibliography

- Abba, Raymond. 1961. The Divine Name Yahweh. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 80(4): 320-328.
- Achtemeier, Paul J. 1996. A commentary on First Peter. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Alexander, Philip S. 1992. 'The parting of the ways' from the perspective of Rabbinic Judaism. (In Dunn, James D. G. eds. Jews and Christians: the parting of the ways A.D. 70 to 135. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). pp. 1-25).
- Allen, Leslie C. 2002. Psalms 101–150 (Revised). Vol. 21. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word.
- Aly, Zaki, & Koenen, Ludwig. 1980. Three rolls of the early Septuagint: Genesis and Deuteronomy. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt.
- Amir, Yehoshua. 1988. Authority and interpretation of scripture in the writings of Philo. (In Mulder, Martin Jan, & Sysling, Harry. eds. Mikra: text, translation, reading and interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in ancient Judaism and early Christianity. Assen: Van Gorcum. pp. 421-453).
- Andersen, F. I. 1983. 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A new translation and introduction. (In Charlesworth, James H. ed. Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments. Vol. 1. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. pp. 91-213).
- Argyle, A. W. 1974. Philo, the man and his work. *Expository Times*, 85(4): 115-117.
- Aristotle. 1933. Metaphysics books 1-9. Translated by Hugh Tredennick. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. (Loeb Classical Library).
- Balla, Peter. 2007. 2 Corinthians. (In Beale, G. K., & Carson, D. A. eds. Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic. pp. 753-783).
- Barkay, Gabriel. 1983. The Divine Name found in Jerusalem. *Biblical Archaeology Review*, 9(2): 14-19.
- Bartholomä, Philipp F. 2008. Did Jesus save the people out of Egypt? A re-examination of a textual problem in Jude 5. *Novum Testamentum*, 50(2):143-158.
- Bauckham, Richard. 1983. Jude, 2 Peter. Vol. 50. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas, TX: Word.
- Bauckham, Richard. 1988. James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude. (In Carson, D. A., & Williamson, H. G. M. eds. It is written: Scripture citing Scripture: essays in honour of Barnabas Lindars. Cambridge: Cambridge University. pp. 303-317).

- Bauckham, Richard. 1990. *Jude and the relatives of Jesus in the early church*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Bauckham, Richard. 1993. *The climax of prophecy: studies on the Book of Revelation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Bauckham, Richard. 1998. The worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11. (In Martin, Ralph P., & Dodd, Brian J. eds. *Where Christology began: essays on Philippians 2*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox. pp. 128-139).
- Bauckham, Richard. 2008a. The continuing quest for the provenance of Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. (In Oegema, Gerbern S., & Charlesworth, James H. eds. *The Pseudepigrapha and Christian origins*. New York: T&T Clark. pp. 9-29).
- Bauckham, Richard. 2008b. *Jesus and the God of Israel: God crucified and other studies on the New Testament's Christology of divine identity*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. 1992. A new Qumran substitute for the Divine Name and Mishnah Sukkah 4.5. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 83(1-2): 1-5.
- Behm, J. 1967. μορφή. (In Kittel, Gerhard, et al. eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans. 4:742-759).
- Bernstein, Moshe J. 2009. Divine titles and epithets and the sources of the Genesis Apocryphon. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 128(2): 291-310.
- Bietenhard, Hans. 1968. ὄνομα (In Kittel, Gerhard, et al. eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans. 5:242-283).
- Black, Matthew. 1946. *An Aramaic approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Black, Matthew. 1971. The Christological use of the Old Testament in the New Testament. *New Testament Studies*, 18(1): 1-14.
- Black, Matthew. 1973. The Maranatha invocation and Jude 14, 15 (1 Enoch 1:9). (In Lindars, Barnabas, & Smalley, Stephen S., eds. *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University. pp. 189-196).
- Blomberg, Craig L. 2007. Matthew. (In Beale, G. K., & Carson, D. A. eds. *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, pp. 1-109).

- Bobichon, Philippe. 2003. Justin Martyr: dialogue avec Tryphon: édition critique, traduction, commentaire. University of Fribourg. (Paradosis 47.1: Études de littérature et de théologie anciennes).
- Bock, Darrell L. 1987. Proclamation from prophecy and pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology. Sheffield: JSOT. (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 12).
- Bock, Darrell L. 1994-1996. Luke. 2 Vols. Baker exegetical commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Bock, Darrell L. 2007. Acts. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Bodine, Walter Ray. 1980. Kaige and other recensional developments in the Greek text of Judges. *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, 13(Fall): 45-57.
- Boers, Hendrikus. 1970. Jesus and the Christian faith: New Testament Christology since Bousset's *Kyrios Christos*. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 89(4): 450-456.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. 1970. *Kyrios Christos: a history of the belief in Christ from the beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by John E. Steely. New York: Abingdon.
- Bowman, Robert M., Jr., & Komoszewski, J. Ed. 2007. Putting Jesus in his place: the case for the deity of Christ. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel.
- Boyarin, Daniel. 2004. Border lines: the partition of Judaeo-Christianity. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Brannan, R., Penner, K. M., Loken, I., Aubrey, M., & Hoogendyk, I. eds. 2012. The Lexham English Septuagint. Bellingham, WA: Lexham.
- Braumann, G. 1971. *μορφή*. (In Brown, Colin, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan. 1:705-708).
- Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., & Briggs, Charles A. eds. 1996. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Brown, Schuyler. 1970. Concerning the origin of the *Nomina Sacra*. *Studia Papyrologica*, 9(2): 7-19.
- Brownlee, William H. 1977. The ineffable name of God. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 226(Apr.): 39-46.
- Bruce, F. F. 1968. "Jesus is Lord." (In Richards, J. McDowell, ed. *Soli Deo gloria: New Testament studies in honor of William Childs Robinson*. Richmond, VA: John Knox. pp. 23-36).
- Bruce, F. F. 1986a. *Jesus: Lord & Savior*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity.
- Bruce, F. F. 1986b. *The Acts of the Apostles: the Greek text with introduction and commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.

- Bruce, F. F. 1988. *The New Testament documents*. 5th revised edition. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. 1988. Some unfinished business with the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Revue de Qumran*, 13: 411-420.
- Buckwalter, H. Douglas. 1996. *The character and purpose of Luke's Christology*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge. (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 89).
- Burkitt, F. Crawford. 1897. *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the translation of Aquila*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Burrows, Millar. 1949. Variant readings in the Isaiah manuscript. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 113(Feb): 24-32.
- Byington, Steven T. 1957. יהוה and אדני. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 76: 58-59.
- Capes, David Bryan. 1990. *Paul's use of Old Testament Yahweh-texts and its implications for his Christology*. Fort Worth, TX: Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. (Dissertation – PhD).
- Capes, David Bryan. 1994. YHWH and his Messiah: Pauline exegesis and the Divine Christ. *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 16(2):121-143.
- Carson, D. A. 2007a. 1 Peter. (In Beale, G. K., & Carson, D. A. eds. *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, pp. 1015-1045).
- Carson, D. A. 2007b. Jude. (In Beale, G. K., & Carson, D. A. eds. *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, pp. 1069-1079).
- Casanellas, Pere, & Hames, Harvey J. 2014. A textual and contextual analysis of the Hebrew Gospels translated from Catalan. *Melilah*, 11:68-81.
- Case, Shirley J. 1907. KYPIOΣ as a title for Christ. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 26(2): 151-161.
- Casey, P. M. 1999. Monotheism, worship and Christological development in the Pauline churches. (In Newman, Carey C., Davila, James R., & Lewis, Gladys S. eds. *The Jewish roots of Christological monotheism: papers from the St. Andrews conference on the historical origins of the worship of Jesus*. Leiden: Brill. pp. 214-233).
- Chambers, T. W. 1886. Ὁ Κύριος ἔγγυς, Philip. iv. 5. *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 6(2): 108-110.
- Charles, R. H. ed. 1913. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. Vol 1. Apocrypha. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Charlesworth, J. H. 1983. Odes of Solomon: a new translation and introduction. (In Charlesworth, James H. *ed.* The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Vol 2. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, pp. 725-771).
- Cherry, M. R. 1962. The servant song of Philippians. *Religious Education*, 59: 42-56.
- Christensen, Sean M. 2015. Solidarity in suffering and glory: the unifying role of Psalm 34 in 1 Peter 3:10-12. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 58(2):335-352.
- Ciampa, Roy E., & Rosner, Brian S. 2007. 1 Corinthians. (In Beale, G. K., & Carson, D. A. *eds.* Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, pp. 695-752).
- Cohn, L., & Wendland, P. *eds.* 1896-1915. Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt. 6 Vols. Berlin: G. Reimer.
- Cohon, Samuel S. 1951. The name of God, a study in rabbinic theology. *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 23: 579-604.
- Collins, A. Yarbro. 1983. Aristobulus: a new translation and introduction. (In Charlesworth, James H. *ed.* The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Vol 2. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, pp. 831-842).
- Collins, J. J. 1983. Sibylline Oracles: a new translation and introduction. (In Charlesworth, James H. *ed.* Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments. Vol. 1. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. pp. 317-472).
- Colwell, Ernest C. 1969. Studies in methodology in textual criticism of the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans. (New Testament Tools and Studies 9).
- Comfort, Philip W. 2005. Encountering the manuscripts: an introduction to New Testament paleography & textual criticism. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman.
- Comfort, Philip W. 2008. New Testament text and translation commentary: commentary on the variant readings of the ancient New Testament manuscripts and how they relate to the major English translations. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House.
- Comfort, Philip W., & Barrett, David P. *eds.* 1999. The complete text of the earliest New Testament manuscripts. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Comfort, Philip W., & Barrett, David P. *eds.* 2001. The text of the earliest New Testament Greek manuscripts. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 2001.
- Cotter, Anthony C. 1945. The divinity of Jesus Christ in Saint Paul. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 7: 259-289.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. 1979. A critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. London: T & T Clark.

- Cross, Frank Moore. 1964. The history of the biblical text in the light of discoveries in the Judaean desert. *Harvard Theological Review*, 57(4): 281-299.
- Cross, Frank Moore. 1973. Canaanite myth and Hebrew epic: essays in the history of the religion of Israel. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Cullmann, Oscar. 1950. "Kyrios" as designation for the oral tradition concerning Jesus (*paradosis* and *kyrios*). *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 3: 180-197.
- Cullmann, Oscar. 1963. The Christology of the New Testament. Revised edition. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie & Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Dacy, Marianne. 2001. The Divine Name in Qumran benedictions. *Australian Journal of Jewish Studies*, 15: 6-16.
- Dahl, N. A., & Segal, Alan F. 1978. Philo and the rabbis on the names of God. *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 9(1): 1-28.
- Daley, Brian E. 2006. Gregory of Nazianzus. New York: Routledge. (The Early Church Fathers, ed. Carol Harrison).
- Daly-Denton, Margaret. 1999. Singing hymns to Christ as to a God (Cf. Pliny *Ep.* X, 96). (In Newman, Carey C., Davila, James R., & Lewis, Gladys S. eds. The Jewish roots of Christological monotheism: papers from the St. Andrews conference on the historical origins of the worship of Jesus. Leiden: Brill. pp. 277-292).
- Davies, W. D. 1996. Reflections on aspects of the Jewish background of the Gospel of John. (In Culpepper, R. Alan, & Black, Clifton C. eds. Exploring the Gospel of John: in honor of D. Moody Smith. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox. pp. 43-64).
- Davila, James R. 1991. The name of God at Moriah: an unpublished fragment from 4QGenExod^a. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 110(4): 577-582.
- Davila, James R. 2005. The provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or other? Leiden: Brill. (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 105).
- Davis, Carl Judson. 1996. The name and way of the Lord: Old Testament themes, New Testament Christology. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic. (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 129).
- De Blois, Kees F. 1992. Translating the names of God: Tryggve Mettinger's analyses applied to Bible translation. *Bible Translator*, 43(4): 406-407.

- Deissmann, Adolf. 1910. *Light from the ancient east*. Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- De Lacey, D. R. 1982. 'One Lord' in Pauline Christology. (*In* Rowdon, Harold H., *ed.* *Christ the Lord: studies in Christology presented to Donald Guthrie*. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity. pp. 191-203).
- Delobel, Joël. 1991. Christ, the Lord of creation. *Louvain Studies*, 16(2): 155-169.
- Derrett, J. Duncan. 1989. Ο ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΕΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΕΝ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΕΥΛΟΥ. *Vigiliae Christianae*, 43: 378-392.
- De Troyer, Kristin. 2005. The names of God, their pronunciation and their translation: a digital tour of some of the main witnesses. *Lectio Difficilior*, 2: 1-35.
- De Troyer, Kristin. 2006. The choice is yours! On names of God. *Journal of the European Society of Women in Theological Research*, 14: 53-66.
- De Troyer, Kristin. 2008. The pronunciation of the names of God with some notes regarding the *nomina sacra*. (*In* Dalferth, I. U., & Stoellger, P. *eds.* *Gott Nennen: Gottes Namen und Gott als Name*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. pp. 143-172).
- DeVries, Simon J. 2003. 1 Kings. 2nd ed. Vol. 12. *Word Biblical Commentary*. Dallas: Word.
- Dillard, R. B. 1992. Joel. (*In* McComiskey, Thomas Edward, *ed.* *The Minor Prophets: an exegetical and expository commentary*. Vol. 1. Hosea, Joel, and Amos. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker. pp. 239-313).
- Driver, G. R. 1926. The Aramaic language. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 45(3/4): 323-325.
- Dunn, James D. G. 1988. Romans 9-16. Vol. 38B. *Word Biblical Commentary*. Dallas, TX: Word.
- Dunn, James D. G. 1989. *Christology in the making: a New Testament inquiry into the origins of the doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Dunn, James D. G. 1997. ΚΥΡΙΟΣ in Acts. (*In* Landmesser, Christof, Eckstein, Hans-Joachim, & Lichtenberger, Hermann *eds.* *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift : Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 363-378).
- Eckman, Edward W. 1964. The identification of Christ with *Yahweh* by New Testament writers. *Gordon Review*, 7: 145-153.
- Edge, Raymond Lewis. 1995. *The use of Palaeo-Hebrew in the Dead Sea Scrolls: paleography and historiography*. Austin, TX: University of Texas. (Dissertation – PhD).
- Edwards, James R. 2009. *The Hebrew Gospel & the development of the Synoptic tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.

- Egan, Patrick T. 2012. Did Peter change Scripture? The manuscript tradition of Greek Psalms 33-34 and 1 Peter 3:10-12. (*In Die Septuaginta: Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte: 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. pp. 505-528*).
- Ehrman, Bart D. *ed.* 2003. *The Apostolic Fathers. 2 Vols.* Edited and Translated by Bart D. Ehrman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. (Loeb Classical Library).
- Elliger, K. et al. *eds.* 1977. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Emerton, J. A. 1970. Were Greek transliterations of the Hebrew Old Testament used by Jews before the time of Origen? *Journal of Theological Studies*, 21(1):17-31.
- Eissfeldt, O. 1974. קִדָּשׁ (*In Botterweck, G. Johannes & Ringgren, Helmer. eds. Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans. 1: 59-72*).
- Fee, Gordon D. 1987. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians.* New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Fee, Gordon D. 2007. *Pauline Christology: an exegetical-theological study.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Feinberg, Paul D. 1980. The kenosis and Christology: an exegetical-theological analysis of Phil 2:6-11. *Trinity Journal NS* 1:21-46.
- Fischer, J. B. 1958. The term ΔΕΣΠΙΟΤΗΣ in Josephus. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n.s. 49(2): 132-138.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1960. Some observations on the Genesis Apocryphon. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 22(3): 277-291.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1979. *A wandering Aramean collected Aramaic essays.* Missoula, MT: Scholars. (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 25).
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1981. *To advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies.* New York: Crossroad.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1988. The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament after forty years. *Revue de Qumran*, 13(1-4): 609-620.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 2004. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): a commentary. 3rd Ed.* Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico. (Biblica et Orientalia 18B).
- Foerster, W. 1965. Κύριος κτλ. (*In Kittel, Gerhard, et al. eds. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans. 3: 1039-1098*).

- Fossum, Jarl E. 1995. The image of the invisible God: essays on the influence of Jewish mysticism on early Christology. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Foster, Robert. 2002. Why on earth use 'Kingdom of Heaven'? : Matthew's terminology revisited. *New Testament Studies*, 48(4): 487-499.
- France, R. T. 1982. The worship of Jesus: a neglected factor in Christological debate? (*In* Rowdon, Harold H., ed. *Christ the Lord: studies in Christology presented to Donald Guthrie*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity. pp. 17-36).
- France, R. T. 2002. The Gospel of Mark: a commentary on the Greek text. *New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Freedman, David Noel. 1960. The name of the God of Moses. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 79(2): 151-156.
- Freedman, David Noel et al. eds. 1992. The Anchor Bible Dictionary. 6 Vols. New York: Doubleday.
- Freedman, David Noel, & O'Connor, M. P. 1986. יהוה YHWH. (*In* Botterweck, G. Johannes & Ringgren, Helmer, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Green. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans. 5: 500-521).
- Frenschkowski, Marco. 2002. Kyrios in context: Q 6:46, the emperor as "lord", and the political implications of Christology in Q. (*In* Labahn, Michael, & Zangenberg, Jürgen, eds. *Zwischen den Reichen: Neues Testament und römische Herrschaft*, Tübingen : Francke. pp. 95-118).
- Furuli, Rolf. 1999. The role of theology and bias in Bible translation. Huntington Beach, CA: Eihu Books.
- Gardner, Paul Douglas. 1994. The gifts of God and the authentication of a Christian: an exegetical study of 1 Corinthians 8-11:1. Lanham, MD: University of America.
- Garshowitz, Libby, 1993. Shem Tov ben Isaac Ibn Shaprut's Gospel of Matthew. (*In* Walfish, Barry, ed. *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*. Vol 1, *Jewish History* 6. pp. 297-322).
- Garshowitz, Libby. 2000. Šem Tob Ibn Šaprut: La Piedra de Toque (Eben Bohan): Una Obra de Controversia Judeo-Cristiana: a review. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n.s. 90(3-4): 457-465.
- Geffcken, J. 1902. Die Oracula Sibyllina. Leipzig. (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 8).
- Geljon, Albert C. 2006. Philo of Alexandria and Gregory of Nyssa on Moses at the burning bush. (*In* van Kooten, George H., ed. *The revelation of the name YHWH to Moses: perspectives from Judaism*,

- the pagan Graeco-Roman world, and early Christianity. Leiden: Brill. pp. 225-236).
- Gianotti, Charles R. 1985. The meaning of the Divine Name YHWH. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 142(565): 38-51.
- Gibbs, John G. 1971. Creation and redemption: a study in Pauline theology. Leiden: E. J. Brill. (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* 26).
- Giblin, Charles H. 1975. Three monotheistic texts in Paul. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 37: 527-547.
- Gieschen, Charles A. 2003. The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology. *Vigiliae Christianae*, 57(2) 115-158.
- Glasson, T. Francis. 1974. Two notes on the Philippians hymn 2:6-11. *New Testament Studies*, 21(1):133-139.
- Gordis, Robert. 1971. The biblical text in the making: a study of the *kethib-qere*. New York: Ktav.
- Göttingen LXX. Wevers, John William, et al. eds. 1967-2008. Göttingen Septuagint. 24 Vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Grant, Frederick C. 1943. The earliest Gospel. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury.
- Grant, Robert M., & Graham, Holt H. eds. 1965. The Apostolic Fathers: a new translation and commentary. Vol. 2: First and Second Clement. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons.
- Gréaux, Eric James., Sr. 2009. The Lord delivers us: an examination of the function of Psalm 34 in 1 Peter. *Review and Expositor*, 106(4):603-613.
- Green, Dennis. 2000. Divine Names: Rabbinic and Qumran scribal techniques. (In Schiffman, Lawrence H., Tov, Emanuel, & VanderKam, James C., eds. The Dead Sea Scrolls: fifty years after their discovery: proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress: July 20-25, 1997. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society. pp. 497-511).
- Green, Gene L. 2007. Lexical pragmatics and biblical interpretation. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 50(4): 799-812.
- Green, Joel B. 2001. Persevering together in prayer: the significance of prayer in the Acts of the Apostles. (In Longenecker, Richard N., ed. Into God's presence: prayer in the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans. pp. 183-202).
- Gregory, Andrew F. 2005. 1 Clement and the writings that later formed the New Testament. (In Gregory, Andrew F., & Tuckett, C. M. eds. The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers. Oxford: Oxford University. pp. 129-157).

- Hagner, Donald Alfred. 1973. *The use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. Leiden: E. J. Brill. (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* 34).
- Hanhart, Robert. *ed.* 1983. *Tobit*. Vol. VIII, 5. *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hann, Robert R. 1982. *The manuscript history of the Psalms of Solomon*. Chico, CA: Scholars. (Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 13).
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. 1965. *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament*. London: SPCK.
- Harris, Murray J. 2005. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: a commentary on the Greek text*. *New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans.
- Harris, R. Laird. 1974. The pronunciation of the Tetragram. (*In* Skilton, John H., Fisher, Milton C., & Sloat, Leslie W., *eds.* *The law and the prophets : Old Testament studies prepared in honor of Oswald Thompson Allis*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed. pp. 215-224).
- Hatfield, Stephen G. 1991. The lordship of Christ: a biblical analysis. *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, 33(2): 16-25.
- Hawthorne, Gerald F. 1983. *Philippians*. Vol 43. *Word Biblical Commentary*. Waco, TX: Word.
- Hayward, Robert C. T. 2002. El Elyon and the Divine Names in Ben Sira. (*In* Egger-Wenzel, Renate, *ed.* *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the international Ben Sira conference Durham – Ushaw College 2001*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 180-198).
- Herford, R. Travers. 1966. *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*. Clifton, NJ: Reference Book Publishers.
- Hermetica. 1924. Translated by Walter Scott. 4 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Herron, Thomas J. 2008. *Clement and the early Church of Rome: On the dating of Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Steubenville, OH: Emmaus Road.
- Hewitt, James Griscom. 2000. *A philological investigation of the Hebrew Vorlage of the Hebrew version of the Gospel of Matthew in Shem-Tob ben Shaprut's Eben Bohan*. Temple University (Dissertation – PhD).
- Holladay, Carl R. 1995. *Aristobulus*. Vol. 3. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. Atlanta: GA: Scholars Press. (Society of Biblical Literature, Text and Translations 39; Pseudepigrapha Series 13).

- Hooker, Morna D. 1975. Philippians 2:6-11. (In Ellis, E. Earle, & Grässer, Erich, eds. *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70sten Geburtstag*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. pp. 151-164).
- Hoover, Roy W. 1971. The *harpagmos* enigma: a philological solution. *Harvard Theological Review*, 64:95-119.
- Horbury, William. 1983. The revision of Shem Tob ibn Shaprut's *Eben Bohan*. *Sefarad*, 43(2):221-237.
- Horbury, William. 1997. The Hebrew text of Matthew in Shem Tob ibn Shaprut's *Eben Bohan*. (In Davies, W. D., & Allison, Dale C., Jr. A critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew. Vol 3: commentary on Matthew 19-28. Edinburgh: T&T Clark. pp. 729-738).
- Horsley, Richard A. 1979. Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8.1-6. *New Testament Studies*, 27: 32-51.
- Howard, George. 1961. Hebrew in first century Palestine. *Restoration Quarterly*, 5(2): 57-61.
- Howard, George. 1971. The oldest Greek text of Deuteronomy. *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 42: 125-131.
- Howard, George. 1973. The 'aberrant' text of Philo's quotations reconsidered. *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 44: 197-209.
- Howard, George. 1977. The Tetragram and the New Testament. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 96(1): 63-83.
- Howard, George. 1978. Phil 2:6-11 and the human Christ. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 4: 368-387.
- Howard, George. 1980. Harmonistic readings in the old Syriac Gospels. *Harvard Theological Review*, 73(3-4): 473-491.
- Howard, George. 1986a. Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew. (In Proceedings of the 9th world congress of Jewish studies. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies. pp. 223-230).
- Howard, George. 1986b. The textual nature of an old Hebrew version of Matthew. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 105(1): 49-63.
- Howard, George. 1986c. Was the Gospel of Matthew originally written in Hebrew? *Bible Review*, 2(4):15-25.
- Howard, George. 1987. The Gospel of Matthew according to a primitive Hebrew text. Macon, GA: Mercer University.
- Howard, George. 1988a. A note on the short ending of Matthew. *Harvard Theological Review*, 81(1): 117-120.
- Howard, George. 1988b. A primitive Hebrew Gospel of Matthew and the Tol'doth Yeshu. *New Testament Studies*, 34(1):60-70.

- Howard, George. 1989. The textual nature of Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 108(2): 239-257.
- Howard, George. 1992a. A note on codex Sinaiticus and Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew. *Novum Testamentum*, 34(1): 46-47.
- Howard, George. 1992b. A note on Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew and the Gospel of John. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 47:117-126.
- Howard, George. 1992c. Tetragrammaton in the New Testament. (In Freedman, David Noel et al. eds. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Vol. 6. New York: Doubleday. pp. 392-393).
- Howard, George. 1994. The Pseudo-Clementine writings and Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew. *New Testament Studies*, 40(4):622-628.
- Howard, George. 1995. Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. Macon, GA: Mercer University.
- Howard, George. 1998. Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew and early Jewish Christianity. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 70: 3-20.
- Howard, George. 1999. A response to William L. Petersen's review of *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*. *Textual Criticism* 4.
<http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v04/Howard1999.html>.
 Date of access: 02 Jun 2009.
- Howell, Don H., Jr. 1993. God-Christ interchange in Paul: impressive testimony to the deity of Jesus. *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society*, 36(4): 467-479.
- Hurtado, Larry W. 1984. Jesus as Lordly example in Philippians 2:5-11. (In Richardson, Peter & Hurd, John., eds. *From Jesus to Paul: studies in honour of Francis Wright Beare*. Waterloo: ON: Wilfrid Laurier University. pp.113-126).
- Hurtado, Larry W. 1993. Lord. (In Hawthorne, Gerald F., Martin Ralph P., & Reid, Daniel G., eds. *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity. pp. 560-569).
- Hurtado, Larry W. 1999a. Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel: a review. *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 50(1): 288-291.
- Hurtado, Larry W. 1999b. Pre-70 CE Jewish opposition to Christ-devotion. *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 50(1): 35-58.
- Hurtado, Larry W. 2003. Lord Jesus Christ: devotion to Jesus in earliest Christianity. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Hurtado, Larry W. 2005. How on earth did Jesus become a God? Historical questions about earliest devotion to Jesus. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.

- Hurtado, Larry W. 2006. *The earliest Christian artifacts: manuscripts and Christian origins*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Isaac, E. 1983. 1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: a new translation and introduction. (In Charlesworth, James H. *ed.* *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. pp. 5-89).
- Jewett, Robert. 1971. *Paul's anthropological terms: a study of their use in conflict settings*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Jobs, Karen H. 2002. Got milk? Septuagint Psalm 33 and the interpretation of 1 Peter 2:1-3. *Westminster Theological Journal*, 63:1-14.
- Jobs, Karen H. 2005. *1 Peter*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Jobs, Karen H. 2006. The Septuagint textual tradition in 1 Peter. (In Kraus, Wolfgang, & Wooden, R. Glenn, *eds.* *Septuagint research: issues and challenges in the study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. pp. 311-333).
- Jobs, Karen H. & Silva, Moisés. 2000. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Johansson, Daniel. 2010. *Kyrios* in the Gospel of Mark. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 33(1): 101-124.
- Johnson, W. Carter. 1961. The Old Testament basis for the doctrine of the Deity of Christ. *Gordon Review*, 6: 62-79.
- Jones, Donald L. 1974. The title *Kyrios* in Luke-Acts. *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*, 1974: 85-101.
- Jordan, Horst William. 1973. *Kyrios* Jesus. *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 44: 213-217.
- Juel, Donald. 1981. Social dimensions of exegesis: the use of Psalm 16 in Acts 2. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 43: 543-556.
- Kahle, Paul E. 1956. A leather scroll of the Greek Minor Prophets and the problem of the Septuagint. (In *Opera Minora*. Leiden: Brill. pp. 113-127).
- Kahle, Paul E. 1959. *The Cairo Geniza*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Kahle, Paul E. 1960. The Greek Bible manuscripts used by Origen. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 79(2): 111-118.
- Kaiser, Walter C. 1990. *Exodus*. The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Vol 2. Genesis – Numbers. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Käsemann, Ernst. 1968. A critical analysis of Philippians 2:5-11. Translated by Alice F. Carse. (In Braun, Hebert, *ed.* *God and Christ: existence and province*. Tübingen: Mohr. pp. 45-88).

- Katz, Peter. 1950. Philo's Bible: the aberrant text of Bible quotations in some Philonic writings and its place in the textual history of the Greek Bible. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Katz, Steven T. 2006. The Rabbinic response to Christianity. (In Katz, Steven T., ed. The Cambridge history of Judaism. Vol. 4: The late Roman-Rabbinic Period. Cambridge: Cambridge University. pp. 259-298).
- Kilpatrick, G. D. 1968. "Kurios" in the Gospels. (In Bonnard, Pierre, ed. L'Évangile hier et aujourd'hui; mélanges offerts au Franz J Leenhardt. Geneva: Editions Labor et Fides. pp. 65-70).
- Kilpatrick, G. D. 1971. The Cairo papyrus of Genesis and Deuteronomy (P. F. Inv. 266). *Études de Papyrologie*, 9: 221-226.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. 1973. Κύριος again. (In Hoffmann, Paul, Brox, Norbert, Pesch, Wilhelm, eds. Orientierung an Jesus: zur Theologie der Synoptiker: für Josef Schmid. Freiburg: Herder. pp. 214-219).
- Kim, Seyoon. 1984. The origin of Paul's Gospel. 2nd revised ed. Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr (Paul Siebeck). (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Reihe 2; 4).
- Kim, Young Kyu. 1988. Palaeographical dating of P⁴⁶ to the later first century. *Biblica* 69: 248-257.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. 1975. The title 'Kyrios' in Matthew's Gospel. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 94(2): 246-255.
- Koehler, L., Baumgartner, W., Richardson, M. E. J., & Stamm, J. J. 1994-2000. The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. 2007. John. (In Beale, G. K., & Carson, D. A. eds. Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, pp. 415-512).
- Kraft, Robert A., Attridge, Harold, Spittler, Russell, & Timbie, Janet, eds. 1974. The Testament of Job according to the SV text. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Kraft, Robert A. 1978. Christian transmission of Greek Jewish Scriptures: a methodological probe. (In Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: influences et affrontements dans le monde antique. Paris: Boccard. pp. 207-226).
- Kraft, Robert A. 1994. The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity. <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak/publics/pseudepig/pseudepold>. Date of access: 25 Feb 2013.
- Kraft, Robert A. 2001. The Pseudepigrapha and Christianity revisited: setting the stage and framing some central questions. <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak/publics/pseudepig/sntsnew.html>. Date of access: 25 Feb 2013.

- Kraft, Robert A. 2003. The 'textual mechanics' of early Jewish LXX/OG papyri and fragments. (In McKendrick, Scot, & O'Sullivan, Orlaith, eds. *The Bible as book: the transmission of the Greek text*. London: British Library. pp. 51-72).
- Kraft, Robert A. 2005. Philo's Bible revisited: the 'aberrant texts' and their quotations of Moses. <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak/publics/judaism/philo-moses.htm>. Date of access: 17 Aug 2012.
- Kreitzer, L. Joseph. 1987. Jesus and God in Paul's eschatology. Sheffield: JSOT. (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 19).
- Kreuzer, Siegfried. 2006. From "Old Greek" to the recensions: who and what caused the change of the Hebrew reference text of the Septuagint? (In Kraus, Wolfgang & Wooden, R. Glenn., eds. *Septuagint research: issues and challenges in the study of the Greek Jewish scriptures*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. pp. 225-237).
- Kuhn, K. G. 1964. μαρναθά. (In Kittel, Gerhard, et al. eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans. 4:466-472).
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. 1975. Introduction to the New Testament. Revised edition. Translated by Howard Clark Kee. New York: Abingdon.
- Kuykendall, Charles & Collins, C. John. 2003. 1 Peter 3:15A: a critical review of English versions. *Presbyterion*, 29(2):76-84.
- Ladd, George Eldon. 1968. The Christology of Acts. *Foundations*, 11(1):27-41.
- Landon, Charles. 1996. A text-critical study of the Epistle of Jude. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic. (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 135).
- Lange, Armin. 2009. "They confirmed the reading" (y. *Ta'an.* 4.68a): the textual standardization of Jewish scriptures in the Second Temple period. (In Lange, Armin, Weigold, Matthias & Zsengellér, József, eds. *From Qumran to Aleppo: a discussion with Emanuel Tov about the textual history of Jewish scriptures in honor of his 65th birthday*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. pp. 29-80).
- Lauterbach, Jacob Z. 1930. Substitutes for the Tetragrammaton. *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 2: 39-67.
- Lifshitz, B. 1961. The Greek documents from the cave of horror. *Israel Exploration Journal*, 12(3-4): 201-207.

- Lightfoot, J. B. 1895. Notes on Epistles of St Paul from unpublished commentaries. London: Macmillan.
- Lightfoot, J. B. 1981. St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. Revised ed. Lynn, MA: Hendrickson.
- Longenecker, Richard N. 1970. The Christology of early Jewish Christianity. London: SCM. (Studies in Biblical theology, second series 17).
- Longenecker, Richard N. 1975. Biblical exegesis in the apostolic period. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Lowrie, Walter. 1951. "The name which is above every name." *Theology Today*, 8(1): 11-19.
- Lowrie, Walter. 1959. The proper name of God. *Anglican Theological Review*, 41: 245-252.
- Lundquist, L. 1998. The Tetragrammaton and the Christian Greek Scriptures. 2nd Ed. Portland, OR: Word Resources.
- Lust, Johan. 1977. Mic 5,1-3 in Qumran and in the New Testament and messianism in the Septuagint. (In Tuckett, C. M., ed. The Scriptures in the Gospels. Leuven: Leuven University. pp. 65-88).
- Machiela, Daniel A. 2009. The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: a new text and translation with introduction and special treatment of columns 13-17. Leiden: Brill. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 79).
- Madany, Bassam M. 2004. Jesus Christ – our *Kurios Pantokrator*. *Mid-America Journal of Theology*, 15: 201-206.
- Marcos, Natalio Fernández. 2000. The Septuagint in context: introduction to the Greek version of the Bible. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill.
- Marcus, Joel. 1992. The way of the Lord: Christological exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark. Louisville, KY: Westminster.
- Marcus, Ralph. 1943. Josephus with an English translation. Vol. 5. Cambridge, MA: Harvard. (Loeb Classical Library).
- Marmorstein, A. 1927. The old rabbinic doctrine of God. Vol. 1. The names & attributes of God. London: Oxford University.
- Marmorstein, A. 1932. Philo and the names of God. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n.s. 22(3): 295-306.
- Marshall, I. Howard. 2007. Acts. (In Beale, G. K., & Carson, D. A. eds. Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, pp. 607-694).
- Martin, Ralph P. 1977. Approaches to New Testament exegesis. (In Marshall, I. Howard, ed. New Testament Interpretation: essays on principles and methods. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans. pp. 220-251).

- Martin, Ralph P. 1997. A hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in recent interpretation & in the setting of early Christian worship. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity.
- Martin, Ralph P. 1998. 2 Corinthians. Vol 40. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas, TX: Word.
- Martinez, David G. 1991. P. Michigan XVI: A Greek love charm from Egypt (P. Mich. 757). Atlanta: Scholars.
- Martínez, Florentino García. 1996. The Dead Sea Scrolls translated: the Qumran texts in English. 2nd ed. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Marx, Alexander. 1929. The polemical manuscripts in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. (*In Studies in Jewish bibliography and related subjects in memory of Abraham Solomon Freidus [1867-1923]*. New York: Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation. pp. 247-278).
- Mattingly, John F. 1951. Jehovah's Witnesses translate the New Testament. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 13(4): 439-443.
- McCasland, S. Vernon. 1949. Some New Testament metonyms for God. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 68(2): 99-113.
- McDonough, Sean M. 1999. YHWH at Patmos: Rev 1:4 in its Hellenistic and early Jewish setting. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- McGregor, Leslie John. 1985. The Greek text of Ezekiel: an examination of its homogeneity. Atlanta, GA: Scholars. (Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 18).
- McWhirter, Jocelyn. 2012. Messianic exegesis in Mark 1:2-3. (*In Evans, Craig A., & Zacharias, H. Daniel, eds. 'What does the Scripture say?': studies in the function of Scripture in early Judaism and Christianity. Vol 1. The Synoptic Gospels. London: T & T Clark. pp. 158-178*).
- Menken, Martinus J. J. 1985. The quotation from Isa 40,3 in John 1,23. *Biblica* 66(2): 190-205.
- Merton, Thomas. 1964. The name of the Lord. *Worship*, 38(3): 142-151.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1981. Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: an introduction to Greek palaeography. New York: Oxford University.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1994. A textual commentary on the Greek New Testament. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: German Bible Society.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. 1988. 1 Peter. Vol. 49. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word.
- Miller, Robert D. 2001. The Greek biblical fragments from Qumran in text-critical perspective. *Bibbia e Oriente*, 43(4): 235-248.
- Migne, J. P. 1857-1866. Patrologia Graeca.

- Migne, J. P. 1841-1855. *Patrologia Latina*.
- Montgomery, James A. 1921. A survival of the Tetragrammaton in Daniel. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 40(1-2): 86.
- Moo, Douglas J. 1996. The Epistle to the Romans. *New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Moule, C. F. D. 1970. Further reflections on Philippians 2:5-11. (*In* Gasque, W. Ward, & Martin, Ralph P., eds. *Apostolic history and the Gospel: biblical and historical essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th birthday*. Exeter: Paternoster. pp. 264-276).
- Moule, C. F. D. 1972. The manhood of Jesus in the New Testament. (*In* Sykes, S. W., & Clayton, J. P., eds. *Christ, faith and history: Cambridge studies in Christology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University. pp. 95-110).
- Mowery, Robert L. 1995. Lord, God, and Father: theological language in Luke-Acts. *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*, 1995: 82-101.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. 1978. 1 Cor., viii, 6: Cosmology or Soteriology? *Revue Biblique*, 85:253-267.
- Mussies, G. 1971. The morphology of Koine Greek as used in the Apocalypse of St. John: a study in bilingualism. Leiden: E. J. Brill. (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* 27).
- Naganoolil, Thomas. 2006. The lordship of Jesus. *Christian Orient*, 27(1): 3-11.
- Nagata, Takeshi. 1981. Philippians 2:5-11: a case study in the contextual shaping of early Christology. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary. (Dissertation – PhD).
- Neusner, Jacob. 1977. The Tosefta: translated from the Hebrew. Sixth division: Tohorot. New York: Ktav.
- Neusner, Jacob. 1981. A history of the Mishnaic law of appointed times. Part 1: Shabbat translation and explanation. Leiden: E. J. Brill. (Studies in Judaism in late antiquity 34).
- Neusner, Jacob & Sarason, Richard S. eds. 1986. The Tosefta: translated from the Hebrew. First division: Zeraim. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav.
- Neusner, Jacob. 2002. The Tosefta: translated from the Hebrew with a new introduction. Vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Neusner, Jacob. 2011. The Babylonian Talmud: a translation and commentary. 22 Vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Niclós, José-Vicente. 1997. Šem Tob Ibn Šapruṭ: La Piedra de Toque (*Eben Bohan*): una obra de controversia Judeo-Cristiana. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. (Bibliotheca Hispana Biblica 16).

- Norris, F. W. 1989. The Tetragrammaton in Gregory Nazianzen (Or. 30.17). *Vigiliae Christianae*, 43: 339-344.
- Obermann, Julian. 1949. The Divine Name *YHWH* in the light of recent discoveries. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 68(4): 301-323.
- O'Brien, Peter T. 1991. The Epistle to the Philippians: a commentary on the Greek text. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Ochs, Christoph. 2013. *Matthaeus adversus Christianos*: the use of the Gospel of Matthew in Jewish polemics against the divinity of Jesus. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe).
- O'Day, Gail R. 1990. Jeremiah 9:22-23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26-31: a study in intertextuality. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 109(2):259-267.
- O'Neill, J. C. 1955. The use of *KYRIOS* in the Book of Acts. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 8-9: 155-174.
- O'Neill, J. C. 1988. Hoover on *harpagmos* reviewed, with a modest proposal concerning Philippians 2:6. *Harvard Theological Review*, 81(4):445-449.
- Orlov, Andrei A. 2008. Praxis of the voice: the Divine Name traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 127(1): 53-70.
- Osburn, Carroll D. 1981a. The text of 1 Corinthians 10:9. (In Epp, Eldon Jay, & Fee, Gordon D., eds. *New Testament textual criticism: its significance for exegesis: essays in honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. Oxford: Clarendon. pp. 201-212).
- Osburn, Carroll D. 1981b. The text of Jude 5. *Biblica*, 62(1): 107-115.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. 1968. *Jesus – God and man*. Translated by Lewis L. Wilkins & Duane A. Priebe. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Pao, David W., & Schnabel, Eckhard J. 2007. Luke. (In Beale, G. K., & Carson, D. A. eds. *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, pp. 251-414).
- Parke-Taylor, G. H. 1975. *Yahweh: the Divine Name in the Bible*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier.
- Parry, Donald W. 1996. 4QSam^a and the Tetragrammaton. (In Parry, Donald W., & Ricks, Stephen D., eds. *Current research and technological developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: conference on the texts from the Judean desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Leiden: E. J. Brill. pp. 106-125).
- Parry, Donald W. 1997. Notes on Divine Name avoidance in scriptural units of the legal texts of Qumran. (In Bernstein, Moshe J., García Martínez, Florentino, & Kampen, John, eds. *Legal texts and legal*

- issues : proceedings of the second meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995, published in honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten. Leiden: E. J. Brill. pp. 437-449).
- Parsons, Peter J. 1990. The scripts and their date. (*In* Tov, Emanuel. The Greek minor prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr) (The Seiyâl Collection I). Oxford: Clarendon. (Discoveries in the Judaeen desert 8). pp. 19-26).
- Parsons, Peter J. 1992. The palaeography and date of the Greek manuscripts. (*In* Skehan, Patrick W., Ulrich, Eugene, & Sanderson, Judith E. Qumran Cave 4: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek biblical manuscripts. Oxford: Clarendon. [Discoveries in the Judaeen desert 9]. pp. 7-13).
- Paschke, Boris. 2013. Prayer to Jesus in the Canonical and in the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 89(1):49-71.
- Peerbolte, Bert-Jan Lietaert. 2006. The name above all names (Philippians 2:9). (*In* Van Kooten, George H., ed. The revelation of the name YHWH to Moses: perspectives from Judaism, the pagan Graeco-Roman world, and early Christianity. Leiden: Brill. pp. 187-206).
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. 2005. Acts. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos.
- Petersen, William L. 1989. The Gospel of Matthew according to a primitive Hebrew text: a review. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 108(4): 722-726.
- Petersen, William L. 1998a. Some observations on a recent edition of and introduction to Shem-Tob's "Hebrew Matthew." *Textual Criticism*, 3. <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol03/Petersen1998a.html>
Date of access: 16 Feb 2017.
- Petersen, William L. 1998b. The *Vorlage* of Shem-Tob's 'Hebrew Matthew'. *New Testament Studies*, 44: 490-512.
- Peterson, David G. 2009. The Acts of the Apostles. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Philipose, John. 1992. *Kurios* in Luke: a diagnosis. *Bible Translator*, 43(3): 325-333.
- Pietersma, Albert. 1984. Kyrios or Tetragram: a renewed quest for the original LXX. (*In* Pietersma, Albert, & Cox, Claude, eds. De Septuaginta: studies in honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday. Mississauga, ON: Benben. pp. 85-101).
- Pike, Dana M. 1996. The "congregation of YHWH" in the Bible and at Qumran. *Revue de Qumran*, 17(1-4): 233-240.
- Plato. 1914. Phaedrus. Translated by Harold North Fowler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. (Loeb Classical Library).

- Plooij, D. 1929-1970. The Liège Diatessaron, edited with a textual apparatus by D. Plooij and C. A. Phillips. English translation of the Dutch text by A. J. Barnouw. 8 Vols. Amsterdam : Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen.
- Pokorný, Petr. 1985. The genesis of Christology: foundations for a theology of the New Testament. Translated by Marcus Lefébure. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Pritz, R. 1991. The Divine Name in the Hebrew New Testament. *Jerusalem Perspective*, 4(2): 10-12.
- Pryor, John. 1992. Jesus as Lord: a neglected factor in Johannine Christology. (In Peterson, David, & Pryor, John, eds. In the fullness of time: biblical studies in honour of Archbishop Donald Robinson. Homebush West, NSW: Lancer. pp. 57-78).
- Quispel, G. 1975. Tatian and the Gospel of Thomas: studies in the history of the western Diatessaron. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Rahlfs, A. ed. 1979. Psalmi cum Odis. Vol. X. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Rainbow, Paul Andrew. 1987. Monotheism and Christology in 1 Corinthians 8.4-6. Oxford University (Dissertation - D.Phil).
- Rainey, Anson F. 1994. How Yahweh was pronounced. *Biblical Archaeology Review*, 20(5): 17-18.
- Redmond, Calvin D. 2004. Jesus: God's agent of creation. *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 42(2): 287-303.
- Reisel, M. 1957. The mysterious name of Y.H.W.H.: The Tetragrammaton in connection with the names of Ehyeh ašer Ehyeh-Hūhā-and Šem Hamm^ephôraš. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Richardson, Neil. 1994. Paul's language about God. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic. (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 99).
- Roberts, C. H. ed. 1936. Two biblical papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester. Manchester: Manchester University.
- Robertson, A. T. 1923. A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research. 4th ed. New York: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Rodgers, Peter R. 2003. *The first edition of the New Testament: a review. Novum Testamentum*, 45(2): 195-198.
- Rösel, Martin. 2007. The reading and translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic tradition and the Greek Pentateuch. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 31(4): 411-428.
- Roukema, Riemer. 2006. Jesus and the Divine Name in the Gospel of John. (In Van Kooten, George H., ed. The revelation of the name

- YHWH to Moses: perspectives from Judaism, the pagan Graeco-Roman world, and early Christianity. Leiden: Brill. pp. 207-223).
- Rowe, C. Kavin. 2000. Romans 10:13: What is the name of the Lord? *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 22: 135-173.
- Rowe, C. Kavin. 2007. Acts 2.36 and the continuity of Lukan Christology. *New Testament Studies*, 53:37-56.
- Royse, James R. 1991. Philo, KYPIOΣ, and the Tetragrammaton. (In Runia, David T., Hay, David M., & Winston, David, eds. *Studia Philonica Annual: studies in Hellenistic Judaism*. Vol. 3. Atlanta, GA: Scholars. pp. 167-183).
- Runge, Steven E. 2009. The discourse and text-critical implications of variation from the LXX. (In Evans, Craig A., & Zacharias, H. Daniel, eds. *Early Christian literature and intertextuality*. Vol 2. Exegetical studies. London: T & T Clark. pp. 103-113) (Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 15).
- Runia, David T. 1993. Philo in early Christian literature: a survey. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Ryle, Herbert Edward. 1895. Philo and Holy Scripture. New York: Macmillan.
- Sanders, Jack T. 1993. Schismatics, sectarians, dissidents, deviants: the first one hundred years of Jewish-Christian relations. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.
- Scharlemann, Martin H. 1959. Why the *kuriou* in 1 Peter 1:25? *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 30(5):352-356.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 1983. Sectarian law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: courts, testimony and the penal code. Chico, CA: Scholars.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 1985. Who was a Jew? Rabbinic and halakhic perspectives on the Jewish Christian schism. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav.
- Schremer, Adiel. 2013. Wayward Jews: *minim* in early Rabbinic literature. *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 64(2): 242-263.
- Schuller, Eileen M. 2006. Prayers and psalms from the pre-Maccabean period. *Dead Sea Discoveries*, 13(3): 306-318.
- Schürer, Emil. 1987. The history of the Jewish people in the age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135) Vol. 2. A new English version revised and edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, & Matthew Black. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.
- Schutter, William L. 1989. Hermeneutic and composition in 1 Peter. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Reihe 2; 30).
- Seeligmann, I. L. 1961. Indications of editorial alteration and adaptation in the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint. *Vetus Testamentum*, 11(2): 201-221.

- Segal, M. H. 1955. El, Elohim, and Yhwh in the Bible. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n.s. 46(2): 89-115.
- Seifrid, Mark A. 2007. Romans. (In Beale, G. K., & Carson, D. A. eds. *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, pp. 607-694)
- Seow, Choon-Leong. 1991. The ineffable name of Israel's God. *Bible Review*, 7(6): 49-50.
- Shaw, Frank Edward. 2002. The earliest non-mystical Jewish use of Ιαω. University of Cincinnati. (Dissertation – PhD).
- Shaw, Frank. 2005. The emperor Gaius' employment of the Divine Name. *Studia Philonica Annual*, 17: 33-48.
- Shedinger, Robert F. 1997. The textual relationship between ϩ⁴⁵ and Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew. *New Testament Studies*, 43: 58-71.
- Shedinger, Robert F. 1999. A further consideration of the textual nature of Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 61: 686-694.
- Shutt, R. J. H. 1983. Letter of Aristeas: a new translation and introduction. (In Charlesworth, James H. ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol 2. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, pp. 7-34).
- Siegel, Jonathan P. 1971. The employment of palaeo-Hebrew characters for the Divine Names at Qumran in the light of Tannaitic sources. *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 42: 159-172.
- Siegel, J. P. 1972. The Alexandrians in Jerusalem and their Torah scroll with gold Tetragrammata. *Israel Exploration Journal*, 22: 39-43.
- Skehan, Patrick W. 1957. The period of the biblical texts from Khirbet Qumran. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 19: 435-440.
- Skehan, Patrick W. 1977. 4QLXXNum: a pre-Christian reworking of the Septuagint. *Harvard Theological Review*, 70(1-2): 39-50.
- Skehan, Patrick W. 1980. The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada scroll, and in the Septuagint. *Bulletin for the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, 13: 14-44.
- Skehan, Patrick W., Ulrich, Eugene, & Sanderson, Judith E. 1992. Qumran Cave 4: palaeo-Hebrew and Greek biblical manuscripts. Oxford: Clarendon. (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 9).
- Smith, Michael. 1967. Another criterion for the καίγε recension. *Biblica*, 48: 443-445.
- Smith, Ralph L. 1998. Micah–Malachi. Vol. 32. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word.
- Sollamo, Raija. 2003. The significance of Septuagint studies. (In Paul, Shalom M., Kraft, Robert A., Schiffman, Lawrence, & Fields, Weston W. eds. *Emanuel: studies in Hebrew Bible Septuagint and*

- Dead Sea Scrolls in honor of Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill. pp. 497-512).
- Sophocles. 1994. *Electra*. Edited and translated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. London: Harvard University. (Loeb Classical Library).
- Spittler, R. P. 1983. Testament of Job: a new translation and introduction. (In Charlesworth, James H. *ed.* The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: apocalyptic literature and testaments. Vol 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, pp. 829-868).
- Stanley, Christopher D. 1992. Paul and the language of scripture: citation technique in the Pauline epistles and contemporary literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University. (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 69).
- Stein, David E. S. 2007. God's name in a gender-sensitive Jewish translation. *Bible Translator*, 58(3): 105-110.
- Steudel, Annette. 1994. 4Q408: a liturgy on morning and evening prayer preliminary edition. *Revue de Qumran*, 16(3): 313-334.
- Stevick, Daniel B. 1988. A matter of taste: 1 Peter 2:3. *Review for Religious*, 47(5):707-717.
- Strazicich, John. 2007. Joel's use of Scripture and the Scripture's use of Joel: appropriation and resignification in Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity. Leiden: E. J. Brill. (Biblical Interpretation Series 82).
- Strimple, Robert B. 1979. Philippians 2:5-11 in recent studies: some exegetical conclusions. *Westminster Theological Journal*, 41(2):247-268.
- Stuart, Douglas. 1987. Hosea-Jonah. Vol 31. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas, TX: Word.
- Sukenik, E. L. 1937. A further note on an inscribed potsherd. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 69: 140-141.
- Sykes, John M. 1952. The lordship of Jesus. *Review & Expositor*, 49(1): 20-35.
- Synge, F. C. 1951. Philippians and Colossians. London: SCM.
- Tan, Kim Huat. 2008. The Shema and early Christianity. *Tyndale Bulletin*, 59(2): 181-206.
- Taylor, Joan E. 1997. The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. 2000. The First Epistle to the Corinthians: a commentary on the Greek text. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans.
- Tidwell, Neville L. A. 1999. Didache XIV:1 (KATA KYPIAKHN ΔΕ KYPIOY) Revisited. *Vigiliae Christianae*, 53(2): 197-207.

- Torrey, Charles C. 1949. The magic of 'Lotapes.' *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 68(4): 325-327.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1978. The nature of the Hebrew text underlying the LXX: a survey of the problems. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 7: 53-68.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1981. The text-critical use of the Septuagint in biblical research. Jerusalem: Simor.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1982. A modern textual outlook on the Qumran Scrolls. *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 53: 11-27.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1990. The Greek minor prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyâl Collection I). Oxford: Clarendon. (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 8).
- Tov, Emanuel. 1996. The socio-religious background of the paleo-Hebrew biblical texts found at Qumran. (In *Geschichte-tradition-reflexion*. Tübingen: Mohr. pp. 353-374).
- Tov, Emanuel. 2003. The Greek Biblical texts from the Judean desert. (In McKendrick, Scot, & O'Sullivan, Orlaith, eds. *The Bible as book: the transmission of the Greek text*. London: British Library. pp. 97-122).
- Tov, Emanuel. 2004. Scribal practices and approaches reflected in the texts found in the Judean desert. Leiden: Brill. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 54).
- Tov, Emanuel. 2005. The evaluation of the Greek scripture translations in rabbinic sources. (In García Martínez, Florentino, Vervenne, Marc, & Doyle, Brian. eds. *Interpreting translation: studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in honour of Johan Lust*. Leuven: Peeters. pp. 385-399).
- Treier, Daniel J. 1997. The fulfillment of Joel 2:28-32: a multiple-lens approach. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 40(1):13-26.
- Trobisch, David. 2000. The first edition of the New Testament. New York: Oxford University.
- Turner, E. G. 1987. Greek manuscripts of the ancient world. 2nd ed. Parsons, P. J. ed. London: University of London. (Bulletin Supplement 46).
- Ulrich, Eugene. 1984. The Greek manuscripts of the Pentateuch from Qumran, including newly-identified fragments of Deuteronomy (4QLXXDeut). (In Pietersma, Albert, & Cox Claude, eds. *De Septuaginta: studies in honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday*. Mississauga, ON: Benben Publications. pp. 71-82).
- Ulrich, Eugene. 1989. The biblical scrolls from Qumran Cave 4: an overview and a progress report on their publication. *Revue de Qumran*, 14(2): 207-228.

- Urbach, Ephraim E. 1981. Self-isolation or self-affirmation in Judaism in the first three centuries: theory and practice. (In Sanders, E. P., Baumgarten, A. I., & Mendelson, Alan. *eds.* London: SCM. pp. 269-298).
- Van Bekkum, Wout J. 2006. What's in the Divine Name? Exodus 3 in biblical and rabbinic tradition. (In Van Kooten, George H., *ed.* The revelation of the name YHWH to Moses: perspectives from Judaism, the pagan Graeco-Roman world, and early Christianity. Leiden: Brill. pp. 3-15).
- Van der Kooij, Arie. 1992. The Old Greek of Isaiah in relation to the Qumran texts of Isaiah: some general comments. (In Brooke, George J., & Lindars, Barnabas, *eds.* Septuagint, scrolls and cognate writings. Atlanta, GA: Scholars. pp. 195-213).
- Van Kooten, George H. 2006. Moses/Musaeus/Mochos and his God Yahweh, Iao, and Sabaoth, seen from a Graeco-Roman perspective. (In Van Kooten, George H., *ed.* The revelation of the name YHWH to Moses: perspectives from Judaism, the pagan Graeco-Roman world, and early Christianity. Leiden: Brill. pp. 107-138).
- Van Rensburg, Fika J. 2009. The referent of *egeusasthe* (you have tasted) in 1 Peter 2:3. *Acta Theologica*, 29(2):103-119.
- Van Unnik, W. C. 1984. With all those who call on the name of the Lord. (In Weinrich, William C., *ed.* The New Testament age: essays in honor of Bo Reicke. Vol 2. Macon, GA: Mercer University. pp. 533-551).
- Vincent, Marvin R. 1961. A critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon. Vol 35. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. 1962. Old Testament theology. Vol 1. The theology of Israel's historical traditions. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper.
- Waalder, Erik. 2008. The *Shema* and the First Commandment in First Corinthians: an intertextual approach to Paul's re-reading of Deuteronomy. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Wainwright, Arthur W. 1962. The Trinity in the New Testament. London: SPCK.
- Waddell, W. G. 1944. The Tetragrammaton in the LXX. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 45: 158-161.
- Walker, Norman. 1951. The writing of the Divine Name in the Mishna. *Vetus Testamentum*, 1(4): 309-310.
- Walker, Norman. 1953. The writing of the Divine Name in Aquila and the Ben Asher text. *Vetus Testamentum*, 3(1): 103-104.

- Wallace, David Hollister. 1966. Note on *morphē*. *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 22(1):19-25.
- Walsh, J. P. M. 1980. Lordship of Yahweh, lordship of Jesus. (In Clarke, Thomas E. ed. *Above every name: the lordship of Christ and social systems*. Ramsey, NJ: Paulist. pp. 35-65).
- Wanamaker, C. A. 1987. Philippians 2.6-11: Son of God or Adamic Christology? *New Testament Studies*, 33:179-193.
- Watts, Rikki E. 1997. Isaiah's new exodus and Mark. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Watts, Rikki E. 2007. Mark. (In Beale, G. K., & Carson, D. A. eds. *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, pp. 111-249).
- Weil, G. E. 1976. Qere-kethibh. (In *The interpreter's dictionary of the Bible*. Supplementary volume. Nashville, TN: Abingdon. pp. 716-723).
- Weiss, Johannes. 1959. *Earliest Christianity: a history of the period A.D. 30-150*. Vol 2. Translation edited by Frederick C. Grant. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Wevers, John William, ed. 1974. *Genesis*. Vol. I. *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wevers, John William. 1977a. The attitude of the Greek translator of Deuteronomy towards his parent text. (In Donner, Herbert, Hanhart, Robert, & Smend, Rudolf., eds. *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift für Walther Zimmerli zum 70 Geburtstag*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. pp. 498-505).
- Wevers, John William. 1977b. The earliest witness to the LXX Deuteronomy. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 39(2): 240-244.
- Wevers, John William. 1978. *Text history of the Greek Deuteronomy*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wevers, John William, ed. 1991. *Exodus*. Vol. II, 1. *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wevers, John William. 2001. The rendering of the Tetragram in the Psalter and Pentateuch: a comparative study. (In *The Old Greek Psalter: studies in honour of Albert Pietersma*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic. pp. 21-35). (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 332).
- Wilkinson, Robert J. 2015. *Tetragrammaton: western Christians and the Hebrew name of God: from the beginnings to the seventeenth century*. Leiden: Brill. (Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 179).

- Williams, A. Lukyn. 1936. The Tetragrammaton – Jahweh, name or surrogate? *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, n.s. 13: 262-269.
- Williams, H. H. Drake. 2001. The wisdom of the wise: the presence and function of Scripture within 1 Cor. 1:18-3:23. Leiden: Brill. (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 49).
- Williams, Jocelyn A. 2007. A case study in intertextuality: the place of Isaiah in the ‘Stone’ sayings of 1 Peter 2. *Reformed Theological Review*, 66(1):37-55.
- Williamson, G. A. 1966. Eusebius: the history of the Church from Christ to Constantine. New York: New York University.
- Williamson, Ronald. 1989. Jews in the Hellenistic world: Philo. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Winston, David. 1979. The Wisdom of Solomon (Anchor Bible). New York: Doubleday.
- Wintermute, O. S. 1983. Jubilees: a new translation and introduction. (In Charlesworth, James H. ed. Vol. 2. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. pp. 35-142).
- Wold, Benjamin G. 2004. Reconsidering an aspect of the title *Kyrios* in light of sapiential fragment 4Q416 2 iii. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 95(3-4): 149-160.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn. 1947. Philo: foundations of religious philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Wolters, Al. 1995. The Tetragrammaton in the Psalms Scroll. *Textus*, 18: 87-99.
- Wong, Teresia Yai-Chow. 1986. The problem of pre-existence in Philippians 2:6-11. *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 62(4):267-282.
- Wright, N. Thomas. 1991. The climax of the covenant: Christ and the law in Pauline theology. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Wright, N. Thomas. 1998. Jesus and the identity of God. *Ex Auditu*, 14: 42-46.
- Wright, Robert B. ed. 2007. The Psalms of Solomon: a critical edition of the Greek text. London: T&T Clark. (Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and related Studies 1).
- Wuest, Kenneth S. 1962. The deity of Jesus in the Greek texts of John and Paul. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 119(475): 216-226.
- Würthwein, Ernst. 1995. The text of the Old Testament: an introduction to the Biblia Hebraica. 2nd ed. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.

- Yeo, Khiok-Khng. 1995. Rhetorical interaction in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10: a formal analysis with preliminary suggestions for a Chinese, cross-cultural hermeneutic. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Yonge, C. D. 1995. The works of Philo: complete and unabridged. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *ed.* 1980. Sapiientia Salomonis. Vol. XII, 1. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *ed.* 1982. Iob. Vol. XI, 4. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *ed.* 1983. Isaias. Vol. XIV. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *ed.* 1984. Duodecim Prophetarum. Vol. XIII. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *ed.* 1999. Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco. Vol. XVI, 2. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *ed.* 2006. Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae. Vol. XV. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.