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STATEMENT OF INTEGRITY

I, Robert B. Hughes affirm that the work in this thesis was researched, compiled and written in both rough and final forms by myself alone under the guidance of my supervisors.
ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Part I presents the textual and conceptual vectors which form the background to the specific examination of the OT in 1 and 2 Cor. The first aim is to discern the original OT text-forms in order to conclude what was or was not a Pauline alteration. Septuagintal transmission-history in first century Palestine is discussed in the light of recent methodological advances made by Barthélemy, Cross and others. The paper follows, in the main, the established positions of Barthélemy and Tov. The second aim concerns why Paul selected and, in several cases, edited the OT texts. Oral and written tradition in Palestine is examined by interaction with the critical debates centered on the works of Gerhardsson and others. Distinctions between literary form and exegetical method are made in view of possible anachronistic errors when comparing early Christianity with Judaism and Rabbinics. Part I concludes by surveying nine major works specifically concerning Paul's use of the OT. A caveat arises to consider Paul's own usage apart from the imposition of a later critical method.

Part II contains the detailed observation of the textual and hermeneutical evidences. Organized by OT
books, each passage is examined on textual, contextual and hermeneutical levels. A cumulative perspective of Paul's textual bases and hermeneutical methods and conceptualities emerges.

Part III presents the textual and conceptual conclusions. Hermeneutically, Paul shows a consistent tendency to use the OT for more than anti-Judaistic polemic (Lindars) or simple illustration (Ulonska). The basis of his use was an historical understanding of the OT. Paul's conceptuality displays a continuity of deity and piety from the OT to the NT. The conclusions of Harnack, Dodd, Lindars, Braun and others concerning Paul's concepts of continuity are evaluated in this light. The paper concludes with an elaboration of possible indications of a Palestinian Greek OT in 1 and 2 Cor.

Textually, Paul shows positive evidence for a Palestinian Greek OT divergent from the LXX. In the absence of evidence from Qumran, Paul's OT text-forms provide early evidence for the state of the Greek OT in Palestine.
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PART I
TEXTUAL AND CONCEPTUAL VECTORS
INTRODUCTION
THE FOCUS OF THE STUDY

A continual need of the careful exegete, theologian or pastor is to gain a more radical insight into the minds of the writers of the New Testament. This paper seeks to achieve such insight by presenting a clearer understanding of the conceptualities behind the Corinthian correspondence than has been done in previous works. Though the discernment of such conceptuality is always a delicate task, the phenomenon of the quotation of the OT in the Corinthian letters provides a control by which to clarify the procedures of the one who quotes.

A. T. Hanson's words are directly to the point:

... if we are to come to any satisfactory solution of the relation of the Old Testament to the New, we cannot simply ignore or rule out of court the solution to this problem adopted by the New Testament writers themselves. In other words, it will not do simply to bypass the New Testament interpretation of Scripture as something which has no relevance for modern Christians.1

This study will endeavor to understand the Old Testament through the mind of one New Testament writer, the Apostle Paul, as seen in his use of explicit quotations in 1 and 2 Corinthians. It has been noted that the OT was sparingly used in 1 Cor. and therefore appears to have had little use for Paul in that letter.\(^1\) However, a foundational and pervasive OT conceptuality can often be found in passages devoid of any formal OT quotation.

The Old Testament has long been seen to be vital to the New. In fact, one need not look beyond the New Testament to understand this. The NT contains over 1,000 quotations and allusions, not to mention the vast body of allusion of thought.\(^2\) The LXX version of the Old Testament has also long been confirmed as the main source of New Testament quotations with the result that the New Testament would be quite a different book if only the Hebrew had been in the authors' minds.\(^3\) The study of the


use of the Old Testament by the writers of the New Testament\(^1\) will therefore bear rich dividends in many aspects of study in 1 and 2 Corinthians.

OTHER DISCIPLINES RELATIVE TO
THE OT IN 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS

A close study of the texts in question can make a contribution to the study of the state of the Greek Old Testament text in the first century A.D.\(^2\) A comparison

---


\(^2\) See Kenneth John Thomas, "The Use Of The Septua-
of the exegesis of the New Testament writers with the Jewish or Hellenistic use of the Old Testament can display both the uniqueness and the communality in the respective methodologies.\(^1\) Of perhaps most importance are the implications of such study for the historical development of the apostolic Church. As one examines the exegetical methods of the New Testament writers, one begins to uncover their hermeneutical presuppositions.\(^2\) These pre-

---


suppositions, because they are not merely academic sets of interpretational paradigms but vital and organic manifestations of the central life and hope of early Christianity, pierce straight to the heart of the theological foundations of the early Church. Such use of the OT cannot be simply reduced to an apologetic intention (Lindars) due to the wide range of application both to the Greeks in Acts 17, the Greeks of the third Gospel and many Hellenistic-Christians.¹ C. H. Dodd tried to change "the prejudice"² of treating the use of the OT by the NT as if it were no more than an ancient relic which was devoid of any relevance to modern understanding of the Gospel. R. V. G. Tasker has referred to the revived current interest in the subject of the OT in the NT as "a rediscovery of the obvious."³ A recent survey in the form of a bibliographical essay relates the place of

to OT in NT research along hermeneutical lines by the DSS and Testimonia and "more importantly, by recognition that, hermeneutically, the New Testament belongs to the same tradition." Carmignac, "Les Citations de L'Ancien Testament dans 'La Guerre des Filis de Lumière Contre les Fils de Ténèbres,'" Revue Biblique 63 (1956), p. 239, makes a similar observation regarding implicit quotations at Qumran which provide insights into the psychology of the authors. David E. Aume, "Early Christian Biblical Interpretation," Evangelical Quarterly 41 (1969), pp. 89-96, notes the impact of the OT on Christian thought in general.

¹Amsler, ATE, pp. 8-9.


Targum and Midrash to the use of the OT in the NT.¹

COMPARATIVE INFERENCES

Inevitably, this study will be based in part upon comparative inferences, therefore one must beware the pitfalls of "Parallelomania."² Samuel Sandmel urges the student to guard against abstractions apart from specific and detailed study of the context as well as the comparison of excerpts; for example, one needs to be aware that Paul, Philo, Qumran, and the Rabbis should overlap due to their historical and cultural propinquity but that such overlaps may not be of any significance in and of themselves. Finally, one should realize that "Paul's context is of infinitely more significance than the question of the alleged parallels."³

¹Merrill P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash And The Use Of The Old Testament In The New Testament," Journal For The Study Of Judaism 2 (1971), pp. 60-64. See pp. 60-64 for a developed methodology of discerning a midrashic or targumic form in the NT; esp. p. 60, n. 2.


THE CENTRALITY OF THE GREEK OT

It is commonly established that Paul used the Greek OT almost exclusively and it appears improbable that he altered the LXX to conform to the Hebrew. The LXX was used whether it was accurate to the Hebrew or not. In fact, to understand that Paul used the Greek

older NT texts. J. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics In The Synoptic Gospels And Acts (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp., N.V., 1954), p. 63, n. 3, cautions that when using S-B one needs to inquire how the particular exegesis was arrived at and by what exegetical means.

1Save the Job citation(s?); F. H. Woods, "Quotations," A Dictionary Of The Bible IV, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 187. Samuel Sandmel, "Philo's Place In Judaism: A Study Of Conceptions Of Abraham In Jewish Literature," Hebrew Union College Annual 15 (1954), p. 221, shows that Philo was also indifferent to the Hebrew OT. Stendahl, SSM, p. 195, asserts that Matthew's formula quotations show a picking and choosing among various text-types and midrash in order to establish the fulfillment motif while the remainder of his quotations is mainly the Palestinian LXX text. Gundry, MUOT, pp. 152-58; 177, has shown that, to the contrary, Markan explicit quotations stand out clearly in their conformity to the LXX while all the other groups of synoptic quotations show an overwhelmingly mixed text-form, thereby denying Stendahl's assertion of the distinctiveness of Matthew's formula citations and their ensuing separate redactional stage. No such debate centers around Paul's explicit quotations.

2B. F. C. Atkinson, "The Textual Background of the Use of the Old Testament by the New," Journal Of The Transactions of the Victoria Institute LXXIX (1947), p. 41. For example, O. Michel, Paulus Und Seine Bibel (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1929), p. 68, writes regarding the omission of ruah which would have better suited Paul's sense in the quotation of Isa. 40:13 in 1 Cor. 2:16: "Es ist selbst-verstandlich, dass er imstande war, den hebraischen Urtext seiner Bibel zur lesen, aber er lebt und arbeitet nur mit seiner griechischen Bibel."
Bible is a key to the fuller understanding of his thought. However, at this stage of LXX study no unified textual tradition can be assumed as a starting basis. This is made obvious by the variations of the LXX from the MT.

There can also be no assumption of a unified interpretive tradition. The problem of relating Judaism to Christian writings in the Pharisaic period will be discussed below. But there is a way toward a more accurate relation of Judaism to the NT:

What will concern the student of NT is not so much formal rabbinic hermeneutic principles as the variety of techniques used in biblical interpretation which cannot really be classified as to formal principles or which existed, at least in an incipient form, long before the descriptive technical terminology.

The methodology, therefore, of relating any continuity of tradition from Jesus through the pre-Pauline Jewish and Hellenistic churches to Paul must be based on a detailed study of particular passages in order to test the general theses of Dodd, Harris or Lindars. Miller asserts that "this is not the time for further comprehensive treatments of the use of the OT in the NT." Therefore, while the format of this thesis will share in characteristics as aged as Drusius, as do nearly all those that followed

---

1Michel, P&SB, p. 57.  
2Smith, UOTN, p. 8.  
3Pages 12ff.  
4Miller, JSJ, p. 49.  
5Miller, JSJ, p. 76.  
6Johannis Drusius, ΤΑ ΙΕΡΑ ΠΑΡΑΛΛΗΛΑ
him, it will present the data in textual and contextual specifics as well as in relation to the influences of early Jewish and Christian exegetical traditions.

AIMS OF THE STUDY

This study of the Corinthian quotations has two aims which relate to the intersection of the textual and conceptual vectors. The first is to examine more closely the textual background of the quotations. As Hanson writes, "to ask whether any given author 'followed the LXX' or not is an oversimplification."¹ The manifold evidence of Greek and Hebrew OT MSS at Qumran and the present state of Septuagintal studies justifies separate study of the text of the Corinthian quotations. The two-fold use of gathering together quotations by a certain author as outlined by E. Hatch still remains valid and is adopted in this paper:

... (a) it enables us to ascertain approximately the text which was in use in his time; (b) it enables

¹Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology (London: SPCK, 1974), p. 197. See the section on textual history of LXX. While Ellis' work, PUOT, is still indispensable, at the time he wrote that the textual investigation of the quotations was "well covered," p. 1. As a result he placed great emphasis on theological reasons for changes in the Greek OT text-forms in the quotations. Marbury, OTTT, p. 160, believes that this is premature to a full textual examination. The point is that the textual and interpretational elements must inform one another in drawing conclusions about either subject.

(Franekerae: Excudebat Aegiduis Radaeus, 1588).
us, upon a general estimate of the mode in which he quotes Scripture, to appropriate the value of the contributions which his quotations make to textual criticism.¹

The second aim of the paper is to understand why Paul selected and, in many cases, edited a particular Old Testament passage. The words of John Hurd in his stimulating work on 1 Corinthians are appropriate:

The fullest possible understanding of Paul's letters must rest in the fullest possible understanding of the factors which caused Paul to write.²

This understanding will be developed by a comparative examination of the contexts from both Testaments and first century thought in order to expose the framework of Paul's hermeneutic.

The writer's rationale for determining which quotations are to be examined is that of H. B. Swete:

(1) those which are cited with an introductory formula . . . (2) those which, though not announced by a formula, appear from the context to be intended as quotations, or agree verbatim with some context in the O.T.³

The thesis adds to Swete's list of quotations for 1 and 2 Cor., however.

The format will be the same for each quotation. A Textual Display will present the texts from the MT,


LXX and New Testament. Appropriate New Testament parallel quotations will also be displayed. The subsequent three sections will list and discuss, where needed, the variants for the MT, LXX and New Testament passages. The fifth section, headed Textual, will explore the affinities and dissimilarities of the New Testament quotation and its source with a view to identifying the text-type used by Paul. The Contextual section will describe the contexts of the Old and New Testament passages in preparation for the final Hermeneutical presentation which will investigate the possible practical or theological factors which influenced Paul in his use of the Old Testament with resultant considerations such as his fidelity to the source's context and editorial methodology. Two questions form the perimeters of this study. What is the precise relationship between the words, grammar and syntax of the OT text and its NT quotation form? Does the text type of the OT, as represented in 1 and 2 Corinthians, seem to have been chosen or constructed with particular and premeditated appropriateness for the Corinthian situation? If so, what methodological considerations affected the choice or construction?
Memory And Tradition

The transmissional mode of the earliest Christian tradition has important implications for the various quotation forms in which that tradition now appears in 1 and 2 Cor. While mode of transmission has more direct and appreciable bearing on Gospel research it needs to be applied also to the portions of Paul's writing where a formative history seems to underlie his use of the OT.

Birger Gerhardsson. A nucleus around which much of the current debate has evolved is a work by Birger Gerhardsson.\(^1\) Harald Riesenfeld, Gerhardsson's mentor, has since published a reply to the criticism of his position. The reply, Tradition And Transmission In Early Christianity, trans. Eric J. Sharpe (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964), is centered on answering three questions: How much did first century A.D. Pharisaism apply Rabbinic principles? How widespread were these principles in the first century A.D. in all groups outside of Pharisaism? To what extent did Jesus and the Church follow these principles or create new forms? T&T has been reviewed by the following, among others: R. S. Barbour, Scottish Journal of Theology 19 (1966), pp. 114-15; Lou H. Silberman, Journal of Biblical Literature 84 (1965), pp. 459-60; and C. K. Barrett, Journal of Theological

\(^1\)Birger Gerhardsson, Memory And Manuscript, trans. Eric J. Sharpe (Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), has
first announced this thesis at the Oxford conference on the Gospels in 1957. Gerhardsson's *Memory And Manuscript*, published in 1961, more fully developed Riesenfeld's thesis by proposing that the memory techniques apparent in Rabbinical literature were current in the early first century and that Paul himself had probably mastered them. Midrashic exegesis existed centuries before the Tannaitic period. Gerhardsson notes that the Rabbis memorized all of the Torah and that Jewish boys were early trained in the law and then the traditions. While not giving a starting period for mishnaic work he notes that while mishnaic and midrashic forms stood side by side in the early centuries A.D., the mishnaic became predominant later. The process by which the MT was preserved on the one hand and fluid interpretation flourished on the other is explained:


3Gerhardsson, MM, pp. 35-36.


5Gerhardsson, MM, p. 89f.

These two tendencies are also psychologically associated: the perception of the text as sacred leads partly to a desire to preserve the text without corruption, and partly to a desire to appropriate all its incomparable riches. Furthermore, certainty that the sacred words of the text have in fact been preserved without distortion adds to the frankness with which the very letter of the text is drawn upon for teaching purposes.

It seems to be just this fact of fluidity that makes many of Gerhardsson's conclusions open to question. While interpretation was fluid were the methods of exegesis firm? Or, with the formation of the final redactions of the Rabbis, were other forms and methods excluded?

To present Gerhardsson's thesis at its simplest, the early Christian tradition was transmitted both orally and systematically in accord with strict principles of memorization. The obvious implication of this is that a reliable pattern can be traced back from the tradition in its present to its earliest forms. To state this thesis at its extreme, the present form is the earliest form with only the minimum of editorial alteration.

In his discussion of the schools of oral torah Gerhardsson writes that "we do not know how schools of the bet hammidrash type were organized during the century before Jabneh." He follows this statement with a discussion of the schools in Tannaitic and Amoraic times.

---

1 Gerhardsson, MM, pp. 40-41.
2 Gerhardsson, MM, p. 90.
The rule regarding oral law, a cornerstone in Gerhardsson's argument, is not found explicitly until b. Git. 60b (b. Tem. 14b) but "the practice seems however to be established before the beginning of the Christian era."\(^1\) Also the rabbinic distinction between the two torahs is precisely drawn at the point at which Gerhardsson has the most interest; "... that of how the material is transmitted and studied, and how it is used in official contexts."\(^2\)

**Criticisms.** With reference to these problems in Gerhardsson's thesis Morton Smith writes that "to read back into the period before 70 the developed rabbinic technique of \(\pm 200\) is a gross anachronism."\(^3\) Concentrating on the Gospels Smith notes: 1) there is no system apparent in the Gospel parallels equal to rabbinic principles; 2) the Gospels are narrative while rabbinics are expository; 3) the Gospels offer fantastic tales of Christ while rabbinics do not go to the same extremes regarding the Rabbis; 4) the Gospel arrangement is neither mishnaic nor midrashic; 5) the NT as a whole shows no traces of mnemonic and teaching methods of rabbinical literature.\(^4\) While several of these points

---

\(^1\)Gerhardsson, MM, p. 159. \(^2\)Gerhardsson, MM, p. 27.


\(^4\)Smith, JBL:173-74. Smith's fifth point may be overemphatic in its exclusiveness.
could be contested they point up the essential non-rabbinic character of the Gospels.

Martin McNamara adds another problem to the attempt to place rabbinical methods in the first century:

Another difficulty with rabbinic material is that it is linked with the Jewish schools; it need not necessarily have been known to the masses of the Jewish people, or if it was, this was probably from sources other than the scholastic discussions in which we now find it.  

This complex problem has been given a major advance by the work of Neusner in his three volume work on pre-A.D. 70 traditions. He argues that the memorized oral modes of transmission of rabbinics are anachronistic and did not begin until after the A.D. 70 cataclysm. Comparison may therefore profitably be made between the textual and literary affinities of Paul and the Rabbis but their specific historical relationship must be based on demonstrable critical study.

One apparent fact is that all evidence which supports the oral transmission is based on literary data. Gerhardsson is also aware of this fact though he


3 Neusner, RT, III, p. 174ff.

4 Neusner, Early Rabbinic Judaism (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), p. 76, writes, "That these data indicate a
writes that "too much scepticism in face of this information is unwarranted." However, one must construct one's thesis on the available evidence whether or not it is sceptical. With reference to, and in agreement with, Morton Smith's statement of "gross anachronism," Neusner asserts that adequate evidence does not exist to clearly illuminate the transmissional methods of pre-70 Judaism or Christianity. In view of the fact that there were scribes (writers) in Jesus' time and that the pre-70 Qumran materials were written the necessity of pre-70 oral composition becomes highly questionable.

Background of oral transmission is a conclusion reached by many, but it is not a fact implied by the tradition. Bernard J. Bamberger, "The Dating of Aggadic Materials," Journal of Biblical Literature 68 (1949), p. 115, criticizes Wolfson in his work on Philo for a similar tendency to selectively use late sources.

1Gerhardsson, MM, p. 86.


3Neusner, ERJ, p. 78. See his The Rabbinic Traditions About The Pharisees Before 70, Vol. 1, pp. 6-9, for a caution regarding methods of uncritically using Rabbinic materials apart from their sources. In a critical response to an article by J. M. Baumgarten, "The Unwritten Law In The Pre-Rabbinic Period," Journal For The Study Of Judaism 3 (1972), pp. 7-29, Jacob Neusner, "The Written Tradition In The Pre-Rabbinic Period," Journal For The Study Of Judaism 4 (1973), pp. 57ff, suggests that there were written sources of pre-70 A.D. date. This is based in part on the fact that there is no adequate evidence for pre-70 A.D. methodology and on the lack of mnemonics in the sources.

4See Neusner, ERJ, p. 80. Lou H. Silberman,
Regarding Gerhardsson's theoretical prohibition of the writing down of tradition, Strack finds that on the basis of his data "there is nothing to point to an interdict on the writing down of Halakoth, and still less on the writing of haggadic matter, formally promulgated and universally recognized." It was not writing in and of itself that was banned but rather writing that was intended for public use. Also Aquila probably fully developed the memory forms because it is in his time that the Tanna or reciters are first referred to.

The assumed continuity between Yavnean and earlier "pedagogical" methods has no hard evidence to support it. This is evident from the fact that the Pharisaic tradition almost completely ignores the entire


2Strack, ITM, p. 17. Gerhardsson, MM, p. 29, allows for written notes in Oral Torah but only for private scholastic use. On pp. 160-61 of MM, reminder books are discussed. Their usage seems to be more prevalent in Palestine than in Babylon so Gerhardsson concludes that the "opposition to the act of writing seems to have been weaker in the Palestinian colleges than in the Babylonian," p. 161.

3Neusner, ERJ, p. 86.
gamut of types and forms of the shaping of biblical literature. Neusner concludes regarding this fact:

That again points to the opposite conclusion, namely, that the Pharisees of the rabbinic tradition were innovators who paid no attention to the forms of biblical literature.¹

The apparent literary forms and the easily memorized and balanced sections of early Rabbinic Judaism point toward a late first century date. Another fact supportive to written transmission is that popular sermons during the Amoraic period have survived even though they sometimes contradict the teachings of the patriarchs and schools. How were these sermons preserved? Silberman wonders if a technique different than that operative in the school's was used.² He suggests that much more groundwork needs to be laid before debate can continue regarding the methods of transmission in the first century A.D.

Memory And Quotation

More to the point of this study is the implication of Gerhardsson's thesis for Pauline methodology. Did Paul, like the Rabbis of a later day, have the Torah memorized or were his methods less dependent on a phenomenal memory than on written sources? Of course much of this must remain a moot point because one simply does not

¹Neusner, ERJ, p. 83.
²Silberman, JBL, 84:460.
have the data available to settle the matter conclusively but the current opposition to Gerhardsson's thesis makes the use of an encyclopedic memory less tenable concerning Paul's OT usage.

If Paul's full training in the rigors of the Pharisees\(^1\) was based on a meticulous memory this would certainly affect one's conclusions regarding the verbal or syntactical nature of his quotations. If not, then the suggestion of "memory lapse" becomes more probable and the entire question of the nature of textual reflections in his quotations is affected.

A memory slip may often be posited simply as a "facile solution" or "gross oversimplification" of the problems involved.\(^2\) However, one should not exclude the possibility completely.\(^3\) Facility in memory would be a necessity due to the bulk of the Scripture MSS and the expense of having them always at hand. The conclusion that a quotation has taken on its present form by way of a memory slip can be denied if one can show that the change is an intentional interpretational adaptation.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\)Gal. 1:14; Phil. 3:5-6.


Jindřich Mánek,¹ building on the thesis that two or more witnesses were needed to establish a NT point of doctrine (Dt. 19:15), writes that if composite quotations were included by memory and mistakenly ascribed to only one author they would then lose their purpose as a double-witness.

Summary

Thus it would seem appropriate that there is no a priori reason for deciding against the use of written notes in the early Christian communities.² Key concepts could become formalized and written at a very early stage to be passed on in both oral and written forms as the occasion allowed. The form of the OT quotation in such a tradition would depend on factors quite removed from the situation of Paul when he incorporated it into his letters. Both hermeneutical and textual factors could have influenced a text as will be seen in the following

---


²Gundry, MUOT, p. 182, has asserted that Matthew was a note-taker and that shorthand was used in Jesus' time. See also Edgar J. Goodspeed, Matthew Apostle And Evangelist (Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company, 1959), p. 111, where he asks, "The secretaries of the prophets! Had Jesus one?," and answers in the affirmative, identifying Matthew. See esp. p. 75 for the reference to shorthand in the Oxyrhynchus papyri.
section on Conceptual Vectors.

LXX TRANSMISSION-HISTORY
IN FIRST CENTURY PALESTINE

Recent Methodology

Translations, Targums and Recensions. With the rise of interest in targumic influences on the NT came the need to use proper methodology in ascribing a text-form of an OT quote to such influence. Paul Kahle's theory of Greek Targums makes this even more necessary.\(^1\) Sidney Jellicoe provisionally rejects this theory due to its reliance on a late date for Aristeas and an unknown "Biblical commission" which formed a revised official text.\(^2\) Stendahl rejects the theory of an abundance of Greek targums due to lack of textual evidence of pre-A.D. 100 targums and the lack of LXX variants in the synoptic Tradition.\(^3\) Smith notes that Qumran evidences of Greek fragments suggest a standardized text-form in the pre-Christian period. He also sees no evidence for a process of standardization and refers to the prologue to Wisdom


\(^3\)Krister Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew (Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1954), p. 180. He prefers to see the NT reading as a possible witness to a Palestinian LXX.
of Sirach in the second century B.C. which speaks of a three-fold canon in a way more than of a loose and unofficial collection of Greek OT targums.¹ He, like Stendahl, allows the possibility that other translations existed:

Accordingly variations in New Testament quotations from the principal Septuagint manuscripts may in any instance simply indicate reliance upon a variant Greek translation.²

This concept of co-existent translations or recensions seems to fit the evidence at hand. The discernment of the characteristics and extent of these translations and recensions forms the growing edge of current research.

Dead Sea Contributions. A frequent misconception concerning LXX text-forms has been that of an underlying standard MT Vorlage.³ The discoveries near the Dead Sea, 4Q especially, reveal that several Hebrew and Greek textile traditions were present in first-century Palestine. The 4Q MSS show a spread of three hundred years⁴ but do not display one standard and pervasive text-

¹Smith, UOTN, p. 10. ²Smith, UOTN, p. 11.
³Marbury, OTTT, p. 164. Daniel J. Harrington, "The Biblical Text Of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 33, p. 1, notes that the assumption of one Hebrew text was behind earlier work on LAB and that the DSS now make a reconsideration of the evidence necessary. This conception is present in Stendahl's The School Of St. Matthew, passim.
type to which Qumran was committed or which was propagated in the scriptorium. ¹ Though the work of Thackeray, Barthélemy, Cross and others is, at times contradictory, one must now cope with the agreed possibility of a Greek version based on a Hebrew text which differs from the MT. ² D. W. Gooding has shown that, though the heavy midrashic elements in 3 Reigns 2 imply that the revisers knew the difference between the Bible and their commentary, the apparent revision to a Hebrew basis shows where the authority lay for those early Jews. ³ Thus, the reason for the non-MT readings implied in the Greek versions may⁴ relate to a change in the Hebrew text. In other words, a Greek version may witness


⁴Another option could be that one is faced with a different translation of the same Hebrew word. See the cautions regarding retroversion by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory And Practice Of Textual Criticism: The Text-Critical Use Of The Septuagint," Textus III (1963), pp. 130-158.
to a non-MT Hebrew Vorlage.

Description Of The Methodology

Theodotion. The affinities of some of the NT quotations with a Theodotionic text type are well known. Barthélemy places the activity of Theodotion in Palestine and suggests that there may have been several editions, possibly produced by means of a school or by his predecessors. It appears, however, that this text, rather than being the first and final translation, has a history of its own. Frederic Kenyon notes that Theodotion was possibly based on an earlier version because the NT and early Fathers often agree with it.2

1Dominique Barthélemy, Les Devanciers D'Aquila (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), pp. 157; 246. See p. 149 for the three Talmudic traditions supporting the thesis that Theodotion was Jonathan ben 'Uzziel; also Kahle, CG2, p. 196, for the opposing view. Alexander Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic IVB (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), p. 3, calls the discussion of who Onkelos and Jonathan were and where they lived a "hopeless question." With reference to the date of Theodotion, Barthélemy places him c. 30-50 A.D. but the 4Q LXX Num. fragments are dated around the turn of the era and show Theodotion-type revisions; Patrick W. Skehan, "The Biblical Scrolls From Qumran And The Text Of The Old Testament," Biblical Archaeologist 28 (1965), p. 94.

2Frederic G. Kenyon, Recent Developments In The Textual Criticism Of The Greek Bible (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 103.

speaks of pre-Theodotion as a body of received pre-Christian tradition which was not necessarily written. This ur-Theodotion was used in the LXX to bridge the lacunae and correct false readings in Daniel. Montgomery links this tradition with the second century Theodotion and calls him the "hellenistic Onkelos, whose work was facilitated by the presence of a large amount of customary oral translation of the Scriptures, possessed by him memoriter."¹

Though Matthew, in his formula citations, is not directly dependent on the LXX nor on Theodotion "he often follows an exegetical or translational tradition alien sometimes to the one and sometimes to the other."² Sherman Johnson identifies the Theodotionic tradition with Montgomery's Hellenistic oral targum. Sidney Jellicoe places ur-Theodotion early in the first century A.D.³ He reconstructs the growth of ur-Theodotion in the following manner. It was the work of Greek Jews of Western Asia Minor who used their own translation to fill up the gaps in the LXX books. When Anthony gave Cleopatra the Pergamene library, the bible of ur-Theodotion probably went with the 200,000 MSS to

¹Montgomery, Dan., p. 50.
Alexandria. There this text was used by the Jews to complete Reigns. But recently the work on the early strata of the Greek OT has become more specifically related to Reigns and to the minor prophets.

The Book of Reigns. Henry St. John Thackeray initially found that two translators were present in 1-4 Reigns. Barthélemy concluded that one was indeed a translator but that the other was a revisor of the first according to a proto-MT basis. The revision level, now commonly known as ἦλιος or proto-Theodotion, is provisionally found in Lam.LXX and possibly Ruth, 2 Sam. 10:1-24:5 (By), 1 Kgs. 22 and all of 2 Kgs. in the "LXX" column of Origen (γ6) and others. Barthélemy writes:

L'existence de cette première recension juive nous oblige donc à envisager l'œuvre d'Aquila sous un jour un peu différent: il s'agit d'une sur-


3Barthélemy, DA, pp. 33-47; 91-143.

4However, see T. Muraoka, "The Greek Texts Of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations Or Recensional Activity?," IOSCS Proceedings, ed. Robert A. Kraft (1972), pp. 90-107, for a recent support of Thackeray's original position that β6 is indeed a second translator.

recension et non d'une traduction originale.¹

F. M. Cross asserts that LXX Daniel also belongs to this recension. This brings a qualified victory to the school of Lagarde regarding LXX origins.²

The Local Text Theory. F. M. Cross has expounded a local text theory which assigns a Hebrew Vorlage and its corresponding Greek translation to each of three locations: Egypt, Palestine, Babylon.³ According to Cross, somewhere in the second or first century B.C. the Egyptian OG was conformed to the Palestinian Hebrew text


(forming proto-Lucian). The resultant text is asserted to contain the proto-Lucianic readings found especially in boc₂e₂, Josephus and the sixth column of Origen's hexapla. This text was in turn revised at the turn of the era according to a proto-MT text probably brought from Babylon (forming proto-Theodotion). The third stage was in the second century A.D. when Symmachus and Aquila revised ψαλιε into conformity with the official Rabbinic text of Samuel.

Barthélemy and others, however, argue that Cross should give up the idea of the Egyptian Hebrew text due to a lack of solid support for it and should begin with the Palestinian Hebrew text evidenced at Qumran. This text would then form the Vorlage of the Old Greek (OG)

---

1 According to Cross this Palestinian Hebrew text is best seen in 4Q Sam. Stendahl, SSM, p. 180 notes that AQf manifest the Palestinian Greek recension which excludes any "wild abundance of Greek Targums." Cross, HTR 57:292, notes that the Proto-Lucian revision of the LXX of Samuel was still used by Josephus in his Antiquities c. A.D. 93-94. This Proto-Lucianic recension is seen in LAB as well. Harrington, CBQ 33:6-17, reaches the same conclusions as Cross regarding the Palestinian Hebrew Vorlage and its presence in Josephus. He dates LAB at A.D. 100 at the latest due to the ascendancy of the MT after that date. LAB's lack of reference to the fall of the temple may also indicate a pre-A.D. 70 date.


which immediately began to undergo a proto-Lucianic type of revision. This is the position adopted in this paper. However, the present state of research does not allow final confirmation of the Greek OT basis of the proto-Theodotionic revision:

Symmetry would suggest that the kaige recension was made from the proto-Lucian recension rather than directly from the Old Greek, but we have no basis upon which to establish its precise textual base, again owing to methodological restrictions.\(^1\)

Therefore, according to Cross, proto-Lucianic readings would theoretically show that aspect of the Greek OT which cannot be placed with the OG of Egypt (or Palestine: Barthélemy) in the third century B.C. but yet is different from the וַיָּכֵן text. Barthélemy does not believe that there is a proto-Lucianic text but says that it is simply the OG.\(^2\) Cross identified the nature of the Lucianic text of Samuel in Greek and found that it showed

---

\(^{1}\) Cross, IOSCS:117.

\(^{2}\) He also denies the effects of an historical Lucian in the "Lucianic" recension, IOSCS:71ff. See Barthélemy, DA, p. 127. Sebastian P. Brock, "Lucian Redivivus. Some Reflections On Barthélemy's Les Devanciers D'Aquila," Studia Evangelica V (1969), p. 180, writes that the recensional activity which overarches א and בֵי is not seen in full form in the pre-Lucian Antiochene fathers whereas post-Lucian writers show Lucianic readings. Therefore "Lucianic" should be kept as a name for such readings. Brock notes two currents, p. 181, in בֵי; one which came closer to the Hebrew and another which made for better Greek. He has also shown this to be the case by examples from א (1 Sam.) where both א and בֵי are partly influenced by the same Atticising tendency. See Brock, T&U, p. 177, where he maintains that בֵי (2 Sam. 11:2-1 Kings 2:11) has undergone considerable hexaplaric influence.
signs of reworking a still older text in order to conform it to a Palestinian Hebrew text of Samuel. One needs, therefore, to be aware of and distinguish between the two identities given \( boc_2 e_2 \) by Cross (a revised OG; proto-Lucianic) and Barthélemy (the OG).

**Deliniation Of Old Greek Strata**

It is just such a deliniation that is at the growing edge of current research. In this study the following methodological considerations will be applied. OG or Ant(iochian) readings (or, for Cross, Proto-Lucian) can, at this time, only be conclusively discerned in the former prophets. The basic cursory formula used by Cross is that Lucian readings will not equal B,MT. Where Lucian = MT but \( \neq B \) the reading may then be hexaplaric.

---

1Cross, HTR 57, passim; also Marbury, OTTT, pp. 10-11. However, the 4Q MSS have yet to be published in full.


3Cross, IOSCS:116. Sebastian Brock, personal let-
However, conformity to the MT also arises in the *赛γε* and hexaplaric revisions which further complicates the process.

For the establishment of OG readings one needs to single out boc²e² or a section of text showing a relationship to Chry, Thdt, the margin of z or the Syriac of Jacob. If such MSS are merely part of a fairly large group of MSS which usually follow B they cannot claim to represent the Ant. tradition. The MSS of B-M (except boc²e²) can more or less represent the KR with B y a being the better witnesses.¹

Cross theorizes that boc²e² has two layers:
1) a proto-Lucian revision to the Palestinian Hebrew, and 2) the revisions of the historical Lucian. Emanuel Tov has recently questioned the revisional character of proto-Lucian and concludes that it is rather an OG text or the OG and not a revision.² Tov is impressed by the vast geographical spread and the long chronological extent of proto-Lucian in the MSS.³ He asks⁴ if all these MSS could have been retouched by Lucianic revisors and concludes

---

¹Barthélemy, IOSCS:45.
³Tov, RB 79:103-04. ⁴Tov, RB 79:105.
they were not. If the proto-Lucianic revision generally left the OG unrevised, as Cross asserts, would it not be better to say with Tov that the sub-stratum of $boc_2e_2 = OG$? With reference to Origen's 6th column (in βγ) Cross says it is proto-Lucianic, Barthélemy says it is OG and Tov reasons that it is more likely that Origen put the OG there rather than an obscure proto-Lucianic revision.1 Tov suggests that one use the Old Latin to find early strata of $boc_2e_2$ and that quantitative revisions of Lucian to the MT may be either Lucian himself or the "Three."2 Therefore, if $boc_2e_2$ is in fact OG it may not be the Vorlage of χαίγε. One may need to posit OG1 and OG2.3 Tov4 found that in the KR sections of Reigns in the non-Lucianic MSS the OG = $boc_2e_2$ whereas in non KR sections all non-Lucianic MSS = OG. Where $boc_2e_2 ≠$ other LXX MSS in non-χαίγε sections, Tov concludes that the other LXX MSS have been retouched and $boc_2e_2 = OG$ or that two OG texts are reflected.5

1Tov, RB 79:105. 2Tov, RB 79:107.
3Tov, RB 79:109, n. 72. Brock, personal letter, April 6, 1977, says there are probably more than Tov allows for.
4Tov, RB 79:107.
5Tov, RB 79:109. When comparing the Greek and Masoretic texts, material found in Q may be a control which enables one to discern the presence of a possible underlying Hebrew text rather than the result of a theological motivated edition by Paul. This is because Q is relatively free from hexaplaric revisions, and therefore, of purer OG representation. With regard to the Pentateuch, with the exception of Genesis, the books appear to
Deliniation Of Kataye

The KR has been described by Barthélemy\(^1\) and Shenkel.\(^2\) Shenkel argues that KR begins in 2 Sam. 10:1 rather than 11:2 à la Thackeray and Barthélemy.

Barthélemy writes that AMNcgjx\(_2\)b\(_2\) are usually Palestinian (KR) and never contain typical Antiochian readings (MSS boc\(_2\)e\(_2\) in βγ and γδ) in 2 Sam. 12:1-10.\(^3\) He also notes the tendency of Pal. to render -7 by the dative.\(^4\) In α-βγ βα\(_2\) are the best Pal. witnesses.\(^5\)

have circulated in varying recensional backgrounds. Patrick W. Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts And Textual Criticism," Vetus Testamentum Congress Volume (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), p. 149, shows 4Q Num.\(^a\) to be a mixed text while 4Q Ex.\(^a\) is of LXX type. He also writes, "Greek Versions Of The Old Testament," The Jerome Biblical Commentary II (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968), p. 569, that the differences between LXXPent and the Hebrew are "comparatively limited" when contrasted with the LXX for other books. The MSS for Gen. show a high degree of uniformity while Ex-Dt show greater variations, esp. Ex. 35-40. Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1958), pp. 143-44, also notes the scarce data for the Pentateuchal recensions. In an earlier paper, D. W. Gooding, RLXXPent:6ff, pointed out the difficulties of isolating the pentateuchal recensions. He noted the scarcity of Lucianic readings in Gen. 14. Gooding also notes the relative purity of A from Hexaplaric asterisk readings, pp. 11-12.

\(^1\)Barthélemy, DA, pp. 47-80.

\(^2\)Shenkel, CRDK, pp. 113-16. With reference to 1 Cor. 1:19, it may be noted that σωφ- is a KR characteristic rendering of ὄνα, p. 114.

\(^3\)Barthélemy, IOSCS, p. 35.

\(^4\)Barthélemy, IOSCS, p. 35.

\(^5\)Barthélemy, IOSCS, p. 41.
The use of a first century control is of utmost importance and the finds near the Dead Sea [4Q (yet to be fully published) and Nahal Hever] have been of great assistance in this area. However, one of the frustrations of the quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. is that, at present, virtually none of the OT passages are represented among the published fragments.\(^1\) In the absence of a certain first century control, two aspects will be evaluated in the examination of Paul's OT text-forms. First, what part has Paul's hermeneutic played in shaping the text-form? Once determined, the original form may be ascertained by textual retroversion. Second, given later LXX Greek MS evidence for the Pauline reading, does such evidence indicate a harmonization to the text of Paul?

One serious problem with attempting to align the quotations of 1 and 2 Cor. with a particular text type is that nearly all the quotations are taken from OT books where the recensional and revisional strata are not yet clearly drawn. Hence one must beware the subjective element which may enter as well as the danger of drawing generalities from one limited set of texts and applying

\(^1\)It is noteworthy that Marbury, OTTT, does not include a single quotation from 1 or 2 Cor. although half of his thesis is given over to such OT quotations which have no representatives at Qumran or in a' a'. In his selective study, Marbury found no single Palestinian Greek OT tradition but did find some Palestinian readings as well as a fluid Hebrew tradition underlying the quotations. The latter was discerned by the process of retroversion, p. 146. W. Stark, ZWT 35, 36 confined his study to the four gospels.
them to another set of specific passages. The areas of the Greek OT which are presently most open to such clear definition are those for which one has DSS MSS evidence, especially in Greek. Those will yield early readings from which one can attempt to establish a sequential framework of textual development.

Given the basic structure of a Palestinian Greek OG which was progressively conformed to a MT Vorlage (the bare minimum of scholarly consensus today) we will see if Paul's quotations shed light on the nuances of the various current theories. Barthélemy found that Justin's citations witnessed to a LXX text current from 70-135 A.D. It was this discovery that began to unlock several LXX problems. Paul's OT quotations can also be important witnesses to an early period of LXX transmission.

Christian Interpolation

One problem which arises concerning the Greek OT MSS is that they may have been harmonized to a NT quotation form. R. H. Charles, in his study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, found several examples of Christian interpolations. The last judgment was inter-


2Barthélemy, RB 60:19-21.

3Netzger, NTS 8:199, cautions that "we can never be sure on which side the borrowing may lie."
interpreted as the crucifixion; God's dwelling with men became His sending of the Son; the story of Benjamin became a prophecy of Christ from the hand of one editor and a prophecy of Saint Paul from another.\(^1\) Christian interpolation is also found in the LXX and is a caveat for the textual critic.\(^2\) Lindars\(^3\) sees the validity of using textual modifications as indicators of editorial activity even though there may still be questions concerning the texts used. This has particular bearing on the discussion of the use of the OT in the NT. For a writer to change even one word of the LXX is significant because the LXX was considered to be an original and therefore to alter a word was to make the verse into a new one.\(^4\) This can be seen in Peter Katz's study of the OT quotations in Philo. Katz notes that the LXX itself was a much revised text as were also Philo's quotations


\(^{2}\)Wood, HDB, p. 188. Thomas, LXX in Heb., p. 281, gives an example in Heb. 1:5 where the ωαί of Paul's quote is found neither in Heb. nor LXX but appears in bghne₂ Sah. Eth Cyr. Theo. Cyp. Joseph Ziegler, ed., Septuaginta Duodecim Prophetae XIII (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943), pp. 25ff, notes how Lk. 3:5 and Ro. 14:11 influenced Isa. 40:4 and 45:23 respectively. He shows that A contains several non-MT corrections, Q reflects more of the original text and Luc. has many alterations which approximate the MT.


\(^{4}\)Sperber, JBL 54:78.
from the LXX. The OT lemmata seem to show Aquila-type readings in Philo and often disagree with the OT text-form which shows a LXX basis in the following expositions. The lemmata would have been more easily subject to later Christian revision whereas the text forms, being integrated into the exposition, would have tended to escape later edition and can therefore be used as evidence for the genuine texts used by Philo.\(^1\) This phenomenon is not present in the text-forms of 1 and 2 Cor., however.

The quotations of the NT in general and Paul in particular show a preference for LXX\(^2\). Swete attributes this to a text of "great antiquity, possibly a pre-Christian recension made in Syria" which underlies A.\(^1\)


\(^2\)James A. Garrison, "Certain Aspects Of The Use Of The Old Testament In The Epistle Of Paul To The Romans" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1970), pp. 384-85 and Swete, IOTG, p. 395. Stendahl has further refined this by showing that in Isa. Paul is close to A but in Lev. he shows F readings, SSM, p. 159. Also, because Paul shows no difference in text-forms in his epistles as he moved from city to city, Stendahl concludes Paul quoted from memory, SSM, p. 160.

\(^3\)Swete, IOTG, p. 489. Swete concluded that the LXX text of Clement was more mixed than the NT writers, IOTG, p. 410. But Donald Alfred Hagner, The Use Of The
With the exception of obviously interpolated theological opinions, the LXX "should be regarded as a witness of a different Hebrew recension when it does not agree completely with the MT."¹

One may find that a text has been edited if there is literalness in translating from the Hebrew text; if there are stylistic modifications to avoid hiatus or to remedy grammatical problems; or if there are interpretational changes.² However, it is misleading simply to ask if a quotation follows A or B because no LXX MS is homogeneous throughout. Katz³ has shown that Isaiah B is the chief representative of Origen's Hexaplaric recension and the Minor Prophets of B show similar influences whereas A stands for the primitive text in Isa. and Minor Prophets. He points out that Job⁴ may be Lucianic. In view of the number of quotations taken from Isaiah and the Psalms "it is obvious how irrelevant it is to count how many of them

---


---

Old And New Testaments In Clement Of Rome (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), p. 68, has shown that the variants from AB are minimal and not consistent throughout which does not indicate that he was using another LXX text. D. Barthélemy, RB 60:18-29, considers the DS Habakkuk Greek text to be a revision of the LXX rather than a translation.
follow B or A." He continues to say that "it is not only irrelevant, but misleading." In fact, the question to be asked is: "does a quotation follow the primitive text or an 'edited' one?" The textual studies in this thesis seek to answer this question relative to 1 and 2 Cor.

\[1\] Katz, ZNW 49:222.
Definition Of Terminology

The terms Midrash and Pesher are more and more commonly used with reference to the writings of portions of the NT\textsuperscript{1} but often one is not precisely clear as to either what is the definition of the terms or what implication is being drawn regarding the biblical author's method of thought. The purpose of this section is to arrive at a satisfactory definition of Midrash and Pesher.

\textsuperscript{1}E. Earle Ellis, "Midrash, Targum And New Testament Quotations," from Neotestamentica Et Semitica, eds. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969), p. 61, notes that this is due to the "interest in biblical literary genres and in biblical hermeneutics generally" and by the evidence from Qumran, but "more importantly, it has been marked by a shift away from the rabbinical Midrashim as the standard by which the genre is to be defined or measured." Richard Longenecker, "Can We Reproduce The Exegesis Of The New Testament?", Tyndale Bulletin 21 (1970), pp. 3-38, has a review of early Jewish exegesis. Daniel Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutic In Palestine (Missoula, Montana: Society Of Biblical Literature And Scholars Press, 1975) has a full work on the subject. For bibliographical aids see Peter Nickels, Targum And New Testament (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), and, more recently, Bernard Grossfeld, A Bibliography Of Targum Literature (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1972). See Cross, ALQ, pp. 14-15, for a 50 B.C. to A.D. 50 date for 1Qp Heb.
sufficient for the use of these terms in the immediate study.

In Scripture the verb patar ( Heb ) only appears throughout Genesis 40-41 where it is used nine times. The noun ( Heb ) is also only used in Gen. 40-41 and occurs there five times. In Daniel יָשָׁה ( the Aramaic equivalent of Heb ) is used thirty times. In both literatures the term is used of the revealing of the true meaning of a dream or vision. To apply pesher to a dream involved relating the basic structure of the dream to a specific event.¹ Therefore within the Biblical data itself pesher relates to a divine revelation which infuses a dream or vision with meaning.² William Hugh Brownlee also noticed this use of pesher in Daniel and was the first to speak of the combined term Midrash-Pesher, later embraced by K. Stendahl.³

Matthew Black has called Midrash-Pesher "a modern invention probably best forgotten" because it introduces a false distinction within midrash-halakah and


midrash-haggadah. In the plain sense of interpretation all midrash is pesher.

There is a possible link between pesher as applied to dreams and as later applied to prophecy in the Rabbinic use of Lam. 2:9 and Num. 12:6 where, in the Petirah Midrashim, the Rabbis held that God spoke to all his prophets, except Moses, in dreams or visions. This could be the formative concept that made all prophecy fair game for pesher interpretation. Even without such a link, however, it is not difficult to see how the apocalyptic mind could easily legitimize such a perspective by the implications of prophetic fulfillment in and of itself.

Identification Of Midrashic Exegesis

Often it is difficult to identify precisely a midrash. Attempts at interpreting the Bible are of course as old as the Bible itself. One finds Rabbinic type glosses which ante-date the LXX because they are

---

1Black, NTS 18:1, n. 1.

2Miller, JSJ, p. 51, supports the concept of pesher as Midrash, not a subcategory of it. José Faur, "The Targumim And Halakha," Jewish Quarterly Review 66, p. 21, says the distinction between Pesher (literal sense) and Derash (further exegetical elaboration of the text) is a late middle ages concept and therefore it is anachronistic to read it back into NT times.

found in the LXX text itself. Ellis uses the term "explicit" to refer to a midrash with a lemma of OT text and "implicit" to refer to an "interpretive paraphrase." Both forms are found at Qumran. Explicit and implicit relate to the type of midrash while the two major literary forms are the "specifying commentary" and the "implying paraphrase." An overt midrash is relatively simple to identify. To find a covert midrash one must 1) locate the Scriptural text commented upon; 2) ascertain the meaning of the text established in the exegesis; and 3) identify the particular hermeneutical process involved in the interpretation. Another way to understand the conceptuality behind a midrash is to ask what place the OT text has in the passage. Does it function as "an initial stimulus," a secondary place in the tradition, or a crucial foundation?

---


3Explicit; 1QpHab; 4QFlor; CD4:14. Implicit: Book of Jubilees (1Q17, 18; 2Q19, 20; 4Q and the Genesis Apocryphon). The latter is hard to categorize as either a targum or midrash; Ellis, NS, pp. 62-63.

4Gertner, JSS 7:268. 5Gertner, JSS 7:269.

6Miller, JSJ 2:44.
Addison G. Wright's article has recently caused much controversy over what constitutes a midrash. In opposition to his concept of midrash as a literary genre, Miller is not happy that Wright excludes the Targums from midrashic literature because such exclusion overlooks the close presuppositional, historical, and methodological relationships between the two. Wright's purpose is to narrow the meaning of midrash so that it will not be so comprehensive as to include other literature which may share its historical and presuppositional contexts but not its form. If the citation puts no emphasis on its interpretation then it is not a midrash. If it contributes to an understanding of the text then it may be termed midrashic.

Roger Le Déaut finds that Wright has not made a correct choice in retaining the term midrash for this more narrow meaning but should have found another description. Daniel Patte, in agreement with Roger Le Déaut also cannot accept Wright's more narrow perspective.


2Miller, JSJ, 2:44.  

3Wright, CBQ 28:439.

tive. Patte writes regarding midrash in the first century A.D.:

It has a broader sense, mainly in the period we are considering. Therefore we cannot use Wright's definition of the term, which is a projection upon the past of the later literary genre. We use the term to express an attitude toward Scripture.¹

This conception of midrash as an attitude toward life and the Bible is defined in Le Déaut's writing as "exegetical method." That method which lies at the base of early Jewish exegesis will therefore act as a more fundamental criterion of midrash than literary form.² This, in effect, defines midrash in accord with what it does (for example, contemporizing the sacred text)³ rather than what it looks like (literary form). After reviewing current study on this topic, Merrill Miller offers a workable method of identification:

I think the minimum requirement for the use of this term as a substantive will be the presence of a literary unit to which the biblical citations or allusions clearly belong as formative elements at some stage in the development of that literary unit. But it would still be correct, as Le Déaut points out, to refer to midrashic tendencies and procedures in the use of Scripture even where such a literary unit is not present.⁴

One standing outside of the field of Jewish and Rabbinic specialization can only examine what Paul has done on

¹Patte, EJH, p. 117, n. 1.
²Le Déaut, Bib 50:405.
³Silberman, RQ 3:324-25.
⁴Miller, JSJ 2:44.
both attitudinal, exegetical and formal levels and see how this data relates to the conclusions of the scholars of Rabbinics and early Jewish literature. This paper will utilize the substantival and adjectival definitions of midrash as formulated by Le Déaut and outlined by Miller.

**Chronological Relationships**

Because we are using a more conceptual rather than formal description of midrash when examining Paul's quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. it must be asked to what extent do the works of the Midrashim and Rabbinics give insight into the conceptualities and methods which were formulative to Paul's writings? While volumes have been written on this subject, the purpose of this section will be to clarify the specific problems pertinent to this study as a guide to the application of a methodology which will allow an accurate comparison of Pauline with Jewish literature while leaving both groups undistorted in their respective genres, contextual nuances, and chronological relationships. One obvious as well as critical foundation of linguistic comparison is the establishment of an accurate temporal relationship between the members compared. In the case of this study, Jewish literature which is contemporaneous, or nearly so, with the life of Paul would have the potential for making the most telling comparisons. Another more pertinent consideration, made possible by ascertaining the temporal
relationship, is that of the demonstrable effect of one literature upon another.

These two aspects enter into the heart of a significant problem concerning the relationship between Paul and Judaism: the available Rabbinic texts stem from a period of final redaction significantly later than the Apostle. A firm continuity has to be assumed between pre-A.D. 70 and post-A.D. 70 Judaism in order for cogent interrelationships to be made but it is just this assumption that is still open to question.

To be sure, the actual date of origin of a considerable part of the rabbinical corpus is earlier than its first redaction\(^1\) and can contain material prior to or contemporary with Paul but this proves to be a perilous hope when one realizes the great difficulties involved in ascertaining the specific early pericopae. There is a basic lack of critical work on the extra-biblical materials of Judaism.\(^2\)

**Dating of the Sources.** The practice of Targumism is viable in NT times because it probably began in the days of Ezra\(^3\) but, with the basic lack of critical works

---

\(^1\)Bamberger, JBL 68:115.


\(^3\)Neh. 8:8.
on the Targums,\(^1\) one is not on the surest ground when asserting the early date of a particular pericope. Allen Wikgren adds one more methodological consideration:

An indiscriminate, uncritical, and eclectic citation of evidence, apart from consideration of context and time of composition, will not suffice, whether made from original texts or from secondary compilations. In fact, such procedure in the past has been largely responsible for both the misuse and disuse of the Targums as sources of information for the early Christian period.\(^2\)

Paul Kahle offered a general chronological framework when he asserted the priority of the Jerusalem Targum to that of Onkelos.\(^3\) He becomes more specific by placing the origin of Onkelos in Babylon and a date not before A.D. 1000 for its introduction into Palestine.\(^4\) McNamara argues for an early date for the Palestinian Targum on the basis of its borrowings from Greek.\(^5\) He is convinced that this Targum, especially as represented by Neofiti I, has a pre-Christian origin.\(^6\) When one is confronted with the Isaiah Targum a similar problem of dating is present. J. F. Stenning writes that a date not earlier than the fifth century A.D. can be given for the final written


\(^{2}\)Wikgren, JR 24:93.  

\(^{3}\)Kahle, CG\(^2\), p. 194.

\(^{4}\)Kahle, CG\(^2\), p. 195.  

\(^{5}\)McNamara, TT, p. 61.

\(^{6}\)McNamara, TT, chap. 8, pp. 86-89 and McNamara, NTPT, p. 257, for a summary of his evidence for an early date.
The dating\textsuperscript{2} and affinities of Targums with the NT have been given much detailed examination,\textsuperscript{3} and the problems are not new. Though their antiquity has been a supposition from as early as the 17th century,\textsuperscript{4} the confirmatory proof of early Targumic MSS is lacking; thus weakening the value in NT research. Their use at present, until such time as further research or discovery provides direct evidence, must be guided by a careful comparison with material whose early date has been established (e.g. NT, Philo, Qumran, Ps. Philo, Josephus). On this basis there is optimism that, on one front of research, "an early date for much of the PT tradition can be established."\textsuperscript{5}

Since the time of G. F. Moore there has been a shift in the direction of haggadic and halachic studies.


\textsuperscript{2}Roger Le Déaut, La Nuit Pascale (Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1963), pp. 41-71, gives the criteria for dating rabbinic material and the PT. In a recent study Le Déaut, "The Current State Of Targumic Studies," Biblical Theology Bulletin 4 (1974), pp. 23-24, stresses that one must 1) distinguish between content or traditions and literary forms, and 2) note that the recent features only give the terminus ad quem.


\textsuperscript{5}Miller, JSJ 2:31.
Onkelos and Jonathan are now seen by some to contain pre-Christian material rather than to be cursorily dismissed as exclusively second century A.D. or later Tannaitic material.\(^1\) Vermes classifies early Targumic literature in two groups. The Fragmentary and Yerushalmi Targums with Codex Neofiti (N) are called early Haggadah, being placed in the second century A.D. The second group is classified according to its form:

\[
\ldots \text{the original haggadic unit covering the entire Torah section is either split into shorter interpretations to expound the passage verse by verse, as in the Targum of PS.-Jonathan, or else its commentary is inserted into the completely re-written biblical narrative, as in Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, Jewish Antiquities, and Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum.} \]

This second group is of a later and more developed date.

Kahle argued for an early date of the PT over Onkelos and was followed by Diez Macho and McNamara.\(^3\) Diez Macho\(^4\) presents his arguments for an early date for the PT on textual, historical, and geographical grounds. He argues that the geographical names in N point to a


\(^2\)Vermes, STJ, pp. 228-29.

\(^3\)Smith, UOTN, p. 12. Stendahl, SSM, p. 175, notes that this school "draws more essential inferences from the fact that we are here dealing with a sacred literature which had been widespread and demanded a translation for its cultic function."

second century A.D. date for its last recension. The use of λαθν το βνωματι ατοσ of Acts 15:4 with reference to baptismal rites is not found in the MT or the LXX but is usual in the PT. The spelling "Rabbuni" in the gospels is not in Rabbinic texts but is common in PT and the Sam. Targum. While Diez Macho lists other evidence to support the early date for the PT and N in particular the argument which he calls the "surest way" to detect the early origin of N is to find its Hebrew Vorlage. His evidence shows that the Hebrew below N is not the MT but a pre-masoretic text.\(^1\) This, Diez Macho concludes, is an indication that N was produced before the MT had gained ascendancy c. A.D. 200. He also finds that Onkelos is based on the MT and that Ps. Jonathan is a PT "more or

less consistently modified"¹ by the Onkelos text. With regard to the ascendancy of Onkelos over N, Le Déaut writes:

Nous pensons d'ailleurs que la recension du Codex Neofiti, à cause des nombreuses retouches qu'il trahit, a pu avoir en Palestine une situation quasi officielle avant d'être supplanté par le targum de babylone.²

McNamara concludes that N represents a "very old text of the PT" which was known to the rabbis of Palestine and was also edited by them to conform it to their laws. "The basis of N would then be very old," writes McNamara, "but its present recension is from later Talmudic times."³

The liturgical form of the PT would also be an indication of its early date. Le Déaut, who holds that the PT contains pre-Christian material, finds a great resemblance between the Mekilta and the PT which is to be explained by their common origin in the ancient liturgy.⁴ Daniel Patte⁵ and Geza Vermes⁶ also see the

¹Macho, RDPT, p. 239.
³McNamara, NTPT, p. 63. Le Déaut, Bib 42:29, sees the content of the PT to be prior to Christianity. Moise Ohana, "Prosélytisme et Targum Palestinien: Données Nouvelles Pour La Datation De Néofiti 1," Biblica 55 (1974), p. 332, concludes that the use of the verb gwr and substantive ger in N shows a pre-mishnaic and midrash-halakic evolution. This concurs with Faur, JQR 66:20 who assigns the Halakah in N to a pre-mishnaic period.
⁴Le Déaut, NP, p. 131, n. 2.
⁵Patte, EJH, p. 87. ⁶Vermes, STJ, p. 228.
common life situation of the synagogue to stand behind the tradition of the PT. This liturgical source of the PT is apparent in the nature of its paraphrase. McNamara calls this an early type of form which probably arose "at a time when the homily was not yet distinct from the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular." 1 It may be concluded that in the absence of positive evidence to the contrary, the portions of haggadah in the PT probably antedate the Jewish uprising of A.D. 132. 2 Therefore this literature will be carefully used as an influencing factor in Paul's quotations.

The Targums, however, can only be the final products of a process of tradition. A Targum in its early stages and by its very nature went through many revisions and certainly its first attempt generally showed no high critical standard. 3 Each subsequent scribe improved as he copied. 4 Therefore a standard text would probably arise as a final product of a tradition rather than an early development. Therefore any study which specifically seeks to investigate textual relationships may, even while in the middle of an early Rabbinical passage, be unknowingly confronted with an actually late set of textual

1McNamara, NTPT, p. 64.


3Kahle, CG², p. 236. 4Kahle, CG², p. 236.
details. The lack of critical works on Rabbinics makes this an especially vulnerable area of weakness.

Midrashic Literature. An early date for the Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael is held by many scholars.\(^1\) Ben Zion Wacholder himself claims an eighth century date because the Mekilta utilizes "masterfully the hermeneutics of the Tannaim and Amoraim to summarize the talmudic halakah and haggadah pertaining to the book of Exodus."\(^2\)

Most authors, however, claim a second century date for the midrash.\(^3\)

Mishnaic Literature. The Mishnah offers early material but this also lies hidden behind the screen of redaction history. In a discussion of Rabbi Judah the Patriarch,\(^4\) Herbert Danby writes:

> Much of Rabbi's material may go back to a time before or not long after the destruction of the Temple. Thus the tractates Middoth and Yoma which deal with the structure and the cultus of the Temple are, according to a reliable source, Yom. 16a, derived (so far as their anonymous contents are concerned) respectively from Eliezer ben Jacob and Simeon of Mizpah, both of whom lived at a time when the Temple was still standing.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) See Ben Zion Wacholder, "The Date Of The Mekilta De-Rabbi Ishmael," Hebrew Union College Annual 30 (1968), p. 117, n. 1, for references.

\(^2\) Wacholder, HUCA 30:144.

\(^3\) Jacob Z. Lauterbach, Mekilta I (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933), p. xviii, asserts it to be one of the oldest midrashim.

\(^4\) b. A.D. 135.

W. S. Towner writes that the houses-disputes are thought to be the earliest strata of Midrashic and Mishnaic literature.\(^1\) Once again, while these guidelines may prove to be helpful in methodological and contextual comparisons they are not sound for textual studies. Martin McNamara concludes:

The importance of all this rabbinical material for an understanding of the New Testament is undoubtedly immense. While receiving its final redaction in the Christian era, much of it can be presumed to go back to pre-Christian times. A large element of uncertainty remains, nonetheless, with regard to the dating of any particular passage.\(^2\)

**Formal Relationships**

When one moves from the dating of particular Jewish works and their various strands to the dating and relating of Jewish exegesis and literary forms, he is confronted with a similar problem, though the Qumran literature has narrowed the chronological question somewhat. As has been stated earlier, Rabbinic evidence is not primary evidence for first-century Judaism. The Talmud and Midrash are post-A.D. 70 Judaism.\(^3\)

---


\(^2\) McNamara, TT, p. 11.

\(^3\) Ellis, PUOT, pp. 42-43.
A common basis of comparison between Paul and Judaism is that of Midrash. Even in the earliest part of the LXX, the Pentateuch, which was the first section to be translated, Midrashic elements are to be found.\(^1\) This places the form into the third century B.C. but it could also be attributed to first century A.D. editions.\(^2\) In speaking of the methods of the Mishnah which reflect early Tannaitic style, Metzger writes that "much of the NT and of the Mishnah reflects the methods of argumentation employed by those who had been reared and trained in Orthodox Judaism of the first century."\(^3\) Therefore both midrashic and mishnaic elements can be placed contemporaneously with Paul.\(^4\)

Whether these were used by the writers of the NT is another question. A. G. Wright, in a helpful but controversial article, notes that in the Qumran literature midrash had come to signify "interpretation" in a sense similar to the verb drš.\(^5\) He asserts, relative to identi-


\(^2\)Gooding, JTS 25:1.


\(^4\)Wright, CBQ 28:113, points to 2 Chr. 13:22; 24:27, for the first use of midrāš.

\(^5\)Wright, CBQ 28:117. Midrash was a more general term than pesher and was not a technical biblical term. He makes a clarification that pesher is not a third type
fying a piece of literature with this tradition, that "to the degree, then, that the precise traditions followed by a work can be ascertained, its classification is sure."¹ His word "precise" is significant. It is not enough to find a midrashic element, whether conceptual or formal, in the NT and use this as a basis for relationship to Judaism. The NT work must conform as a whole to the sought after genre. The point becomes further refined when Wright, as noted above, states that Midrash is a genre and not a method of exegesis.² His description of this genre obviates the fact that its presence goes beyond the bounds of Judaistic literature. Midrash, he writes, "begins with a text of Scripture and proceeds to comment on it in some way" with a view to making the Bible relevant to the present.³ Wright can therefore conclude:

The techniques of exegesis found in Rabbinic midrash are not among the primary characteristics of the literary form, and one is not justified in demanding that a literary work must employ one or another of these techniques before it can be called a midrash.⁴

To put it another way, a successful demonstration of a

---

¹Wright, CBQ 28:111.
³Wright, CBQ 28:133-34. ⁴Wright, CBQ 28:135.
midrashic form in 1 or 2 Corinthians is not, in itself, proof of the presence of a particularly rabbinical method of exegesis. To this extent, Wright's conclusions are pertinent to this study.

Conceptual Relationships

World View. It is well known that Paul used the methods commonly related to Hillel in his use of the OT in order "to gain from the text new meanings by a process of inference and combination with other texts."¹ It is just such a process of inference that is at the core of Paul's hermeneutic and which is so determinative in his use of the OT.² Paul's practical intentions for using the OT were the same as those of Judaism: "to fuse Scripture with life."³ When this fusion resulted in

¹H. J. Schoeps, Paul, ET Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), p. 39. It must be noted, however, that the rules of Hillel show the influence of the Hellenistic rhetoric of Cicero and were "entirely in line with the prevalent Hellenistic ideas on the matter;" David Daube, "Rabbinic Methods Of Interpretation And Hellenistic Rhetoric," Hebrew Union College Annual 22 (1949), pp. 246ff.

²Sandmel, HUCA 15:234, when contrasting Philo and the Rabbis, says that the essential difference can be found in their "different inferences from a common Biblical basis." Wilfred L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1925), p. 126, speaks of similarities consisting in the quotation of a common passage only, but with difference of conceptuality.

regulative principles it was called halakic.\textsuperscript{1} A result having no "direct legal consequence, bearing no immediate practical effect, and carrying no normative authority,"\textsuperscript{2} was labeled an haggadic tradition. There was, however, no sharp break between the Haggadic and Halakic literatures.\textsuperscript{3} The thrust of these fusions of Scripture with life was determined by the underlying conceptions about life and religion. The very presence in Judaism of written and oral Torah shows how pervasive was the need for fusion and how determinative and persistent the underlying conceptualities. Neusner writes regarding the oral and written laws:

The sole reciprocal relationship we can describe, therefore, is conceptual, or, in a loose sense of the word, metaphysical. And here the relationship is amazingly close. The two Torahs complement one another, balance and complete the conceptions of one another. The world-view of the one invites and instigates the reflections which lay the foundations of the other.\textsuperscript{4}

This world-view issued in the bringing of the sense of an OT text into line with present teachings;\textsuperscript{5} or, more specifically, making the commands of the OT possible in present circumstances. Two elements were involved: the intent of

---

\textsuperscript{1}Strack, ITM, p. 202. \textsuperscript{2}Neusner, RT III, p. 43.


\textsuperscript{4}Neusner, ERJ, p. 29. See Weingreen, BJRL 34, #1:166, who also speaks of the "attitude of mind" present in Jewish commentators.

\textsuperscript{5}Weingreen, BJRL 34, #1:190.
the OT and reality of the present. These are also seen in Paul's hermeneutic. Just as with the Jew, Paul's conceptions and understanding of the present formulated his understanding of the OT.¹ Christian Dietzfelbinger concludes:

Denn die rabbinische Methode gibt dem, der mit ihr umgeht und sich in ihr versteht, nur eine bestimmte, in dieser Methode liegende Fähigkeit, das vorgegebene Material zu formen zu dem Zweck, den der Exeget verfolgt. Diesem Zweck gegenüber ist die Methode als solche indifferent.²

To have a firm grasp on Paul's concept of the reality of his present will aid in avoiding the attribution of incorrect editorial motivation to his use of the OT and will provide a basis for discerning the reasons for his editorial work when a textual basis for his OT quotations seems improbable.

Conceptual Determinants

With the difficulties of dating rabbinical methodology arises the place of conceptualization of religious and historical data in the formulation of exegetical conclusions. The midrash form may be used by two writers but the conclusions reached by them will be mainly depen-

¹Dan O. Via, "A Structuralist Approach To Paul's Old Testament," Interpretation 28 (1974), p. 202, speaking regarding structuralism, calls structure the "hidden or underlying configuration that can offer some explanation for the more or less visible or obvious pattern in the text."

dent on their religio-historical perspective.

The Mekilta. Max Kadushin, in a work concentrating on the Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael, evaluates this midrash and concludes that it contains several emphasized trends: the individual's free access to religion, universality, and the closely knit combination of experiencing love and God.\(^1\) His point is that the "coherence of rabbinic concepts is organismic."\(^2\) The technical haggadic structures of an early midrash, the Mekilta, display an exegesis, rather than exposition, which was based on word-plays, syntax, and spelling.\(^3\) Kadushin supplies the ideology behind this exegetical structure and the conceptual framework within which the content of the Mekilta was unified:

For a haggadic idea the stimulus is usually a biblical text. In other words, though haggadic ideas [God's love, justice, kinship, etc.] are derived from biblical verses, the ideas have not been derived through rules of interpretation but are largely the result of the impact of the verses on creative minds. As stimulus, however, the verse is not just a point of departure for the haggadic idea. Instead, the verse acts as a channel for bringing out the idea and, by the same token, the idea is a construction or interpretation of the verse. The interpretation is certainly something other than the plain meaning of the verse; nevertheless, in midrash there is an association between the interpretation and the plain meaning - an immediate and an ultimate association. The immediate association is obvious: the words of the plain meaning give rise to the interpretation, but that alone does not make the interpretation midrash. In midrash there is also an ultimate association. Now it is not a matter of the relation between

\(^1\)Kadushin, CAM, p. 8. \(^2\)Kadushin, CAM, p. 17. 
\(^3\)Lauterbach, Mek. I, p. 1vii.
a single biblical verse and its haggadic interpretation; the association is between the Bible as a whole and rabbinic thought as a whole. An intrinsic conceptual bond unites the Bible and rabbinic thought, the bond of relationship between the rabbinic concepts and their biblical antecedents.¹

More important than literary forms, therefore, in relating Paul to the literature of Judaism, is the comparison of their conceptions regarding man and God.

Religious Tradition. It is at this very point of world-view that great differences are seen between Pauline and Rabbinical concepts.² C. G. Montefiore saw Paul's divergence from the rabbis to be due to the apostle's Diaspora perspective.³ W. D. Davies refuted this notion by showing that Montefiore was too idealistic with regard to Palestinian Judaism and asserted that Jerusalem could have provided whatever pessimism and emotionalism may be found in Paul's theology.⁴

Several basic presuppositions also parted the way between Paul and Rabbinics. Foremost among these is Paul's Christo-centric rather than Torah-centric perspective⁵ which may explain Paul's remarkably few statements

¹Kadushin, CAM, pp. 20-21.
²Differences can be as important and illuminating as similarities; Sandmel, HUCA 15:221.
⁴Davies, PRJ, pp. 5-16.
⁵Gerhardsson, MM, p. 225.
about the oral Torah of Judaism.¹ The fact that Paul had the Messiah's life before him as history radically altered the messianic views which he had held as part of his cultural mileu.² For Paul, his own revelations and the apostolic traditions were the framework within which he developed his exegesis. This exegesis is hard to root immediately in Judaism.³ Both Johnson and Ellis find only superficial resemblance between Paul and Judaism. The resemblances relate to technicalities such as IF and literary forms of quotation rather than to interpretational principles and actual exegesis.⁴ Johnson writes that "... the resemblance is chiefly in appearance, when the reader pierces below the surface, he finds little of it; ... ."⁵

The strong individual character of early Christian exegesis as demonstrated in the NT can safely be said to be due to the pervasive and consistent impression of the Christ. The Christian tradition, when related to the OT, was not simply a conceptual ideal but rather a reality which was determinative to the whole kerygma of first century Christianity.⁶

¹Gerhardsson, MM, p. 289. ²Toy, QNT, p. xxiv.
³Ellis, PUOT, p. 58. ⁴Ellis, PUOT, p. 83.
⁶Gerhardsson, MM, p. 234.
This reality had a narrowing effect hermeneutically upon the exegesis of the OT. Whereas the rabbinical literature offered little to keep the interpreter from finding whatever he wanted in Scripture\(^1\) the NT writers seem to be purposely limited in their use of the OT to the actual event of Jesus and the specifics of His new ethic. This is best expressed in the Christological clustering of OT proof-texts in the NT around specific OT passages\(^2\) or possibly testimonia.\(^3\)

Certain middot are found both in early haggadic and halakic literature\(^4\) and are used by Paul as well. Merged quotations, though few, are common to Paul and the Rabbis.\(^5\) Certainly both Paul and the Rabbis began with a general awareness of the plain meaning of the biblical data.\(^6\) Beyond these similarities, however, further hermeneutical correspondence is not easily adduced. Paul was one man at one time while the Rabbis were many and from many times. Samu1e Sandmel's words regarding comparative studies in Philonic material well apply to such endeavors with Paul: "For the comparison to be the most

\(^1\)Toy, QNT, p. xxii.
\(^2\)Dodd, AS. See below pp. 409ff.
\(^4\)Towner, RESE, pp. 251-55.
\(^5\)Ellis, PUOT, p. 53.  
\(^6\)Kadushin, CAM, p. 7.
reliable, it would need to assess the imponderable measure of the heterogeneity within the milieu of the rabbis."\(^1\) But "an assumption of total, all-embracing homogeneity among the rabbis is gratuitous."\(^2\)

Conclusion

With this great diversity\(^3\) between Paul and the Rabbis conceptually, and the methodological pitfalls due to gaps in rabbinical criticism, one must ask what legitimate place can rabbinics play in a study of Paul's use of the OT in 1 and 2 Corinthians. One specific benefit of a detailed comparison will be in the area of the history of religious thought. Paul and the Rabbis were engaged in a similar task; that of keeping alive and relevant a religious perspective of life. A return to Max Kadushin's book will show this similarity:

Since value concepts do not refer to objects or relations in common sensory experience, they need to be cultivated, nurtured. Even more vital is the need to establish norms of behavior ensuring the steady concretization of the value concepts, norms whereby the opportunities for actualizing the concepts discovered by the gifted man, may become similar opportunities for the ordinary man. These needs were met by the Rabbis, the trained intellectual leaders of the people who nevertheless did not constitute a professional class, and whose interests were therefore largely the same as those of the folk. In Haggadah they made the value concepts vivid, and in Halakah they developed the norms which developed and directed the steady actualization of those concepts in daily life.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Sandmel, HUCA 15:213.  
\(^2\) Sandmel, PPJ, p. 213.  
\(^3\) Ellis, PUOT, p. 83.  
\(^4\) Kadushin, CAM, p. 30.
A comparison with the Apostle's nearest religious counterpart can show how Paul conceived and executed his role as promulgator of the Christian faith in the Corinthian Epistles.

Secondly, the Jewish tradition may be used to provide insight into possible targumic renderings of OT passages in Paul. Septuagintal readings in later MSS leave open the possibility of conformity to the Pauline version, whereas this is less likely to have occurred in the middle of a Jewish tractate. The presence of a text-form of Paul's OT quote in the text of a Jewish piece of literature would argue quite strongly against an ad hoc Pauline quotation.

Finally, comparisons between Pauline and Rabbinic exegetical methodology and literary forms will be at a minimum both due to the present state of rabbinical criticism and because such comparisons are not central to this paper. Each case will have to be treated separately and interpretive or literary cross-checks will be made with other writers where possible. Care will be exercised to be precise in the use of terminology such as midrash or pesher, the differentiation between form and method, and the implicational use of underlying conceptual forces. With an author who so expressly states his complete break with his rabbinical heritage\(^1\) we do not

\(^1\)Phil. 3:8.
expect to find close parallels of content and the evidence to be examined seems to support this.
MODERN EXEGESIS IN OT IN NT STUDIES

Introduction

In studies of Paul's use of the OT, one's conceptions of the nature of first-century Christian piety affect, in a substantial manner, one's conclusions regarding Pauline hermeneutic. These conclusions are valid as long as the theological suppositions are consistent with the full range of available textual data. A brief survey of several notable authors will show the results of various theological emphases on their conclusions. This chronological survey does not include all works relative to this subject, but is limited to those authors who have written major and formative studies specifically dealing with the hermeneutical and textual influences on Paul's use of the OT. Other studies will be evaluated throughout the paper.

Harnack (1928) And Michel (1929)

In a paradigmatic essay, Harnack has rightly emphasized the interpretive light which the cross shed on the OT and concluded that Paul's piety found its source in the gospel and the Spirit rather than the OT.¹ One

¹Adolf von Harnack, "Das Alte Testament In Den
feels, however, that Harnack underemphasized the explicit use of the OT in the NT by limiting such use solely to confrontation with the Jews.

Michel supported that aspect of Harnack's view which emphasized the cross-illumined place of Paul's view of the OT but questioned the limiting factor of Jewish conflict. Harnack traced the beginning of the overestimation of the OT as a book of piety for Christian growth to the phrase ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν of 1 Cor. 10:11, but stressed that in Paul's intentions this was only incidental (beilaßig). The quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. will show that this was not merely an incidental statement of Paul but, on the contrary, revealed a foundational and pervasive approach to the OT. Pauline piety as outlined by Harnack is not consistent with the evidence at hand in 1 and 2 Cor.

It will become evident that Paul used the Greek OT for his own devotion and not just for apologetic purposes. Also, Paul's piety did not perceive a fundamental tension between the OT and Christian devotion whether or not in apologetic contexts. A critical

---


1Michel, PSB, p. 6.

2Michel also does not see a tension here or in the accounts of Acts. Paul can speak of a continuity between the OT and NT because "er innerlich wirklich an das A.T. und die alttestamentliche Frömmigkeit gebunden ist;"
response to this view of continuity is raised by Herbert Ulonska who questions whether Paul was in such a strict continuity with Judaism and if, as we would also assert, this conclusion arises from proper exegetical methodology. Such continuity, Ulonska argues, causes the OT to speak against itself in, say, 2 Cor. 3 concerning the midrash on the veil.¹ The issue, however, has been blurred in Ulonska's critique due to his lack of distinction between a resolved continuity from the OT to the NT in the mind of Paul and the comparison and contrast of such a continuity with the Judaism of his day. To speak of the latter is, of course, to find great discontinuity but this must not be interpolated into the Pauline conceptuality. If anything, 2 Cor. 3 heightens and confirms continuity rather than the opposite. Paul had found what he thought was the correct interpretation and application of a passage of Scripture. Though it was not in harmony with the currently held view, his methodology may be impugned but not his sense of continuity. It may certainly be asked whether Paul's piety before and after his conversion was contradictory, but this would not necessarily affect his final sense of continuity.

Michel conceives three aims adopted by the

writers of the NT: 1) to overthrow the old religion; 2) to support the new religion from the selected kernel of the OT; 3) to interpret Jesus and prove His Messiahship.¹ These three aspects may be applied both to the Synagogue community of Acts and the Gentile Christian community of Paul's letters.² While there is no proof of the Messiahship of Jesus in 1 and 2 Cor., the second of the three aims outlined by Michel provides a general category for the uses of the OT in 1 and 2 Cor.

Michel tried to weaken the arguments of Harnack against the continuity of Paul with the OT by showing the unity of Paul and Acts with the OT religion. Ulonska³ does not find this convincing because Michel works from a post-Pauline and dogmatic conception. For Ulonska, the problem of Paul's position regarding the OT still remains.

Goppelt (1939)

In the debate concerning continuity of piety, Leonhard Goppelt shows close affinities with Michel by asserting the central connection of the OT with the NT to be that Christ is the "Yes" to the promises of God.⁴ The

¹Michel, PSB, p. 152.
²Contrary to Ulonska, FAZA, p. 8, who contends for a major and determinative split between the two.
³Ulonska, FAZA, p. 8.
connection becomes typological. This was also true for Michel though he and Goppelt do not use the term 'type' in the same way. Because the OT illuminates rather than pre-figures the salvation of the new community Paul's works contain not Heilsgeschichte (Michel) but rather Heilslehre (Goppelt). For Goppelt only the Adam/Christ motif is general and comprehensive enough to justify speaking in typological terms. To compare Christ with Moses, a prophet, or David's son is erroneous and peripheral to the Heilslehre distinction. However, Goppelt's assertion that Paul was only interested in the Adam/Christ type does not agree with the data in 1 and 2 Cor. and to say Paul did not have an interest in salvation-history may be cutting the distinction finer than Paul or his readers would have done. Ulonska is correct in asserting that Paul worked from a systematic thought and exegesis rather than an ad hoc typology.

Typology shows not only the way of the new religion over against the old but that the new stands on the very historical ground of the types rather than on a syncretistic myth. Ulonska finds two major problems with this view. First, he questions how this can be

---

1Michel, PSB, p. 143.  
21 Cor. 10:11.  
3Goppelt, Typ., pp. 152-54.  
4Goppelt, Typ., p. 155.  
5Ulonska, FAZA, p. 10.  
reconciled with Paul's near expectation of the end. Second, he finds it hard to see how the pagan community could have been expected to have such a knowledge of salvation-history from the OT in order to understand this foundation. This criticism is due to Ulonska's basic thesis that Paul used the OT as illustration only, with no intention of typological implications. This study will show that Paul understood his OT quotes as typologically grounded. Ulonska's insistence to the contrary and his use of the term "illustration" are helpful, however, in that the intent of Paul's OT quotes are illustrative. Even if Paul's typological implications would have been missed by many of his readers his basic point would be made. Also, the Corinthian letters give all too painful examples that Paul was often not understood by his readers.

Dodd (1952)

C. H. Dodd differed from Michel (and Goppelt as we have seen) in that he saw the OT-NT unity to be in the missionary kerygma. The reason why Paul's letters show no development that Jesus is the Messiah as do the Gospels and Acts is because the communities addressed in his letters did not need convincing. One must realize, however, that such kerygma must be interpreted in its context

1Ulonska, FAZA, p. 10. 2Dodd, AS, p. 18.
and with flexibility. This avoids viewing each quotation with a preconception as to its underlying conceptuality.\(^1\) Dodd,\(^2\) like Goppelt and Michel, asserted that Paul based his theology on a fulfillment schema.

**Ellis (1957)**

E. E. Ellis, who is statedly in dependence on Dodd and Michel,\(^3\) asserts that Paul used the OT as a salvation-historical source\(^4\) viewed through the implications of the Damascus road experience.\(^5\) While Ellis is a most handy reference to the whole corpus of Pauline quotations from the OT, current research now demands more specific studies of each book, if not each section. Ulonska finds Ellis' work too leveling and general to do justice to the details of the quotations.\(^6\)

**Lindars (1961) And Dietzfelbinger (1961)**

Barnabas Lindars\(^7\) elaborates the OT-NT usage under three aspects: 1) the use of the OT within the quotation; 2) the use in the OT context; 3) its relationship to the Christian kerygma. One agrees with Lindars that the use of the OT in the NT can clarify the development of

---

1Ulonska, FAZA, p. 15.  
2Dodd, AS, p. 135.  
3Ellis, PUOT, p. vii.  
4Ellis, PUOT, p. 135.  
5Ellis, PUOT, p. 149.  
6Ulonska, FAZA, p. 18.  
7Lindars, NTA, pp. 19-20.
the Christian faith¹ and that the OT has an apologetic function in the NT. Lindars is also correct in seeing a major distinction between Christianity and Judaism to be the place of the Law.² Though his thesis does not cover nor explain all the OT quotations in the NT, Lindars' work seems to be weakest at its most important point. He asserts that through the debates with the opponents at Galatia Paul learned the early Christian testimonies. During this process of debate Paul gradually came to realize the necessity for overthrowing the Law. Therefore, Paul came to this overthrow after his initial conflicts with Judaism.³ It is most difficult to understand how Paul could have annulled the Law and its authority simply on the basis of early Christian testimonies. One would conclude from the impressions of Acts and Galatians that Paul had analysed the place of Scripture and Law in Christianity prior to his entry into the major early Christian controversies.⁴ While an apologetic function is present in OT quotations, this function is not sufficient to explain the quotations of 1 and 2 Cor.⁵

¹Lindars, NTA, p. 31. ²Lindars, NTA, p. 232.

³Lindars, NTA, p. 249. This process of development is also seen in Lindars' assertions that the OT was first used for Christ's resurrection and then was used to prove other areas of His life.

⁴Ulonska, FAZA, p. 19.

⁵Gundry, UOTM, p. 160, writes that:
"... strengthening of faith and instruction within the Church were also motives for the use of the OT."
Christian Dietzfelbinger\(^1\) stresses the kerygmatic alignment of OT quotations and asserts that Paul's goal was a conceptualization (Vergegenwartigung) of the OT. Like others, Dietzfelbinger centers this hermeneutical force in the Damascus road experience.\(^2\) This experience enabled Paul to interpret the OT by a promise and fulfillment schema.\(^3\) Unlike Harnack, Dietzfelbinger concludes that the OT became a Christian church-book. Ulonska\(^4\) again insists that this perspective is a later adoption in view of the delay of the parousia. Dietzfelbinger, like Michel, is accused of reading his own piety into Paul's OT in NT use when he claims\(^5\) the unity of God from the OT to the NT on the basis of 2 Cor. 5:19. Ulonska\(^6\) asserts that such a view of the OT places an interpretation back into the OT which makes the OT writers write something of an answer to what was for them

Lindars, NTA, passim, asserts that LXX elements indicate a late stage of development in Gospel quotations but this would not be the case with the Pauline quotations of 1 and 2 Cor.

\(^1\)Dietzfelbinger, TEH, p. 33.
\(^2\)Dietzfelbinger, TEH, p. 36.
\(^3\)Dietzfelbinger, TEH, p. 34.
\(^5\)Dietzfelbinger, TEH, p. 40.
\(^6\)Ulonska, FAZA, p. 23.
an unknown and later question. Such a link between the Old and New Testaments and therefore the ways of God with men is seen to be outside of the circle of Paul's thought. One feels that the thought finds more problem with Ulonska than with Paul. For Ulonska, the reinterpretation of the OT did not influence continuity.

Braun (1962)

Herbert Braun\(^1\) asserts that the exercise of the NT hermeneutic of applying the OT text is not repeatable today. He writes that NT eschatology violates the OT context by claiming that an event, which for the OT writer was future, for the NT writer is near.\(^2\) Any important continuity of God between the Testaments is denied.\(^3\) For Braun, the OT citations do not conceal any hidden meanings which overarch history, therefore the hermeneutic seen in NT writings distorts the meaning of OT passages. Braun\(^4\) concludes that what binds the two testaments together is the understanding of the relationship of God to man. He sees the Christian message to be but a breath (Hauch) in the OT which is fleshed out in

---


\(^2\) Braun, ZTK 59:30.

\(^3\) Braun, ZTK 59:30.

\(^4\) Braun, ZTK 59:30-33.
the NT. One wonders, however, if indeed Paul only used and understood the OT as a "Vorform" of the Christian message.¹

**Ulonska (1963)**

Herbert Ulonska asks three crucial questions which are pertinent to Paul's hermeneutical and textual use of the OT:² 1) Has Paul presupposed the OT as known to his pagan communities? 2) Has he, in the manner of salvation-history, unfolded the OT in terms of the Luke-Acts speeches and in the schema of promise and fulfillment as in Matthew? 3) Has he been so bound to his materials that he can be judged by the presentation of the OT sayings themselves? Ulonska specifically concludes regarding 1 and 2 Cor.:³ 1) Paul did not treat his hearers as acquainted with the OT and therefore did not treat them as Jewish Christians; 2) The OT was not used in a salvation-historical schema; 3) The OT was used for illustration only and not as an authority for piety. Much of this argument is based on the implications of Paul's near expectation of the Parousia:

> Weil für ihn durch die Parusieerwartung die Zukunft qualifiziert ist, bleibe die Vergangenheit - besonders als Instanz zur Legitimierung der Gegenwartungefragt.⁴

---

¹ Ulonska, FAZA, p. 26. ² Ulonska, FAZA, p. 27. ³ Ulonska, FAZA, pp. 128-29; 150. ⁴ Ulonska, FAZA, p. 208.
Paul's words, therefore, take on the timeless (Zeitlosigkeit) quality of "Goldene Worte" which is based in turn on Paul's lostness in the freedom of the Lord.¹

In 1 and 2 Cor. Ulonska concludes that there is no systematic citation scheme but rather the OT was used as opinion or contemplative material (Anschauungsmaterial) and as a support for thought or warning, but no Frömmigkeitsbild was transmitted.² Paul did not set his pre-Christian piety before his hearers:

Ihm geht es noch nicht um Lehre, die aus der Vergegenheit begründet werden soll, sondern um Verkündigung, die immer neu den Menschen treffend und ihn jetzt schon vor den Kyrios stellen will.³

To make a distinction between the use of the OT as contemplative material as over against pietistic conceptuality is gratuitous. Ulonska follows Harnack's essential position that Paul did not use the OT for Christian piety but, unlike Harnack, he allows for more than an anti-Jewish apologetic use for the OT. Ulonska's classification of Paul's use of the OT as illustrative or contemplative material is still too narrow a definition to do justice to the 1 and 2 Cor. quotations. Ulonska's thesis

¹Ulonska, FAZA, pp. 207-08.
²Ulonska, FAZA, p. 223. In 1 and 2 Thess. Ulonska finds no fulfillment motif as in Acts. In Gal. the OT quotations are used to refute named opponents. In Romans the OT is used as an elaboration of the faith phrased in Jewish Scriptural conceptualities in order to win the Jews.
³Ulonska, FAZA, p. 223.
does not reflect a serious consideration of the IF and Jewish hermeneutical methods inherent in Paul and his view of the OT. Also Ulonska presents the case for a more fully developed Gnosticism in Cor. than the data allow, but that subject cannot be treated here.

The material to be presented in 1 and 2 Cor. will show that Paul used the OT in a legalistic and authoritative way which was immediately concerned with the piety of his readers. The variety of uses of the Exodus motif clearly shows that the moral conceptions of the OT precisely fit the situation in the Corinthian church and were integral to the moral growth and religious standing of its members. This will be seen more clearly in the detailed examinations of the quotations.

Summary

As can be seen in the foregoing survey, the positions regarding Paul and the OT range from harmony to complete discontinuity. Harnack saw the unity to be based in the piety of Paul. The OT was useful for debate with Judaism but faith was only alive in the kerygma. Harnack imagined a difference between Paul's view of the OT and the community which he founded. Michel agreed with Harnack regarding Paul's piety but saw this view as passed on to his community.

Goppelt confirmed Michel's observations by the example of typology but in doing so he diminished the
salvation-historical conceptuality of Paul.\textsuperscript{1} Dodd, Ellis and Lindars do not seem to question the unity at all but in fact widen it to include the first century of Christianity. Ulonska\textsuperscript{2} believes this harmonization to be premature to a detailed view of the evidence and brings the same criticism to bear on Dietzfelbinger.

Braun saw the conceptual gulf to be great between the OT and the NT. The OT materials have an original meaning different from that which Paul ascribes to them. On this basis Braun concludes that Paul did not find a unity in the God of the OT and the God of the NT.

Conclusion

The foregoing survey shows the need and importance of defining levels of conceptuality and legitimacy. In approaching and answering the questions of continuity and piety raised by the quotations in the Corinthian correspondence, four levels of conceptuality will be observed: 1) modern criticism; 2) first century Judaism; 3) Pauline piety; 4) OT context. Ulonska, Braun and Harnack allow their critical conceptualities to be determinative on the level of Pauline piety and fail to distinguish between levels three and four at the interpretive level. That Paul had a view of the OT which is unacceptable in part to modern critical standards is

\textsuperscript{1}Ulonska, FAZA, p. 26. \textsuperscript{2}Ulonska, FAZA, p. 26.
quite conceivable, as against Ulonska's criticisms, and Paul must be allowed such deviation. To make the accusation that one has interpreted Paul in light of one's own piety can also reflect an equally erroneous eisegesis of the accuser's own critical methodology (modern piety?).

The problem, then, is to examine the Corinthian quotations from the perspective of Paul's own conceptualities, using early Jewish material as comparative data when possible. The OT context formative to the conclusions of this paper is specifically that from the Greek OT of the first century. The insights gained by modern scholarship into the original Hebrew textual tradition were not part of Paul's conceptuality and he must not be expected to conform to them. The possibility that first century Judaism had an inaccurate interpretation of the OT will not be excluded. Judaism, therefore, will not form the control for evaluating Paul's continuity with the OT but rather will be one aspect of his hermeneutical and exegetical conceptuality of which the implications of the Damascus road experience will form the other aspect.

Thus this study of the OT as used in 1 and 2 Cor. will be done on various levels. Each level interacts with and affects the others. The textual area has two vectors:

---

1 Ulonska, FAZA, p. 6.

2 As Braun's works seem to assert.
the text which lay before Paul or was in his mind, and the same text as it appears in 1 and 2 Corinthians. The actual text before Paul will have to remain in part a moot point due to lack of evidence. Despite the vast and divergent body of literature on the textual aspects of the OT in NT, conclusions must, however, be drawn. One basis for such conclusions is the assumption that the extant LXX textual evidence is sufficient to form a reliable picture of texts which could have been available to Paul. With this assumption one can then proceed to identify text types with which Paul agrees. This may lead to a fragmented relationship between Paul and various MSS, therefore, statements implying that Paul used this or that text must be integrated with the current theories about the history of the transmission of the Greek OT. One will then be able to state more accurately what appears to be a variant from the Greek OT due to the influence of interpretive rather than textual phenomena. At this point the textual-comparative study becomes a basis for not only research in the history of the text, but for understanding the first principles of Paul's hermeneutical conceptuality.

On the conceptual level, what one concludes to be actual variants in Paul's writing must then be accounted for. In dealing with interpretive phenomena one must ask what the new text form says and how it compares to the OT sense. This is asked not to force Paul into today's con-
textual paradigms, but to ascertain any development in sense within Paul's historical context. While this context consisted of Jewish, Roman and Greek influences, such comparisons are only of limited value in delving into the motives of the Apostle.

As Paul found the Messiah Jesus to give central meaning to life, so also he found in Him the determinative hermeneutic to the OT Scriptures. It is this identification of Jesus with the Messiah that gives historical and dogmatic specificity to OT texts. Variants in the text or its interpretation need to be studied in order to see what understanding of the Messiah they reflect. Thus the conceptual vector of the use of the OT will be accurately rooted in specific textual data.

These aspects of Paul's exegetical methodology will also be seen in their proper perspective as medium rather than message. Paul's literary forms (epistola, haggadah, halakah), exegetical methods (implicit or explicit midrash, typology, allegory) and cultural or religious transmissional methods (testimony, text-plots, oral and written) will be seen to be secondary and in subservience to his underlying conceptualities. This conceptuality must be as clearly accounted for as form or methods. The writer is convinced that this must be a descriptive process showing how these aspects have served the guiding hermeneutical conceptuality in the formation of the text as it appears in its final form.
PART II

TEXTUAL AND HERMENEUTICAL EVIDENCES

INTRODUCTION

This section has a twofold purpose. The first aspect is a presentation of the textual data concerning each quotation in order to see if a particular Pauline variant from the main LXX tradition has other Greek or Hebrew OT support. Such support has been often overlooked in a number of passages with the result that a theological or hermeneutical explanation has been unnecessarily offered instead. The textual data will also provide a cumulative picture of the text-types present in Paul's quotations with a view to placing this picture within the framework of current theories regarding LXX transmission-history by Barthélemy and others. These results will be tabulated and evaluated at the end of this part of the thesis. Their implications will be delineated in Part Three.

The second aspect of this section is an evaluation of Paul's hermeneutical conceptuality. This is an area which has been subject to much coverage in general but this study will be limited to the specific areas of
1) contextual awareness and fidelity; 2) the related aspect of historical understanding of the OT passages; and 3) the continuity or discontinuity of Paul's conceptions of God and religion which are explicit in his use of the OT. The accumulated hermeneutical data from each quotation will be correlated and final conclusions drawn in Part Three.

The quotations are presented in their OT sequence rather than the order in which they occur throughout 1 and 2 Cor. This is done in order to highlight the textual affinities of the quotations by seeing together all the passages from a particular OT book. One exception to this format concerns the chain or merged quotations which are considered as a unit for contextual and hermeneutical reasons.¹

¹The apparatus follows the MSS numberings and notations of the Göttingen LXX and Tischendorf 1872. See Benedict Kraft, Die Zeichen Für Die Wichtigeren Handschriften Des Griechischen Neuen Testaments (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1955) and Kurt Aland, Kurtzgefasste Liste der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter und Co., 1963) for conversion tables to current numberings.
## Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>γέγραπται</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔγένετο</td>
<td>ἔγένετο</td>
<td>ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄνθρωπος</td>
<td>ἄνθρωπος</td>
<td>ἄδριμως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψυχήν</td>
<td>ψυχήν</td>
<td>ψυχήν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰδον</td>
<td>Ἰδον</td>
<td>Ἰδον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

### Septuagintal Variants

- ω is omitted by 15, 408-761 18-19-108-119-537-Bs, 106, 664*, 343 46*: haplogr. of the final ω of ἔγενετο and the article. ω ἀνθρώπως is omitted by Hieronymus Ezch 11 Is 12, Iren. II 34.4. εἰς is added to Ἰδον in 135* by the original scribe. α’ agrees with LXX. σ’ σ’ read: ἔγενετο ω ἄδαμ ἀνθρώπως εἰς ψυχήν, Philop. 273s.
New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that d e m\textsuperscript{39} vg\textsuperscript{cle} and others read οὐτω̂ς καὶ while F G f g and others read καθω̂ς. ανθρωπος is read by Ν Α C D E F G L P and others while BK 13 39 63 Ιr. ιnt\textsuperscript{3}g omit ἀνθρωπος. Άδαμ is omitted by 31 and four other MSS.

Textual

The quotation deviates from the main MSS of the LXX by the inclusion of πρῶτος and ἀδάμ. σ’ θ’ include ἀδάμ but before, rather than after, ἀνθρωπος, thereby placing ἀνθρωπος in apposition to ἀδάμ. This is evidence for a doublet reading in σ’ θ’. ‘Αδάμ would be a conformity to the Hebrew דתא. Robin Scroggs writes:

In I Cor. xv. 45 Paul has virtually the same introductory formula, [as in 1 Cor. 2:9] followed by a targumic translation of Gen. ii. 7 which varies at least as much from the text (if one allows 45b as part of the targum) as does 1 Cor. ii. 9 from Isa. lxiv. 4.1

It is more probable, however, that vs 45b is a midrashic commentary rather than a targumic allusion. This conforms more appropriately to Paul's general use of the OT. Also it is difficult to see how Scroggs' point of comparison is made between ἀλλὰ καθω̂ς γέγραπται (1 Cor. 2:9 IF) and the IF here, οὕτω̂ς καὶ γέγραπται. These are not "virtually the same" IF.

Héring writes that ἄνθρωπος, in 1 Cor. 15:45, should be deleted as a mere duplication of ἄνθρωπος. He feels it was "added to make the texts more like that of the Hebrew Genesis"¹ but offers no support for this. At this point in the investigation it appears that Paul's text was the same as the LXX and that he inserted the adjective and the proper name.

Contextual

The Old Testament context is the second account of creation in which man is related to God as a product of His personal formation and inspiration. The New Testament context is Paul's discussion of the necessity and varieties of resurrection life.² Specifically, the quotation follows Paul's assertion of the order of the natural then the spiritual bodies.

Hermeneutical

Paul's development of the order of natural then spiritual bodies differs radically from both the develop-


²A most important series has been inaugurated by H. C. C. Cavallin, Life After Death (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974), in which he explores the Jewish background to 1 Cor. 15 and concludes, p. 200, that there was no unified Jewish conception of physical resurrection in early 1st cen. A.D. This only came later in 1st cen. by the Rabbis. Jack H. Wilson, "The Corinthians Who Say There Is No Resurrection Of The Dead," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 59:99, notes this flux also.
ment of Judaism and Philo; from Philo in that Paul introduces an historical and chronological relationship between the two men Adam and Christ; from Judaism in that Paul gives the restored body a completely spiritual and esoteric quality, totally based by analogy on the new existence made possible by the Messiah Jesus. Paul, while not seeking to provide a new translation, expanded the OT passage both to bring out its original sense and to adapt it to his own conceptuality.¹ The present form of the quotation therefore derives from a hermeneutical, and not a textual, tradition. Though ἀδαμ is a transliteration of the Hebrew, ἄνθρωπος would be a suitable translation. σ' and θ' present a doublet in using both ἀδαμ and ἄνθρωπος to translate ὄτι. Paul inserted πρῶτος in order to balance with the "second" man, Christ. If ἀδμ was present in Paul's OT text, after the pattern of σ', he has changed its location and given the whole phrase a balance with its second member. This aids in the explanation of and the distinguishing between the first and second Adams and can be seen as the fundamental reason for the insertions.


²Because ἀδαμ was also a proper name it serves as a specifying factor as seen both in Paul and σ' θ'.
The Targums and Midrash. In Targum Onkelos the verse is paraphrased "and it became in Adam a Discoursing Spirit."\(^1\) Neofiti reflects a similar concept.\(^2\) In Midrash Rabbah the activities of God teach that man was both terrestrial and celestial as a balance with reference to God's creative work of the "heavens" and "earth." The purpose of this was to maintain peace between the created elements;\(^3\) the underlying concept being that man was the crown of creation and made from its finest substance.\(^4\) With reference to הַיָּדָה שָׁבָה, "Judah b. Rabbi said: This teaches that he provided him with a tail, like an animal, but subsequently removed it from him for the sake of his dignity."\(^5\) Another interpretation was that man fell under obligation to keep his soul, שָׁבָה, alive and living, הָיָה.\(^6\) This last interpretation is seen again in MR where the living soul made man "a slave indentured to himself, so that if he does not work he does not eat."\(^7\) That Paul

---


\(^2\) והווה לוּבְשׁוּס דֶּחָיָה מַלֵּלָא.

\(^3\) H. Freedman, ed., Midrash Rabbah, 10 Vols. (London: Soncino Press, 1939), Genesis, p. 94; Leviticus, pp. 118-19, echoes this concept.

\(^4\) Freedman, MR: Leviticus, p. 111, n. 2.


\(^7\) Freedman, MR: Ecc., p. 67. This interpretation
does not hold this interpretation is seen by the contrast he supplies in asserting that Christ became a life-giving spirit. Adam was a contained living soul with reference to his existence. Christ was a life-generating being. The common ground between Paul and Jewish interpretation at this point is that both interpreted Adam as a historical human figure. Such was not the case with Philo.

Philo. Philo, in speaking of the earthly and ideal Adam,\(^1\) calls the ideal Adam τὸν πρῶτον ἄνθρωπον.\(^2\) Philo's account of the creation of Adam was recorded in the words of the LXX tradition, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζώσαν.\(^3\) Philo speaks of this act: "The body,

derives two men or inclinations from the two yods in Γ'Υ’) ("and He formed"). Scroggs also notes this in LA, p. 86.\(^4\) However, the fact that both Paul and Judaism speak of two men is their only parallel. The same may be said regarding the parallels from MR: Gen., p. 62, concerning the angels having natures from above and animals having earthly natures then man sharing in both elements. Scroggs, LA, p. 88, finds the parallels so striking he is moved to write that "Paul's statements are so similar here that he may very well have had rabbinic theology in mind." The conceptualities of both are radically divergent and therefore the comparison is more interesting than illuminating.


\(^{3}\)Colson and Whitaker, Philo, Leg. All. I, sec. 31.
then has been formed out of earth, but the soul is of the upper air, a particle detached from the Deity,⁴ In other places Philo uses πνοήν ζωής for the πνεῦμα ζωής of God but the rest of the quotation remains unaltered from the LXX.² In an allusion to Gen. 2:7, Philo writes: ἄνθρωπω τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ ἀρχηγήτῳ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἐμφυσῆσαι πνοήν ζωής τὸν θεοῦ.³

Paul. Paul used the analogy between mankind, as focused in Adam, and Christ, to build his comparison between the resurrection body of Christ and that of resurrected humans. Toy writes:

Paul attaches to this statement the doctrine that the present body was made by God to serve the purpose of the psyche, or animal-intellectual nature; while the raised body, like that of Christ, will be pneumatical or spiritual, in that it will be a fit organ of the pneuma, the higher spiritual nature by which we come to apprehend God and live in communion with him.⁴ With this analogy in view one sees that the quotation is not intended as a proof of vs 44b⁵ but to show that what

---

¹Colson and Whitaker, Philo, Leg. All. III, sec. 161, p. 409.

²Colson and Whitaker, Philo, De Plant. 19. Quis Her. 56, and De Somn. sec. 34, where the mind of man is a fragment of deity.

³Colson and Whitaker, Philo, De Spec. Leg. IV 123.


⁵Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 386.
was true regarding Adam is also true regarding Christ.

Thus Paul has reversed the Philonic concept of the ideal and historical Adam. This is a result of the fact that, with Paul, the first and second men were linked to a "real temporal distinction."¹ Conzelmann asserts that "... das Verhältnis von erstem und zweitem Menschen gegenüber dem gesamten religion-geschichtlichen Vergleichsmaterial umgekehrt ist."²

Paul called the earthly Adam ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος and may have been the first to conceive of Christ as the second Adam.³ Not only are the two men reversed by Paul but the heavenly first man of Philo bears no resemblance to Paul's second man who was a historical individual, Jesus, exalted to divine status.⁴ Also, the heavenly man of Philo is not described in Genesis 1 or 2 nor was he


²Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 341.

³Davies, PRJ, p. 44. C. F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin Of The Fourth Gospel (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1922), p. 45, shows that the concept of a second Adam is not found in Judaism until the fifteenth century.

ever compared with Adam. Philo saw both creation accounts to speak of the same man.¹

Lala Dey² has shown that with Philo there was a great fluidity of terminology regarding titles given to the intermediary world and that these titles were based on an underlying and controlling conceptuality. Therefore Philo was led to identify a figure of the intermediary world, such as the ideal man, on the basis of key-words which triggered his conceptuality rather than blocks of rigid exegetical material. Dey asserts that the two types of men were not based on a distinction between Genesis 1 and 2 but on phrases from one or both. The phrases are not substantival but rather are descriptive of relationships. Therefore, while verbal similarity is interesting, it is the underlying conceptuality that is the real basis for the usage of the passages. At this conceptual level Paul and Philo do not evidence any interdependence.

With reference to Judaism it is interesting to note in MR Gen. Vol. I, p. 17, that the spirit of God which hovered was an allusion to the spirit of Messiah

¹This goes against Wedderburn, NT 15:306, who asserts Philo's two men reflect the order of the biblical narrative. Scroggs, LA, p. 87, n. 3, finds that Paul has nothing in common with Philo at this point.

which would rest upon a man. Also one interpretation concerning "He formed" related to the schools of Shammai and Hillel and to the formation of the body at the resurrection. Hillel argued that at the resurrection the order would be skin and flesh, with sinews and bones last, while Shammai reversed the order. This shows how far Paul's conceptuality was from the contemporary Jewish and Hellenistic views of restoration. For Judaism, the restitution of the perfect earthly state was to crown the future events but for Paul the body itself would be changed into a radically superior body of divine glory.

This relationship between Adam and Christ was typological, being neither an exegetical expedient nor mere speculation. In fact it is the very difference between the two men that forms their relation to the progression which was revealed through typological conceptuality. Amsler concludes that the Adam-Christ typology

---

1Cf. Isa. 11:2.
was a reaction to Gnostic speculations at Corinth and that this pattern had a pastoral function only: to clear up misunderstandings and to act as a basis for exhortation. Lengsfeld sees this typology as an object of faith (Glaubensgegenstand) rather than teaching or Creed (Lehre, Bekenntnis). The Adam-Christ analogy, however, was not simply a reaction to the speculations at Corinth (whether they were gnostic or otherwise) as is seen in Paul's use of the analogy in Romans 5. Such analogy did find application to the Corinthian situation. The distinction between Glaubensgegenstand and Lehre is anachronistic. Conzelmann writes that "first" signifies mankind typologically and that "Adam" indicates his character as primal man. However, the term "Adam" in and of itself only specifies the historical figure of Judaism. The addition of Adam in Symmachus and Theodotion cannot be made to intimate a primal man concept at work in those recensions. We conclude that the addition of Adam acts as a proper name in balance with that of Christ. Paul's Adam is not based on the philosophical speculation of the primal man of Hellenism.

Thus vs 45b is Paul's commentary on Gen. 2:7. The last half of vs 45 finds no origin in the OT though

---

1Lengsfled, AUC, pp. 63-64.
2Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 337.
some take that passage to be part of the quotation.\footnote{Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 337, notes "Es muss beachtet werden, dass Paulus V. 45b wie einen Teil des Schriftwortes hinzusetzt." Burney, AOFG, p. 45, concurs.}

Rather than asserting that vs 45b is a part of the quotation we conclude that it is a pesher-type addition.\footnote{Ellis, PUOT, pp. 144-45, says it is "perhaps the most notable instance of Pesher quotation in the Pauline literature."} In first century Palestine the line was not as clearly drawn between text and commentary as Conzelmann and Burney argue.

Summary. While Paul's development of Gen. 2:7 is indeed midrashic the underlying conceptuality breaks with Judaism and Hellenism and indicates that Paul viewed a historical link between the first and last man. He no doubt held that Adam was an historical person and interpreted Gen. 2 quite literally thereby placing the relationship between the two men into history and existence. This is not to deny either an archetypal representative sense inherent in Paul's two men or a prior formulative exegetical tradition.\footnote{Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 338.} Paul's use of Gen. 2:7, however, stands within the general tradition of Jewish, rather than Philonic, conceptualities by relating the first man to what Judaism believed to be an historical personage. It was Paul's christocentric view of mankind, therefore, that allowed him to insert "first" and "Adam" into the quotation.
### Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>έσονται</td>
<td>έσονται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἥν</td>
<td>γάρ</td>
<td>Φησίν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ</td>
<td>οἱ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύο</td>
<td>δύο</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ῥκα</td>
<td>σάρκα</td>
<td>σάρκα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μιᾶν</td>
<td>μιᾶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mt. 19:5; Mk. 10:8; Eph. 5:31: καὶ έσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μιᾶν.

### Masoretic Variants

BHK notes that the LXX, Syriac, Vulgate, and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan insert οὖν after ἥν. This would reflect a Hebrew text which varied from the MT.¹

### Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX notes that the οὗ δύο is included in the Samaritan Pentateuch and Targum Neofiti but is absent from Chrysostom IV, (in F. Field, Interpretatio Omn. Epp. Paulinarum) and 305 which agree with Targum Onkelos and

---

¹Gough, NTQ, p. 302.
the MT. Philo follows the LXX when he quotes Gen. 2:24 in Leg. All. II 14, i. 75 and De Gig. 15, i. 272.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that φησίν is read by Ν Β Α ΤΕ F G K L P the Vulgate and others. A Marcion JEpiph N Tertullian Pud 3 Cyprian 323 and Ambrose passim omit φησίν.

Textual

The quotation, apart from the IF, γὰρ φησίν, equals the text of the LXX.

Contextual

Genesis 2:24 is an explanation inserted into the Hebrew regarding the propriety and reason for marriage and is to be attributed either to Adam or Moses.1 The complete unity achieved in the creation of one flesh from two individuals is described.

In Corinthians the sexual aspect is in the background as one could hardly suspect that Paul was asking, in vs. 16, if the readers knew the physiology involved in sexual union. Paul stressed the unity of emotion and spirit which was achieved in the sexual act. A comparison was drawn of the union of the believer with Christ to show, not the impossibility of being at the same time one with Christ and one with a τοποθετημένη, but to show its utter

---

1Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 149.
incompatibility.¹ By presenting this illustration of unity, the Apostle was trying to convey clearly the absolute contradiction involved. The mild adversative δὲ heightens this contrast by noting the even more thorough-going unity of man with Christ.² Mt. 19:5 reproduces the vs as in 1 Cor. 6:16 and emphasizes unity in relation to the idea of divorce. Mt. 19:6 says the man and wife are σώμα μία. The Mk. 10:8 context parallels Mt. 19:6. In Eph. 5:31, regarding Christ and the Church, Paul quotes Gen. 2:24 without the IF after διὰ μέλη ἐσμέν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. He called this concept a mystery of Christ and the Church and saw this relationship of unity to be a figure (type?) of the nurture and care of Christ for His church. The bride metaphor underlies Paul's thought and his exposition highlighted one implication of that figure.

Paul quotes a larger portion of Gen. 2 in Eph. 5:31 where προσκόλλησεται precedes the portion of Gen. 2:24 common to both Eph. and 1 Cor. In 1 Cor. 6:16-17 Paul used κολλάω. Mt. 19:5, quoting Gen. 2:24 uses κολληθησεται. Sampley³ suggests that Paul got this concept from Sirach 19:2 where κολλάω is similarly used. It is more convincing to conclude that the word occurs because it was known to Paul in the LXX context, as Eph. 5:31 shows (granting Pauline authorship of Eph.).

---

¹Wendland, Kor., p. 47. ²vs 17.
Hermeneutical

T. A. Burkil1 judges that Paul "carries his analogical argument beyond the bounds of rational experience" when he makes a "sudden switch from the notion of corporeal or carnal henosis to that of merging into one spirit (pneuma)." This OT sense of essential unity was adopted by Paul in placing the quotation into its new setting. It is not clear whether υμων refers to God2 or the Scripture. Though this is essentially a distinction without a difference. Gen. 2:24 is treated as an utterance of God in Mt. 19:5.

In other literature the verse is variously interpreted. In MR Gen., pp. 131, 146, the verse is used in its plain literal sense. Neofiti I and Onkelos also adhere closely to the original sense. Philo used the passage to speak of a carnal man leaving the Father who is God and Mother, who is God's excellence and wisdom, to cling to his sense perceptions.3 As such, both Philo and

1T. A. Burkil, "Two into One: The Notion of Carnal Union in Mark 10:8; 1 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 5:31," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 62 (1971), p. 120.


3Leg. All II 49, p. 254. A similar idea is found in De Gig. 65, p. 478, where men are seen turning from
Paul agree that the concept of "one flesh" is a good vehicle for communicating the idea of a spiritual unity though their methods and conclusions are quite divergent.

The "they" of εὐνοοῦμεν becomes, by application, the Corinthian and his πορνή. Contextually this is a startling contrast to the originally pure and serene setting in the Garden concerning Adam and Eve's initial union. This broadening of the verb's subjects shows that Paul had drawn from Gen. 2:24 and then applied it to a specific situation. The unity implied by the union with a prostitute was greater than the Corinthians believed. As prostitution was so commonplace they possibly thought that there was little more than a casual and superficial personal implication in such activity. Paul used the quotation to demonstrate that in God's judgment such acts point to a vital and significant union, so vital as to be only appropriate within the marriage bond. The quotation serves to illustrate why a man is one flesh with a prostitute.

It is noteworthy that Paul used σῶμα just prior to the quotation and yet allowed the quoted σῶμα to remain. In doing so Paul gave sarx a greater specificity than in Genesis. Barrett sees a progression from "body" to

reason to the fleshly nature.

¹Héring, 1 Cor., p. 46. F. F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians (London: Oliphants, 1971), p. 64, calls this a variation on the "one flesh" concept of Gen. 2.
"flesh" to "spirit" and holds that the use of Gen. 2:24 formed the bridge between body and spirit. It is doubtful that Paul made a trichotomous distinction between σῶμα and πνεῦμα (and ψῡχή) at this point but rather concentrated on the physical body in general thereby allowing for the ostensibly synonymous use of both terms.

Paul's use of Gen. 2:24 is consistent with its use elsewhere within the first century Christian tradition. Paul presented an argument from the lesser to the greater by implying that if the unity achieved on a human level of marriage is not intended to be broken but rather is permanent, how much more the spiritual unity achieved between the believer and His Lord. While the context is innovative, the use of the passage maintains its historical and primary sense. The use of the passage in an ethical argument also shows a continuity of piety and deity from the OT.

1Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 149.

2Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 127. Robert H. Gundry, Sōma In Biblical Theology With Emphasis On Pauline Anthropology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 51-80, puts forth a case for seeing soma to refer to the physical body in 1 Cor. 6:12-20, indeed throughout the entire NT. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., pp. 134-35, notes that σῶμα is used in a neutral anthropological manner. But it is clearly the physical body which is in view. See also Sampley, TOE, p. 78.
### Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נָה</td>
<td>ὁ ὦκ</td>
<td>καθὼς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָהְרָע</td>
<td>ἐπλεόνασεν</td>
<td>γέγραπραι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָבָרָה</td>
<td>τὸ</td>
<td>τό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְבַן</td>
<td>πολὺ</td>
<td>πολὺ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁנְנָה</td>
<td>χαὶ</td>
<td>χαὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלָטָט</td>
<td>τὸ</td>
<td>τὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֹל</td>
<td>οὔκ</td>
<td>οὔκ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רָאָס</td>
<td>ἡλαττόνησεν</td>
<td>ἡλαττόνησεν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

### Septuagintal Variants

B-M notes that f omits the first οὐκ-ἐλαττον. Οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν comes after πολὺ in n Armenian Boharic (begins with χαὶ). The first ω is read ὁ by m q Eth. The
second ο το is omitted in a codex of Philo. The second ο is read ὃ by m q Eth. Ελαττων is read ελασσον by b x; ολιγον by A² Philo and Paul. The second ουκ is preceded by και in m. n reads ελαττονευθειν for ηλαττονηθειν and Philo reads ελαττωσε. α' and δ' follow the LXX but σ' reads και ουχ ευρον περισσου ο το πλεον ουδε ο το ολιγον ηλαττονηθειν. Onkelos reads:

... and he who had much had not more, and he who had little had not less; every man according to the mouth of his eating they gathered.¹

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that F and G read πολλυ. ο sec: F G al fere ¹⁵ (5 ap Scri) om ... 26* 38.48.72 al aliq bis ὃ for ο, item tol cui multum et cui modicum.

Textual

In the first part of the quotation, Paul reads ουκ επελεόνασεν after δ το πολυ.² This reading has widespread geographical support, therefore the possibility that Paul witnesses to an early Palestinian Greek text should be considered. There is no need to posit a non-MT Hebrew basis because, though the chiasmus of the Hebrew and LXX is altered in Paul's version, n. Arm. and Boh., this is most likely a translational preference. In the last half of the quotation Paul reads ολιγον for Ελαττων.³ This

¹Etheridge, TOJ. ²As do n Arm. and Boh. ³A² Philo and σ'.
quotation includes all the words in the LXX of Ex. 16:18.

**Contextual**

The OT context concerns the gift of manna which was given to the Israelites in the early part of their exodus from Egypt. The nation was told to gather an omer of the food for each person\(^1\) with the result that some heads of households gathered more, some less.\(^2\) The verse under consideration expresses the fact that when what was gathered was measured all needs were met with neither excess nor lack as each man had gathered "according to his eating."

Paul, in 2 Cor. 8, wrote with regard to the pending offering for the Jerusalem church. In 2 Cor. 8:12 Paul stressed the aspects of freewill and practicality in the giving and continued in vss. 13-14 to explain the flow of equality necessary between Christian communities. The church who had the ability was obligated to see its way clear to share its abundance "that there may be equality."\(^3\) The quotation is inserted to illustrate or substantiate this point.

**Hermeneutical**

The quotation has only minor variations from the LXX and has been classed as free.\(^4\) However, MS evidence

---

\(^1\)Ex. 16:16.  \(^2\)Ex. 16:17.  \(^3\)2 Cor. 8:14.

\(^4\)For example, Gough, NTQ, p. 306.
has been noted with a wide geographical spread which supports Paul's word order, What has been termed "free" may be, in reality, a close adherence to a first century text-type. Bonsirven writes that ἄλιγγον used for ἔλαινον is an example of the replacement of a word by its equivalent, though he also overlooks the textual basis as has been already noted. It would appear that Paul's text read ἄλιγγον.

This verse is used by Philo in referring to "the heavenly food of the soul, wisdom" which is the spiritual meaning of manna. This food is given "to all who will use it in equal portions by the divine Word, careful above all things to maintain equality." Hanson writes:

Thus Philo's treatment could be said to have prepared the way for Paul's in the sense that it transfers the whole incident into the sphere of spiritual transactions, and that it whitewashes the Israelites and represents the affair as a matter of God giving rather than Israel procuring.

It seems likely, however, that, not Philo, but the OT passage itself first and originally demonstrated a spiritual lesson of God's provision; that all needs were met

---

1 Bonsirven, EREP, p. 333. See also Turpie, OTN, p. 21.

2 Colson and Whitaker, Philo IV, p. 378, Quid Her. 191.

3 Colson and Whitaker, Philo IV, p. 379.

4 Hanson, SPTT, p. 175.
both by God's provision and man's gathering.\(^1\) The Exodus context quite clearly points out man's responsibility to gather but only according to his daily needs. The point was a day-to-day reliance upon the sovereign provisions of Yahweh. Philo's spiritualization of the passage, making manna wisdom, the spiritual food of the soul, takes the Exodus passage into quite another direction than would be useful to Paul. The Apostle applied the verse to explicitly physical and tangible matters of support and provision for the daily maintenance of the saints.

Several commentators conclude that Paul has ignored, by varying degrees, the historical context of the OT quotation. Edgar calls this a "flagrant misuse of a verse" and writes that "in the original passage this referred to the manna in the wilderness; there was no suggestion of sharing . . . . Paul paid no attention at all to the context."\(^2\) This problem with the context arises more from a preconception of what kind of quota-


tion was demanded by Paul's context rather than a desire to let the quotation speak for itself and then to seek to understand its place in the Epistle.

While most commentators find the human element of sharing absent they correctly evaluate the quotation's stress on equality. This is exactly central to Paul's use of the passage. Plummer elaborates this equality as being not "the result of mutual give and take, which is a voluntary process, but that which is the result of the same measure being imposed on all, which is not voluntary." But it is what constitutes this formal imposition of equality which is at the foundation of Paul's selection of this passage. Theologically Paul linked the actions of God among Israel with His actions among the Church. While human responsibility in giving was ultimately Paul's message he used the quotation to provide a divine pattern upon which he could build his exhortations. Therefore to criticise Paul's regard for context on the basis of a lack of sharing in the OT passage is to miss the real reason for Paul's use of it. This theology was organic in the motivation of the Corinthians to give in accordance with the generosity which God showed in

1 Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 62.
Christ. Thus the quotation is a theologically centered typological figure of the way God's character and acts, which form a consistent link from Israel to the Church, should be expressed through the responsible acts of the community. It is an example, "une révélation symbolique," of God's desire and provision for equality, not only for the nation in the wilderness but for the new Israel, the Church. Thus Paul displays a sense of continuity of deity from the OT and makes application of the quotation on the basis of its plain historical context.

---

1Hanson, SPTT, p. 177, notes the use of περίσσεια, πτωχεία, ἐπερίσσευσεν, πλοῦτος, χάριν; see 1 Cor. 10:1-11.

2Bonsirven, EREP, p. 329.

EXODUS 32:6, 1 CORINTHIANS 10:7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Display</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>ναὸς</td>
<td>γεγραπται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔκκαθισεν</td>
<td>ἔκκαθισεν</td>
<td>oduspe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅ</td>
<td>ὅ</td>
<td>γέγραμμαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαὸς</td>
<td>λαὸς</td>
<td>λαὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φαγεῖν</td>
<td>φαγεῖν</td>
<td>φαγεῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πεῖν</td>
<td>πεῖν</td>
<td>πεῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνέστησαν</td>
<td>ἀνέστησαν</td>
<td>ἀπέστησαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παίζειν</td>
<td>παίζειν</td>
<td>παίζειν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masoretic Variants

BHK offers no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

Swete notes that the original scribe of B corrected πεῖν to πεῖν.¹ In A πεῖν is the correction of the second scribe as confirmed by the third. Brooke-McLean note that Justin reads ἐφαγε καὶ ἐπεῖν ο λαὸς καὶ

¹James Hope Moulton and Wilbert Francis Howard, A Grammar Of New Testament Greek II (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929), p. 89, notes that this is an example of the normal Koine tendency to contract two i-sounds into one. See also Hans Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 193, n. 7.
ανεστη του παιζειν.

**New Testament Variants**

Tischendorf notes that πειν is read by Ν (πνυ) B* D* F G while A B C D E K L P and others read πειν.

**Textual**

Other than the orthographical variations surrounding πειν, Paul's quotation is an exact quotation from the Greek OT.

**Contextual**

The OT context is Israel's idolatry which occurred during Moses' delay on Mt. Sinai. The golden calf had been constructed and Ex. 32:6 describes the activities of Israel in her worship of it.

The NT context continues Paul's illustrative discourse on the example of Israel in the wilderness. The phrases υπο την νεφελην and δια της θαλασσης of 1 Cor. 10:1 have become symbols, or types, of the participation in, hence identification with, the great redemption of Israel from Egypt. This identification is heightened by the use of ἔβαπτισαντο and ἐν τῇ νεφελῇ.\(^1\) The mention of spiritual food and drink also heightens the sense of Israel's participation in the privileges of their salvation. Paul has clearly drawn a comparison between Israel

\(^1\) Cor. 10:2. The prepositions exhibit an instrumental of means.
and the Christian community by his reference to baptism and eating which pictures the elements of the Lord's supper. Paul has even emphasized this later aspect by insisting that the meat and drink was directly from the spiritual presence of the Messiah. He draws this identification in detail in 1 Cor. 10:14-22. In specifying the types\(^1\) of Israel which should be avoided by the Corinthians, Paul used the quotation descriptive of idolatry. Idolatry is the second in a list of five prohibited actions.\(^2\)

**Hermeneutical**

The quotation illustrates the actions of a certain group within the nation\(^3\) but it is of interest that Paul felt the need to illustrate this point with a quotation when the other four (lust, immorality, tempting Yahweh, murmuring) are described in his own words. The quotation certainly shows the pleasures of Israel in their sin\(^4\) as well as the format of their sin: eating and immoral

---

\(^{1}\)τοὺολ, 1 Cor. 10:6.

\(^{2}\)lust, vs 6; idolatry, vs 7; immorality, vs 8; tempting the Lord, vs 9; murmuring, vs 10.

\(^{3}\)τινος αὐτῶν, 1 Cor. 10:7.

This quotation is therefore an easily remembered and concise description of idolatrous acts and was included as an apt description of the idol feasts in Corinth.2

According to Bonsirven, the texts cited in 1 Cor. 10:7-10 are not cited for a demonstration or illustration, but for enunciating a part of Paul's argument and do not display any exegetical method.3 This use of the OT by Paul does display evidence of his hermeneutical methodology, however. He viewed the events of Israel as historical realities which then became examples for his readers. The use of ἐγενήθησαν of 1 Cor. 10:6 needs to be compared with τυπικῶς συνέβαλεν of 1 Cor. 10:11. In the first instance Paul is saying that the events of the Exodus became (culminative aorist) types. This process was evidently a result of Paul's hermeneutical pro-

---


2 F. F. Bruce, 1 & 2 Cor., p. 92. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 193, n. 33, notes the parallelism of the eating and playing with idolatry and immorality.

3 Bonsirven, EREP, pp. 320-21.
cess which viewed the OT as having direct implications for the present. At this point such implications would be at home in Judaism as well as in Christianity. The adverbial τυπικός of 1 Cor. 10:11 draws the relationship of the OT to the present even more directly. The mode of the happening of the events was typological; that is, infused with a meaning for Paul's present. This is one reason why they were recorded. The hermeneutical methodology displayed here can only be loosely termed "typological." There is no sense of fulfillment in Paul's use of the quotation. The link with Paul's present was not so much the event of Ex. 32 but the attitude of God toward that event. Because the attitude of God (ἀλλ' ὁ κατακατ᾽ θεός αὐτῶν εὐθύνησεν ὁ θεός κτλ. 1 Cor. 10:5) was the link with the present situation in Corinth, the translations for τόποι (1 Cor. 10:6) and τυπικοίς (1 Cor. 10:11) should be "examples" and "as examples" rather than "types" and "typologically." Paul did not point to a prophetic antitype but used the OT event as warning or parenesis [νουθετίαν (1 Cor. 10:11)] based on the continuing and consistent attitude of God toward idolatry. God's principles of conduct as implied in the use of the five categories then became applicable to the Christians in Corinth.

1 έγραψα, 1 Cor. 10:11.

2 This is consistent with 1 Thess. 1:7; 1 Tim. 4:12; 1 Pet. 5:3.
Paul presented a finely tuned ethical demand leading to the conclusion of vs 14.\(^1\) Idolatry had not totally left his mind since 1 Cor. 8:1 and therefore the quotation must be seen as another support for Paul's anti-idolatry argument. The quotation itself proves only that some of the Israelites were idolaters, not that they were punished for it. The next verse\(^2\) speaks of punishment. The quotation is designed to place idolatry in the context of judgment within the community of the redeemed. This process, as transferred to the Corinthian church, shows the ubiquitous Pauline conceptuality of the Church as the New Israel. Paul used the vivid historical example of the events at Sinai to parallel the events in Corinth. The cry of "all things are lawful"\(^3\) for the redeemed had prompted Paul to counter with distinctions inherent within ancient redeemed Israel. This is a direct, historical application of an OT event to a NT ethical problem and shows a continuity of deity and piety.

\(^{1}\)Διόπερ, ἀγαπητοί μου, φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλο-λατρίας.
\(^{2}\)1 Cor. 10:8.
\(^{3}\)1 Cor. 10:5.
## Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἡνίκα</td>
<td>εἰσεπορεύετο</td>
<td>ἐπιστρέψῃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δὲ ἄν</td>
<td>μωσῆς</td>
<td>πρὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔναντι</td>
<td>κυρίου</td>
<td>κύριον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαλεῖν</td>
<td>αὐτῷ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περιπρέπειτο</td>
<td>περιαρέσται</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κάλυμμα</td>
<td>ἐκπορεύεσθαι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

## Septuagintal Variants

B-M note that q reads ἡνίκα ἃν and q* reads ἡνίδαν. Δὲ is read for δ ἃν by b c w Chr. ἐπορεύετο is read by f x. B k m n p read μωσῆς while A F M rell read μωσῆς and Chr. omits it. ἔναντι κυρίου bis scr p*. Ἐναντίον is read by a b Chr. Cyr.; c reads ἐνωσίον. Chr.
places τού before κυρίου. Δαλών is read by n and several MSS of Cyr. d has αυτό instead of αυτω, x has αυτον, and Chr. omits the pronoun. f (pex corr fa) reads περιεληπτώ. a n r Chr. Cyr. read περιηπετ and x has περιερρετ. The article before καλαμμα is omitted by m b z. o has καταλυμμα. A reads ου for του. n has εισπορευεσθαι. k and m have εξελεθεν αυτον and c Chr. add αυτον to εισπορευεσθαι.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that K* A and 17 read ηνικα δε εαν. Or.1,686 reads ηνικα γαρ εαν and 3,498 εαν γαρ. Alibi tantum εαν and 3,459 ηνικα αν. c Mac.7,217 Dam. al pler. read ηνικα δε. ΝC B D E F G K L P Chr. 567 Thdrt. ad h.l. and 1,173 read ηνικα δ αν. Did. 229 Nyss. 1,652 Bas. 3,44 Thdrt 1,442 read οταν δε.

Textual

Paul has omitted the proper name μωσῆς as well as the purpose (λαλεῖν αὐτῷ) of Moses' going into the presence of the Lord. With Paul δε δυν has become δε δεν. The δεν of the quotation may be a correction of literary morphology.1 Εἰσεπορεύετο is changed to ἐπιστρέψῃ. ΄Εναντι becomes πρὸς. The tense of περιεληπτω is changed from the imperfect to the present. The textual evidence at this point

---

1Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 102.
suggests that the Pauline form was hermeneutically, rather than textually, determined.

**Contextual**

The OT context is that of Moses' second appearance with the tablets of the Law. His face shone in such a glorious manner that the people were afraid to come near him. They were recalled, however, and stood before Moses while he spoke the words of the covenant. After these words Moses placed the veil over his face and removed his covering only when he went before the Lord in the tabernacle. He replaced the veil whenever he spoke the words of the Law to the people.

Paul, in 2 Cor. 3, demonstrated the superiority of the New Covenant over the Old. This is part of a long apology for the apostolic ministry. Because of this superiority the Apostle is able to use great boldness in his speech. The Law's inaugural glory was seen on Moses' shining face when he became the recipient and transmitter of the revelation. His glory was temporary

---

1 McNamara, NPTP, p. 169. 2 Cor. 3:7-8. We concur with J.-F. Collange, Enigmes De La Deuxieme Epitre De Paul Aux Corinthiens (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1972), p. 85, who has shown that there is no break between 2 Cor. 3:11 and 12 and that vss 12-16 are not a gloss from a pre-Pauline document. Vs 9 demonstrates the use of qal vahomer.


3 2 Cor. 3:12.
but nonetheless from Yahweh. A contrast is thus drawn between the actions of Moses, which were veiled, and those of Paul which were done in unhindered reflection of the glory of the Lord.¹

Paul's double use of τὸ καταργούμενον² and τοῦ καταργούμενον³ supports the concept that that which was "passing away" was not only the reflection of glory on Moses' face but the whole content and context of the Law. For Paul the law was not the last word of God to his nation but acted as a temporary step in God's economy.⁴ Moses' intention was to keep Israel from becoming spell-bound, ἀπενίσθαμ,⁵ by the glory of the Law to the detri-

¹ 2 Cor. 3:18.
² The "passing away" element has shifted from the glory on Moses' face to what it heralded: the Law itself, or as Paul phrases it in vs 9, ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως. 2 Cor. 3:11, τὸ καταργούμενον . . .
³ 2 Cor. 3:13.⁴ Amsler, ATE, p. 50.
⁵ 2 Cor. 3:13. Collange rightly notes that this term is the key to Paul's interpretation, E2Cor., p. 96. See James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1930), p. 89, for the term's intensive quality. It is interesting to note that κατανοήσας translates Ναβι in Ex. 19:21 where a too eager desire to see the glory of God on Sinai would have resulted in death. No wonder the Israelites both feared the similar glory on Moses' face but would most likely also have had a strong curiosity to see it. Ἐξεκούσε translates Ναβι in Ex. 34:30 and ἔλεγον for Ναβι in Ex. 34:35. Also note the key-word ἀφάντα, (2 Cor. 3:13) in Paul's analogy. 2 Cor. 3:14-15 sustains the analogy of the public reading of the Law by Moses and in Paul's day. C. J. A. Hickling, "The Sequence Of Thought In II Corinthians, Chapter Three," New Testament Studies 21 (1975), p. 390, sees ἀπενίσθαμ as an "expansive exegesis of Exodus" rather than a motive for Moses putting on the veil. But this
ment of their appreciation of the Person of Yahweh. The veil had then become the symbol for the reason why Israel rejected Christ. They were veiled from seeing His eternal glory but Paul does not elaborate on why or how they are blinded. At the end of this midrash the NT believers themselves are transformed by the vision of Christ. The parallel was between Moses and his glory and the minister and his glory.  

Hermeneutical

This quotation is the climax of Paul's midrashic exposition of Ex. 34 and serves as a support for the contrast between the Law and the ministry of the apostle.  

Origin. One initial problem concerns the origin of this midrash. Georgi theorizes that Paul turned a

ignores the grammatical thrust of the προς το μὴ ἀνενίκαι of 2 Cor. 3:13.

1Demann, CS 2-3-4:195.


3Dunn, JTS 21:312.

midrash which had been composed by Paul's enemies around on them. This supposed allusive and sarcastic method of argumentation is doubtful. Were Paul's readers so subtle and would Paul risk another misunderstanding just to be clever and sarcastic?¹

Language. A second problem concerns the language from which Paul drew the quotation. Doeve remarks that it is doubtful if Paul used the LXX here. He bases this opinion on the supposition that Paul had 1) knowingly left out the end of the OT verse because it was of no use to his purpose and 2) that the present tense of the Hebrew (יָדַע הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן הָבְשָׁן Hiph. impf. 3 ms.) would be significant to a rabbi like Paul.² Doeve holds that Paul has used the principle of the deeper sense of Scripture because he has interpreted the verse in a spiritual manner. Because מִלְג and מִלְג alternate in being translated ηπιστρέφειν (but only in LXX 1 Kings 22:27-28) this offers grounds for substitution elsewhere.³ There is much in Doeve's remarks.


²Doeve, JHSG, p. 99.

In addition it must be noted that the allusive quality of the passage is supported by the absence of an IF. There is, however, enough correspondence with the LXX here, as in the vast majority of Paul's OT quotations, to support Paul's use of the Greek rather than Hebrew OT.

Early Jewish Interpretation. Paul's substitution of επιστρέψω for εὐσκεπτωστο is the hermeneutical crux of this passage. While this substitution may be conjectured as a textual rather than a hermeneutical phenomenon, its particular causes are more adequately treated as part of the hermeneutical considerations. Several early Jewish works use this OT passage but do not show Paul's conceptuality regarding repentance.

on p. 728 should be corrected from 3 Βασ. 22:17 to 22:27. Vs 17 reads ἀναστρέψω.

1Allo, 2 Cor., p. 92, writes that this verse in Cor. is not "une citation biblique expresse" but is more like an adaptation to the present subject of Ex. 34:34 which colors the syntax and terminology of the quotation. This is most important to bear in mind with reference to the repentance concept. Bruce sees the hermeneutical aim of this adaptation by calling it a derived principle, 1&2 Cor., p. 193. The obscurity, Hanson, SPTT, p. 190, of the quotation is brought about by its closeness to, yet divergence from, the language of Ex. 34:34 while, at the same time, the context of Exodus gives the important key to its understanding, Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 122.

2περιλαμβάνει τὸ καλυμμα.

3Ορκε, "καλυμμα," p. 560, states that possibly ἐπιστρέφειν stood in Paul's copy of the LXX. But there is no LXX MS evidence for this. If ἐπιστρέφειν was in the LXX text before Paul, he has given a moral sense to a local one, Roger Le Déaut, "Traditions Targumiques Dans Le Corpus Paulinien?" Biblica 42 (1961), p. 44.
Onkelos reads: "But when Mosheh went in before the Lord to speak with Him, he removed the veil until he came out." 1 In LAB 2 three events are apparent: 1) Moses was ignorant of the glory of his face; 2) the people did not recognize him; 3) when Moses found out regarding the glory, he made the veil. In MR Song of Solomon 3 Ex. 34:34 is quoted as a support for God’s reason for having Israel construct a Tabernacle: it was no longer becoming for God to speak to Israel in the open as in the past. Therefore the Tabernacle was to act as the place where God would meet with man. In the Mekilta 4 the term "saying" is expounded to mean that the message was spoken immediately after it was first heard. Ex. 34:34 is quoted to support the interpretation that Moses came directly out of the tent of meeting and spoke the words of God to Israel. 5 Martin McNamara, in two works, 6 notes the similarities between Paul’s use of ἐπιστρέψις and that of Pseudo-Jonathan on Ex. 33:7. 7 Ps. Jon. notes that

1 הובך עלינו משיח לאדם כי לעילל实木דעיה והיה בינה, Etheridge, TOJ.


3 Freedman, MR Song of Solomon, p. 165.

4 Tractate Pishaon Ex. 12:ff.

5 Lauterbach, Mekilta I, p. 11.

6 McNamara, NTPT, pp. 168-81 and TT, pp. 111ff.

7 Etheridge, TOJ, Ex. 33:7, "and it was that when
this turning of Israel in Ex. 33:7 is equal to one turning in repentance "in precisely the same sense as does 2 Cor. 3:16."¹

R. Le Déaut, in considering ἐπιστρέψαι, observes the relationship between Ps. Jon. and Paul² and notes that ἐσεπορεύετο exactly renders the וַיְנַחַם of the Targum. "Du reste, la formule paulinienne ἥνεκα δὲ ἐδε τις ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς κόριον resemble étrangement à la phrase du Targum: ‘וַיְנַחַם ... וַיְנַחַם רַדְאָה.'³ Given the antiquity of the Targum, it becomes a weighty probability that Paul shares in at least the conceptual tradition of this rendering.⁴

Pauline Contribution. Paul's own thinking also paved the way for this conceptuality. He had, no doubt, previously thought through the implications of the

anyone turned by repentance with a true heart before the Lord, he went forth to the Tabernacle of the House of Instruction that was without the camp, to confer and pray for the pardon of his sins; and praying, he was forgiven." Paul also appears to have followed the PT of Dt. 30:12-14 in Ro. 10:6-8 and represents Targum Jonathan I on Ex. 7:11 in 2 Tim. 3:8, McNamara, NTPT, p. 169.

¹McNamara, NTPT, p. 178, and TT, p. 111. McNamara, NTPT, 180, asserts that Paul's thought has shifted from Ex. 34:29ff to Ex. 33:5ff.

²R. Le Déaut, Bib. 42:46f.

³Le Déaut, Bib., 42:46-7.

⁴"From what we have seen of the portions of TJI not found in any other PT text, we have no difficulty in taking this particular one to Ex. 33,5ff. as pre-Christian. The relation of such passages proper to TJI with the NT appears, in fact, to be the best way of determining the age of many of them," McNamara, NTPT, p. 181.
Christian ministry with reference to the Mosaic covenant. His clashes with the Pharisees would have sharpened his thinking relative to the place of the Mosaic legislation and ritual. With reference to such conflicts and to the passage in 2 Cor. 3, Ernst Käsemann writes:

It is characteristic of Paul's method of argument that the question of credentials should lead immediately to fundamentals, and it is no less characteristic of it for the ideas to tumble over one another and for very different motifs to be loosely linked up by a process of association.\(^1\)

Paul's work of church founding would have given him practical experience in relating the Law to Christian experience. His own personal religious reconstruction would have given him a well-tried perspective and philosophy upon which he would cope with any new religious trend. Any position which asserted its own superiority over that of the Christian ministers would immediately be examined and found to be in error simply by virtue of the insurpassable character of Christ and the quality of His ministry as understood by Paul.\(^2\) If the Corinthian opposition came partially or completely under the guise of orthodox Judaism the comparison with the Mosaic and New covenants would be readily brought to Paul's mind. Such


\(^{2}\)2 Cor. 3:14 clearly shows the superiority of Christ as the center of the OT hermeneutic. See also the use of antithetic parallelism in 2 Cor. 3:3, 6, 7-8, 9. Cf. Maurice Carrez, "Présence Et Fonctonnement De L'Ancien Testament Dans L'Annonce De L'Evangile," Recherches De Science Religieuse 63 (1975), p. 327.
is the case in 2 Cor. 3 where Paul, in defending his ministry, points to the superiority of the new covenant over the Old.

The intention of Paul's argument is specifically directed to his opponents and not to Jews in general. The argument which is being answered by Paul is that because Moses was not bold, but rather covered his face, so also should Paul.¹ This leads to a consideration of another term in Paul's argument, παρονσία, in connection with the concepts of being veiled and unveiled. Both McNamara and Van Unnik note the Aramaic background of παρονσία meant "to uncover the face or head"² and indicated "the characteristic of free men and sets them apart from slaves."³ This sense is clearly relevant to Paul's movement to Moses' covered face. Perhaps the literal sense of ἑξάπλωσις may have brought to mind the contrast between Paul and Moses.⁴

The mention of the παρονσία of Paul in his ministry must be seen to relate back to 2 Cor. 3:1 and

¹Collange, E2Cor., pp. 104-05.


³McNamara, NTPT, p. 177.

⁴Collange, E2Cor., p. 86, says that the word should be given its primitive sense and not its Jewish-Hellenistic religious sense. Of course a reason for the veil may well be reverence: the end of the glory was just as sacred as its beginning. Cf. 2 Cor. 3:7.
the question of the need for Paul to commend, συνιστάνειν, himself again. It must also look ahead to 4:1ff regarding the renunciation of the hidden things and the manifestation of good to men's consciences. Thus the concept of repentance is placed within the context of Paul's apology for freedom in the ministry of the new covenant. The next problem, then, concerns the subject ἐπιστρέψῃ. Is it Moses, Israel or simply indefinite? This obscurity does not necessarily eliminate Moses as the subject. However, the use of the present tense, περιαστείται is awkward for such an interpretation. In any case ἐπιστρέψῃ is certainly essential to Paul's progression of thought because εἰσεπορεύετο would be meaningless in view of the fact that he makes no reference to the tabernacle.

The immediate context, however, is more supportive to the subject being left purposely indefinite in order for it to apply to the Jews of Paul's day. Paul had just introduced the veiled minds of Israel, vs 14, with a strong adversative, ἀλλά. The implication was that the purpose of Moses in veiling himself was to focus Israel's attention on the crucial issue, God's abiding word, glory and character, rather than the fading

---


2πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι τοὺς ὄνομα Ἰσραήλ εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου.
reflection on Moses' face. This purpose, however, was thwarted as the strong adversative of vs 14 shows.

Instead of enlightenment issuing from the action of Moses, the people became hardened, ἐπωρώθη. The use of the verb elsewhere indicates that it was not the veil which hardened Israel's minds but their own disregard for the truth of God's Word.1 Moses' veil was designed to hide the temporal glory of the reflection of God. The same veil was still present when the Law was read, vs 14b, and hid the eternal glory of God in Christ. Ἐπωρώθη should therefore not be seen as a result of the veil of Moses. In vs 14 the veil of Moses, hiding temporal glory,2 became a figure (τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα) of the physical veil but by contrast, in Paul's day, hid the eternal and greater glory in Christ. Verse 15 restates the fact that the veil still remained upon the individual Israelite's heart whereas in vs 14 it was the Israelites' minds, νοῆματα. Verse 14b described the removal of the veil by the phrase ἐν χριστῷ while vs 16 clarifies this more

---

1 It was the mental reflections of the Jews which were hardened. Νόημα is the result of the use of the νοῦς. See Collange, E2Cor, p. 93. See also Ro. 11:7,25 for πωρόω in reference to the hardening of the Jews. Paul, when speaking more broadly, used the terminology ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτοῦ ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοῆματα τῶν ἀπίστων ἐξ τὸ μὴ αὐγάσατι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ ἐυαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. 4:4. In 2 Cor. 3:14 Paul wrote ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοῆματα.

2 The Targums offer no parallel to Paul's use of the veil of Moses acting as a cover to hide transient glory, McNamara, NITPT, p. 175. Also Démann, CS 2-3-4:194, n.6.
fully by another reference to Moses' actions.

It is important to bear in mind the fact of the two glories implied in vs 13.¹ The one was temporary on Moses' face. The other was the Lord Himself; the focus on whom Moses tried in vain to encourage by the veil. Also one must keep in mind the radical change in the potentiality offered the Israelite in Paul's day compared with Moses. For Moses, he alone could gaze unveiled at the presence of God, but in Paul's day this privilege was open to all.² As a result of Israel's self-hardening they were not aware of this new possibility but if any would repent and turn to the Lord they would become unveiled as those in vs 18. Menzies writes:

... when attention is turned from the law to the Lord, i.e. to Christ, then misunderstanding has an end. The law is understood, glory shines unobstructed where the true glory is.³

¹McNamara, NTPT, p. 171, holds that Paul is "going on some exegetical tradition that took the texts to refer to a special glory that shone from Moses on this occasion." While LAB 12:1 and LXX Ex. 34:29 elaborate somewhat on the Heb. OT it appears that the initial concept of a transient glory on Moses' face is first met in 2 Cor. 3.

²The question arises as to the identity of μφωλος. Scholars are divided as to its reference to Christ or Yahweh. Lucien Cerfau, "Kyrios" dans les citations pauliniennes de l'ancien Testament," from Recueil Lucien Cerfau I (1954), p. 183, sees it to be Christ, while Collange, EzCor., p. 104, sees it to be Yahweh. The use of the preposition without the article gives "une saveur de nom propre" for Cerfau. Verse 16 appears to be a modified quotation with vs 17 as its Pesher, Hickling, NTS 21:394, n. 2. Also Dunn, JTS 21:313ff. See της σομερου ημερας in 2 Cor. 3:16 and Ro. 11:8 Qt. Also see Isa. 6:10 in Mk. 4:12.

³Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 25.
Paul had clearly established his metaphor by the αὐτός of vs 14 and continued it in vs 16. As Moses alone could be unveiled only when he returned to the Lord so the Israelite of Paul's day could be exposed to the glory of God in Christ if he would turn to Him. The same veil would be lifted. The term ἐπιστρέφω, therefore, acts as the cure to the ill of the hardening of vs 14. Israel hardened and turned from God. If they turned back to God the veil would be removed. Therefore, the subject of ἐπιστρέφω is left indefinite as part of the transformation of the historical narrative of Exodus into a principle of religious experience.¹

Conclusion. While the form of this quotation is certainly a difficult midrash, Paul spoke to an audience which was already familiar with the OT allusions and concepts as well as the pervasive work of the Spirit and the relations and contrasts between the Old and New covenants. Le Déaut writes:

Les lecteurs de Paul avaient sans doute connaissance de toute une tradition orale littéraire, illuminant des passages pour nous assez obscurs, et qu'il serait important de décélérer dans les couches anciennes de la littérature juive, en particulier dans ce qui nous reste du Targum palestinien.²


²Le Déaut, Bib. 42:48; also McNamara, NTPT, p. 175. Hickling, NTS 21:394, n. 1, disagrees with McNamara and Le Déaut regarding Paul's dependence on the Targum of Ex. 33:7ff: "The only point of contact that is at all exact is the equivalence between ἐπιστρέφω and ἦττα ('who
If the specific midrash as a whole was not of Paul's origin it certainly belonged to the earliest stage of the Christian community. The sense of repentance given to the quotation is definitely not unique to Paul as it is present in the Palestinian Targum. McNamara concludes that "apparently Paul is merely Christianizing a midrash already formed within Judaism."\(^1\) Paul brings a radical conceptuality to the passage, however. The heart of his hermeneutic was the work of the Spirit\(^2\) which illuminated the nature of the old covenant by the conditions of the new.

\(^{1}\)McNamara, TT, p. 112.

\(^{2}\)Richardson, S&L, p. 214.
### LEVITICUS 26:11-12, 2 CORINTHIANS 6:16-18
ISAIAH 52:11, 2 SAMUEL 7:14

#### Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
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Lev. 26:11-12

| נִקְרָב | נִקְרָב | נִקְרָב |
| מֵשָׁבַע | מֵשָׁבַע | מֵשָׁבַע |
| הָרָכָכָם | הָרָכָכָם | הָרָכָכָם |
| לֶאָה-גָּרָע | לֶאָה-גָּרָע | לֶאָה-גָּרָע |
| נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ | נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ | נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ |
| הָרָכָכָה | הָרָכָכָה | הָרָכָכָה |
| נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ | נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ | נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ |
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| הָרָכָכָם | הָרָכָכָם | הָרָכָכָם |
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| לֶאָה-גָּרָע | לֶאָה-גָּרָע | לֶאָה-גָּרָע |
| נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ | נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ | נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ |
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| נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ | נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ | נָפֶשֶׁי אֶלֶּהוּ |
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<td>Ezek. 37:27</td>
<td>Lev. 26:11-12</td>
<td>Ezek. 37:27</td>
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<tr>
<td>μου</td>
<td>ἐσονταὶ</td>
<td>μου</td>
<td>ἐσονταὶ</td>
<td>μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰσα. 52:11</td>
<td>Ἰσα. 52:11</td>
<td>Ἰσα. 52:11</td>
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<td>Ἰσα. 52:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔξελθατε</td>
<td>ἔξελθατε</td>
<td>ἔξελθατε</td>
<td>ἔξελθατε</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔκειθεν</td>
<td>ἔκειθεν</td>
<td>ἔκειθεν</td>
<td>ἔκειθεν</td>
<td>διὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀκαθάρτου</td>
<td>μὴ ἀπεσθε</td>
<td>καὶ ἀκαθάρτου</td>
<td>μὴ ἀπεσθε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰνδήν</td>
<td>ἔξελθατε</td>
<td>ἔξελθατε</td>
<td>ἔξελθατε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν μέσου</td>
<td>ἐν μέσου</td>
<td>ἐν μέσου</td>
<td>αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτῆς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄφορίσθητε</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄφορίσθητε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>λέγει</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀκαθάρτου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μὴ ἀπεσθε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>καγώ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>εἰσδέξομαι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>2 Sam. 7:14</td>
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<td>18</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַנִּיחֹן יְנֵה</td>
<td>אָּשְׁמַא שְׁמַא</td>
<td>יָכֹל יָכֹל</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֹתּ</td>
<td>אֹתּ</td>
<td>יָכֹל יָכֹל</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּאֵל</td>
<td>בָּאֵל</td>
<td>יָכֹל יָכֹל</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲבָרֹת</td>
<td>אֲבָרֹת</td>
<td>יָכֹל יָכֹל</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לִבְּס</td>
<td>לִבְּס</td>
<td>יָכֹל יָכֹל</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heb. 1:5. 'Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτός ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν.

Rev. 21:7. . . . καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ θεὸς καὶ αὐτός ἔσται μοι ὑιός.

Masoretic Variants

**Ezek. 37:27.** BHK offers no variants for this section.

**Lev. 26:11-12.** BHK only notes A B which may reflect the Hebrew יְנֵה.
Isa. 52:11. BHS offers no variants for this section. 4Q Flor. reads Ν α for 17.

Septuagintal Variants

Ezek. 37:27. The GLXX notes that for εν αυτοίς 106 reads επ αυτοίς = MT and 239 reads μετ αυτοίς. The second αυτοίς is read as αυτοὶν by the Lucianic groups 22-36-48-51 96-231-763 311-538 V-46-449. The Alexandrian texts A 106-410 198 239-306 403-613 Arab. Arm. Eusecl. +MT read εἰς Θεόν for Θεός; 147 precedes Θεός with εἰς and Aeth follows Θεός with αὐτῶν. 106 omits αυτοῖς. Tyconius Afer reads οὐσονται μοι = MT; οὐσονται μου is read by the hexaplaric texts Q-88-147 and the Lucianic texts 22-48-51-96-231-763 V-499 Arm (part only) while B reads μου οὐσονται. For λαος 534 106 Arab Arm (part only) Eusecl. + MT read εἰς λαον and Aeth adds μου to λαος.

Lev. 26:11-12. B-M notes that δ2 omits the first καὶ-ομιν. Στησω is read for Θησω by b c d g h n p t w Arm. Eth. (uid). Διαθησεν is supported by B A g h n v (mg) a2 b2 Arm. while σινησεν is read by F G M N ν(txt) rell Boh. Eth Or. For εν υμιν o reads μεθ υμων: apud nos Eth. The second καὶ-ομας post (12) λαος 16.77. The second καὶ is omitted by a. Βεδελυξεται is read for Βεδελυξεται by s and μη Βεδελυξητε is read by c. The second καὶ is omitted by a. 30 reads υμιν for υμας.

With reference to ν. 12 καὶ-ομιν is after λαος in 130. Περιπηνω is read for εμπεριπηνω by b w and Philo three out of four times. n reads εσωμαι for εσωμαι. B*
f x Arm-codd. Boh. read υμιν for υμων and Phil-cod-unic reads εν υμιν one out of four times. Υμείς pr lac (6.) a² and is omitted by e and the Old Latin. B A k x support μου and F G M N rell Arm. Boh. Old Latin Philo Or-lat read μοι. b w Arm-ed read εις λαον for λαος. o' reads την ψυχην μου (ν) for την διαθηκην μου. M reads ουκ απομηνωμενει for ου βεβελεξεται. 4Q LXX Lev² reads μου before λαος and ευνος for λαος.

 Isa. 52:11. GLXX notes that the first and second εξελθατε read -θετε in 26 V-QC-88-109-736, the Lucianic texts 22-48-51-231-763+62-147+90-130-311+36-93-96-86²-233 and the Catena group, 87-91-309-490+49-764-564. Ἀφησοθε is read for απτεσοθε by B-V-88, 91-309-490 (Catena group) 456 538 544 Just. Eus. ecl. Ν puts του before μεσου. Ἀυτων is read for αυτης by the Lucianic groups 22-48-51-231-763+90-130-311+36-93-96-86C 534 Cypr. + Cor. α' o' read μεμιαμενου for ακαθαρτου Chr. α' reads εκλεκτωθητε for αφορισθητε 86.

 2 Sam. 7:14. B-M note that εγω is preceded by και in b g h n e² Sah. Eth. Cyr. Thdt. Chp. and is substituted by και in O C². Εσωμαι is read for εσομαι in g m ν c²*. 

New Testament Variants

Vs 16. Tischendorf notes that καθως ειπεν is supported by f vg syr utr cop arm Clem⁵⁴⁴ Didtri Ath² while λεγει γαρ is read by D² E FΓ G d e g go TertPud Augcont. Leif² Lectionem est enim. ep. parm² (non itemep¹⁸⁷)Ἀ 137 reads ο κυριος for ο θεος
while TertPud syrsch Augcont ep parm2 Clem54 gives a loose rendering of προφητείας. 37 omits οτι. Α Ἐνπεριπατησω is read by B* C D* F G but εὐπεριπατησω is read by Ν B3 D* E K L P and others. The αὐτῶν of vs 16 is read by d e f vg Clem54 EusPraepl70 and marc186 cod vene and PS354 Cyrhr181 Ath704 Epiph893 al μu TertPud15 Lcif217 Hil288 and others but αὐτοῖς is read by FGr G Pg OR2,124 and υ,233 Eusmarc ed. Likewise Chr628 reads εἰσονται μοι εἰς λαον καὶ εἰς εἰσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεον. Μου is read by Ν B C P 17. 37. Arm Clem54 Or1,756 Eusmarc186 and PS354 Dam while μοι is read by D E F G K L al pler it vg rell Orcdd2 at υ,233 and int2,159 EusPraepl70(υ,21) Ath704 Cyrhr181 Epiph893 (Chr vide ante) EuthalCod Thrdt al Tert Lcif and others.

Vσ 17. Ἐξελθάτε is read by Ν B C F G 17 47 71 EuthalCod Dam and Ἐξελθάτε is read by D E K L P al pler, also Clem54 (but 680 εἰσερχεσθε) Chr628 Thrdt al. F G 37 al aliq αἰφρισθητε. Clem680 Lcif217 and others read λεγει κυριος while K 4* TertPud15 and 18 om (al aliq Chr Thphyl post εἰσοδεῖ. νμας πον).

Vσ 18. F G read εἰς πατέραν.

Textual

The writer had several OT passages in mind when he recalled God's promises to adopt and become intimate with His people.1 With reference to vs 16a, διὶ ἐνοικήσω

1 D. Plooij, "Studies In The Testimony Book,"
ἐν αὐτοῖς has more clear affinity with the Ezekiel passage καὶ ἔσται ἡ κατασκηνωσίς μου ἐν αὐτοῖς that with Lev. 26:11. However, the next phrase of Paul's quotation, καὶ ἐμπερισματίσω, is clearly aligned with Leviticus 26:12. The rest of Paul's quote is closer to the Ezek. passage with the variations being a change from αὐτοῖς to αὐτῶν and the transposition of μου ἔσονται. The relative compactness and context of the Ezekiel passage makes it the most probable source of the quotation.

The next quotation forms an exhortation based upon the content of the Ezekiel quotation. Introduced by διό, it follows Isa. 52:11-12 most closely although it

Verhandlingen Der Koninklijke Akademie Van Wetenschappen Te Amsterdam. Afdeeling Letterkunde Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 32, no. 2. (Amsterdam: Uitgave Van De N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1932), p. 20, notes that Paul and a Persian Sage, Aphrahat, quote the passages in 1 Cor. 3:16 and therefore both Paul and Aphrahat found the quotation from the same testimony. However, because Aphrahat writes of "the Apostle" and introduces his very quotation with the words "by the apostle," certainly the Sage got his quotation linked to a Pauline source, not from a pre-Pauline testimony book.

has affinities with Ezek. 20:34,41. Turpie notes the similarities of the third quotation in the chain, vs 18, with Jer. 31:33, Ezek. 37:28 and Jer. 31:1 but cites 2 Sam. 7:14 as the nearest representative "from which it differs in being stated directly, not objectively, and pluraly, not singularly, and also in adding καὶ ὑπάρχως."

Contextual

Ezekiel 37:27. The broad context is that of restoration, Chs. 25-48. The immediate context concerns the "conditions and process of restoration." Ezek. 37:15-28 speaks of the future unified and eternal restoration under David. Verse 26 speaks of the covenant of peace God will make with Israel and of His presence among the people as symbolized by God's sanctuary or tabernacle. This divine presence became a witness to the heathen of God's sanctifying work, vs 28.

Leviticus 26:11-12. These verses are in the context of sanctions which formally conclude the holiness

---

1Allo, 2 Cor., p. 186, offers Isa. 52:1, Jer. 51:45, Ezek. 20:34, 41, cf. Rev. 18:4. See Ellis, PUOT, pp. 49f, regarding the practice in the Talmud of using καὶ to connect quotations.

2Turpie, OTN, p. 63. Also Gough, NTQ, p. 314.


code. The immediate context is the blessing of obedience,\(^1\) which is "crowned with the inestimable blessing of the Lord's presence."\(^2\) This is based in turn on the covenant of Sinai and the redemption from Egypt.\(^3\)

Isaiah 52:11. The context of this passage is the promised restoration of Israel from Babylon. Yahweh would provide a new Jerusalem which was to be inhabited by those of pure hearts and hands.

2 Samuel 7:14. The context is that of Nathan's oracle to David. David wished to build a house for God but Nathan told him that God would build David a house or dynasty. The personal promise concerns Solomon and his temple construction.

2 Corinthians 6:16-18. Paul, after outlining the present ministry of reconciliation entrusted to him,\(^4\) exhorted the Corinthians to receive the grace of God and His apostles as well.\(^5\) The immediate context involves the plea for separation from close fellowship with unbelievers.\(^6\)

Hermeneutical

One problem relative to the hermeneutics of this passage concerns whether it is part of the letter as

\(^1\)vs 3. \(^2\)Faley, JBC:Lev, p. 84. 
\(^3\)vs 13. \(^4\)Chapter 5. 
dictated by Paul or whether it is an interpolation from a writing which had close affinities with Qumran.  

Gnilka sees four OT sources for the composite quotation and notes the use of Ezek. 20:34 or 35 in 1QM 1:2f:  

If we apply this background to the understanding of our passage the withdrawal required of Christians is viewed in the perspective of the imminent hour of salvation, and appears as primarily directed to excluding as completely as possible any danger of backsliding or infidelity arising out of their association with their pagan fellow-citizens.  

Thus, one argument for the theory of interpolation is the relation of the passage to its present context in 2 Cor.  

The affinities of this section are well known.  

Gnilka stresses that this portion breaks the continuity of the letter (right at the time when Paul is trying to gain the restored affections of the Corinthians) by introducing thoughts about a Christian's relationship to...  

---

1 For a recent summary of the problem and its proposed solutions see Margaret E. Thrall "The Problem Of II Cor. VI. 14-VII. I In Some Recent Discussion," New Testament Studies 24 (1977), pp. 132-48. Thrall gives a qualified decision in favor of Pauline authorship and the contextual appropriateness of the passage in its present location. Her insights were supplemented by the members of a seminar on II Cor. which met before the S.N.T.S. Aug. 1975, including E. Best, I. A. Moir and others.  

2 Gnilka, P&Q, p. 60, gives Lev. 26:11f, Isa. 52:11, Ezek. 20:34, and 2 Sam. 7:14 as the sources.  

the unbelievers.\(^1\) Furthermore, this passage contains words and conceptualities which do not appear to be compatible with Paul's character and writings.\(^2\) The new sense given to words and the many hapax legomena cause Gnilka and others\(^3\) to conclude that this passage was not written by Paul because the radical separation from the pagan cultural environment "does not seem to harmonize with the Pauline concept of the relationship heathen/Christian."\(^4\) Gnilka, however, does conclude that this passage was written by a Christian (rather than an Essene) who saw a moral (rather than a literal) sense in the call for separation. This presents quite a difference from Qumran conceptuality.

Fitzmyer also finds this to be a "puzzling passage" 1) in that it "radically interrupts" the flow of thought; and 2) because of its completeness as a unit, "like a short homily."\(^5\) He also notes the hapax legomena and sees identification with Qumran thought in the dual-

\(^1\)Gnilka, P&Q, p. 48.
\(^2\)Gnilka, P&Q, pp. 48-49. To the six seemingly un-Pauline words mentioned by Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 204, Gnilka, P&Q, p. 53, adds έμπεριματήσω and παντοκράτωρ. Hanson, SPTT, p. 172, calls this a "strange Qumran-like fragment." The words in question are ἑτεροζυγέω, μετοχή, συμφώνησις, συναφάνθεσις, βελιάρ, μολυσμός.
\(^3\)E.g. Hanson, SPTT, p. 172.
\(^4\)Gnilka, P&Q, p. 63.
isms, the polemic against idolatry, the temple imagery, the separation emphasis, and the concatenation of OT quotations. Regarding the dualism of Christ and Beliar he notes that Christ's presence in the 2 Cor. pericope proves that the Qumran material has been edited by a Christian. Thus it is generally agreed that, whatever the origin of the catena, its present form shows clear signs of Christian alterations and editions. Thus the link with Qumran must be forged on linguistic and conceptual grounds.

The Concept of Separation. With reference to ἐπερχόμενος Fitzmyer offers the OT sense of "believing a teaching, following a doctrine" and concludes that the basic idea is of OT derivation. The separation motif, however, "resembles strongly the general Qumran proscription of all contact with outsiders." Of course this motif also, and more fundamentally, bears a strong resemblance to the general OT prescription of holiness.

With reference to the use of the OT texts Fitzmyer writes: "The unifying thread running through all the citations is

1Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:272-73.
2Fitzmyer notes 1QS, 1, 7-11 and 1QS 2,16-17.
3Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:275.
5Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:278. See CD 17; 1QS 9,8-9; 1QS 5,13-14. For a general account see Gärtner, TCQ.
the theme of God's chosen people, 'God's lot,' to use the Qumran expression."¹ He concludes: "We are faced with a paragraph in which Qumran ideas and expression have been reworked in a Christian cast of thought."² He admits, however, that how the paragraph became inserted into 2 Cor. remains a mystery.³ The fact the idea of God's chosen people is of OT extraction and not unique to Qumran blunts this conceptuality being a formulative influence from Qumran. Regarding the strong opposition to idols in 2 Cor. 6:16, Fitzmyer notes 1QS 2,16-17 in passing but writes that this does not show a "common conceptual background" with Paul.⁴

We conclude that the OT conceptual derivation coupled with the reworked character of the material makes unnecessary a direct link with Qumran. It is more probable that both Qumran and Paul share the same OT conceptuality at this point. Paul gave the material a Christian cast and the Qumranites supplied their own views as seen in their literature. A direct link should not be presupposed between the passage and Qumran.⁵

Temple Imagery. Another problem for Pauline authorship is seen by some to be the contextually foreign

¹Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:278. ²Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:279. ³Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:280. ⁴Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:277. ⁵See Lev. 26:1 for the need to separate from idolatry and Lev. 26:13 for the concept of the yoke, ζώγος.
concept of the temple. But it can be countered that the legitimate introduction of a new subject should not be called "foreign." Fitzmyer notes that in 1 Cor. 6:19 Paul speaks of the individual as the temple. Qumran always speaks of the community as the temple, never the individual, and it is the Qumran collective image that appears in 2 Cor. 6:16 rather than Paul's individuated conceptuality. But this cannot be used to show a special Qumran influence because elsewhere Paul uses both images. Even if the collective concept could be ultimately traced to Qumran, several Pauline passages use the terminology and show that Paul's own conceptuality accounts for the temple imagery in 2 Cor. 6:16 without having to postulate a non-Pauline origin.

Introductory Formula. The IF is also compatible with Pauline usage. This catena is introduced with an

1See 1 Cor. 3:16-17 and Eph. 2:21-22, however.

2Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:277, n. 18.

3The combined Alexandrian and Western support for the θυμός of 2 Cor. 6:16 is to be preferred. The θυμός was probably suggested by 1 Cor. 3:16 and 2 Cor. 6:14 and 17 as noted by Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary On The Greek New Testament (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 580.

41 Cor. 6:19 represents the temple as the individual; in 1 Cor. 3:16-17 Paul speaks of the community as the temple. Eph. 2:21-22 also clearly shows that the believers collectively are the temple.

5Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 200, writes that Paul could have used this IF. See Ro. 9:15, 25; 2 Cor. 6:2 (Gal. 3:10) 2 Cor. 4:6 for similar, but not identical, IF.

6Swete, IOTG, p. 400. Bruce, I&2 Cor., p. 215,
unusual formula only used here in the NT. This IF has a Qumran example in CD 6, 13; 8; 9 (וּלְמָא רָאוּא שָפַם) but is found neither in the OT nor the Mishnah.¹

Early Jewish Usage. The affinities of the passage with Qumran have been examined above. The following sections will explore affinities with select early Jewish literature and Philo.

Regarding the Lev. 26:11-12 passage, Midrash Rabbah² makes a distinction between tabernacle and pledge. God is quoted as saying that if the people sin "the Temple will be seized in pledge." The verse supporting this is Lev. 26:11: "And I will set My Tabernacle (mishkani) among you." The reader is then instructed not to read "mishkani" but "mashuni" (my pledge), the interpretation being that where tents shall stand they equal tabernacles but when they are destroyed they become pledges.³

Lev. 26:11f is also used in MR⁴ of what could have been if God had walked among His people. MR⁵ also speaks of the comfort that would be brought when God comes to His people. Targum Onkelos reads:

And I will set my Tabernacle among you, and My word shall not reject you. And I will make My Shekinah dwell among you, and I will be to you Eloha,

calls this conflation a "testimonium."

¹Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:279. Also Waard, CSOT, p. 16. We suggest the IF reading as given on p.135 above. See pp.134-40 for variants.
²MR:Ex., p. 389.
⁴MR:Lam., p. 15.
⁵MR:Lam, p. 181.
and you shall be a people before me.\(^1\)

Paul finds no hermeneutical kinship with these early interpretations but he does have a basic affinity with MR regarding Isa. 52:11. Midrash Rabbah,\(^2\) on Ex. 15:18 shows that the Isaiah passage is interpreted messianically. Paul has placed Isa. 52:11 into the context of the messianic age. Hans Dieter Betz argues that \(\omega γ\) \(\epsilonσσε\) \(\epsilon\)\(μ\)\(α\) is not an OT quotation but is rather an interpretation of the 2 Sam. 7:14 quotation which follows.\(^3\) He notes that 2 Sam. 7:14 is quoted in 4Q Flor. 1:10-11 where "Son" equals the Davidic Messiah. However, the addition of \(\tau\)\(υ\)\(γ\)\(α\)\(τ\)\(ε\)\(ρ\)\(α\) shows a clear distinction from Qumran literature.\(^4\)

**Philo.** Philo makes use of Lev. 26:11f in several locations. With reference to God taking those who are spiritually fit unto Himself Philo quotes "\(\kappa\)\(α\)\(λ\)\(μ\)\(ε\)\(ς\) \(\epsilon\)\(σ\)\(σ\)\(θ\)\(έ\) \(μ\)\(ο\)\(ι\) \(\lambda\)\(ά\)\(ς\) . \(\epsilon\)\(γ\)\(ώ\) \(\epsilon\)\(μ\)\(ι\) \(\kappa\)\(ό\)\(ρ\)\(ι\)\(ο\)\(ς\)," with Ex. 6:7 precede-

---

1 Translation by Etheridge, TOJ, Lev. 26:11f.

2 Freedman, MR:Ex., p. 185.


4 Betz, BJL 92:97-98. Ellis, PUOT, p. 144, notes that the hermeneutical deviations in this catena seem to be designed for a messianic-age fulfillment. The significant addition of "daughters" may be a recollection of Isa. 43:6, cf. Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 201.
Speaking of God walking in the "rich and fertile souls" Philo quotes "περιπατήσω γάρ φθόνιν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἐσομαι ὑμῶν θεός." Those who are purified are promised that "περιπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἐσομαι ὑμῶν θεός." God will walk in the soul of the wise man as He would walk in a city. Finally he writes "οὕτως θα ψήσειν ὁ προφήτης τὸν θεὸν ἐμπεριπατεῖν οὐά βασιλεῦς." In light of Philo's use of ἐμπεριπατεῖν to equal the indwelling of God in man Paul's ἐνοικίασθαι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων appears to interpret ἐμπεριπατεῖν as also being divine indwelling. The verb ἐνοικίασθαι is not used of God in the LXX and Paul clearly has excluded institutional contingency from God's presence with men.

Conclusion. The unity of sense in these quotations is striking. Paul has bound this catena together within a promise-fulfillment schema (ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντές τὰς ἐπαγγελίας κτλ 2 Cor. 7:1) as a basis for exhortation to purity. The conceptuality is the underlying continuity and consistency in the character of God. The Solomon—
Church transference manifests the effects of the Christian concept of adoption of sonship.

We have concluded that the conceptuality of the catena is based on OT imagery and is not foreign to Pauline thought. This is not to assert, however, that Paul was the originator of the series. Longenecker, for example, classes this passage along with 1 Cor. 14:2 and 15:45 as pre-Pauline text-forms.¹ Whatever the source of the catena, Paul has incorporated it into his arguments and, in doing so, becomes responsible for its remarkable hermeneutic.

Paul's reading of ἐνοικήσω is not found in the OT and functions as a paraphrase² of Ezekiel's ἔσται ἡ κατασκήνωσίς μου. Plummer reasons that this substitution is designed to make the quotation better conform to Paul's purpose.³ However, the two phrases give equivalent and equally suitable meanings.

What is striking about the catena is the transfers of subject that have taken place between the OT and the Church. The Ezek. passage, which promised Israel the eternal presence of God among His people, becomes in

¹Longenecker, TB 21:29. See also Ellis, PUOT, p. 146.

²This goes against Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 209, who sees the first part of 2 Cor. 6:16 to be a paraphrase of Lev. 26:11 with the actual quotation of Ezek. 37:27 following.

³Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 11.
2 Cor. 6 the presence of God in His temple, the Church. Isa. 52:11, which spoke of redemption from captivity and the need to leave the uncleanness of Babylon, becomes an exhortation to remain unspotted by the evils of the Corinthian culture.\(^1\) The subject of 2 Sam. 7:14, Solomon, becomes the elect of the Church. What is more, all three quotations are called promises\(^2\) which directly relate to the Corinthian readers.

To try to unravel completely the hermeneutical process which led to such a transference is difficult, if not impossible, for the student of today. But the key to the process is Paul's understanding of the Messiah as Jesus of Nazareth who had begun a new work of redemption among a new chosen people.\(^3\) For Paul the Church was the new Israel and it was this fact that enabled him to adopt the passages in this catena as promises for the Church. Therefore, within this context, passages of promise for Israel are essentially promises for the faithful, or remnant, of Israel which, for Paul, was the Church, the true community of God. While this involves a transference of attributes from the Messiah to the Church, there is

\(^1\)Johnson, QNTO, p. 305, places the interpretation into its historical context when he writes that Paul "sees in the departure from Babylon a departure from corrupt and corrupting associations, and in the ceremonial defilement a symbol of spiritual defilement." See also Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 51 and Allo, 2 Cor., p. 187.

\(^2\)2 Cor. 7:1.

\(^3\)e.g. Ro. 9:6-9 and Eph. 1:4. See pp. 343ff below.
also a progression from cultic to moral purity. It is most likely, however, that the cultic and ethical concepts were present in the original OT sense. This perspective does not ignore the context of the OT passages but is, in fact, dependent upon the historical framework of Israel's history. There is also a continuity of deity from the OT to Paul. Thus the OT is used to guide the piety of the Christian community.

1Dodd, AS, p. 106. Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 215. See Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 201, who calls this a "new, non-cultic interpretation."
NUMBERS

NUMBERS 14:16, 1 CORINTHIANS 10:5

Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בָּאוּש</td>
<td>κατέστρωσεν</td>
<td>κατεστράθησαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּרָבָם</td>
<td>αὐτοῦς</td>
<td>γάρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν</td>
<td>ἐν</td>
<td>ἐν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῇ</td>
<td>τῇ</td>
<td>τῇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔρημῷ</td>
<td>ἔρημῷ</td>
<td>ἔρημῷ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masoretic Variants

BHK notes that evidently the LXX translated בָּאוּש (to spread out\(^1\)) instead of בָּאוּש (to slaughter) when it adopted κατέστρωσεν.

Septuagintal Variants

Brooke-McLean note that καὶ precedes κατεστρώσεν in Gx, an Armenian variant and the Syro-hexapla. p reads κατεστρέψεν, Theodoret reads καταναλώσεν, the Old Latin, contruit, and the Ethiopic, occidit.

---

\(^1\)Contrary to this, M&M, p. 333, refer one to Papyri Graeci Musei Antiquarii publici Lugduni-Batavi, Cii. 28, edited by C. Leemans, for a 163-2 B.C. derived sense of "overthrow," "prostrate," for δνψ as in 1 Cor. 10:5. Thus there is no evidence for a non-MT basis.
New Testament Variants

Tischendorf lists no variants for this passage.

Textual

The verb has been changed from third singular active to third plural passive\(^1\) with the \(\alpha\otau\omicron\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) of the LXX being deleted presumably by virtue of its redundancy and implication in the passive sense of the verb.

Contextual

In the OT context the nation Israel had just received the message of the twelve spies and were viewing with horror the impossible task of entering Canaan. Only the sudden appearance of the glory of Yahweh saved Joshua and Caleb from being stoned by the people. Yahweh then gave the verdict that He would destroy His nation and begin again with Moses. At this point Moses interceded for Israel, pleading the slander which would come upon the character of God if He were to carry out His plan of destruction. Numbers 14:16 is a theoretical slanderous remark: God was not able to lead His people into the land and consequently had to destroy them in the desert. This quotation, then, is actually a sentence which Moses imaginatively put into the mouths of the scoffing nations

\(^1\)Paul adopted a passive, possibly reverential, but retains God as the understood subject. Yahweh was the subject in the OT and \(\Theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\) is the implied referent in 1 Cor. 10:5 where the destruction is linked with the ill-pleasure of God.
if they should hear that God had destroyed Israel.

The New Testament context is the freedom and authority of the apostle. He concluded 1 Cor. 9 by showing that his main goal was not the exercise of his rights but the effective striving to win men to Christ while maintaining his own personal discipline. Chapter ten commences an illustrative argument showing that though one has a relationship with God, he must still keep himself from the vagaries of human lust and pride. This has arisen from Paul's remarks in 1 Cor. 9:26 about being excluded himself due to personal lack of discipline and from the Corinthians' tendency to participate in local idolatrous practices. Though all Israel had a common share in the blessings of God, they were not all pleasing to God. The quotation from Numbers functioned as one of several historical examples (τούτων) from which the Corinthians could benefit and learn.³

Hermeneutical

The "Following Rock." Any full treatment in the

---

¹ Cor. 10:1-5.

² Cor. 10:6.

³ A. Feuillet, "L'Explication 'Typologique' Des Événements Du Désert In 1 Cor. 10:1-4," Studia Montis Regii 8 (1965), has attributed the concepts here to three figures 1) the prefiguration of baptism, 2) the prefiguration of the eucharist, and 3) the identification of the rock with Christ.
commentaries\(^1\) of this quotation is often eclipsed by an extensive examination of the preceding verse which speaks of the following rock. H\(\text{\'}e\text{\'}r\text{\'}i\text{\'}ng\(^2\) does not mention 1 Cor. 10:5 at all while Grosheide simply writes that "nearly all of those who departed from Egypt died in the desert (cf. Num. 14:16)."\(^3\) But it is well to repeat that Num. 14:16 is not a historical narrative of the events of Israel's downfall but merely a conjecture of Moses regarding what the Egyptians might say if God destroyed Israel. Bruce\(^4\) rightly notes Num. 14:20-24, 28-35 and Deut. 1:34-40 as substantiation for Israel's wilderness destruction rather than Num. 14:16.

Though there is no explicit quotation in 1 Cor. 10:1-4 there is much that scholars have used in evaluating Paul's hermeneutical conceptions regarding the Exodus event. Therefore, these verses are deserving of treatment here in relation to vs 5.

\(^1\)In some of the volumes specifically devoted to NT quotations, Toy, QNT, and Turpie, OTN, do not list this passage while Gough, NTQ, p. 67, lists the text without commenting upon it. Ellis, PUOT, p. 153, judges this to be an allusion. A large single volume, comprising numbers 2, 3 and 4, Cahiers Sioniens is devoted to a consideration of Moses in the NT. Of its many helpful articles not quoted in this paper the ones by Geza Vermes, "La Figure De M\(\text{\'}o\text{\'}s\text{\'}e au Tourn\(\text{\'}\)ant Des Deux Testaments," and by Paul D\(\text{\'}e\text{\'}m\(\text{\'}\)ann, "M\(\text{\'}o\text{\'}s\text{\'}e Et La Loi Dans La Pens\(\text{\'}e\text{\'}e De Saint Paul," are the most notable.

\(^2\)H\(\text{\'}e\text{\'}r\text{\'}i\text{\'}ng, 1 Cor., p. 86.

\(^3\)Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 222.

\(^4\)Bruce, 1\&2 Cor., p. 92.
Jewish Tradition. Much of what has been written concerning this passage evolves around the supposed use of the Jewish legend of the following rock.\textsuperscript{1} Perhaps the earliest mention of this tradition is in Liber Biblicarum Antiquitatum 11, 5.\textsuperscript{2} Moses, while on Sinai, received not only the Law but was shown the Tree of Life by which he made sweet the water of Mara. This sweetened water went with Israel for forty years and followed the nation up into the hills and down into the plains. In LAB 10, 7, an actual well of water following the nation is spoken of as part of God's provision.

In the Tosefta Sukkah III,11\textsuperscript{3} the well is described as being like a rock the size of a large water vessel which traveled with Israel up the mountains and down into the valleys. In III, 12-13, the well is seen to make mighty streams and a great river which flowed into the Mediterranean Sea bringing in return precious goods from all over the world. This was derived from Dt. 2:7 where Israel in Edom had no goods but was promised that they would lack nothing.

One view sees the synagogal midrash as Paul's source of this tradition. This midrash was theoretically

\textsuperscript{1}See S-B vol. 2, pp. 435f. for the literature concerning the Torah/Wisdom/Water motif.

\textsuperscript{2}James, Pseudo Philo.

\textsuperscript{3}A. W. Greenup, trans., Sukkah, Mishna And Tosefta (London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1925).
developed by the haggadist linking Ex. 17:3ff with Num. 20:2ff where a rock was spoken of near both Rephidim and Massah. In both passages the waters are from Meribah. Thus the haggadist concluded that it must have been the same rock which had followed Israel.

Diez Macho gives the translation from Neofiti Num. 5:19:

And since the well (namely the rockwell) was given to them as a gift, it became strong overflowing streams, and it ascended to the top of the mountains and went down with them to the deep valleys. (Italics mine)

Macho, contrary to Doeve, concludes that this does not rest on a midrashic, but rather on a targumic explanation. He sees it as deriving from a wrong translation of the name of a city Bēēra in Num. 21:16 as the noun bēēr which means "well" and also from a wrong translation of Mattana, a city, in Num. 21:18 as "gift." The motif of the following well going up into the mountains and down into the valleys appears also in the PS. Jon and Frag. Targums on Num. 21. Thus this tradition was contemporary with

---

1Ex. 17:7 and Num. 20:13.
2Doeve, JHSG, pp. 110-11.
3Macho, RDPT, p. 232. 4Macho, RDPT, p. 232.
Paul. The manner in which Paul adopted this legend will next be considered.

Pauline Adaptations. In Paul's passage he never refers to the physical rock or well mentioned in the Jewish traditions. His rock is the Messiah alone. His basis was the historically considered provision which was made for the Israelites in the wilderness. Paul's double use of πνευματικόν in vss 3-4 refers to the supernatural origin of the nourishment to which the manna and water pointed. What was emphasized was the presence of the Messiah even with ancient Israel and the ensuing spiritual blessings. We see no endorsement or propaga-


1Feuillet, SMR 8:131, writes that Paul's perspective is "très loin de la puérile légende rabbinique, que Paul pourrait n'avoir utilisée que pour en prendre le contrepied."

2Hamerton-Kelly, PWSM, p. 132, n. 2, notes that CD 8:6 identifies the springs of Num. 21:18 with the Torah and concludes that 1 Cor. 10:11 expresses "the same basic hermeneutical assumption" as Qumran. But does it? Paul did not present a typological relationship. For the apostle the Messiah was actually present in the OT event and not a type. What the Qumran passage does is make clear that in the first century A.D. the provision of water during the Sinai wanderings was a subject of meta-physical speculation. While the Qumran image of Torah and Paul's Messianic identification may have a common share in the wisdom literature tradition, no direct links between them are apparent.

3Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 91; Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 221; for "Spiritual" see, 2:10f; 12:1; 15:44; Ro. 1:11; 7:14. Hering, 1 Cor., p. 86, notes that the adjective
tion of the fanciful Jewish myth.\(^1\) The Hebrew and LXX text uses "The Rock" for Yahweh\(^2\) and Paul identified the pre-incarnate Christ with the Angel of the Lord who went


\(^1\)E. Earle Ellis, "A Note On First Corinthians 10:4," Journal of Biblical Literature 76 (1957), p. 56, concludes that Paul and the rest of Jewish literature are related more to the interpretation of the OT than to each other. However, one must assert that Paul was influenced by the legend. The "following" concept is not accounted for by the OT texts. We agree with Eduard Schweizer, "πνεύμα, πνευματικός," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament VI (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968), p. 437, n. 707, who writes that the rock in 1 Cor. 10 was a "miraculous, non-earthly rock from God's world." While Paul's use of "following" is a direct link with the Jewish legend and the rock imagery was drawn from the miraculous supply of water from an actual store during the wilderness journey, Paul's rock is the spiritual presence of the heavenly Messiah.

\(^2\)Regarding the LXX rendering of rock by ὁσς in Dt. 32, Thome Wittstruck, "The So-Called Anti-Anthropomorphisms In The Greek Text Of Deuteronomy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 38 (1976), p. 32, notes that this could be "a non-figurative rendering of a metaphor, which is a legitimate translation practise. The referent is made clear."
with Israel.¹

1 Cor. 10:1-4 was designed to demonstrate the free participation of all Israel in the blessings of Yahweh in order to show that such participation still required consistent personal morality. This pattern of divine sovereignty and human responsibility was a part of the early Christian understanding.² The continuity between the OT and NT here was the plan and provision of God in relation to the moral behavior of its recipients.³ This "first sketch"⁴ of the Messianic community provided a rich source for those who saw the Person and plan of God to continue from the OT to the NT era. The pivotal

---
¹Ex. 14:19; 23:2ff; 32:34; 33:2, 14ff; cf. Acts 7:30, 38, Bruce, 162 Cor., p. 91. Feuillet, SMR 8:152-53. Lucien Cerfaux, "'Kyrios' Dans Les Citations Pauliniennes De L'Ancien Testament," Recueil Lucien Cerfaux I (Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, 1954), p. 183, rightly conjectures that this identification of the rock with Christ is more than just a figure and shows early Christian speculation about the manifestation of the λόγος in the OT.

²F. F. Bruce, Paul 6 Jesus (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974), p. 64.


⁴Cerfaux, RCL I, p. 182.
and underlying conceptuality is seen in 1 Cor. 10:6, 11. Even the apocalyptic language of 1 Cor. 10:11 was understood in terms of the preliminary salvific activity of Yahweh in Israel's history. Paul once again shows his distinctive Christological hermeneutic. It was only the historical appearance of the Messiah on the earth that allowed Paul to give this deeper significance to the history of Israel.  

---

1The typological relations seen in the Exodus were, of course, also prevalent in Judaism. J. K. Howard, "Christ Our Passover: A Study Of The Passover-Exodus Theme In I Corinthians," Evangelical Quarterly 41 (1969), p. 104, notes the relation between Jewish proselyte baptism and the passing through the Red Sea. The proselyte would pass from Heathenism through baptism to the "promised land" of Judaism. See also Harald Sahlin, "Der Neue Heilsexodus Bei Paulus," Judaica 7 (1952), p. 135 and Michel, P&SB, p. 157. Philo Leg. All. II 86 identifies the rock with the wisdom of God.


3Feuillet, SMR 8:134.
Allusion or Quotation? We return now to the quotation itself. If it were not for the fact that the verb καταστράφησαμεν occurs only here in the NT and only at Num. 14:16 in the Pentatuch\(^1\) one might assume that it is not dealing with a quotation but rather with a summary phrase retrospective to the whole of Israel's wilderness experience. This being a quotation, however, Paul has altered the verb for syntactical reasons.\(^2\) Because Paul is using the phrase as part of his midrashic\(^3\) comment on Israel's history, one would not find such a variation out of place.

The most interesting aspect of this use of the OT passage is that Paul employed the conjectural statement of Moses to speak of the historical facts of Israel's sojourn in the desert rather than other passages which would have been direct narratives of that event. Though the original event pictured by Num. 14:16 never occurred

\(^1\) Elsewhere it is used in Judges, once in Job, and in 2 Macc.

\(^2\) McNamara, TT, p. 93, writes, "When speaking of God's relations with the external world, the targumists shy away from making deity the direct subject or object of an action. To effect this, active verbs of the biblical text become passive in the Aramaic renderings, sometimes with a certain amount of violence being done to the Aramaic language." But there is no need to assert a reverential passive here. A random look through 1 Cor. alone shows how frequently Paul uses θεὸς as the stated subject of an active verb; 1 Cor. 1:20, 27, 28; 2:10; 3:6, 17; 4:9; 5:13; 6:13; 10:5, 13; 12:18, 24, 28.

\(^3\) Davies, PRJ, p. 105. See also MR Num., p. 694 and SS 1:7, p. 63.
it is most improbable that Paul did not know location and context. One would assume, therefore, that he was well aware of his divergence of application. Though the phrase did not narrate the actual event it was used as a convenient historical summary and, in fact, was true to the later facts of Israel's history.
### DEUTERONOMY

**DEUTERONOMY 19:15, 2 CORINTHIANS 13:1**

**Textual Display**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>167</code></td>
<td><code>έπι  ἔμπλημα</code></td>
<td><code>επι</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>168</code></td>
<td><code>στόματος</code></td>
<td><code>στόματος</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>169</code></td>
<td><code>δύο</code></td>
<td><code>δύο</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>170</code></td>
<td><code>μαρτύρων</code></td>
<td><code>μαρτύρων</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>171</code></td>
<td><code>καὶ</code></td>
<td><code>καὶ</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>172</code></td>
<td><code>επί</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>173</code></td>
<td><code>στόματος</code></td>
<td><code>στόματος</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>174</code></td>
<td><code>τριῶν</code></td>
<td><code>τριῶν</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>175</code></td>
<td><code>μαρτύρων</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>176</code></td>
<td><code>σταθήσεται</code></td>
<td><code>σταθήσεται</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>177</code></td>
<td><code>πᾶν</code></td>
<td><code>πᾶν</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>178</code></td>
<td><code>δῆμα</code></td>
<td><code>δῆμα</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mt. 18:16, cf. Jn. 8:17

επὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων

η τριῶν σταθή πᾶν δῆμα

1 Tim. 5:19

επὶ δύο η τριῶν μαρτύρων

**Masoretic Variants**

BHK notes that the LXX and Vulgate appear to read `167-72`. At the present there is no Heb. MSS evidence to support the non-MT reading.
Septuagintal Variants

B-M note that the first ἑμιστοματος is omitted by d n Arm. Cyr 1/11. The καὶ is preceded by η in Cyr 1/11 and is replaced by η in b d f m n w Cyr 2/11 Luc Spec-codd. The second ἑμιστοματος is omitted by b d f m n w Arm. Cyr. Luc. Spec-codd. The second ἑμιστοματος is omitted by b f m w. Ἠτοι μετὰ παν is read as omnium stabit in the Old Latin. For Ἠτοι μετὰ, f reads σταθη; A F M V W rell Arm. and Cyr read σταθησται. k omits παν while the Syro-hexaplar from the MS (now lost) of A. Masius reads παν under an obelus :. An asterisk precedes ομμα in M.1

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that while Κ reads ομμα, Κ* and 35 have ιω before ομμα.

17 73 74 a ΣΤ ARM Dial 867 place ἑμιστοματος after τριων. Κ 32 46 f vg arm Dial 867 read η before τριων.

Textual

Paul’s omission of the second ἑμιστοματος is seen in b d f m n w Arm Cyr. Luc. Spec-codd and his use of σταθησται is seen in A F M V W rell arm. and Cyr. The passive voice (σταθη) is also found in Mt. 18:16 and may be evidence for an early Palestinian Heb Pu’al reading in that it differs from the Alexandrian and MT traditions.

1Stendahl, SSM, p. 181, notes that the quotation form in Mt. 18:16 agrees with LXXA and Lucian.
Contextual

The Deuteronomy passage is from the Book of the Law\(^1\) and dealt specifically with the use of witnesses in the detection and punishment of crimes.

Paul was in the process of informing the Corinthians about his impending visit\(^2\) but still maintained the defensive and apologetic tone which he began in chapter 10:1. Paul's coming was linked with his judgment on the disobedient.

Hermeneutical

The Two or Three Witnesses. The primary hermeneutical question concerns the meaning which Paul ascribed to the idea of the two or three witnesses. Some commentators surmise that Paul was referring to his three visits.\(^3\) Menzies\(^4\) distinguishes visit from "intention" to visit. Oostendorp notes that "Paul is only one witness even if he has made three visits" and calls this a loose quotation of the law.\(^5\) Plummer\(^6\) supplies three possible meanings. The first is that Paul will carry out

\(^1\)Dt. 12:1-28:68. \(^2\)2 Cor. 12:14-13:10.

\(^3\)Bonsirven, EREP, p. 319; Allo, 2 Cor., p. 335. Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 252, attributes this to "a more general application here than in other NT contexts (cf. Mt. 8:16; 1 Tim. 5:19; Heb. 10:28)."

\(^4\)Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 100.


\(^6\)Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 372.
a formal investigation when he arrives.¹

The second possibility is that Paul meant that he would wait for first-hand evidence rather than hear-say. But this is not necessary because the acts were openly committed. The third interpretation is that Paul spoke of three visits but Plummer concludes that one must remain in doubt as to Paul's exact intent.² Bultmann³ says the three witnesses equal accusations or charges rather than visits. This is compatible with the Damascus Document 9, 17-22 which shows that a single witness may see an act done three separate times. Each time is noted and on the third occurrence a conviction may be brought.⁴

Early Jewish Literature. The OT passage is interpreted with varying degrees of faithfulness to the OT context in other literature. The Mishnah⁵ speaks of at

¹Hanson, SPTT, p. 174, concurs. See also Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 100-01, who sees this as a reference to the proper procedure which Paul will execute when he arrives.

²Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 372.


⁴Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Qumran Law of Testimony," Revue de Qumran 8 (1975), pp. 604-05. This may also be related to Ex. 21:29 and the forewarned ox. See also, Philo, on Joseph sec. 235, regarding Joseph's threefold trial of his brethren to see if there was any enmity among them. This may also relate to Mt. 18:15-17 and the three-stage concept of going from private to public accusations.

⁵Danby, Mishnah, Sotah 6:3, p. 299.
least two witnesses needed to condemn a woman for adultery. Onkelos reads: "But upon the word of two or of three witnesses shall the case be confirmed."¹ In the Mekilta² a man who enters a ruin and finds a man dying and another holding a bloody knife can do nothing because of Dt. 19:15. In Qumran the passage takes on a more diffuse application. Commenting on the Damascus Document, IX, 16-23 Dupont-Sommer³ writes that in a case where a capital offence has been seen by only one man "two more witnesses are needed, each of them denouncing the culprit for a new offence: three witnesses in all, therefore."

Pauline Adaptations. Regarding the omission of the second ἐπὶ στόματος and the second μαρτύρων this may be due to a "natural omission"⁴ or a desire to abbreviate the quotation⁵ or, of course, to a text different from those known at present as has been noted in the Textual section. Because the phrase had become idiomatic one expects to find it in varying text-forms, some containing a fuller (Mt. 18:16) or abbreviated (1 Tim. 5:19) text. Paul's text, in 2 Cor. 13:1, falls somewhere in the

¹Etheridge, TOJ: על מימר הַרְּפָאָה שָׁדָּדוֹן על מימר הַלִּיָּה שָׁדָּדוֹן הקיימוּ יִתאְמַא
²Lauterbach, Mekilta, III, p. 171.
⁴Atkinson, JTVI 79:50. ⁵Toy, QNT, p. 46.
middle, therefore Atkinson's suggestion is the more probable.

It is clear that Paul began a new aspect of his thought regarding returning to Corinth in chapter 13. This is the climax to his warnings and exhortations. Whatever the quotation means it must be closely linked with 2 Cor. 13:1 and the rather stark announcement that this would be Paul's third visit. Paul made it clear that he himself would act in judgment.\(^1\) This personal action was linked to his third visit and the quotation. The content of the judgment was given further clarification in vs 10 where Paul spoke of his own power to be sharp in judgment. The emphasis was on Paul's own actions of judgment rather than on a community trial as suggested by some interpretations. There is also no indication that Paul had moved outside of grace and faith and entered into pure law as Hanson suggests.\(^2\) Paul, while certainly contemplating severe measures, was still concerned with edification for all concerned, not destruction.\(^3\)

Paul gave the explanation of his OT quote in vs 2. He had previously warned the Corinthians about their disobedience and if they were still unrepentant upon his

\(^1\)"I will not spare . . . .", 2 Cor. 13:2. KJV

\(^2\)Hanson, SPTT, p. 174.

\(^3\)2 Cor. 13:10.
arrival he would not spare any offender. This was a clear way of saying that the visits were to be understood as the three witnesses and that the establishing of every word was equated with the personal judgment of the Apostle.

Paul has adopted a widely used principle from an OT passage. The intent of Dt. 19:15 was that no punishment should be executed unless clear and uncontroversible proof be brought to the conviction. For this, two or three witnesses were needed to bring about justice. Paul was saying that he had twice witnessed the same acts of disobedience at Corinth. If he came and witnessed the same acts the third time he would have more than enough proof to pass judgment. The details of the OT legal system are revolutionized in the NT church but the spirit of the OT passage (community purity) is maintained. While this phrase had become an idiom Paul clearly used a juridical principle of OT extraction for the regulation of the Church's piety.
### DEUTERONOMY 22:24, 1 CORINTHIANS 5:13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Display</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ηα</td>
<td>ηαι</td>
<td>ηαι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυνα</td>
<td>γυνα</td>
<td>γυνα</td>
<td>γυνα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γη</td>
<td>πονηρον</td>
<td>πονηρον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαρην</td>
<td>γαρην</td>
<td>γαρην</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαν</td>
<td>γαν</td>
<td>γαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αυταυ</td>
<td>αυταυ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Masoretic Variants

Kittel lists no variants for this passage.

### Septuagintal Variants

Brooke-McLean note that εξαρειτε is read by a b d (-ται) f h p q t w z (mg) a2 and the Armenian, Old Latin: Roberts' edition of the Lyons Octateuch, and Cyril, εξαρατε is read by 18. το is read for τον by d* f and cyr-ed. εξαρατε is read by m* in the first part of the vs not given above.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf reads εξαρατε with η Α Β Ζ Χ Θ F G P al fere15 Euthal Cod d e f g vg Bas eth 44 46. 46 67. For εξαρειτε he notes Stephanus D3EL al plu OrCat98 Eus.Ps651, etc. Nestle notes that D46 reads εξαρετε. η Α Β Ζ Χ Θ F G P and others have no και before εξαρατε.
Stephanus with D3 E L and others inserts the μαυ.

Textual

Toy\(^1\) locates this quotation at Josh. 7:13 (LXX ἐως ἄν ἐξάρπητε το ἀνάθεμα ἐξ ὑμῶν) but this reading requires Paul to have made more changes than in using the Deut. 22:24 passage. While this does not settle the location of the quote in itself, it is more conclusive when coupled with the fact that Paul normally quotes from the Pentateuch and Psalms and that the quote is more easily recognized as sourced in Deuteronomy. This terminology occurs at several places throughout Deuteronomy, however.\(^2\) Deut. 22:24 has nearer conformity of sense with the case referred to by Paul.\(^3\) Perhaps Dt. 17:7 and 22:24 should be considered equal candidates in that the contexts of both concerned the purging of immorality from the community of God by the harshest of punishments.

Though P\(^4,6\) is early evidence for the ἐξάρπητε reading and usually follows the Alexandrian text-type, it seems best to adhere to the ruling of the combined testimony of ΝΑΒCD* and assert the priority of ἐξάρπητε. The μαυ which several Byzantine MSS place before ἐξάρπητε may be a later attempt at conformity to the LXX. Thus the single variant from the LXX reading in Paul's citation is

---

\(^{1}\)Toy, QNT, p. 173.


\(^{3}\)Gough, NTQ, p. 81.
the change from second person singular to plural of 

This appears, at this point, to be a hermeneutically motivated alteration.

**Contextual**

The passage in Deut. 22:24 is in the midst of various apodictic laws regarding the morality of Israel when they would enter the land. The specific at hand was the case of adultery with another man's betrothed. This case is preceded by that of adultery with a woman who has completed the marriage vows.

1 Corinthians 5 opens with Paul's verdict of the man who had his father's wife in immorality. The next verses express an exhortation to holiness and vss 9-11 are designed to clarify Paul's previously misunderstood statement concerning disassociation with immoral people. A summary and conclusion of his thoughts on this matter of immorality are given in vss 12-13.

**Hermeneutical**

Even if one cannot be dogmatic regarding which of the several OT passages Paul had in mind, the use of the sense in this passage is not contradictory to its use throughout Deuteronomy. The people of God were to be holy and to purge evil from among them. Paul viewed the Church as the temple of the Spirit and subject to a

---

1 vss 1-6.
rigorous scheme of holiness. Hermeneutically the change from second singular to plural does no violence to the original as the εὐμῶν αὐτῶν of the LXX indicates that the subject is considered as a single group consisting of many people. The fact that in Deut. 17:7; 19:19; 22:21, 24; 24:7 the verbs are singular\(^1\) and in 1 Cor. 5 it is in the plural, leads Barrett to see an implication that excommunication was a NT community responsibility. But this would be true in both Testaments and therefore does not provide a satisfactory reason for the change of number. It presupposes that the readers would have been highly familiar with the minutiae of the LXX of Dt. 22:24 and that they would have been insightful enough to perceive the meaning so subtly intimated in the change from singular to plural.

More consistent with the NT context is the fact that Paul has not used an IF for this quotation. It reads as if it were an integral part of the narrative flow and stands as the final word. There seems to be no desire on the part of the Apostle to use this as a proof-text to bolster his argument nor does he use it in an illustrative manner. Ἐξαίφω is only used here in the New Testament\(^2\) though the rest of the quotation's words are

\(^1\)Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 133. Although Sperber, JBL 59:282, notes that the plural is evidenced by: Auferetis malignum ex uobis ipsis (Ulysse Robert, Heptateuchi Versio Latina Antiquissima, Lyon 1900, p. 13).

\(^2\)Unless the Byzantine variant Ἐξαποθ of 1 Cor.
not unusual for Paul. It seems that Paul had thought of the Deuteronomy passages due to the similarity of the immoral man of Corinth with adultery in ancient Israel. While he did not need to quote a passage formally to prove from Scripture that an adulterous man had to be punished, he did see the command to be an evocative and fitting climax for his words. His adaptation of the second plural is a simple continuance of the number he has been using throughout the context in addressing his readers. A mere shift of the number of εἰκαίρως would not effectively communicate community action though the community is certainly implied.

It is noteworthy that Paul would quote a command whose method of fulfillment in Corinth would differ so radically from that in Israel when Deuteronomy was written. Certainly, one assumes Paul was not advocating stoning.¹ Both Barrett² and Grosheide³ assert that the punishment advocated in Corinth was excommunication.

---

5:2 be accepted which is, nevertheless, also an allusion to the Deuteronomy quotation terminology.

¹In the Talmud, Sanhedrin 87b comments on Ex. 21:23-25. Money rather than life had become the required compensation in order to conform the old law to advanced legal norms. Weingreen, BJRL 34:184, writes: "The primitive law of talio may have had validity in the dim, distant past in ancient Israel; it certainly had no place in Talmudic law, for the principle of monetary compensation seems to have been firmly entrenched."

²Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 133.

³Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 131.
Paul exhibited a method of using the spirit of the command, to rid the community of evil, without the literal historical method of such ridding. But how different were the effects of the Pauline and OT methods of purification considering 1 Cor. 5:5, παραδοθήκη τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ εἰς δεισθέν τῆς σάρκος κτλ. Paul extracted a principle which allowed for various applications yet still effected the end towards which the original OT passage pointed; purity of the community. This exhibits another use of the OT as an ethical authority for the new people of God, the Church.

1Paul has omitted the commands for stoning to death, Dt. 22:24a, out of his quotation.
**DEUTERONOMY 25:4, 1 CORINTHIANS 9:9**

**Textual Display**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐν</td>
<td>οὐ</td>
<td>οὐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάρ</td>
<td>φιμώδεις</td>
<td>ημώδεις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῇ</td>
<td>θοῦν</td>
<td>θοῦν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μωσείως</td>
<td>γέγραπται</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νόμῳ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I Tim. 5:18**

θοῦν  
ἀλοῶντα  
οὐ  
φιμώδεις

---

1 With regards to 1 Cor. 9:10, Alfred Resch, Agrapha (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), p. 30, on the basis of the use of Dt. 25:4 followed by a dominical saying in I Tim. 5:18, finds the same to be the case in 1 Cor. 9:10 although in 1 Cor. the following saying may possibly be an apocalyptic saying. Wendland, Kor., p. 64, also feels 1 Cor. 9:10 is a quotation though he is at a loss to find its source. It seems better to take the ὅτι ἡμᾶς ἐγράφη κτλ to be an answer to the two-fold question immediately preceding.
Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this passage.

Septuagintal Variants

Swete notes that B* reads φιλομαχεῖς for φιλομαχεῖς but is corrected to φιλομαχεῖς by Bb. B-M note that μημονον is only read by Philo and Paul. The reading μημονον in Philo is found in the tenth century MS Seldenianus. Probability points to this being a harmonization of Philo to Paul. Philo, De Virt. 145 quotes, βουν αλοωντα μη φιλομον.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that μημονον is read by B* D* F G Chrysostom com. ad. h. l. 215 Theodoret 1,179 glossar albertin 127 and others. φιλομαχεῖς is read by A K B C D b c E K L P (σοσο)ئ ث Origen 1,170,388,541 and cat 168 Dial. 817 Chrysostom txt 214 Euthal. cod Cyril esai 430 and Thdr. Nestle adds P46 and 1739 to those witnesses reading φιλομαχεῖς. Εν γαρ τω μωσεωι νομω γεγραπται is read by Ν A B C K L P and others along with the Vulgate Armenian Ethiope Origen 1,388 Dial 817 Euthal. cod Cyril ador 139, γεγραπται γαρ is read by D* E F G d e δ g Origen Hilary (i.e. ps118). Μωσεως is read by Ν B C K L P and many others while A and others and Stephanus read μωσεως.

Textual

The textual matter here primarily concerns
whether Paul wrote φιμωσεις or κημωσεις. Toy writes that "if Paul used the latter term, it must be supposed that he translated this familiar saying from the Aramaic, instead of taking it from Sept." Hanson writes:

It seems likely that Paul's Greek version had κημωσεις, and that it is neither a mistake of memory on Paul's part, nor the effort of a later scribe to smarten up Paul's Greek: the nouns κημος and φιμος can be used interchangeably in translation Greek.

This interchangeability is apparent in Prov. 26:3 where σ' used φιμος and α' and Θ' used κημος to translate metheg or "bridle." The strongly supported variant reading of φιμωσεις may be an attempt to harmonize with the LXX and 1 Tim. 5:18. In the end a similar sense is gained by either rendering. The transcriptional probability is stronger in this case that scribes would have altered κημωσεις, which lacks literary lustre, to φιμωσεις. Κημωσεις will be the accepted reading for the

---

1 Toy, QNT, p. 174. Bonsirven, EREP, p. 332, notes that κημωσεις is a better rendering of the corresponding Hebrew term and clarifies the thought. Κημως does not occur in the LXX and is rare in Patristics; cf. Lampe, PGL, p. 750. See H&F, p. 763, for κημος in Ps. 31 (32):9 and Ezek. 19:4, 9.

2 Hanson, SPTT, p. 161. Hanson, SPTT, p. 174.

3 Hanson, SPTT, p. 174.

4 Hering, 1 Cor., p. 78.

5 Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 205, n. 4.

6 Metzger, TCNT, p. 558. Hanson implies just the opposite, SPTT, p. 161, as do M&M, p. 672. Metzger's view is also supported by Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 183, n. 35, who calls κημος an "unliterarische Wort" and says that φιμος "das sekundäre Angleichung an LXX ist."
purposes of this study.¹

The only variation from the LXX is Paul's use of ἡμώσεις. He has duplicated the tense, person and number as well as the syntax of the quotation as a whole. It would appear that ἡμώσεις was an early, though not widespread, variant in the Greek OT text of the first century.²

Contextual

The quotation is, in its OT setting, surrounded by various laws concerning mercy and justice toward one's fellow countryman. Chapter 24 contains divorce regulations, (vss 1-4) military exemption for newlyweds, (vs 5) humanitarianism where pledges are concerned, (vss 10-13) wages for the poor, (vs 15) death penalties for fathers and sons, (vs 16) fairness for orphans, widows and aliens, (vss 17-18) and gleaning restrictions, (vss 19-22). Chapter 25 discusses humaneness in punishment, (vss 1-3) the present quotation,³ (vs 4) then a section on Levirate marriage, (vss 5-10).

¹Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 183, settles on ἡμώσεις noting that ἡμώ was rare and is not in the LXX therefore a scribal correction would readily go from ἡμώσεις to φιμώσεις. See also Robertson, 1 Cor., p. lxii.

²Cf. p. 181.

³Johannes Hempel, Die Schichter des Deuteronomiums (Leipzig: R. Voigtländers Verlag, 1941), p. 226, finds Dt. 25:4 to be a marginal gloss which later became incorporated into the text.
Dt. 25:4, concerning animals, appears rather unexpectedly in the middle of laws concerning humane treatment of humans. Unlike the other surrounding commands, this one does not have an appended reason for obedience. Its almost proverbial tone gives the impression of a principle rather than a strictly literal agricultural procedure. C. F. Keil writes:

The command not to put a muzzle upon the ox when threshing, is no doubt proverbial in its nature, and even in the context before us is not intended to apply merely literally to an ox employed in threshing but to be understood in the general sense in which the Apostle Paul uses it in 1 Cor. ix. 9 and 1 Tim. v. 18, viz., that a labourer was not to be deprived of his wages.

The ox is not to be muzzled; but why? The OT context outlined various balances which needed to be observed. The poor need their stones, garments and wages; each is put to death for his own sins; the redemption from Egypt is a sign to be generous regarding a pledge and gleaning; even in punishment personal integrity must be respected. Verse 4, then, may well have been understood as a proverbal and figurative summary of the preceding exhortations.

Thus the interpretation would be that each must

---


2 What is being considered here is the meaning of Dt. 25:4 in its present structure and context and how it
be given his just due.

The image of the ox, then, was used as the illustrative vehicle for conveying this principle along the line of minor to major argument. If a lowly ox has inalienable rights how much more would fellow Israelites.

The NT context is a series of questions and challenges centering on the basic exercise (or lack of it) of Paul's authority as an Apostle. The final question preceding the quotation was whether Paul was simply speaking in human thoughts or with the authority of God. In answer, Paul brought to bear the weight of the Law. The subsequent context implies that Paul did have a right for support and that the quotation, as explained in vss 9b-10, established positive answers to his questions in vss 4-5.

Hermeneutical

The general trend of opinion regarding this quotation is that Paul has not only openly ignored (vss 9b-10) the literal meaning of the OT but, in fact, he has claimed that it was never there in the first place!

---

may relate to both agricultural and human activity. If the passage had a pre-Scriptural history relating only to animal humaneness the question is, has its meaning been altered by its present context? Did the one who placed it in its present context have more than oxen on his mind? Unless one feels compelled to hypothesize a gloss or rather erratic editorial arrangement, the context itself, contributes significantly to the intentional connotation of the verse.

1Thackeray, SPJT, p. 193.
Higgins writes:

Paul denies the literal meaning of the passage he is quoting (Deut. xxv, 4), which is an example of the humanitarianism of Deuteronomy, and uses it to prove that the (spiritual) labourer is worthy of his (material) hire.  

This is written in reference to 1 Cor. 9:5-11 to which Riesenfeld's remarks are pertinent:

Dans cette phrase, ou en tout cas dans son premier membre, le langage allégorique n'est pas fait d'images spontanées, mais pré suppose un usage courant de ces métaphores dans la terminologie commune à l'auteur et à ceux auxquels il s'adresse.  

The formal presentation of the quote presupposes such a tradition as do Paul's interpretive remarks which follow. It is well to hold that Paul was communicating in known terms and was not relating one unknown to another.  

Bruce takes the "oxen-only" approach in Deuteronomy when he writes that Paul's "argument may clash with modern exegetical method and western sentiment, but he must be allowed to mean what he says."

Many commentators conclude that Paul adopted an allegorical interpretation. One author suggests that Paul may have been writing playfully but sees the effect

\[\text{---}\]

1 Higgins, CSOT, p. 115.


3 Johannes Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925), p. 237, writes that this is "Deutung noch einer Begründung aus einem allgemeinen Lebensgesetz."

4 Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 84.
of later Rabbinical allegory if Paul was serious.  

James Barr goes further and asserts that the legal text is quoted "which has no event correspondences in it at all; and the literal and original sense is explicitly repudiated by the apostle." But the conclusion that Paul had indulged in allegory is not inescapable although Hanson would assert that Paul was not "deliberately designing an allegorical use of the text." An analogical use is more suitable for Paul's conceptuality, especially in view of the OT context. Robertson writes that Paul did not allegorize, 

1Sir George Adam Smith, The Book of Deuteronomy (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1918), p. 286. Gerhardsson, MM, p. 317, claims Paul used it allegorically because he could not use it as straightforward law. Knox, SPCJ, p. 127, calls this a method of "explaining away the details of the Law by the introduction of a moral allegory . . . ." But does this also apply to Josephus who (Jew. Ant IV sec 233) uses Dt. 25:4 regarding oxen but in a context of sharing with those in need such as poor, beasts, wayfarers?


3As against Weiss, 1 Kor., p. 236, "Hier liegt die vollausgebildete allegor. methode . . . .", and others. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 183, writes that for Paul even "die Detailvorschriften des Gesetzes allegorisch auszulegen sind."

4Hanson, SPTT, p. 166. 5Hanson, SPTT, p. 166.

that is, the historical meaning, but asserted "that the prohibition had a higher significance, in comparison with which the literal purport of it was of small moment." This higher significance was based on the presupposition that God speaks to the church from the OT and thus, in this OT passage, has found God's word for the community. This should be related to the concept of minor to major argument. Paul stands in contrast to the apologetic allegorizing of Philo while others see Paul in the same tradition and using the same motivation as Philo. Philo noted that the Law was concerned only with lofty things but this does not deny that the Law lacks mention of mundane things or unreasoning creatures. In De Virt. 145 Philo noted the mark of the Law's humanity by these prescriptions about oxen and other animals. It is to be doubted if Paul was motivated to avoid associating the Law with mundane items as was Philo.

However, if one sees that the Dt. 25:4 itself is a principle which in its present context has a primary significance for human as well as livestock relationships then Paul has neither violated the historical context nor

1Wendland, Kor., p. 64.
2Moffatt, 1 Cor., pp. 116-17; Weiss, 1 Kor., p. 236; Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 183.
3De Specialibus Legibus I, 260.
4Hanson, SPTT, p. 165. See also Somn. I 231ff for Philo's concern for the literal meaning of the Law.
indulged in extreme typology. When Hanson notes that Paul has used other allegories in vss 7-10 he sees that they, like the ox, "are only valid if they are understood literally in the first place." A literal meaning, however, is not a wooden-headed understanding of bare word-forms but of the intention of the literary style. For example, when the Psalmist said of Yahweh "He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust," Psalm 91:4, he was not saying that God was a giant bird. Even though that example is drawn from poetry, where figures of speech are more commonly expected, it well illustrates the nature of what the "literal" sense may be in figurative language. The intended meaning of Psalm 91:4 would be that God will protect and comfort His own. Paul was asserting that the intended sense of Deut. 25:4 was that the one who worked has a right to eat of his labor. This fits inherently well into both the context of Deut. 25 and with later Rabbinical usage.

When the Rabbis used Deut. 25:4 "it was very freely applied in an analogical sense, though no rabbi suggests that the literal meaning can be ignored." This

---

1Hanson, SPTT, p. 161-62.

2Dt. 6:8 is another passage whose intent was something quite other than the actual wearing of a physical box on the forehead.

3Hanson, SPTT, p. 164.
literal sense is seen in MR.\(^1\) If Paul adopted a currently held interpretation of this passage it will not do to term it allegorical without being absolutely positive that its original intent was limited to the well-being of oxen alone. Smith\(^2\) calls this "a clear case of kindness to animals" typical to Dt. Gerhard von Rad\(^3\) notes that its Sitz im Leben will be found "in dem alten Sippenethos." G. Meredith Kline, on the contrary, writes regarding the OT passage:

The positive counterpart to the prohibition of dishonouring a man in spite of his evil works is the requirement that he receive all proper honor for his good works. This verse, probably a proverbial expression, seems even here to have the force given it by Paul in 1 Corinthians 9:9 and 1 Timothy 5:18.\(^4\)

One does not need to go as far as Barrett, however, and assert:

The only interpretation that is not forced is that in the Old Testament law God had in mind not oxen, but Christian preachers and their needs.\(^5\)

\(^1\)MR, Num., p. 335 and SS, p. 255, quotes Dt. 25:4 as an example of how Israel was to be different from the other nations, thus referring to oxen in a literal manner. In MR, Num., p. 705, the passage shows how God had included every earthly thing in His Torah. Onkelos remains close to the Hebrew.

\(^2\)Smith, Deut., pp. 285-86.

\(^3\)Gerhard von Rad, Das füntfe Buch Mose (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1964), p. 110.

\(^4\)G. Meredith Kline, Treaty Of The Great King Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963), p. 117. Johnson, QNTO, p. 259, also asserts that the OT precept itself was typical in nature.

\(^5\)Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 205.
This appreciation of the nature of principle and figurative language in Scripture seems a bit too rigid. One would not, for example, take it that the events recalled in Ro. 15:4 and 1 Cor. 10:11 only happened as examples for Christians in the First Century A.D. They happened for many reasons and for the benefit of many times and peoples. When Paul applied a principle he was not primarily concerned with the past or future applications but rather with the case at hand. So it was with Paul here. Deut. 25:4 was not simply written for Christian preachers in the sixth decade of the First Century but they could and were certainly included in its application. Here again the OT was used as authority for Christian piety.1

1Biörn Fjörstedt, Synoptic Tradition In 1 Corinthians (Stockholm: Rotobeckman, 1974), p. 76ff, shows the affinities of Luke 10 with 1 Cor. 9. The Dt. 25:4 quotation is not examined, however. Fjörstedt is convinced that Paul shows signs of synoptic influence.
DEUTERONOMY 32:17, 1 CORINTHIANS 10:20

Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλ'</td>
<td>θεουσιν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰτ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐξουσιω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δαμουνιοις</td>
<td>δαμουνιοις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐ</td>
<td>οὐ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεῷ</td>
<td>θεῷ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

The Chester Beatty Papyri have a lacuna at Dt. 32:17. B-M note that in the Old Latin the translation of ἐξουσιω is preceded by et. Justin omits καὶ - Θεω.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that the second θεουσιν is supported by Ν Α Β Ρ ΣΤ Υ Ζ Ω Θ ΘΕΛΑ is read due to the addition of Τα Θεουν after the first θεουσιν.*

by K L and most others, καὶ οὐ (F ουχ) Θεω is as above in Α

by others while it is after the second θεουσιν in D E F G K L Α

and d e f g vg syrutr sah cop, etc.

* cf. ΧΑΚ (L) al omnv and many versions and patristic witnesses.
Textual

The phrase δαυμονίως καὶ οὐ θῶ is taken verbatim from the LXX. Paul has changed the tense of θῶ and placed it at the end of the quotation. Because Paul had integrated the passage into his context, supplying no IF, this might be passed over as an allusion rather than a quotation. This is, however, the only place in the NT where θῶ and δαυμονίω are connected. While this is not a formal citation it does however agree with the Hebrew and LXX of Dt. 32:17.

Contextual

The OT context is the "Song of Moses" where the writer envisaged the failures of Israel's history. Paul had continued his argument against idolatry and entered into his conclusion. The readers' attention is turned in vs 18 to "Israel according to the flesh," to show how the priests had a share in the altar according to the same principle as does the Christian in his Eucharist. Vss 19-20 show Paul's intent. He looked beyond the elements of ritual to the spiritual object of worship. For the Jew it was Yahweh, for the Christian it was Christ, but for the idolator it is the world of demons.

1σιόμερ, 1 Cor. 10:14.
Hermeneutical

Midrash Rabbah notes regarding the "satyrs" that "these satyrs are nought but demons, as is borne out by the text which says, they sacrificed unto demons, nogods."²

What is striking in Paul's use of the OT in this case is his resorting to OT language and concepts to describe contemporary Gentile events. The entire section of 1 Cor. 10:14-21 seems to be a Christian midrash on Deut. 32:17-21.³ Without denying or distorting the OT event of Israel's idolatry in the wilderness Paul has drawn an application to the events of Corinthian idolatry.

¹MR Lev. 17:7, p. 287.

²Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 216, also translates οὐδεὶς of 1 Cor. 10:20 as "no-god" rather than "not to God." Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 205, n. 36, decides for "not to God." See Dt. 32:21 for the use of no-god. NEB "no-gods," Jerome Bible "not-god," and NASV "not-god." Δαμιάνος is more abstract than Δαμιάνος; Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 235. Werner Foerster, "Δαμιάνος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament II (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), p. 2, writes that Δαμιάνος is "less precise than Θεός." It is best defined as a "super-natural power" or lesser deity. It is difficult to know if τῶν in Dt. 32:17 is "used contemptuously of idols or of real demons," Foerster, TDNT II, p. 11. τῶν originally signified a type of supernatural being, inferior to the gods proper, Toy, QNT, p. 174. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, Charles A. Briggs, A Hebrew And English Lexicon Of The Old Testament (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 993, give τῶν an apparent meaning of "demon" as a loanword from Assyrian "sēdu, a protecting spirit, esp. of bull-colossus." Onkelos goes its own interpretive way: "they sacrificed to demons in whom there is no help (nothing that is needed)," Etheridge, TOJ, II, Dt. 32:17. Cf. Acts 19:26, Gal. 4:8.

³Hanson, STPP, p. 115.
He was able to use the third person plural of the quotation of Deut. 32:17 which related to Israel to apply to the idolators in Corinth and, in a more general sense, to idolatry world-wide. Paul's sense of OT history was not distorted (i.e. allegorized) by his method of drawing a principle.
**JOB, PSALMS, PROVERBS**

**JOB**

**JOB 5:13 AND PSALM 94:11 (93:11 LXX),**

1 CORINTHIANS 3:19-20

**Textual Display**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 5:13</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MT</strong></td>
<td><strong>LXX</strong></td>
<td><strong>NT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γέγραπται</td>
<td>γάρ</td>
<td>γάρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταλαμβάνων</td>
<td>δρασοδέμενος</td>
<td>τούς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σοφοῦς</td>
<td>σοφοῦς</td>
<td>σοφοῦς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν</td>
<td>ἐν</td>
<td>ἐν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῇ</td>
<td>τῇ</td>
<td>τῇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φρονήσει</td>
<td>πανουργία</td>
<td>αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psa. 94:11</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MT</strong></td>
<td><strong>LXX</strong></td>
<td><strong>NT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>πάλιν</td>
<td>πάλιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>κύριος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γινώσκει</td>
<td>γινώσκει</td>
<td>γινώσκει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τούς</td>
<td>τούς</td>
<td>τούς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαλογισμοῦς</td>
<td>διαλογισμοῦς</td>
<td>διαλογισμοῦς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Psa. 94:11 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דָּוִן</td>
<td>ἀνθρώπων</td>
<td>σοφόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דָּוִת</td>
<td>ζῷον</td>
<td>ζῷον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰσίν</td>
<td>εἰσίν</td>
<td>εἰσίν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָתָאֲו</td>
<td>מָתָאֲו</td>
<td>מָתָאֲו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Masoretic Variants**

**Job**

BHK lists a variant reading of the masculine plural suffix of מָרָעָב. A medieval Hebrew MS 89 in Kennicott, Vetus Testamentum, Vol. 2, 1780, reads מָרָעָב which is also read by B and N.

**Psalms**

BHS offers no variants.

**Septuagintal Variants**

**Job**

Swete notes that A adds αὐτῶν after φρονησεῖ in accord with the masculine plural suffix of the Hebrew. Holmes and Parsons note that for καταλαμβάνων Chrysostom

---

1 Brown, Driver, Briggs, BDB, p. 791, note that מָרָעָב may possibly be from רָעָב but gives רָעָב as the n.m. form which is represented in Job 5:13. William Gesenius, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, ed. E. Kautzsch, ed. and trans., A. E. Cowley (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1898), p. 267, section 91e, notes that with feminines, the Masora may possibly regard א_ as a shortening of אֹ_ in the נַהֲרֶגֶן of Hos. 13:2 and מָרָעָב in Job 5:13.
reads καταλαμβάνει κυρίος. He adds τοὺς to σοφοὺς,
omits τῷ before φρονησεῖ and adds αὐτῶν after. 254 (a
Vatican codex #337 of the 13th cen.) adds αὐτῶν.

Psalms
Neither Swete nor the GLXX list any variants for
this passage.

New Testament Variants

1 Cor. 3:19
Tischendorf lists no variants for this passage.

1 Cor. 3:20
Tischendorf lists no variants. Nestle notes that
3 33 614 and a great number of late witnesses read
αὐθρωπῶν for σοφῶν which seems to be a harmonization to
the LXX.

Textual

Job
The syntax is nearly identical with A, the only
alteration being Paul's addition of the accusative plural
article before σοφοὺς. The word correspondence is less
marked in the Pauline version of δρασσόμενος for
καταλαμβάνων and πανουργία for φρονήσει. This substitu-
tion has caused many scholars to view this quotation as
a direct translation from the Hebrew. 1

1 Turpie, OTN, p. 24. Robertson, 1 Cor., pp. 70-
71, also sees it to be nearer to the Hebrew. Lightfoot
sees the substitution of the more correct and forcible
term πανουργία for δια, NEP, p. 195. See also
Ellis asserts that when Paul varies from the Alexandrian text he "reflects the Hebrew because no LXX translation was available to him." 1 Elsewhere he states that "Paul's citations from Job (Rom. 11.35; 1 Cor. 3.19) may follow the Hebrew simply because it is the most familiar text." 2 One wonders why Paul, who once moved in the highest circles of Jerusalem Jewry, would never have had access to a Greek version of Job 3 and why, when he so consistently favors the LXX version, he would be more familiar with one book, Job, in Hebrew. 4 Neither Philo

Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 99.

1Ellis, PUOT, p. 4. 2Ellis, PUOT, p. 144.

3The LXX of Job was known to Philo and was therefore in existence in Paul's day. C. H. Dodd, The Bible And The Greeks (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), p. 15, n. 1.

4Toy, QNT, p. 172, offers a more likely possibility when he thinks that this quotation probably came "from an Aramaic version, which was nearer the Hebrew than is our Septuagint text; not, however, because it was a more accurate rendering (for he often follows an incorrect translation of the Septuagint), but probably because this proverbial expression was familiar to him in its Aramaic form." Unfortunately, 11Qtg Job starts at 17:14 and has a lacuna from 40:31 to 41:7 which also excludes comparison with the Romans 11:35 quotation of Job 41:3. This Targum, dated pre-70 by J. Van Der Ploeg, Le Targum De Job De La Grotto 11 De Qumran (Amsterdam: N.V. Noörd-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1962), p. 6, has a text which approaches the MT, p. 11, but its priority to Onkelos and Jonathan makes it a potentially important witness. See also Donald H. Gard, The Exegetical Method Of The Greek Translator Of The Book Of Job (Philadelphia: Society Of Biblical Literature, 1952), p. 1, regarding an MT vorlage for the Targum of Job and J. A. Sanders, "Cave 11 Surprises And The Question Of Canon," from The Canon And Masorah Of The Hebrew Bible, ed. Sid Z. Leīman (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1974), pp. 37-38, who concludes that the Targum is in reality a simple Aramaic translation.
nor Qumran offer any textual evidence on this passage. There is strong evidence that Paul quoted from a Greek text, however.

Kataalambov translates eighteen different Hebrew words.\(^1\) Δράσεσθαι translates ἔφα and ἤπι\(^2\) and is found in Lev. 2:2; 5:12; Jud. 5:26; 13:7 and Psa. 2:12. The two Greek words do not overlap in translating any Hebrew word, therefore the latter is not born of a mainstream LXX pattern of translation. However, ἡμῶν translates ἡμῶν only in Job 5:13.\(^3\) Πανούργια is only translated by ἡμῶν in the LXX,\(^4\) therefore Paul's use is within the semantic range of LXX expression. Not only this, but Paul's use of Πανούργια (ἡμῶν) follows a Theodotionic pattern elsewhere.\(^5\) LXX Job is well known for its freedom from the Hebrew and paraphrasing tendencies.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, A Concordance To The Septuagint And The Other Greek Versions Of The Old Testament I (Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck U. Verlaganstalt, 1954), p. 735.

\(^2\) H&R I, p. 348.

\(^3\) H&R II, p. 1439.

\(^4\) H&R II, p. 1053; Nu. 24:22; Josh. 9:4; Prov. 1:4; 8:5.

\(^5\) Ellis, PUOT, p. 15, n. 4.

\(^6\) Gillis Gerleman, Studies In The Septuagint. I. Book Of Job (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946), p. 17. See also Henry Gehman, "The Theological Approach Of The Greek Translator Of Job 1-15," Journal of Biblical Literature 68 (1949), pp. 231-40, who cautions that extreme literalism and paraphrase may be found side by side in the same verse and shows the unconscious but pervasive theological bias which colors the translation.
Orlinsky has shown¹ that when Greek Job appears to show a non-MT basis three possibilities exist; one, the translator of Job may have rendered the Hebrew interpretively. Two, the Greek itself may be corrupt. Three, there may be a legitimate non-MT basis. Concerning the passage under consideration there is no Hebrew MSS evidence, from the Dead sea area, for example, to support the idea of a non-MT reading. Secondly, there is no evidence that the Greek of the LXX or Paul is corrupt. Therefore it seems that Paul has used a translation which differed from the main LXX tradition but which, in fact, provided a better translation of the Hebrew. Because this is not an ad hoc translation it must represent a first century text. Thus, when Paul seems to correct the LXX after the Hebrew, as in this case, another Greek version was being used.²


²Bonsirven, EREP, pp. 325-26. Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 94; and Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25, also commend this view. L. Cerfau, "Vestiges D'Un Florilège Dans I Cor., I, 18-III, 24?", Revue D'HistoireEcclésiastique 27 (1931), p. 528, does not think Paul was responsible for the change of καταλαμβάνων to δρασσόμενος. Stendahl, SSM, p. 173, also sees an unknown Greek version behind the quotation. Henry St. John Thackeray, The Relation Of St. Paul To Contemporary Jewish Thought (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1900), p. 53, n. 3, relates ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν to 2 Cor. 11:3 ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ which he claims is Paul's equivalent for the φρονιμώτατος of Gen. 3:1. He notes the similar sense found in the Jerusalem Targum I on Gen. 3:13 and wonders if Paul had ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ in his text. Thackeray is convinced that Paul did not make an independent rendering.
Psalms

The only variation from the LXX is Paul's substitution of σοφῶν for ἄνθρωπον. This substitution has no Greek or Hebrew MSS evidence and must, at present, be attributed to hermeneutical alteration.¹

Contextual

Job

The OT context centers on the first response given to Job by Eliphaz. He teaches that Job is being reproved for sin and that he should submit to and profit from such reproof.² The specific context, the prelude to Eliphaz's exhortation of vs 17, concerns how God would lift up the lowly and confound the evil doer.

Psalms

Psalm 94 is an imprecation against the enemies of God. The wicked are described in vss 1-6. Verse 7 supplies insight into the thoughts of the wicked and also acts as the basis for vss 8-11. In response to the

of the LXX but had a widely divergent LXX text, p. 181. Ellis, PUOT, p. 15, n. 4, has shown that "Paul's use of πανουγία (ὅγιο) in 1 Cor. 3.19 as contrasted with the LXX's ἐφονήσις also agrees with Theodotion's translation of δήσις in other places." In MR Ex., p. 365, Job 5:13 is quoted regarding Abraham being caught up in his own sin and in MR Num., p. 759, as a thought of Moses as he was deciding in Dt. 19:9 whether or not to strike the rock.

¹See Ro. 15:10-12 for a three-fold use of ὅτι ἡμᾶς as an IF.

²Job 5:17-21.
accusation that the God of Israel does not pay heed, the wrong doers are themselves told to pay heed and realize the true identity of the God they are mocking. God, who made the ear and eye, hears and sees better than they. In contrast with the One who is the source of knowledge, man's thoughts are like a vapor.

In the first part of Chapter 3 Paul had shown that the Corinthians were unable to receive the teaching of the mature due to their factious spirit. This spirit was especially ill-grounded because the human objects of boasting were, in fact, unified in their efforts so the distinctions were superfluous. Verses 10-17 are a double-edged parenesis to those who pervert the teaching begun by Paul.²

In vss 18-23, Paul's argument against becoming taken up with the wisdom of the world was being drawn to

---

¹ 1 Cor. 3:8.

² J. Massyngberde Ford, "You Are God's 'Sukkah,'" 1 Cor. 3:10-17," New Testament Studies 21 (1974), trying to see a Sukkah or Temple imagery throughout 1 Cor. 3, attempts to place the wood, hay and stubble and precious metal imagery within the Temple context and, as a result, finds them inappropriate. She concludes that they are more appropriate to the "Sukkah" of Israel as described in the Mishnah and Talmud (see her pp. 139-40 for the rabbinic evidence). But this imagery was not intended to be included in Temple imagery in the first place. Ford's assertion, p. 140, that Paul's ναός rather than ίερον may signify "any shrine" misses Paul's point of ναός as the inner place of the Spirit in the believer. The conclusion that the purging fire of 1 Cor. 3:13-15 represents the light ceremony of the feast of tabernacles is stretched too far beyond Paul's context and intentions.
a close. He had shown how the Corinthians' immaturity had kept them from understanding the nature of God's work and had moved them away from the foundation of their faith. They were the temple of God, and should therefore understand all their attendant responsibilities. Verse 18 begins Paul's summary exhortation that the wise of this age should become foolish; that is to say, paradoxically, truly wise by God's standards. The quotations of vss 19 and 20 are followed by the exhortation not to boast in men with an added encouragement that in Christ all belonged to them, hence no need to seek security or partisan favor in men should arise.

Hermeneutical

Job

Because the OT quote was concerned with God's confounding of the wise and elevation of the humble, it was quite appropriate to Paul's thoughts in 1 Cor. 3. If it be concluded that Paul made a direct translation from the Hebrew then the final citation is certainly more powerful in sense than the LXX. Δρασσόμενος is a stronger verb than καταλαμβάνω and πανουργία is a "more perjorative word" than φρονήσει.¹ If a now lost non-LXX Greek Job be rejected, a possible reason for the presence of πανουργία is that Paul substituted, by memory or deliberation, the word from the πανουργόν from the preceding

¹Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25.
verse in Greek Job 5:12.

Though the IF, γέγραπται γάρ, does not have the function of quotation marks to introduce a verbally accurate citation of a standard text, its point is centered on stating the authoritative source of the citation followed by the sense of the quotation in varying degrees of fidelity to the textual particulars.\(^1\) Paul held that the God whose characteristics were displayed in Job was the same as the God of the Corinthians. This passage displays a continuity of deity and piety from the OT Scriptures.

**Psalms**

This quotation forms part of a meditation on wisdom placed παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, vs 19a. Thus the OT context is consonant with Paul's usage of the quotation. If man's thoughts were like breath before God, why persist in clinging to the wisdom ἐν τῷ αἰώνι τούτῳ, vs 18? The conclusion of vs 21 followed quite naturally: one should not boast in the things of men.

The substitution of σοφῶν becomes clear when one compares it with the previous quotation of 1 Cor. 3:19 which uses σοφοῦς. Paul conformed his text to the situation at hand by making specific the more general ἄνθρωπων.

---

\(^1\)Herbert Edward Ryle, *Philo And Holy Scripture* (London: Macmillan And Co., 1895), pp. xxxvii-xliv. This is the general pattern followed by Philo as well. This and Paul's quotation in 1 Cor. 2:9 are not complete sentences and are not integrated into their surrounding syntax.
in the light of his argument. Turpie writes that "in other words, what in the Hebrew is stated to belong to the body-general, is in the New Testament made applicable to a part particular, and that to the more unlikely part." This could be a memory lapse but, most likely, is a purposeful alteration to advance and support the argument.

On the other hand, Héring calls this a curious divergence from the LXX text and from the MT. He notes that the "method of changing the traditional text is not a habit of his" and accepts ἀνθρώπων as the original thus making σωφῶν a correction by a copyist who was influenced by the σωφός and σοφία of vss 18-19. It is difficult to reason why an early copyist would make a change of Paul's text away from the LXX simply to supposedly enhance Paul's argument. More probably an editor would make the kind of change exhibited in 3, 33 and 6:14 where the text is changed to conform to the LXX. Therefore Paul made the change himself to fit his own argument. The problem with which Héring wrestles disappears when one realizes that Paul was not bound to modern conceptions of

---

1Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 111, Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 43.
2Turpie, OTN, p. 34.
3Toy, QNT, pp. 172-73; Ellis, PUOT, p. 14; Hanson, SPTT, p. 1147 and Bonsirven, EREP, p. 331, agree as well.
4Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25. 5Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25.
precise quotation.\footnote{See Johnson, QNTO, chapter II "Quotations From Memory," pp. 29-61 for extensive treatments of quotations from Philo up to the Fathers.} Also, it is inaccurate to say that changing the traditional text was not a Pauline habit. For Paul, such a change would carry no sinister connotation and would conform to the common midrashic patterns of his day. Johnson writes:

It should be observed, therefore, that verbal exactness in quoting is a habit only recently introduced in literature. It was impossible, in effect, before the invention of printing made books abundant and the construction of indexes and concordances rendered it easy to find any passage at will. It has prevailed especially since the invention of quotation marks, which seem to call attention to the very words, and even letters, and to certify their correctness. Yet even to-day it is far from universal; and in the age of the apostles centuries were to elapse before it should be thought of by any one.\footnote{Johnson, QNTO, p. 29.}

Even memory lapse should be considered before conjecturing that ὑπομνήσσεσθαι is a later editorial emendation. In this case the harder reading should be accepted as prior. It must be noted, however, that the powers of memory, especially in a cultivated Jew such as Paul, could be quite phenomenal.\footnote{Gerhardsson, MM, p. 40, 89f.} Therefore, while the halakic and haggadic midrashim of Paul's day would not be under the present-day conceptions of quotation, such exegesis depended on a minute preservation of the text\footnote{Gerhardsson, MM, pp. 40-41.} and it is not accurate
to describe a given variant as an arbitrary deviation from the text.

Héring\(^1\) also seems to resist the use of the general Psalm passage in a more particular way by Paul. This is not undemonstrable in one other instance of Psalm quotation\(^2\) and should present no problem here in light of the midrashic tendencies of the apostle. The textual evidence supporting Héring's contention is also not convincing. He writes that ἀνθρώπου is "attested by a number of minuscules, the Armenian version, as well as by Marcion (according to Epiphanius, Haer. 42, MPG XLI, col. 724B, etc., 781A)."\(^3\)

Grosheide\(^4\) finds that the change of "man" to "wise" is "a remarkable modification" and asserts that Paul made the Psalm text into a proof-text. A text becomes a proof-text in a negative sense when it is used without accuracy to its original context and when its original historical sense means something quite different. Current examples such as "a little child shall lead them," Isa. 11:6, used with reference to adults following the wise advice of babes or an assertion that "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers," 2 Cor. 6:14, refers to the marriage of a believer with an unbeliever

---

\(^1\)Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25. \(^2\)Eph. 4:8. \\
\(^3\)Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25, n. 7. \\
\(^4\)Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 93.
well illustrate the vagaries of proof-texting. Paul does not here violate the essential historical understanding of the OT text nor apply it to a situation beyond its limits.² Here is what already has been seen in 1 Cor. 2:16; the application of a general principle to a specific situation. Newness is always inherent in application otherwise all one merely accomplishes is restatement. The newness of this particular application is its focus on a specific group, the wise, yet the theological and historical connections of the OT source are neither denied nor invalidated.

¹Thomas Randolph, The Prophecies, And The Texts, Cited In The New Testament, Compared With The Hebrew Original And With The Septuagint Version (Oxford: J. and J. Fletcher, 1782), p. 40. Robertson, 1 Cor., p. liii, asserts that "the Psalm contrasts the designs of men with the designs of God, and therefore the idea of σοφία is in the context."
PSALMS

PSALM 8:6 (8:7 LXX & MT), 1 CORINTHIANS 15:27

Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כ</td>
<td>פָּנְתַּא</td>
<td>פָּנְתַּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַקָּשָׁה</td>
<td>ὑπέταξας</td>
<td>ὑπέταξεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-קָקָה</td>
<td>ὑποκάτω</td>
<td>ὑπὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רֶגֶל</td>
<td>ποδῶν</td>
<td>πόδας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָוֵתוֹ</td>
<td>אָוֵתוֹ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eph. 1:22: . . . καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ . . . .

Heb. 2:8: . . . πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.

Masoretic Variants

BHS offers no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX apparatus shows that the Sahidic and Syriac of Paul of Tella read τὰ before πάντα.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf supplies no variants to this section.

Textual

Other than changes resulting from Paul recording
"in the historical mode," the textual differences relate to a change from adverb to preposition (ὀπωσδήσω to ὑπὸ) with the resultant alteration of the case of τῶν ποιήσων. Psalms 110:1 and 8:7 are combined in Eph. 1:20-22 and appear in Heb. 1:13; 2:8. ὑπὸ does not translate ἐπὶ in Greek OT.²

Contextual

Psalm 8 speaks of the praiseworthiness of God as Creator and of the inherent dignity which God gave to humanity by placing man over His creation. The Corinthian context continues the proofs that Christ must presently reign until he subjects all of His enemies.³

Hermeneutical

It is a well-known fact that while the Psalmist speaks of mankind in general, Paul, like the writer to Hebrews, made this a primary reference to Christ.⁴ More specifically, this OT passage was used "to express the implications of the Lordship of the risen Christ."⁵ Psalm 8 was also used in wider application to refer to

---

¹Turpie, QTN, p. 35.

²With the doubtful exception of a questionable reading of Sirach 16:15; H&G sup., p. 194.

³In Hebrews, the Psalm also refers to the enthronement of Christ. See Thomas, LXX in Heb., p. 37.

⁴See Bruce, 1 Cor., p. 147; Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 368.

⁵Lindars, NTA, p. 168.
Christ's priority in the new creation. The key-word πανταρ relates this passage with the preceding quotation. Because the messianic sense of Psalm 8 was current in Paul's day, Paul shared in a tradition which, while perhaps not based on a collection of written testimonies, was sourced in the Messianic speculations of Judaism and later adopted by the early Church. This adoption, as with most other OT passages, was made according to the fundamental hermeneutical paradigm of the identification of the Messiah with Jesus of Nazareth.

Paul was speaking against a position which denied a future resurrection and implied that hope in Christ was a matter for this life alone. Verses 20-28 were written to refute the denial of a future resurrection and to explain the delay of glorification by describing what was taking place behind the scenes, so to speak. A process of subjection was occurring during which Christ, reigning at the right hand of the Father, was systematically subduing His enemies. All this was being done according to a unique order (τῶν ἐξ ἐαυτοῦ τὰ ἀμαλλάτων).

---

1 Wendland, Kor., p. 129.
2 Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 325.
3 Brevard S. Childs, "Psalm 8 In The Context Of The Christian Canon," Interpretation 23 (1969), passim, discusses the Psalm as treated within the entire canon as its context. This is a most interesting exposition of OT and NT concepts though Child's purpose is to produce edification rather than to investigate and produce contextual-descriptive results.
4 vs 12. 5 vs 19. 6 vs 27. 7 vs 23.
PSALM 24:1 (23:1 LXX), 1 CORINTHIANS 10:26

Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τοῦ</td>
<td>κυρίου</td>
<td>τοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἢ</td>
<td>γὰρ</td>
<td>ἢ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ</td>
<td>πλήρωμα</td>
<td>τὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὕτης</td>
<td></td>
<td>αὕτης</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX lists no variants for this section.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ is read by Ν Β Σ D E F G while A H K L P read τοῦ γὰρ κυρίου.

The entire quotation is read after the συνεδρίαν of 1 Cor. 10:28 in Η Ι Κ Λ Α LOST LONGER PHIL SOF.

Textual

Paul made a direct quote of the LXX and inserted
only the postpositive γὰρ as an IF.

Contextual

The Psalm is one of praise to the Lord who owns the earth by virtue of His creative and sovereign powers. It is a dazzling processional of the entrance of the victorious king of glory (τῶν θεών). Paul placed this quotation in the context of what was proper to eat regarding meat sacrificed to idols and how one related to fellow Christians who did not feel such food was appropriate to eat. Paul had returned to the πάντα ἔξετων theme of 6:12. In the latter passage Paul emphasized bodily self-control by the addition of ἄλλα' ὥσπερ ἔσωσιασθήμεναι. In the former he stressed the need for concern for corporate edification by adding ἄλλα' ὧν πάντα οἰκοδομεῖ to the πάντα ἔξετων phrase.

Hermeneutical

The quotation was designed to supply the basis for one's confidence in eating any meat and not asking regarding the nature of the food one bought at the market.1 A preliminary reason for concern over such matters was given in vs 25b: διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν. The conscience was that of the weaker brother.2 The fundamental reason for the disregard of the prior use of meat was supplied

---

1Toy, QNT, p. 175; Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 220.
2vs 29.
by the principle of the quotation: all is the Lord's; that is, by virtue of His creative powers all food is inherently good. This application of the Psalm cut against the grain of Jewish halakah on the eating of meats. Peter's reluctance to eat the food offered him by a vision in Acts 10 is symbolic of the insight soon to come that God was no respecter of persons. It does not appear, however, that the vision was also applied to the meats themselves. But there is no indication that Paul was advocating the eating of unclean meats because the meat offered to idols may well have been from kosher meats. The Psalm, as used in this context, only supported the context that a Christian was free to eat the meat previously offered to idols. Paul was dealing with an essentially Gentile, rather than Jewish, problem.

This sense of the goodness of creation was inherent in the Psalm's context and was adopted by Paul. Such a use would have been familiar to Jewish readers as a context for joy and thanksgiving.

---

2Acts 10:34.
3Gal. 2:11-14.
4Tamid 7:4, Danby Mishnah, p. 589. In Tosefta Beräkut iv. 1 this Psalm is "quoted as the justification for saying grace at mealtimes," Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 99. The Mekilta, Tract. Shirata on Ex. 15:1, quotes this text in support of the fact that Yahweh is rich when compared with earthly kings, Lauterbach, Mekilta II, p. 9. See also Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 143. Midrash Rabbah, Song of Solomon 4:4, p. 193, notes the use of Psa. 24:1 by the Levites in the temple. On Ge., p. 83; Ex., p. 468;
Evidently Paul did not know any specific word of the Lord to quote regarding clean and unclean foods but this OT quotation provided a suitable answer to the libertarian cry, "All things are lawful." The use of the Psalm, however, placed freedom in a specific context; that of Christian edification. In comparing Ro. 14:14, 20 with 1 Cor. 10:26 Conzelmann writes:

Beide Briefe bieten hier ein Paradigma für die konkrete Bedeutung des Schöpferglaubens für die Einstellung zur Welt, für die Begründung der Freiheit in derselben.

This, therefore, was a new application for the OT passage. The Lordship of God over the earth, as seen by Paul, was not simply a reason for thanksgiving but opened a new freedom for the believer. This attitude of freedom became the means whereby a weaker brother could be freed from his cultural and primitive religious concepts. But it also, more importantly, became the perspective by which the mature were able to appreciate their freedom and, at the same time, also to see the positive reasons

Num., p. 568; and Num., p. 876, all reflect a similar use of the Psalm.

1 Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 208, n. 16. See, however, Ro. 14:14, 20.

2 1 Cor. 10:23, 32.

3 Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 209, n. 16, cont.

4 Wendland, 1 Kor., p. 75, writes: "Hier wirkt der Glaube an den Schöpfer statt der kultischen Ängstlichkeit des Judentums.


for its situational limitation. The fact of divine lordship over the earth continued from the OT and became infused with Christian content. Continuity of deity and piety is implied.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בֵּש</td>
<td>κάθου</td>
<td>וְהִי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>éx</td>
<td>αὐτόν</td>
<td>γάρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεξιῶν</td>
<td>βασιλεύειν</td>
<td>ἀρχι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ᾑδῆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοὺς</td>
<td></td>
<td>πάντας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐξεροῦς</td>
<td></td>
<td>τοὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σου</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑποπόδιον</td>
<td>ὑπὸ</td>
<td>τοὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ποδῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td>πόδας</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mt. 22:44 and Mk. 12:36: Ἐξερευνήσετε τὴν κυρίαν μου, κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἐως ἔναν ἄν τοὺς ἐξεροῦς σου ὑποκατώ τῶν ποδῶν σου.

Heb. 1:13: κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἐως ἔναν ἄν τοὺς ἐξεροῦς
σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.
Heb. 10:12b-13: ... ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, ... ἐώς τεθνήν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.

Masoretic Variants

BHS gives a variant of the omission of Ἴ before Ὠν in several MSS. A few MSS add Ἴ- to Ὠν.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX lists no variants for this section.

New Testament Variants

These are the pertinent variants listed by Tischendorf. ἄχρι is read by K* A B* and P while ἁχρίς is read by K C B D E F G K L. ἄχρι οὐ without οὖν is read by K* B D* F G P while οὖν is included in K C D B and C K L. ἑχθροῦς without αὐτοῦ is read by K B D E K L P but αὐτοῦ is present in A F G. F G and G omit αὐτοῦ after τῶν ποδῶν.

Textual

The verbal correspondence, though loose, is related to the use of the verb τίθημι, the identical words τοῦς ἐχθροῦς, and the τῶν ποδῶν - τοὺς πόδας relationship. Sense correspondence is present in the relationships of ἐως to ἄχρι ὑποπόδιον to ὑπό, and σου to αὐτοῦ. This is therefore a clear reference to Psalm 110:1. The γὰρ should not be considered a formal IF because it clearly presents an illative connection of the
Psalm with the preceding syntax rather than providing the sense of "for it stands written." The phrase δει γάρ αὐτον βασιλέων may be a broad paraphrase of the LXX κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μοῦ. Because, at present, there is no Hebrew or Greek MSS evidence for Paul's readings, these variant readings appear to be due to hermeneutical alterations.

Contextual

The Psalm ascribes glory and dominion to the king with a view to his future total rule over his enemies. Paul's use of this verse is in a context of the description of the proper order, τάγματι,\(^1\) surrounding the final consummation of Christ's rule. The kingdom would be handed over to the Father\(^2\) but only after Christ had subjected all powers.

Hermeneutical

Jewish Usage. This verse from Psalm 110 had an interesting use in rabbinical literature. It was used in the Mekilta\(^3\) to comment on the concept of overthrowing the enemies of God. The specific phrase quoted by Paul was, in the Mekilta, implied by the sign of "etc.,” (‘אלא) because only the first part of Psalm 110:1 was quoted. In

\(^1\) 1 Cor. 15:23. \(^2\) 1 Cor. 15:24. \(^3\) Tract. Shirata on Ex. 15:7-8, vol. II, Lauterbach, Mek., p. 6.
MR on Leviticus, Psalm 110:1 was quoted with reference to God's giving the priesthood to Abraham. This was proved by the fact the Lord, presumably Yahweh, said these things unto David's Lord, Abraham.

In the Midrash on the Psalms R. Shallum taught that "sit at hand" meant that David was to wait until he could be king after Saul. Another interpretation was that God told Abraham to sit at his right hand and let Yahweh fight his battles:

That God did so is not made plain in the narrative [in Genesis]. Who made it plain? David, who said: The Lord saith unto my Lord: 'sit thou at my right hand.'

With reference to Isa. 16:5, the Messiah would also be told to sit while God fought His battles. It is this last interpretation which most nearly approximates that espoused by the Apostle.

This OT reference was drawn from a common source for NT testimonies but here alone the significance of ἀξιόλογον (ἐξως LXX) is explained. The verse served to clar-

---

1 Freedman, MR, p. 320.
3 Braude, MOP, p. 207. 4 Braude, MOP, p. 207.
5 Bruce, 162 Cor., p. 147. See Traugott Holtz, "Zur Interpretation Des Alten Testaments Im Neuen Testament," Theologische Literaturezeitung 99 (1974), regarding the complex and detailed OT in NT schema present in 1 Cor. 15:3-5.
ify the position that the hostile powers which were destroyed at the crucifixion would ultimately be destroyed.  

1 Psalm 8 was cited after Psalm 110:1 in several NT books and this fact is used to argue for a testimony collection.  

2 It seems, then, that Ps. 110 was understood messianically by the early Christians.  

3 The significant addition of ἐναντίους before τοὺς ἐχθροὺς was due to harmonization to Psalm 8:7 in 1 Cor. 15:27 which was most likely already present in Paul's thoughts.

---

1 Héring, 1 Cor., p. 167. Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 356, shows that the son continues to hold the βασιλεία because it "has been so decreed by God, and the decree has been made known in Prophecy." Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 367, notes that the phrase "under his feet" is "an oriental way of indicating complete subjection." It is "not the victory itself but the public indication of the victory." Simon Kistemaker, The Psalm Citations In The Epistle To The Hebrews (Amsterdam: Wed. G. Van Soest N.V., 1961), p. 107, compares this passage with Heb. 2:8ff noting the verb "to subject" is a key word in both. Lindars, NTA, p. 50, calls this a metaphysical use of enemies with no intention of allegory. He notes that this sense of subjugation of spiritual enemies is "simply the consequence of applying the first half of the verse [Psa. 110:1a] to the heavenly session of the Messiah."

2 Sidney G. Sowers, The Hermeneutics Of Philo And Hebrews (Zurich: EVA-Verlag, 1965), p. 85. See Heb. 1:13-2:6f; 1 Cor. 15:27; Eph. 1:20, 22; 1 Pet. 3:22. Black, SJT 7:173, sees this testimony as first applied to Jesus as the Son of man. Bruce, P&J, p. 90, writes: "For it seems to have been common ground to Jews and Christians in New Testament times that the oracle was addressed to the Davidic Messiah, and for those who believed Jesus to be the Messiah the words introducing the oracle implied that Jesus was Lord." The two-fold use of κύριος in Psa. 110:1 helped cause Christ to be called κύριος where the Hebrew equals Yahweh. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 273, cautions that one cannot be too specific in showing what is to be proved.

3 Wendland, Kor., p. 129.
It appears that Paul had freely adapted the Psalm into his context. In doing so he had drawn out an important implication of the believers' corporate unity with Christ.\(^1\) He took ἀχρ as the temporal aspect of his assertion that Christ must (δεῖ) reign. An equivalence is seen between βασιλεύειν in 1 Cor. and the sitting at the right hand of Psalm 110:1. The changes from ὑποπόδιον τὸν πόδαν σου to ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ are resultant from the freedom of the quotation and its incorporation into its new syntactical framework. The tradition from which Paul learned his Scriptures saw Psa. 110 as a messianic reference and the Apostle made the reference specific in application to Jesus of Nazareth, Paul's messiah.

\(^{1}\) Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 323, n. 92, writes: "Im Psalm bezeichnet ξος ου den Endzustand des Sieges. Paulus macht daraus eine zeitliche Grenze: V. 28!"
PSALM 112:9 (111:9 LXX), 2 CORINTHIANS 9:9

**Textual Display**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>פַּלְפַּל</td>
<td>εἰσκόπτον</td>
<td>καθὼς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קְנֵי</td>
<td>ἔδωκεν</td>
<td>γέγραπται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָוֶת</td>
<td>τοῖς</td>
<td>τοῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעָרָבָא</td>
<td>πένησιν</td>
<td>πένησιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ἡ</td>
<td>ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικαιοσύνη</td>
<td>δικαιοσύνη</td>
<td>Αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μένει</td>
<td>μένει</td>
<td>Αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐῶνα</td>
<td>τόν</td>
<td>τόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ</td>
<td>αὐῶνα</td>
<td>αὐῶνα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐῶνος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Masoretic Variants**

BHS offers no variants.

**Septuagintal Variants**

The GLXX lists no variants for this section.

**New Testament Variants**

Τὸν αὐῶνος is added after αὐῶνα by F G K 6 39 42 238 f g vg cle (et. harm tol, non am fu demid) aeth.
Textual
Paul followed the LXX rendering except for the omission of τοῦ αἰῶνος.

Contextual
Psalm 112 is an acrostic wisdom Psalm. Though there is no plainly identifiable structure, the content is that of "typical wisdom sayings which describe the just Godfearing man and which reflect Proverbs and other wisdom books."¹

Paul wrote in the context of the offering for the Jerusalem church. As we will see,² Paul could use the OT as an example for cheerful giving, and in this passage he has brought the OT to bear on the issue of God's ability to provide abundantly for the giver.³

Hermeneutical
Regarding the omission of τοῦ αἰῶνος this most likely was done for brevity.⁴ Plummer notes that it is not omitted in order to limit the application to the present life.⁵ The context of the quotation is limited,

²Prov. 22:9; 2 Cor. 9:7. ³2 Cor. 9:8-9.
⁴Toy, QNT, p. 188.
⁵Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 262. See Jn. 8:51, 11:26, 12:34 for ἐξ τοῦ αἰῶνα for the future life as well.
however, to the specific of the collection.

Midrash Rabbah\(^1\) applied Psa. 112:9 to David "of whom it is written," and the part of Psa. 112:9\(^2\) which was not included in Paul's quotation was applied to the priesthood.\(^3\)

In Paul's usage it is important to note the pervasive connection between the receiving of God's grace\(^4\) and the resultant outflow of good works.\(^5\) Since the word "righteousness" in the Psalm had been translated alms and often had this meaning in Jewish writings, Menzies conjectures that Paul may have had that sense in his mind when he used the passage.\(^6\) The other option offered by Menzies is that Paul could have understood the word in the sense of merit.\(^7\) The latter is more to Paul's point. For Paul, however, this was not a question of good works being the catalyst for receiving the grace of God, but rather, just the opposite.\(^8\)

---

\(^1\) Freedman, MR Lev., p. 445.

\(^2\) KJV

\(^3\) Freedman, MR Lam., p. 168, also n. 6, p. 168.

\(^4\) 2 Cor. 9:8a.

\(^5\) 2 Cor. 9:8b.

\(^6\) Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 66. e.g. see Mt. 6:1.

\(^7\) Menzies, 2 Cor., pp. 66-67.

\(^8\) Hanson, SPTT, p. 180, writes: "We can hardly envisage Paul as preaching in Galatians and Romans a doctrine of justification in Christ, and in 2 Corinthians a doctrine of justification by almsgiving."
In the Psalm itself the phrase ή δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰώνος occurs twice, both times in reference to the man who is the subject of the Psalm. The term δίκαιος occurs in Psa. 112:4, 5 in reference to the class of men of which the subject of the Psalm is a member. In fixing the sense attached to δικαιοσύνη in this Psalm it is important to note the description of the man in question: he is ὁ φοβοῦμενος τὸν κυρίον, vs 1. This must be linked with the last verse of the preceding Psalm, ἀρχῇ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου. In other words, the subject of the Psalm 112 is the man who trusts in the Lord, (vs 7) fears him, (vs 1b) and delights in His commandments.

In 2 Cor. 8:7 Paul exhorted the readers to abound ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι with reference to the collection. In 2 Cor. 8:9 χάρις was used of the Lord's act of giving and Himself for their enrichment. χάρις refers to the act of giving and not the gift alone. χαρίτος was used of the gift.¹ The collection is termed ἀλλότριον.² χάριν was used of the grace of God³ as the cause of good works. In 2 Cor. 9:11 the enrichment was once again to bountifulness, εἰς πᾶσαν ἀλλότρια.

Paul, therefore, has in mind the good deeds of the Corinthians as being resultant from their reception of

¹ 2 Cor. 8:19.
² 2 Cor. 8:20.
³ 2 Cor. 9:8.
the grace of God, or, to put it another way, as a natural outflow of their relationship with God. This is quite similar to the relationship established in Psalm 112:9 and therefore the use of διακοσμοῦν need not present any soteriological stumbling blocks. While it will be considered in detail in the quotation from Isa. 55:10 (2 Cor. 9:10), it may be helpful to note in passing that this conclusion is supported by Paul's use of "the fruits of your righteousness" in the next verse. It appears that righteousness and its fruits are not clearly distinguished in moving from the quotation to the following verse.

Paul's mention of the good work in 2 Cor. 9:8 was his link with the good works of the man in the Psalm. Plummer, however, thinks Paul has made God the subject of 2 Cor. 9:9 which causes him to conclude that "quotations are often made, and with the more effect, with a complete change of application." It is more probable that Paul saw the image of the godly man in Psa. 112 to be a fitting picture of the man who, contemporaneously with Paul, had received the grace of God in Christ. Therefore as the grace of God in Christ would abound to every good work, a similar pattern of the fear of God as the heart and motivation of the good works was apparent in the Psalm. It is to be noted that the blessed man follows the pattern

---

1Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 261.
of Yahweh,\(^1\) therefore the OT passage describes the actions of the truly blessed man. Significantly, Paul was in the process of exhortation which makes it more probable that he described what a righteous man did rather than what he was. This is also the emphasis of Psa. 112. Paul, dealing with a very practical matter, has applied this verse to the righteous man and his actions thereby applying the verse in its historical and contextual sense.

PSALM 116:10 (115:1 LXX), 2 CORINTHIANS 4:13

Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κατά</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τό</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπίστευσα</td>
<td>ἐπίστευσα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διό</td>
<td>διό</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έλάλησα</td>
<td>έλάλησα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masoretic Variants

BHS proposes that א be read in place of יְוָא.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX lists no variants for this section.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that καὶ is included by N F G g Syr utr arm go Epiph 367 Aug 187 but is excluded by B C D E K L P al omn vid d e f r vg (item cop αἵθ, sed om etiam, pariter ac vg ms ap Ln, ante λαλοῦμεν) Chr Thdrt Dan Ambrst.

Textual

The only variation from the LXX is the addition of καὶ.

Contextual

Psalm 116 is an individual lament and Hallel.
The immediate context of the quotation is thanksgiving for Yahweh's deliverance.

Paul had demonstrated the superiority of the Christian ministry in the midrash of 2 Cor. 3 and in chapter 4 he asserted his diligent attitude to its accomplishment in spite of quite adverse external difficulties.

Hermeneutical

This introductory formula (κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον) is not used by Paul elsewhere in the NT. It has the same intent as καθὼς γέγραπται both in referring to an OT passage (γέγραπται) and implying some form of a similarity or parallel (καθὼς). Deissmann notes that this IF is exemplified in the legal language of 52-53 A.D.¹

Paul's use of the Psalm is seen by some to bear a different meaning than the Psalmist's. Barrett asserts that Paul paid no heed to the OT context but merely made use of the two significant words "believe" and "speak."² Also, the LXX of the Psalm is far from the sense of the Hebrew.³ The Psalmist asserted that even though he spoke of his great affliction he nevertheless still maintained his faith: "Paul affirms that he speaks with the Spirit


²Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 142.

³Hanson, SPTT, p. 17.
of faith when he contemplates the certainty of resurrection. But, more than this, Paul asserted it was the same spirit of faith as the Psalmist.

Paul attributed to the Psalmist the attitude that faith made him believe he would continue on in life even though external circumstances seemingly contradicted this belief, and therefore he spoke as he did. Dahood writes that Paul has quoted the Alexandrian version "which was an honest but unsuccessful attempt to reproduce the extremely difficult Hebrew original." The concept of the Hebrew Psalm was that the writer, while in great tribulation, did not abandon his faith but cried out for and received deliverance. Toy notes that is not translated as δεδοκιμηθη but must rather mean "that," "when," "if," "because." Paul's meaning is best found in a relationship of cause and effect between faith and his preaching.

---

1. Bruce, 1:2 Cor., p. 198. The genitive of πνεεμα της πισεως is subjective and the quotation was designed to show that Paul had a "Glaubensgeist" like in the Psalm, Bultmann, 2 Kor., p. 123, n. 98 as in 1 Cor. 4:21 and Gal. 6:1.

2. Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 32.


5. Dahood, CBQ 17:23, writes that the translation "when" is "quite impossible."


ture\(^1\) of revocalizing יד to the pu'al of dibber "to drive, pursue, persecute" be followed, then the OT יד would need to be seen as a concessive particle "even though." Dahood's translation is as follows: "I trusted even though I was persecuted.\(^2\) But Paul obviously followed the LXX text and conceptuality.\(^3\) Thus the hermeneutical use of the OT conforms to the following of an OT pattern, or, as Ellis writes, "a typological frame of reference."\(^4\) Bonsirven writes:

> Sentant en lui l'esprit de foi que le psalmiste (116,10 suivant la lettre des LXX) assure posséder, S. Paul réclame (2 Cor. 4,13) pareillement le droit de parler hardiment.\(^5\)

The triple mention of death in 2 Cor. 4:10-12 is also reminiscent of the first 9 vss of Psa. 116 [114 LXX]. The context of Paul's quotation is, therefore, very apt for the inclusion of the Psalm. He has used the authority of the LXX to support his attitude.\(^6\) Plummer finds

---

\(^1\)Dahood, CBQ 17:23.

\(^2\)Dahood, CBQ 17:24. See BDB, p. 473b for many instances of a concessive کی followed by the yqtl verbal form, as here.

\(^3\)Oostendorp, AJ, p. 65, writes that "the specific point which he proves by his quotation is that speaking based on faith is good."

\(^4\)Ellis, PUOT, p. 134. See Collange, E2Cor., pp. 168-69, who stresses the content of faith required and its Christological orientation.

\(^5\)Bonsirven, EREP, p. 320.

\(^6\)Allo, 2 Cor., p. 116, writes: "Mais il avait le droit de s'appuyer sur les LXX dont l'autorité était reçue de ses auditeurs comme de lui."
it remarkable that Paul used the LXX translation which was "certainly wrong."  

The quotation is part of a prepositional phrase which modifies a participial phrase which modifies the verbs πιστεύωμεν and λαλούμεν. A second participial phrase begins with εἶδότες and provided the ground or motivation for the faith expressed by Paul. Therefore, Paul's understanding of the OT quotation can be ascertained through the meaning of the two participial phrases. The object of the faith demonstrated by Paul and the Psalmist was God. The specific reasons for each one's faith differed but the concept of faith in God in the midst of trial was common to both contexts and provided the reason for Paul's phrase "ἐχοντες ὅτο πνεύμα τῇς πίστεως..." One does not need to assert, as does Hanson, that the Messiah was the subject of the quotation as understood by Paul. The second participial phrase, mentioning the resurrection of Christ, relates to Paul's discussion of death in the preceding quotation.  

1Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 133.  
2 ἑχοντες δε κτλ, 2 Cor. 4:13.  
3 Hanson, SPTT, pp. 17-18.  
4 2 Cor. 4:14 εἶδότες κτλ.  
5 αὐτὸ is related to the κατὰ of the IF not to the person of Jesus spoken of just before and after the quotation.
Faith was one line of continuity from the OT to the NT which was clearly drawn by Paul. Continuity of deity is also implied.
## Proverbs

**Proverbs 3:4, 2 Corinthians 8:21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Display</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:3b</td>
<td>και</td>
<td>εὐθέσεις</td>
<td>γάρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>χάριν</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>προνοοῦ</td>
<td>προνοοῦμεν</td>
<td>γάρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>καλά</td>
<td>καλά</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>ὡς</td>
<td>μόνον</td>
<td>ἐνώπιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>ἐνώπιον</td>
<td>ἐνώπιον</td>
<td>ἀλλὰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>ἐνώπιον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ro. 12:17 προνοοῦμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων.

### Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.
Septuagintal Variants

Swete lists no variants for this section.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that προνοομεν χαρ is read by ΝΒΔΕFGPG ζ 11 67** 80 91 fsερ d e f g m23 vg syrsch and ρ arm Chr668 Aug op mon Ambrst while c 17 21 26 32 37 39 47 73 cop. go. Clem302 Chr mosc ω Euthal cod Cyr ador 408 read προνοομενοι χαρ. Προνοομενοι is read by K L Thdrt Dam. The second ενωπιον is omitted by Ν* but added by a later corrector.

Textual

This is a free quotation from Prov. 3:4. The LXX seems to have misinterpreted the Hebrew by reading ἐγείρε as a verb in the imperative.1 The quotation agrees with the LXX against the Hebrew. Paul's quotation has οὗ μόνον after καλά, ἀλλά after μυρίου and ενωπιον after καὶ, all of which finds no LXX or Hebrew MSS support at present.

Contextual

In Prov. 3 a son is exhorted to remember the words of his father and to make mercy and truth an intimate aspect of his character (vs 3) with the result that he will find approbation in the sight of God and man.

In 2 Cor. 8 Paul has turned the subject to that of

1Toy, QNT, p. 162, and Hanson, SPTT, p. 128.
the offering for the church of Jerusalem. After encouraging them to complete the gift, Paul, in vss 16-24, explained the precautions he had taken to ensure the safe and proper delivery of their contribution.

Hermeneutical

Philo used this passage in Ebr. 84 where he reads, "προοοοόντων καλὰ ἐνόπλων κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων," with reference to attaining excellence. The passage also appears in MR\(^1\) where it is used to support the exposition of Numbers 11:6 which speaks of God being gracious or imparting grace wherever He goes. In MR Esther 2:15 this passage is used to refer to the heavenly and earthly beings. In MR Song of Solomon\(^2\) it is used to support women abstaining from going out perfumed in order to carry out the injunction of Numbers 32:22 and Prov. 3:4. Finally, in the Mishnah this verse is used as the aim of exercising all circumspection in the removal of shekels from the shekel-chamber of the temple.\(^3\)

Therefore, in spite of the mistranslation by the Greek OT, one cannot say that Paul exploited it for his own purpose because his basic interpretation is found not only in the above-cited passages but also in the Talmud.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\)Freedman, MR Num., p. 436.


\(^3\)Danby, Mish., p. 155.

\(^4\)Hanson, SPTT, p. 129, writes: "What seems to us a fantastic and far-fetched interpretation of some text often proves to be simply the generally accepted under-
In Ro. 12:17 this verse was quoted to alleviate self-righteous vengeance. Here its application centers on Paul's sensitivity regarding the appearance of his actions in the eyes of the world. This is straightforward application of the OT to the aspirations and intentions of the apostles. It shows how a fundamental aspect of OT piety remained part of Paul's piety in Christ.

standing of it in Paul's day. Paul the unscrupulous perverter of Scripture often turns out to be simply Paul the well-read rabbi."
### Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- בָּרֵע</td>
<td>אָנָדְרָא</td>
<td>יִלְּאָרֹון</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִרְע</td>
<td>יִלְּאָרֹון</td>
<td>γάρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַה</td>
<td>δόρη</td>
<td>δόρη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָנָה</td>
<td>εὐλογεῖ</td>
<td>ἄγαπᾷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γε βε</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>θεός</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

### Septuagintal Variants

Swete lists no variants for this section. Field notes that Origen reads εὐλογεῖ ο θεός and alia exempl. Ἀγαπᾷ ο θεός. "Sic in uno alio libro margini adscriptum est; in uteris libris est, ἀγαπᾷ ο θεός." -Nobil. sic comp., ald., codd. 68 106 alii. Haec, ἀνδρα-συντελεσεῖ, absunt a Syro-hex., et cod. 23.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf lists no variants for this section.
Textual

The New Testament quotation has the substitution of ἀγαπᾷ for ἐὐλογεῖ and excludes ἀνδρα placing the adjectives ἱλαρόν and δότην in a different syntactical relationship. Δότην is used substantively and is modified by ἱλαρόν.

Contextual

The broad context is the first collection of the proverbs of King Solomon, Prov. 10:1-22:16.¹

Paul was speaking in the context of the missionary collection for the Jerusalem believers. The immediate context concerned the necessity for the giving to be done in a proper mental and spiritual attitude of freedom.

Hermeneutical

With reference to the change of ἐὐλογεῖ to ἀγαπᾷ Plummer asserts that this is a memory slip because such a deliberate alteration would be foreign to Paul's methodology.² Toy, on the other hand, concludes that Paul purposefully made the exchange to the "more expressive synonym."³

The latter of these conjectures is the more plausible on

²Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 259.
³Toy, QNT, p. 188.
the basis of contextual evidence, especially with the absence of textual evidence for ἁγαμή. The line between allusion and quotation was very finely drawn, if drawn at all, for Paul. The use of ἁγαμή κύριος ὑπάτος καρδίας in Prov. 22:11 LXX may have affected Paul's memory. This is more probable due to Paul's concentration on the inner attitude of the heart in giving (προσφέρειν τῷ καρδίᾳ, 2 Cor. 9:7). Also Paul may have used ἁγαμή to contrast with his previous four-fold use of the term εὐλογία in 2 Cor. 9:5-6. It is remarkable that there is no NT MS evidence showing a harmonization of ἁγαμή back to the LXX reading. Regarding the source of Paul's quotation we are left with the conclusion of A. T. Hanson that "we are here in touch with a number of 'giving' texts from Proverbs habitually used by Paul to encourage generosity among his converts and probably inherited from his rabbinic tradition."²

---

¹Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, Paul's Second Epistle To The Corinthians (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1962), p. 329, n. 63, cont. from p. 238 writes: "εὐλογία should be understood in the same sense as in the preceding verse, [2 Cor. 9:5] namely, a gift freely and spontaneously bestowed and thus constituting a blessing to the recipient." One should add that this would constitute a blessing to the giver as well. Is not this the point of the sowing metaphor?

²Hanson, SPTT, p. 178.
Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָרַשׁ</td>
<td>φάγωμεν</td>
<td>φάγωμεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַעֵלָה</td>
<td>וְ</td>
<td>וְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִשָּׂרַע</td>
<td>πίωμεν</td>
<td>πίωμεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּרָה</td>
<td>αβριον</td>
<td>αβριον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִרְחַף</td>
<td>γάρ</td>
<td>γάρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נוֹמַק</td>
<td>ἀποθνῄσκομεν</td>
<td>ἀποθνῄσκομεν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this passage.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX apparatus lists no variants for this section.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that L and a few others read ἀποθνῄσκομεν for ἀποθνῄσκομεν.

Textual

The quotation is taken verbatim from the Greek OT tradition, which, at this point, appears to have been transmitted with no corruption.
Contextual

The Isaiah context concerns the people of Jerusalem who, in time of siege, made merry and trusted in their own resources rather than in the protection of God. The NT context concerns the two attitudes which would be engendered by either the surety of resurrection on the one hand or its unreality on the other. The problem, mentioned in 1 Cor. 15:32, involved the error of disclaiming the concept of future resurrection but not necessarily of asserting that Christ was not raised. It was Paul who drew out the implications for both Christology and Soteriology by showing the necessity of the believers' resurrection as based on Christ's. However, Paul's next remarks show that he understood the assertion of vs 12 to relate to the concept of resurrection as a reality for both Christ and men. To illustrate the manner in which belief in a future resurrection influenced the practical activities of the community Paul presented two examples in 1 Cor. 15:29-32; those of baptism for the dead and religious persecution. The former related to the state of those gone before, the latter to the ongoing results of faith in Christ.

1Bernardin Schneider, "The Corporate Meaning and Background of 1 Cor. 15:45b - 'O ESCHATOS ADAM EIS PNEUMA ZΩIPOIOION," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 29 (1969), p. 450.
Hermeneutical

That Paul has not used the Isaiah passage in its context has been noted by several authors who assert that Paul used the words of Isaiah but imported another sentiment into them.¹ Wendland writes that Paul knows only two alternatives: "Auferstehungsglaube oder Verfallensein an das blosse natürliche Leben, wenn der Tod das Ende ist."² But it must be noted that the quotation is not introduced by an IF and is used in a proverbial manner. This usage carries the same basic OT sense: a hedonistic life attitude in the face of cessation of existence at the moment of death. Paul did not import another sentiment into the words of Isaiah but rather applied its original sense to another life situation. This is a striking example of how OT conceptualities and phrases became part of the NT religious vocabulary.

¹Ellis, PUOT, p. 10, and Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 150, who finds Paul's sentiment in a passage such as Ecclesiastes 2:24a.
²Wendland, Kor., p. 131.
**Textual Display**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isa. 25:8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Isa. 25:8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπὸ</td>
<td>κατέπλευ</td>
<td>κατεπόθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ</td>
<td>ὁ</td>
<td>ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡμᾶς</td>
<td>θάνατος</td>
<td>θάνατος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡμᾶς</td>
<td>ἐνχύσας</td>
<td>νῖκος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hos. 13:14</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hos. 13:14</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ</td>
<td>ποῦ</td>
<td>ποῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ</td>
<td>τὸ</td>
<td>νῖκος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπὸ</td>
<td>νῆστος</td>
<td>νῆστος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄνω</td>
<td>θάνατε</td>
<td>θάνατε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀν</td>
<td>ποῦ</td>
<td>ποῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀν</td>
<td>θάνατε</td>
<td>θάνατε</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Masoretic Variants

Isa. 25:8

BHS notes that a few MSS read ὑπαί and that the Syriac, as well as .DeepEqual and 1 Cor. 15:54 reflect a reading ὑπαί.

Hos. 13:14

Many MSS read ἸῚ with LXX and Syriac.

Septuagintal Variants

Isa. 25:8

The GLXX notes that 613 reads ἄδης for θανάτος and 93 reads κατασχύσας for ἴσχυσας. ㅌ reads καταποθή ο θανάτος εἰς νῖκος, Q. Syh reads κατεπιεύν ο θανάτος εἰς νῖκος. α’ reads καταποθήναι ποιήσει τον θανάτον εἰς τέλος, Eus.

Hos. 13:14

The Göttingen LXX indicates that 22ε, 130, 311, 534 Arm., Cyrillus Alexandrinus, in part, Thph. read νίκη for δική; διαθήκη is read by 22, 48, 51, 231, 719, 763. The second ήσυ is omitted by 410 and Theophylactus Achridensis. Field notes that α’ reads εομαί ρηματα ήσυ, θανατε; σ’
reads εσομαι πληγη σου εν δανατω; Θ' reads και εσται η δικη σου εν δανατω.1

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that the νικος and κεντρον of vs 55 are in that order in N* B C I M 17 71 vg cop arm*oh aethro Or3,306 and int 1,80.81 Eusdem 166 Ath57 Did399 Cyrhr214 and others. The order is reversed in N C A** (* omits που usq. νικος) D E F G K L P and others d e f g syrutr arm cdd aethpp go Or1,240 and int 4,547 Eusdem 470 Ath52 Ephiph 698 Chr412 his Thnfr Eucher 15 (ep Thnfr) 9,145) Tert res corn 43 51 54 (ep Tert 321 Hil* Al* and others Θανατε bis cum N* B C D E F G I 39 67** d e f g vg cop aethro Eusdem 166 and 470 Int 222 308 Or int 1,80.81 and 4,547 Tert marc 5,10% altero loco et id quidem ante το νικος habet αδη (sed testium quos adscribimus multi ante το κεντρον) cum N C A** K L M P al pler Syrutr arm go aethpp Or1,240 and 3,306 Ath52 Did399 Bos lyp 327 Ephiph 698 Chr412 Euthal ced Garker (up pente) Thnfr7 al mu. Robertson2 notes that because the Hebrew and LXX differed, subsequent NT scribes were influenced by one or the other.

Textual

Isa. 25:8

Paul's quotation displayed a Theodotionic text-type. Alfred Rahlfs3 sees Paul's correspondence with Θ'

---

1Fridericus Field, Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt II (Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875), Hosea 13:14.

2Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 378.

3Alfred Rahlfs, "Über Theodotion-Lesarten im
to be limited to εἰς νῦνος, the verb being a later Christian correction to the Greek OT MSS. This single similarity is then seen to be a result not of textual dependence of Paul on Θ' but of both independently being closer approximations to the sense of the Hebrew. Even if Rahlfs' idea of interpolation be correct and the similarities are diminished, to base their agreement on a shared closeness to the Hebrew text is precarious in light of recent discoveries concerning the age and pervasiveness of Θ'. Rahlfs finds the Syh. reading to be more fitting to Theodotion's style of revision and sees the Q reading as too radical regarding the syntax of the nominative subject with the passive verb. With νῦνος the only link with Θ' and νῦνος being found also in α' the proof of a Theodotionic reading evaporates.

Bruce supports the position that the quotation was not produced from a variant LXX version but in a


1Rahlfs, ZNW 20:188-89.
2See for example, Barthélemy, DA.
3Rahlfs, ZNW 20:183.
version approximate to that of Aquila and Theodotion. In α' and θ' εἰς νίκος is the translation of ΠΥΤ which is seen in several other LXX passages. According to a recent study the ΠΥΤ/νίκος translation pattern is a characteristic of the ΚΑΙΓΕ recension. The Hebrew was mistaken for victory by some Aramaic version which underlies Aquila and Theodotion. Arndt and Gingrich write that νίκος "agrees w. the improvement which Theod. made in the LXX wording of Is. 25:8." Conzelmann also sees a "vortheodotionische" text-type here.

While νίκος appears in Isa. 25:8 of θ' Syh, Q and α', it is not to be found in other LXX MSS. Paul therefore exhibits an early first century Greek OT reading which appears to be limited to the Palestine area.


3 Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 267.

4 William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: The University Press, 1957), p. 542. Rahlfs, LXX I, p. xxvii, writes that the rendering of εἰς νίκος corrects an "all too inaccurate LXX translation of ΠΥΤ." He denies that conformity of Paul with Theodotion does not justify the assumption of an original of Theodotion which was older than Paul.

5 Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 349.
Why Héring writes that vs 54b is "not a biblical quotation, and Nestle is wrong to mark it as such" is explained when he says that it is instead an interpretive reply to Isaiah 25:8 inserted by Paul. But with the textual evidence of several Greek OT versions, the possibility of quotation should not be so completely ruled out. Grosheide also writes that this is not based on the LXX or MT but perhaps he also does not find the evidence of the parallel with Theodotion convincing.

Hos. 13:14

The LXX MSS reading of νῶη for δίωη may also reflect the early tradition followed by Paul. However, Rudolph cautions that the change of νῶη for δίωη in various MSS of the LXX is due to the influence of 1 Cor. 15:55. Another possibility is that Paul has simply continued the use of νῶος from the Isa. 25:8 quotation. Swete and Dodd see it as a conflation which would be a free mixture of the two passages. Because the variant

1Héring, 1 Cor., p. 181.
2Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 393.
4See Rudolph, Hos., p. 239, n. 14.
εἰς νῆκος appears several times as an integral part of the quotation this conflation may have been known to Paul in this form. Conversely, if Paul's Greek OT contained the variant, the conflation could be attributed to Paul's own invention. The Syriac approximates Paul. Randolph, following his curious argument, concludes that the Hebrew, not the Greek, had been corrupted. Ellis, however, feels that Paul was dependent on the Hebrew.

While Bruce writes that νῆκος is not found in any known Greek version of the passage of Hosea his conclusion that Paul probably selected the word as an "extra link" with the Isaiah passage may be modified by an additional fact that νῆκος is a later form for νῆη. It is quite possible, then, that Paul was using a LXX MS with νῆη and quite naturally substituted the more current term νῆκος.

1Ellis, PUOT, p. 145. See also Toy, QNT, p. 181.
2Randolph, TPNT, p. 40.
3Ellis, PUOT, p. 14. Toy, QNT, p. 179, sees Paul's approximation of the Hebrew to be a result of recourse to an Aramaic reminiscence.
4Walters, TS, p. 36, sees it as possibly from the first part of the 'testimony-like' passage. Morissette, MSM, p. 173, is unable to prove a testimony basis here.
6Morissette, MSM, p. 163. Michel, P&SB, pp. 79-80, does not decide whether the state of the text is due to a theological reformation of the text by Paul or a theological selection of available texts to suit his thought.
Contextual

The Isaiah passage speaks of the future blessings which God would bestow upon Israel when all her enemies had been defeated\(^1\) and all reproach had been removed.\(^2\) The Hosea context concerns God's judgments on Ephraim. In His wrath God would hide compassion from His sight.\(^3\)

The NT context is that of the final victory over death brought about by the resurrection power of God as exercised among His people.

Hermeneutical

In the Mishnah,\(^4\) Isa. 25:8 is said to speak of a time to come when God would swallow up death and remove all tears. Therefore, one should not wail or lament after the burial of a corpse. In the Mekilta\(^5\) reference is made to Isa. 25:8 with emphasis on "for the Lord hath spoken it." The question is asked, "where was this spoken?" The answer is given in Deut. 32:39, "It is I who put to death and give life."\(^6\) The idea was that the observances of Ex. 12:25-28 were only to be observed in

\(^1\)Isa. 25:10.  \(^2\)Isa. 25:8.  \(^3\)Hos. 13:14b.

\(^4\)Danby, Mish., Moed Katan 3:9.


\(^6\)Deut. 32:39 NASV.
the Land. The immediate context of Mekilta does not supply a time reference for the actualization of the victory over death, however. In Midrash Rabbah, Isa. 25:8 is consistently used with reference to the joys of the Messianic Age, one joy being the absence of death.\(^1\) This Jewish use of the passage generally agrees with Paul's interpretation. Of course Paul saw Jesus to be the Messiah of the new age and His redemptive work to be the basis of its offer of immortality.\(^2\)

The intent of the Hosea passage appears to be a summons to death and Sheol to come and claim their victims.\(^3\) Bruce writes that Paul, deviating from Hosea, "treats the double question as a defiant challenge to death to do its worst."\(^4\) Thus the questions from Hosea may either be a summons or a challenge. While Paul understood it as a word of salvation, James Mays asserts that Hosea saw it as a summons.\(^5\)

\(^{1}\)Freedman, MR Gen., p. 210; Ex., p. 187, p. 349; Deut., p. 60; Lam., p. 120; Ecc., p. 12.

\(^{2}\)This contemporizing of the OT has led Morissette, MSM, p. 161, to label this as a Midrash.

\(^{3}\)Toy, QNT, p. 181; Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 382.

\(^{4}\)Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 156. Bonsirven, EREP, p. 327, writes: "certains exégètes y voient un mot d'espérance. Pourquoi S. Paul n'aurait-il pas eu licence de suivre cette interprétation?"

It is also important to note that Paul was not basing an argument on Scriptural proof but, rather, was using biblical language to express the final defeat of death. However, the IF implies more than a verbal correspondence with the passages quoted, therefore, it must also be concluded that Paul saw in the quotation a support for his statements. The IF presents a fulfillment motif with reference to the future.

Paul has freely adapted the language of Hosea 13:14. His substitution of ὑποτατος for θανατος is consistent with his style. "St. Paul never uses θανατος, perhaps because the word might have erroneous association for Greek readers," writes Robertson. This erroneous association concerns the suggestion of a heathen god. The change δικη to νικος is due to the Isaiah quotation. Gertner posits that Paul had applied a double reading ('al tiqrey) and a double meaning (tartey mashma') to νικος. Gertner surmises that in Hos. 13:14 can mean either word=Torah, (ἀνθρωπός) or it can mean plague.

---

1Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 82. 2Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 382.
3Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 378. Also Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 156. Also Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 268. Apart from Rev. 7:8; 20:13f, Hades is not personified in the NT or sub-apostolic literature.
4Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 382. The god in question would have been Pluto.
5Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 349.
6Gertner, JSS 7:283.
or sting. This is brought forth to explain what νόμος of 1 Cor. 15:56 had to do with Ἕλκιτος. Paul first read "sting" and then re-read "law." But there is no indication that "law," in vs 56, is an interpretation of the Hosea passage. On the contrary, Gertner does not account for the fact that ἁυαρία, not νόμος, is Paul's interpretation of "sting."

Finally, it is central to see that Paul understood Hosea 13:14a as a statement rather than an ironical question. The most important consideration is that the LXX interpreted the passage as a statement and this is exactly the sense implied by Paul in his appropriation of the two following questions as a basis for confident assertion of future deliverance. Therefore, one needs not to see Paul as "taking his own way from Hosea" (Bruce) but in fact following in the same thought pattern presented in his Greek Hosea.


2 S-B shows the Hosea passage to have been used in Rabbinics with reference to the deliverance from Babylon.
### Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יִכְּנֶֽֽוּךְ</td>
<td>ἐν</td>
<td>ἐν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֵּלַעָגִֽים</td>
<td>τῷ</td>
<td>τῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָפַֽֽשׁ</td>
<td>νόμῳ</td>
<td>γεγραπται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רְבָּלָֽוּרַה</td>
<td>διὶ</td>
<td>διὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָֽחַר</td>
<td>διὰ φαυλισμῶν διὰ γλώσσας</td>
<td>ἐν ἐτερογλώσσοις ἐν καί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνὴρ</td>
<td>χειλεῶν</td>
<td>καί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυνὴ</td>
<td>ἐτέρας</td>
<td>ἐτέρων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άρση</td>
<td>δἰ τοῦ λαλήσουσιν</td>
<td>λαλήσω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άρμα</td>
<td>τῷ λαῷ τοῦτῳ</td>
<td>τῷ λαῷ τοῦτῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άξιόλογον</td>
<td>λέγοντες αὐτοῖς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άνεκάθορτος</td>
<td>τοῦτο τὸ ἀνάπαιμα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναιρετικός</td>
<td>τῷ πεινῶντι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναλήθη</td>
<td>καὶ τοῦτο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άναπτύξιμος</td>
<td>τὸ σύντριμμα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άναγεγραμμένος</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άλλος</td>
<td>οὐκ</td>
<td>οὐδ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλὰ</td>
<td>θελεῖσαι</td>
<td>οὐτως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άλλος</td>
<td>ἀκούειν</td>
<td>εἰσαχούσονται μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γενομένος</td>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>λέγει</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Masoretic Variants

BHS notes a variant reading of הַלַע for מְלַע in 1Q Is a and other MSS. BHK notes that the Syriac reads רַבְּת for רַבְּתָה and רַעֲן for רַעֲן.

Septuagintal Variants


With reference to 1 Cor. 14:21 GLXX notes the reading of Origen:

ἐν ετερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χειλεσιν ετεροις λαλησω τω λας τουτω . . . (ευρον γαρ τα λοσθυναμουντα τη λεξει ταυτη ἐν τη του α’ ερμηνεια κειμενα) Or. Philocalia ed. Robinson, p. 55. "ο’ θ’ et LXX de
hoc loco diversa senserunt," Hi.\(^1\)

σ' reads ἄλλως, for ἑτέρως, 86. σ' (Tht.) for καὶ οὐκ ἡθελ. ἀκουεῖν reads οὐκ ἡθέλον ἀκουεῖν.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that Ν\(^{c}\) reads γεγραμμένον alone while Ν has τί γεγραμμένον. ἑτέρως is read by Χ Α Β Β\(_{6}\) 10 17 31 39 67** 73 Euthal cod. ἑτέρως is read by D E F G K L P al pler mcionepiph. Or. nec aliter it vg cop rell.

Textual

The IF (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γεγραμμένον ἐστὶ) probably indicates that Paul quoted from memory but in doing so he shows an improvement on the mistranslation of the LXX.\(^2\)

This IF can generally stand for the whole OT.\(^3\)

\(^{1}\)Field, Hex. II, p. 479. See Turpie, OTN, p. 157, regarding Aquila. Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 322 also speaks of the possibility of Paul's use of a version later known to Aquila, as does Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 285, n. 17.

\(^{2}\)Swete, IOTG\(^{2}\), p. 402. See also Dodd, AS, p. 83, and Toy, QNT, p. 176. While Swete attributed the improved translation to Paul's knowledge of the Hebrew, we see it due to the text-type which Paul had memorized; a text-type closer to the Hebrew.

\(^{3}\)Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 285, writes: "Nach jüdischen Sprachgebrauch kann der ganze AT so bezeichnet werden." Also Toy, QNT, p. 177; Gough, NTQ, p. 321; Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 132; Hanson, SPTT, p. 266; Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 316. Metzger, JBL 70:302, shows that the Mishnah refers to the Scriptures as a whole by the word πᾶσα; cf. Aboth 6.7, where the quotations are from Proverbs. Philo refers to the whole Pentateuch as "torah" in Quod det. Sec. 44, i, 221 and Quod Deus Sec. 1, i, 273, when quoting Gen. 12:7 and 22:9; cf. Ryle, PHS, p. xlv.
The quotation agrees neither with the MT nor with the LXX. Lindars\(^1\) says the LXX text is quoted but has been radically altered. On the contrary, Robertson notes that Paul quoted freely and from a non-LXX Greek OT.\(^2\) Either of these positions is possible but what is needed is MSS evidence to decide the matter. Qumran, at present, does not provide evidence for a Hebrew Vorlage for Paul's text but the \(\alpha'\) reading may be a witness to an early Palestinian Hebrew text. Aquila uses \(\text{ἕτερογλῶσσος}\) in variance from the LXX in Psa. 113:1 and Isa. 33:19, thus this word is a characteristic of his translation and was a part of his Greek OT text which he did not alter. The fact that this text is a better translation of the MT is consistent with Aquila's standards. Though the evidence is not decisive, we conclude that Paul displays an Old Greek version divergent from the LXX tradition.

**Contextual**

In the OT context the prophet gave warning to the inhabitants of Jerusalem that, for all their efforts to save themselves, they would be broken for their offences against Yahweh. The foreign tongue was the language of the Assyrians.

The NT context concerns the proper place of glos-

---

\(^1\)Lindars, NTA, p. 175.

\(^2\)Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 316. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 285, also asserts Paul used another translation.
salalia in the Church. The quotation from Isa. 28:11-12 was used to prove that tongues were a sign for unbelievers\(^1\) whose unbelief would only be aggravated by the phenomenon.

Hermeneutical

An undertaking to reinvestigate the whole question of glossolalia cannot be made here. While some reference will be made to the wider biblical teaching on the subject, this study will be limited to understanding the use of the OT quotation in this context.

\(\text{Δέγει κύριος} Quotations.\) This quotation is one of several in the NT which incorporate the phrase \(\text{Δέγει κύριος}.\)\(^2\) Ellis\(^3\) has shown that these quotations vary markedly from the LXX and MT and that in all the Pauline usages \(\text{Δέγει κύριος}\) is part of the OT quotation. This may be evidence for a testimony collection which circulated in the earliest Church tradition. Textually, this implies that Paul did not design the text-form of the quotation. Hermeneutically, this places Paul within an existing, rather than \textit{ad hoc}, interpretation of the passage.

\(^1\)Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 285, writes: "Das Zitat ist also nur auf den einen Gedanken hin ausgewertet, dass die Zungenrede ein 'Zeichen' ist (nämlich für die Unglaubigen, +V.23)."

\(^2\)Acts 7:49; 15:16f; Ro. 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor. 14:21; 2 Cor. 6:16ff; Heb. 8:8-12; 10:16f, (10:30 is textually uncertain).

\(^3\)Ellis, PUOT, pp. 107-13.
Tongues as Sign. In this quotation Paul demonstrated a correspondence between the speaking of God through the Assyrians and His speaking through the Corinthian Christians. This correspondence centered on the concept of "sign" for both Israel and the Church. The explanation and purpose of the sign was not elaborated but was inherent in the sense conveyed by the quotation. The Assyrian tongue was a sign of divine judgment and impending destruction for Jerusalem. Thus Paul asserted that as God had spoken a message to Israel through the sign of the Assyrian tongue, so also he was speaking a message to Israel through Christian glossolalia. It is the need to decipher that sign that challenges one to understand the hermeneutical use of this passage.

Text-form. The text-form can contribute to this process. The variance of the quotation from its LXX counterpart has led some to conclude that Paul himself made the changes and has therefore purposely altered the meaning of the original. The evidence of Aquila and Barthélemy's research in Aquila's precursors provides evidence that Paul may have found the quotation as is. Also, the omission of the middle portion does not sig-

---

1Manson, CC, p. 115, traced the origin of tongues speaking to Jerusalem.

2Toy, QNT, p. 176.
nificantly alter the meaning of the passage.

The omission excludes the most sarcastic and ironic section of the "very clever and cynical retort" by Isaiah and reduces the historical particulars inherent in the passage. But even in Paul's shortened version, the unintelligible tongues were a message of correction from God which was frustrated by a disobedient response.

Context. Given the essential communality of sense of the OT and NT texts, a second argument, that of the radical divergence from the OT context, is more pertinent to the hermeneutical use made by Paul. One has said that the OT context "has nothing in common" with the ecstatic utterances Paul was discussing. This position assumes that the utterances were ecstatic rather than the foreign languages of Acts. If the utterances were languages then Paul's use of Isa. 28:11-12 would be within the bounds of the OT context. This, combined with the shared sense of a divine, but rejected, message, serves to


2Edgar, NTS 9:57 and Dodd, AS, p. 83. Bonsirven, EREP, p. 328, says that Paul's fascination with the potential typological figure has led to a sense contrary to the original. See also Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 323. Clemen, GAT, p. 199, prefers to have Paul see an analogy between Isaiah and Corinth.

further Paul's harmony with the OT.

Paul presented an explanation of the OT passage in vs 22. Tongues were for a sign: a sign of God's delayed but righteous judgment in the OT historical context. That sign was for unbelieving Jews (ἐστήμων - Ἰδων). The people had been offered rest but did not listen, therefore, the next message they would receive from God would be unavoidable judgment.

Paul followed the LXX Interpretation. The LXX had given a different twist to the Hebrew by translating ἐαρηγήσεις by the participle λέγοντες which made the central section the content of the message spoken by the Assyrian tongues. The Pauline quotation has excluded this error but has imported another sense divergent from the Hebrew yet dependent upon the LXX. The final phrase in Paul's text implied that the dullness of hearing was in the face of the foreign tongues. The Hebrew phrase was, rather, a retrospective look to the days when Yahweh had spoken through his prophets, i.e. Isaiah, before He had to bring the judgment of Assyria. Thus the passage as used by Paul took up two strands of the Isaiah conceptuality: foreign tongues and disobedience but followed the LXX conceptuality by directly linking hardness of hearing with the tongues.

This structure of sense and cause/effect is seen in Paul's application of the quotation to the situation at Corinth. In 1 Cor. 14:23b he linked the derisive con-
clusion of the unskilled or unbeliever to the exclusive presence of glossolalia. To know that tongues were a sign for unbelievers was a mark of maturity. The quotation asserted that tongues were not a final effort to gain repentance before destruction but were rather a sign that talking was at an end and irrevocable judgment was at hand. Such was the bald intention of the phenomenon of glossolalia.¹

Summary. Thus the concept of tongues was approached in 1 Cor. 14:21 from one perspective only, its relation to edification. In showing the primary conceptualities surrounding the original use of tongues (irreversible judgment directed to Israel) Paul showed how incompatible this was with the work of the assembled Church. The unbeliever, when given the sign, would be hardened in his unbelief: he would not listen.² This is the understanding of tongues which Paul termed "mature" in vs 20.

¹Paul later (1 Cor. 14:26-27), effected a modification to this basic sense by the addition of one who may interpret tongues, thereby the effect moved from unintelligibility to intelligibility, from judgment to the realm of προφητεία and οἰκοδομή and thereby gained acceptability for public use in the Church.

²Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 133, notes that the scriptural proof considers the effect of tongues on the unbeliever from a historical standpoint: regarding both prophecy and tongues, tongues are a divine sign which always annoy and harden the unfaithful. See 1 Cor. 14:23. J. P. M. Sweet, "A Sign For Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude To Glossalalia," New Testament Studies 13 (1966-67), p. 242, also supports the concept of tongues as a sign of judgment.
While Paul did not violate the OT context, his transference of the significance of tongues from the OT to the NT context was innovative.1 "Tongues" and "other" seem to have caught Paul's attention here as well as the context and become the basis for the comparison. The correspondence is also to be seen in the auxiliary significance of tongues as a judicial force.

1Judaism is quite silent in its use of this passage. S-B includes no Jewish use but only discusses the wider use of νῆλαν - ἡλαν. However, 1 QH 2:18 and 4:16 quote this passage with the latter being an apparent attack on glossolalia as Roy A. Harrisville, "Speaking In Tongues: A Lexicographical Study," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 38 (1976), pp. 42-43, notes. It is doubtful, however, that 1 QH 4:16 refers to glossolalia. More probable is a reference to the teaching of the Jerusalem leaders which was considered to be apostate by the Qumran covenanter.
### Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נֶפֶשׁ</td>
<td>καὶ ἄπολοῦς</td>
<td>γέγραπται γάρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תַּהַן</td>
<td>τὴν σοφίαν</td>
<td>ἄπολοῦς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רַעְמָה</td>
<td>τῶν σοφῶν</td>
<td>τὴν σοφίαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפֹרֶה</td>
<td>καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν</td>
<td>τῶν σοφῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רוֹנֶה</td>
<td>τῶν συνετῶν</td>
<td>καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רָחַפת</td>
<td>κρύψω</td>
<td>ἀθετησώ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this pericope.

### Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX shows that ἄπολοῦς is replaced by ἀφελῶ in Justin, Tertullian, 384; 613. Αὐτὸς is added after σοφῶν and συνετῶν by the Lucianic groups 22-48-51-231-763, 62 (omits αὐτὸς after σοφῶν) - 147 90-130-311 36-96 -86 (a late correction) -926 403-613 and Theodoret. This addition of αὐτὸς represents the translation of the third masculine singular suffixes of the Hebrew. Αὐτῶν is added to σοφῶν and συνετῶν by the eighth century Hexaplaric witness V, 93 and Eusebius.

A more pertinent variation is the reading of ἀθετησῶ for κρύψω by 564\textsuperscript{txt} 301 and Eusebius' commentary on Isaiah 29:14. This reading by Eusebius in his
commentary on Isaiah and the ninth and tenth century MSS may reflect a Christian conformation of the OT text to that of 1 Corinthians 1:19 or, possibly an independent textual tradition used by Paul.

New Testament Variants

Neither Nestle or Tischendorf offer any variants for this quotation.

Textual

Paul varies from the LXX by the substitution of ἀπετύχω for ἀρύψω. The chiastic structure of the original is retained but the voice of the two verbs, which commence and conclude the chiasmus, is changed to the active in the LXX, making explicit the implicit subject of the Hebrew. The LXX and New Testament supply the actor: the Lord Himself.¹

Contextual

This quotation was taken from the section of Isaiah in which the prophet clarified the moral deficiencies which were to bring about the destruction of Judah. The reasons for this impending chaos are begun in Isa. 29:9 and concluded in Isa. 29:13 which is a protasis asserting that the peoples' hearts were far from Yahweh.

¹With reference to 1 Cor. 1:20 we conclude that it is not a quotation but rather a reminiscence of passages from Isaiah. See Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 42.
The apodosis of Isa. 29:14 is commenced by a summation, ἡκτερία, and a demonstrative interjection, τίς τι λέγει. The rest of vs 14 provides a description of the wonder God was about to perform.

In the Corinthian context Paul has dealt with the problem of divisions\(^1\) aggravated by the partisan selection of human leaders.\(^2\) In 1:18-2:16 Paul contrasted the central message of the cross and the work of the Spirit with human wisdom. Paul's point was that he did not order his ministry according to the wisdom of his age. Such wisdom made the cross of no use.\(^3\) The message of Christ was foolishness to the wise of his age,\(^4\) therefore making it useless to adorn the Christian gospel with such sophistry. Then, to show that such had always been the way of God in contrast with worldly wisdom, Paul wrote that God would even do away with that manifestation of wisdom.

Hermeneutical

Omission of αὐτοῦ. This quotation supplies the divine opinion of the relevance of human wisdom to the work of the gospel. With regard to the addition of αὐτοῦ or αὐτῶν to σοφῶν and σοφητῶν by the Lucianic group and others, some hold that Paul made the passage apply more

\(^{1}\) 11:10ff. \(^{2}\) 21:12. \(^{3}\) 31:17. \(^{4}\) 41:18.
broadly. ¹ This, however, assumes that Paul was either following the Hebrew text or a Greek form of the Lucianic OT and had purposely omitted the pronouns. There is no evidence that Paul's quotations show enough consistent correlation with the Lucianic type at this point to conclude that he has altered it in this case. Though Paul's OT quotations show a Lucianic-type at certain points, he follows the OG form here. Also, the third masculine singular suffix of the MT refers to the people as a singular unit. It can be concluded, on the evidence available, that Paul was simply following a LXX⁹⁹ type of text rather than consciously comparing the Hebrew and a LXXLucian and then omitted the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew suffix. Edwin Hatch writes that "the omission of the words [αὐτῶν] both in 1 Corinthians and in the uncials of the LXX is probably due to an adaptation to the immediate purpose of the writer."² Perhaps one should say "writers." However, it still is clear that, for Paul, the absence of the pronouns cannot become evidence for hermeneutical conclusions. Paul saw no reason to add the singular or plural pronouns and merely quoted verbatim from the text before him which omitted αὐτῶν or αὐτῶν.

An Incorporated Poem? An interesting hypothesis

¹Turpie, OTN, p. 148.
²Hatch, EBG, p. 199.
has recently been put forward by K. E. Bailey\(^1\) that Paul has incorporated a poem into 1 Cor. 1:17-2:2. Bailey provides an elaborate schema of grammatical diagrams which progressively depart from the facts of the text as they approach a form which supports his thesis. Bailey does violence to the grammatical sense and structure. His break between his C' (vs 26b ὑπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ κτήσεως) and B' (vs 29) does not make sense.\(^2\) Even so, B' still does not show a parallelism with B (vss 18-19a). The large portions of the text which have to be relegated to a later redactional effort tells against this theory. Is the structure of the supposed poem so obvious and convincing that it should become the basis upon which the text is amended? The last half of the OT quotation in 1:19 is said to have been expanded by a later redactor, but what is Bailey's proof or methodology apart from claiming the "form" of the poem demands such a redaction?\(^3\) Bailey concludes\(^4\) that Paul had adjusted sections of the poem "to allow for a smooth transition into the poem from the previous discussion."

---

\(^1\)K. E. Bailey, "Recovering The Poetic Structure Of 1 Cor. i17-ii2," Novum Testamentum 17 (1975), pp. 265-96.

\(^2\)Bailey, NT 17:268.

\(^3\)See Bailey, NT 17:294, where he also claims Paul would have had the poem in memory.

\(^4\)Bailey, NT 17:293.
Paul then added comments that explain key words in the poem and that reinforce the original poetic structure.\(^1\)

Bailey's methodology is weakest when he deals with the OT quotation in 1:19. He asserts\(^2\) that the redactor added the second half of the verse because he knew it. Because this destroys Bailey's "four line balance of the unit" it could not have been original. The deciding factor is that, because the corresponding parallel in vs 31 is a one line quotation the quotation in vs 19 must also originally have been a one liner.

Bailey comments that the first half of the quotation in vs 19, line B-2' [sic] (he means B-1'), is from the LXX but the last half of the quotation varies from the LXX and is therefore not original. Surely every variation from the LXX is not to be counted as inauthentic. Even if the last line of vs 14 is "secondary" in meaning it is certainly original.

The Testimony Hypothesis. Harris\(^3\) notes that Justin, Dialogue with Trypho 78 and Tertullian, Adv. Mar. iii. 6, also use this testimony. Harris concludes that Paul, Justin and Tertullian were all using a similar

---

\(^1\)Bailey, NT 17:294, n. 56, also finds in 1 Cor. 2:6-10 another poem but concludes that this is an original Pauline creation.

\(^2\)Bailey, NT 17:274, n. 23.

\(^3\)Rendel Harris, "Did Jesus Use Testimonies?," Expository Times 36 (1924), p. 412.
testimony, though Paul was nearer the Hebrew in his use of ἀπολῶ. Tertullian wrote regarding prophecies which showed that the Messiah would be temporarily unrecognized.1 This is followed by the quotations from Isa. 29:14 and 6:9ff.2 Harris' point is to link Justin's use of a longer quotation of Isa. 29:13-14 to Mark 7:6, which quotes vs 13 only and Paul who quotes vs 14. This testimony is supposedly an anti-Judaic remark which Harris then traces back to the use of Jesus Himself, of which Mark quotes the first part and Paul the second (See also Mt. 15:8 for Isa. 29:13). If there be a common apologetic testimony tradition behind this use by Paul and Mark it would be more convincingly presented along the lines laid down by Lindars and Dodd.3 Paul, however, used the quotation in a different application than either Mark or Justin. It is more likely that both Justin and Clement have been influenced by Paul. This passage was undoubtedly part of early Christian apologetic and drawn from a shared tradition but the evidence put forth by Harris does not support his theory of a single testimony book.

---


2Justin's quotation is as follows: Διὰ τούτο ἵδον προσήκοι τὸν μεταθείναυ τὸν λαβὼν τούτον, καὶ μεταθήσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀφελῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν, καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν αὐτῶν κρύψω.

3Lindars, NTA, p. 164, and Dodd, AS, p. 84.
Various opinions have been given for the change from κρύψω to ἀθετήσω. The substitution differs from the LXX and from the Hebrew. Unless one posits a text earlier than Paul which read ἀθετήσω, which is always a possibility, Eusebius of Caesarea is the earliest other witness to the reading.  If Paul himself made the change one must question why he chose a stronger expression to the alteration of the text from which he quotes.

'Αθετῶ is used only here in the Corinthian letters. Elsewhere it is used by Paul in Gal. 2:21; 3:15; 1 Thess. 4:8; 1 Tim. 5:12. In Galatians the word concerns the setting aside of τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ, where an idea similar to 1 Cor. 1:17 is present. The annulment of God's grace equals a vitiation of the worth of Christ's glory.

1 Toy, QNT, p. 169. The Isaiah Targum reads "hidden" (ירָקְשָׁה). ירָקְשָׁה is in chiastic synonymous parallelism with the רָקְשָׁה (perish) of the Targum as פָּתַת is with ירָקְשָׁה of the MT thereby making the terms nearly synonymous. A similar synonymous relationship is seen between ἀπολῶ and ἀθετήσω in Paul.

death. In Gal. 3:15 the setting aside is related to a human covenant. 1 Thess. 4:8 relates to a disregard for God's approved concepts. The 1 Timothy reference concerns those young widows who have set aside their first faith. In all these uses the basic sense of the word is maintained and does not conflict with the meanings found in the papyri\(^1\) or the LXX.\(^2\)

If Paul selected the word, rather than copying it from an extant MS, he did so because it conveyed a concept more to his purpose.\(^3\) What then is in the word that is more suited to Paul's line of thought? The word was capable of translating seventeen different Hebrew words in the LXX.\(^4\) It must be pointed out, however, that άθετήσω never translates τιν in the LXX. Nor do the Hebrew word groups behind άθετήσω and κρύψω overlap in the LXX. Therefore the substitution of άθετήσω for κρύψω

\(^1\)M&M, p. 12.

\(^2\)Christian Maurer, "τίθημι," from Theological Dictionary of the New Testament VIII (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), p. 158, writes that "in the LXX τίθημι has strongly the character of willful repudiation of an institution and even more so of a person." See, for example, LXX Isa. 31:2 and Psa. 32:10.

\(^3\)Atkinson, JTVI, pp. 40-41, says this "modification arose owing to inaccuracy of memory." While memory lapse is possible, the fidelity of the rest of the quotation to the LXX would make this to be a conclusion of only the last resort. Note the forms of τίθημι in Isa. 29:14a, διὰ τοῦτο ἡδον προοθήσω τοῦ μεταθεται τοῦ λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ μεταθήσω αὐτοὺς . . . .

\(^4\)M&M, p. 12.
cannot be accounted for on common semantic grounds. There is, however, a possible conceptual reason for the use of ἀδετήσω to be found in the word's association with wisdom in the LXX. Psalm 33:10 (LXX 32:10) is one example from which Paul may have drawn his conceptuality: κύριος διὰ σοφίας βουλας ἐθνῶν ἀδετεὶ ὑπὸ λογισμοῦ λαῶν καὶ ἀδετεὶ βουλάς ἀρχόντων. ¹ This use of ἀδετητν matches Paul's general use of the term. Using Reider's index² one may conclude regarding a possible reading by α' σ' θ' that 1) ἀδετητν never translates ΠΝΥ in the Three; 2) the Hebrew word groups do not overlap; 3) Paul does not show an early Palestinian Greek OT reading at this point.

Several positions have been held regarding these two words: 1) they are basically synonymous;³ 2) ἀδετήσω is the more forcible,⁴ 3) ἀδετήσω was chosen to adapt the quotation to its context.⁵ There is, however, enough

¹See also Prov. 11:3 LXX⁴.


³Turpie, OTN, p. 147, displays an apologetic tendency to diminish possible differences between Paul and the OT.


⁵Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 52. Bonsirven, EREP, p. 331, says that the change "accuse l'intention divine de rejeter la fausse sagesse."
evidence at least to merit consideration of a textual rather than an editorial solution. The MSS evidence for ἀπετήσω (564\textsuperscript{txt}, 301 and Eusebius) is not considered by the above authors.

**Harmonizations in 564 and 301.** Due to the paucity and lateness of the Greek OT MSS evidence supporting Paul's reading the possibility of harmonization to Paul must be considered. Paul quoted from the book of Isaiah outside of 1 and 2 Cor. in Romans and Galatians. A study of these quotations gives no evidence of a tendency of 301 or 564 to conform to Pauline renderings of Isaiah.\(^1\) However, the distinctiveness of Paul's reading of ἀπετήσω for νεφεσ in 1 Cor. 1:19 may weigh in favor of a conformity of 564 and 301 to Paul. Eusebius shows Paul's reading. Eusebius used a hexaplaric type of text while 301 is Alexandrian and 564 is, at this point, mixed.\(^2\)

\(^1\)The evidence is as follows (Paul's variant is listed first): Ro. 9:33a σκανδάλου for πτώματι, 9:27 ὃς ἦ for ὁςεί, 301 only; 15:12 no variants; 9:33b κατασκυλησμένως for κατασκυλησθή (Paul repeats this quotation in Ro. 11:8. Clement follows Paul in Ro. 11:34 where Isa. 28:16 is quoted but 564 does not.) 564 agrees with the main LXX witnesses in the rest of the Isa. passages and does not harmonize to Paul; Ro. 14:11; 2:24; 10:5; 15:21; Gal. 4:26; Ro. 11:26; 10:20f.

\(^2\)(Zwitterstellung) GLXX Isa., p. 94. Regarding the catena groups CI and CII, Zeigler, GLXX Isa., p. 95, writes: "Wenn sich CI + CII von C trennen, dann geht C immer mit der hexaplarischen Rezension, CI + CII dagegen mit der alexandrinischen Textfamilie." In Isa. 29:14 the catena groups are not thusly divided and therefore must be considered to be mixed.
In 1 Cor. 2:16, while 564 agrees with Paul regarding συμβιβάσει it disagrees with him at three other places within the same quotation. The GLXX groups 564 with 377 and 565, which also read συμβιβάσει. However, all the Catena groups follow this reading as well as major witnesses to the Hexaplaric (V Q⁷⁰), Alexandrian (A 106) and Lucianic (22C-55C) renderings showing a wide spread for this dialectical preference. One may conclude then, that this reading of 564 is also not a conformity to the text of 1 Cor. 2:16.

In 2 Cor. 6:17b, 564 disagrees with Paul and reads ἔξαθατε for his ἔξαθατε but agrees with his καί before ἀφορίσθητε. But this καί is also read by witnesses to the Alexandrian (Q), Hexaplaric (88 Syc), Lucianic (22C 93 456) groups and is therefore not a conformity to Paul in 564. Only when there is singular agreement with a weighty MSS witness to a particular type can a textual link be forged. Therefore, 564 and 301 do not show a tendency to conform to Paul's variants from the LXX tradition and the possibility must remain open that Paul's

---

1 564 reads καί for Paul's τις before ἔγνω; φ for Paul's δΣ; αὐτῷ for his αὐτόν.

2 As in the case with the quotation of Isa. 45:23 in Ro. 14:11 where the Alexandrian group alone agrees with Paul's reading of ἔξομολογήσεται. Ziegler, GLXX Isa., p. 25, writes: "Man könnte vermuten, dass von hier aus die HSS. beeinflusst waren. Jedoch bürgt die Vorzüglichkeit der alexandrinischen Gruppe für die Ursprunglichkeit dieser Lesarten." No Christian interpolation is seen in this case.
Greek OT read ἀθέτησον.

**Fidelity to the OT Context.** With this possible textual base for the use of ἀθέτησον, the question as to the justice done to the OT context by the NT use of the quotation may now be answered. Because, as we have seen, this quotation was drawn from an OT passage which was used in several NT texts\(^1\) it is interesting to see what became of its OT context.\(^2\)

Both contexts concern the moral behavior of redeemed peoples. Lightfoot wrote that "the spirit of the application here is in exact accordance with the original context of the passage."\(^3\) The people of Judah had become cold-hearted in their devotion to Yahweh. They denied God's central ownership over their lives.\(^4\) The hardening work of God spoken of in Isa. 29:10 concerned a loss of wisdom and insight because of prolonged disobedience to God. Men who persisted in supporting themselves without the wisdom of God would not prosper.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Bruce, I&2 Cor., p. 34.

\(^2\) Jewish usage is seen in MR Lam., p. 112, where the demise of the righteous is seen to be more grievous than the curses of Dt. or the destruction of the Temple. Isa. 29:14 is then quoted on the basis of the three-fold occurrence of "wonder." Such an interpretation seems to view the wise in a positive rather than disparing light. In MR Ex. 5:14, Isa. 29:14 is quoted in response to the audacious remark of Pharaoh and his wise men that Yahweh was merely a son of the wise.

\(^3\) Lightfoot, NEP, p. 158.

\(^4\) Isa. 29:16.

\(^5\) Isa. 29:14.
W. D. Davies provides an accurate summation of the New Testament context:

1 Cor. 1:17ff is not a polemic against specific persons or parties but against the Corinthian church as such, because, through its sophialehre it was confusing the Gospel with the philosophy and sophistry of its Hellenistic milieu and had thus come to misunderstand the nature of the gospel, of its own Christian leaders and of its own character.  

With this context in mind, Bonsirven's words are well taken: "Les savants actuels qui se complaisent dans leur vaine sagesse (1 Cor. 1,19) sont préfigurés par les sages qui reprend Isaïe (29,14)." Paul had applied a principle drawn from OT history which was seen to be true for the Corinthians: man could not stand before God in his own deviant form of wisdom. Bonsirven classifies this as an example of typological exegesis. Paul viewed this as a divine principle of action with specific reference to the methods of salvation derived by man. The purpose of the quotation then was to provide God's opinion regarding those who stood on human sophistry rather than God's revelation.

Pauline Adaptations. This quotation finds its


2Bonsirven, EREP, p. 329. Clemen, GAT, p. 189, sees the Christian condemnation of pretentious wisdom as a necessary and natural extension of the OT criticism of wisdom.

3Bonsirven, EREP, p. 329.

4Toy, QNT, p. 169.
dynamic in that the destruction of wisdom was brought about by the tragic demonstration of how wrong were the conclusions of human wisdom.\(^1\) The physical destruction of Judah was secondary to the lesson taught that their wise men were, in truth, foolish.\(^2\) Wuellner sees this quotation as stating the main theme of a homily Gattung adopted by Paul, and rightly points out that "the central theme of the homily with all its haggadic connotations is not that of wisdom as such, but the divine sovereignty and judgment over all wisdom."\(^3\) Paul thus used this OT context as a keystone to nearly four chapters of argument against the grouping of Christian allegiance around human

\(^1\)For a Synoptic concept of the selective and divinely promulgated hiddenness of the Messiah see Lk. 10:21-22 and Mt. 11:25-27. Fjärstedt, STIC, pp. 145ff and 155, states, furthering his own thesis, that the wisdom/foolishness themes in 1 Cor. 1:17-2:16 were not based on the OT quotations but rather on the gospel tradition. The OT passages, says Fjärstedt, merely give a wider and richer scope. But the gospel tradition itself is based on the OT, and it is there that the wisdom/foolishness themes are sourced. Paul certainly wrote from a NT perspective but the OT remained his authority. The OT quotations were formulative to Paul's remarks to the Corinthians.

\(^2\)Isa. 29:15ff.

\(^3\)Wuellner, JBL, 89:201-02. The main theme of the homily is assertedly stated in 1 Cor. 1:19 concerning divine judgment on human wisdom. 1 Cor. 1:20-25 is then the first development of the theme from the prophets. 1 Cor. 1:26-31 is a second development using a Torah seder from either the creation, patriarchal or Exodus cycles. 1 Cor. 2:1-5 is a "characteristic digression." 1 Cor. 2:6ff is a third development from the prophets and writings while the eschatological section appears at the end, 1 Cor. 3:10-15. Conzelmann, NTS 12:238, assumes a more general Jewish wisdom motif in 1 Cor. 1:18ff.
figures.

The hermeneutical conceptuality underlying Paul's use of Isa. 29:14 becomes clear when one sees exactly what Paul was illustrating. The commonly held view is that the quotation illustrated the destruction of wisdom which vaunted itself before God but this can be more specifically defined. What triggered the quotation in Paul's mind was no doubt the divine judgment of wisdom motif in the OT and thus the quotation was intended for "those perishing" in the first part of 1 Cor. 1:18.1 But Paul was not concerned with the meaning of such judgment for the wise but rather with its implications for the Corinthian believers. Thus the key to the underlying conception of the passage is found in the last half of vs 18.2 A deep soteriological understanding was at work here. The quotation related σοφία to what God destroyed at the cross. The way of salvation had not come to the Corinthians by means of wisdom or signs, but rather by faith.3 The questions of vs 21 were designed not to show the end of worldly wisdom in and of itself, but to show its replacement by the kerygma. Thus the emphasis is on the δύναμις Θεοῦ revealed in the word of the cross which

1ο λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μορία ἐστί... .

2τοῖς δὲ σωζομένοις ἡμῖν δύναμις Θεοῦ ἐστι.

3vss 21b; 24.
removed worldly wisdom in order to bring in faith.

It is doubtful that Paul conceived the Corinthian situation to be equal to that portrayed in Isa. 29. The Corinthians' hearts and lips were not far from God nor had God poured a deep sleep upon them. The "wise" human leaders of Corinth could not compare with the rebellious wise and foolish men of the Judah of Isaiah's day. But the basis of the comparison is not found in a correspondence of the acts of the people in the Isaiah passage but in something more fundamental: their world view. It was not the people themselves who would be destroyed but their wisdom. This meant that their pattern and attitude to life would be shown to be in error because it deviated from the express will of God. Paul had been reminded of this situation by the self-seeking schisms in Corinth. If part of the problems were caused by Judaizers the analogy becomes more telling but Paul was quite clear in referring to the Greeks as well. Thus Paul illustrated the course the power of God in the cross took in providing salvation, especially noting the casualties, wisdom and foolishness.

The conceptuality is clear. For Paul, the God of the OT was the same as the God of the NT in His attitude towards autonomous human wisdom. Paul did not draw an

---

1 Isa. 29:10, 14.
elaborate typology of historical event here but rather used words of divine authority to emphasize an ongoing and consistent divine attitude.
**ISAIAH 40:15, 1 CORINTHIANS 2:16**

**Textual Display**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;מ&quot;</td>
<td>τίς</td>
<td>τίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐγνω</td>
<td>ἐγνω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοθν</td>
<td>νοθν</td>
<td>κυρίον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίς</td>
<td>αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σύμβουλος</td>
<td>ἐγένετο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δς</td>
<td>δς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμβιβᾶ</td>
<td>συμβιβάσει</td>
<td>αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Romans 11:34: τίς γάρ ἐγνω νοθν κυρίον;

ἡ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;

**Masoretic Variants**

BHS notes that the LXX with the Syriac and Vulgate reflect the reading Υ two for Υ.

**Septuagintal Variants**

For the first τίς the GLXX notes the addition of γάρ in Ro. 11:34 and 1 Cor. 2:16. Καὶ is read by Justin and ἡ by 26 V 51c 87-91-309-490 377-564-565 49-764 403.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf reads Χριστου in vs 16b on the basis of N A C DC E L P al omn vid e vg syr utr Coptic Armenian Pseudo-Justin Zen et ser όρις,1,167,2,565,3,597 etc. Lachmann reads κυριου with B D* F G f g r Theophilus txt Augustine iob 3,632 Ambrosiaster. This does not affect the quoted pericope, however, but does indicate some difference of thought regarding the use of Χριστος for the κυριος of Isa. 40:13.
Textual

Paul omitted the LXX phrase from the conjunction ωαί to ἐγένετο and reproduced the last part of the quote exactly. 1 Paul reads σωμβιβάσεi which is represented by the LXX Να corrections, the Lucianic, Alexandrinus and several ninth, twelfth and thirteenth century texts.

Moulton supplies an orthographical reason for the change:

In LXX and occasionally in papyri and inscriptions we find a . . . future from stems in -ακω: thus ἔργαται from ἔργαζομαι. The absence of this in the NT is marked, and shows a dialectic distinction: thus in 1 Co 2:16 the LXX σωμβιβάσε is altered to σωμβιβάσει. 2 This indicates that Paul may have used a text conforming to this reading. The presence of σωμβιβάσει is distinguished from the best Old Greek representative Q as well as from B. Qmg Να A V and most Lucianic witnesses agree with Paul and may show an early Palestinian stratum behind the Lucianic recension.

Contextual

In the OT the pericope is a part of an extended question in a section designed to display the surpassing

---

1The Isaiah Targum (Stenning) reads: תַּחַל יִפְטָר קֹרֶץ חוֹדָשׁ בָּאוֹת כָּל בְּרֵי אֵלֻהָי הַיָּהוָה. "Who hath directed the holy spirit in the mouth of all the prophets? Is it not the Lord?" Sperber, JBL 59:227, includes Isa. 40:13 as an example of a doublet in an asyndetic connection present in the Hexaplaric LXX text: καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σώμπουλος ἐγένετο// (// = a division of the doublet) δὲ σωμβιβά αὐτόν.

2Moulton, GNTG II, p. 187. Orr, 1 Cor., p. 159, calls this an Attic future.
greatness of Yahweh. The answer to the question of Isa. 40:18,¹ as with all the questions of Isa. 40:12-14 was "no one." Though no one was comparable² to Yahweh, this awesome contrast was designed to encourage rather than dismay as Isa. 40:29-31 shows. The contrast was intended to give men unshakeable confidence in Yahweh; to draw them to Him. As men were confronted with their own inability to direct God's Spirit and to counsel Him, they were brought to the crucial point of utter reliance upon Him.

In Corinthians, Paul drew a contrast between the world's and the Christian's way of knowing. He stressed the distinct medium of the Spirit as the conveyor of God's wisdom. The apologetic thrust had been to clarify why men who were caught up in their own pride and boasting (a description of the Corinthians, but tactfully focused on the rich and powerful in the κόσμος) were ignorant of all the good which God intended for them through Christ. Paul had shown that the Christian had a means of knowing God's mind.³ In vs 14 Paul plainly

¹"To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him?" KJV


³vss 10-15.
stated the inability of the ψόχως to receive God's word. Because the spiritual man could know the things given through the Spirit of God, he was not subject to human evaluation. The quotation elaborates this last point.

Hermeneutical

Pauline Adaptations. If Paul used an OT text with συμβιβάσας, which is most likely, it becomes a matter of direct quotation. If συμβιβάσει represents a change from the standard OT text it seems that Paul either had a memory lapse or purposely changed the spelling to conform to contemporary usage.

Paul omitted the central part of Isa. 40:13 from his quotation. Bonsirven classifies this among the condensed adaptations.\(^1\) It is to be noted that Paul quoted from the Isa. 40:13 passage in Ro. 11:34, including the part of the verse he omitted here, but omitting the last part, thereby showing his knowledge of the verse in its entirety. One would assume, therefore, a purposeful alteration rather than a memory slip in 1 Cor. 2:16.\(^2\)

For Paul the τις αύτού σύμβουλος and δες συμβιβά αύτόν of the LXX both imply virtually the same sense and either one

\(^1\)Bonsirven, EREP, p. 334.

\(^2\)Lightfoot, Notes, p. 183. Cerfauz, KCP, p. 185, posits a florilegium in order to explain why Paul quoted differently in Ro. and 1 Cor. In Ro. Paul applied the passage to God.
could be excluded without obscuring the point of the quotation.  

Regarding Paul's adherence to the LXX even when dividing a verse, Hanson writes:

But he does not alter the text. His fidelity is shown in the fact that he will not alter the LXX's νος υμών, although he must have known that the Hebrew had רוח, and πνεύμα would have suited his argument better in 1 Cor. 2.  

Hatch writes that the usage of νος rather than πνεύμα is striking "because πνεύμα would have followed more naturally from the preceding verses: and since this is the only passage in the LXX in which ηλλ is translated νος, the presumption if very strong that S. Paul had the LXX in mind." On the contrary, νος could not be more fitting for Paul's argument. The topic of the Spirit was only incidental to the purpose of Paul which was to mend the factions in the Corinthians' thinking, (Ἰνα το αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες. . . ἢτε δε κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοι καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ). This is the key to and the commencement of Paul's exposition in 2:16; unity around the

---

1 Having omitted the part containing σύμβουλος, the δε lost its direct and proper antecedent but has its nearest antecedent in τις; Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 51.

2 Hanson, SPTT, p. 148.

3 Hatch, Essays, p. 100. Davies, PRJ, p. 182, n. 6, writes that "Paul apparently equates πνεύμα and νος" which indicates his non-acceptance of a stoic metaphysic. Also Wendland, Kor., p. 27. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 87, notes that Paul has in mind only the group of spiritual people when he says ἡμεῖς δε.
mind of Christ.

To dwell on the mind/spirit relationship does not lead to a clearer understanding of the use of the passage. It is clear that Paul did not use a midrashic Gattung even though he quoted the first and last parts of Isa. 40:13 in 1 Cor. and the first and middle parts in Romans. This is a straightforward quotation, therefore an examination of the function of the γαρ of 1 Cor. 2:16 will help to explain the force of the quotation and show what words, if any, within the quotation are central.

The Functions of γαρ. Γαρ has both a grammatical and a syntactical function. As an IF its syntactical function is to prepare the reader for the introduction of the quotation. As a part of grammar its illative function relating to vs 15b must not be overlooked. Actually, the quotation itself functions as an illative by expanding, illustrating, or supporting its object. Thus the IF and quotation form one homogenous grammatical unit. Γαρ appears in many IF\(^1\) and, being post-positive, is inevitably found within the actual quotation when γαρ comprises the entire IF. Such is the case in 1 Cor. 2:16 and this discussion will be limited to other such cases in Paul's works.\(^2\) The grammatical function of the general use of

---

\(^1\)See Ellis, PUOT, appendix II, pp. 156-85.

\(^2\)This excludes Ro. 4:3 (τη γαρ) ἄ γραψαι λέγει; Ro. 12:19 γέγραπται γαρ; Ro. 15:9 το γαρ; 2 Cor. 6:2 λέγει γαρ, etc.
particles for IF are used for specific reasons. For example the ἀλλά of Gal. 4:30 and the ὅ and ἀλλά of Gal. 3:16 show a definite adversative movement. The conclusive διό in Eph. 4:8 sharpens what would otherwise be blunted if a simple γάρ had been used. Even the common καθὼς in 2 Cor. 3:15 and 9:9 retains much of its adverbial force. The five quotations which have γάρ as the IF show a less formal relationship to the train of thought and are more integrated into the syntax than the other, more elaborate, IF. Notice in 1 Cor. 6:16 how the γάρ is syntactically separate from the φησίν. In Ro. 10:11 there is the λέγει γάρ ἢ γραφή IF followed by three uses of γάρ, two in vs 12, one in vs 13. The vs 13 γάρ introduces OT scripture though grammatically this γάρ is indistinguishable from the preceding two. Thus, when used as an IF, the grammatical function of a particle is not lost.

Though the grammatical range may be somewhat limited due to the formalizing of the γάρ as an IF into a literary device, one can, however, find insight into the purpose in the mind of the author for selecting a particular IF. Paul's selection of γάρ shows he wanted to use the quotation in an illative sense.

The quotation itself implies what it did in Isaiah, that no one knows the mind of the Lord or is able

---

1 Ro. 10:13; 11:34-35; 1 Cor. 6:16 (with φησίν); 10:26; 15:27.
to become His counsellor. What follows the quotation is a slightly adversative δέ indicating that what was not true in the quote is, in some way, true of the ἡμεῖς which follows. The Christian had been given the knowledge of God through the Spirit. The οὐδενός of vs 15 refers to the theme of human versus divine evaluation\(^1\) in the sense that ultimately man was answerable to God alone.\(^2\) The sense is that the spiritual man himself was above evaluation by men but not by God. Christ alone was the one who could evaluate. The point is that to judge a πνευματικὸς is to judge God Himself; a very telling blow to those Corinthians who were full of judgmental factiousness. The γάρ and the quotation of vs 16 relate to an illative use explaining why no one appraises the πνευματικὸς. The believer's participation with and submission to God's thoughts is hardly expressed more strongly elsewhere.

**Summary.** The emphasis of the quotation falls therefore not on the already clearly indicated participation in God's thoughts but on the concept of συμβιβάσει. The quotation does not announce that the Christian has the mind of God. That was done in vs 16b and had been already clearly intimated in vs 10ff. The quotation explained the absurdity of presumptuous eval-

---

\(^1\)See 1 Cor. 4:3f.

\(^2\)Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 41.
uation of men in Christ. So one must agree with Scroggs when he writes:

Paul has reserved his scriptural quotation until the end of the section as a climax (so also in verses 6-9), but the similarity in form of 11a and 16a suggests that Paul in 11a already had in mind his later use of Isa. x1.13.¹

By omitting the middle section of Isa. 40:13 Paul compressed the verse and placed the emphasis on the verb συμβιβάσει rather than on the noun σύμβουλος as in the Romans passage. Paul brought together the two concepts of the high position of the believer and the inability of men to evaluate divine things. The climax, however, is found in vs 16b. The quotation provides only a small part of the progression of thought begun in 2:6.

The historical contexts of the Old and New Testaments are compatible. The Isaiah context concerns the inability of man to direct God's thoughts and actions. This should have caused man to trust in Yahweh over idols. The Corinthian context draws the principle that a man apart from the Spirit is not to presume to judge God's work among His people. More precisely, the gulf between the πνευματικός and the ψυχικός is widely drawn; there could be no understanding of the former on the part of the latter, therefore there can be no evaluation either. Ability to judge the worth of, for example, Paul's

¹Scroggs, NTS 14:53.
ministry, was directly related to one's receptivity to the mind of Christ in the Spirit. In both contexts the particular passage carries the same sense.
**Textual Display**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἡν</td>
<td>ὅτι</td>
<td>ὅτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν</td>
<td></td>
<td>ὅτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐστιν</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐστιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Masoretic Variants**

BHS lists no variants for this passage.

**Septuagintal Variants**

The GLXX shows that ἐτι is added to ἐν σοὶ by 109-736 and omitted by 544. The article before θεὸς is not present in 147 87-91-309-490 A-564 239-306 403-613 449-770 Theodoret. ᾦ reads μονον εν σοι θεος και ουκ ἐστιν ἐτι ουδ' υπαχει θεος. ο' reads πλην εν σοι λοιχυος. ο' reads πλην εν σοι λοιχυος.

**New Testament Variants**

Tischendorf notes that οὐντὼς is before (ο) θεος in Ν A B D E F G al fere¹⁰ it. vg syr sch cop arm aeth go Or Cat ²⁴⁵ and int bis Did tri ²³⁰ Chr ²⁵¹ Euthal cod
Amb. It is after Θεός in K L and others, syrP
Bas, Chr, Thrt Dam. N* D* F G 109*, Or Cat
Chr, have Θεός without the article while N* B
D, E K L and others Did tri Bas Chr, Thrt and Dam
read o Θεός.

Textual
Grosheide is correct that this is an allusion.
Even though the text is quoted informally it may be
located in the OT at Isa. 45:14. 1 Paul's use of δυνάμειν
better represents the Hebrew than the LXX. 2 The Isaiah
Targum reads: נַעֲלֵ֣מָה יְהֹוָ֔ה מִשְׁפָּתָ֖הּ.

Contextual
Isa. 45:15 speaks of the praise that would come
to Israel from foreign nations when Israel was reestab-
lished. As a result of divine power behind Cyrus, God's
name would be recognized to be active within Israel.

The NT context concerns the convicted utterances

---

1Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 333. Bruce, 1&2 Cor.,
p. 133, sees it as a quotation. Toy, QNT; Gough, NTQ;
Turpie, OTN do not include it. Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 327,
indicates that Paul may have had in mind 1 Ki. 18:39.
Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 287, n. 33, suggests Dan. 2:47,
Isa. 45:14, or Zech. 8:23. See also Wendland, Kor., p.
113.

2Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony
Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek (Cambridge
181ff.

3"Of a truth God is in thee..." Stenning,
of the one who, by means of prophecy, was brought to the realization that God was indeed among those who were formerly thought of as being provincial babblers.

**Hermeneutical**

Paul did not use the passage in any formal way as indicated by its lack of an IF and general syntactical framework. It is certainly not merely a verbal coincidence, however, and indicates that either this phrase had become a religious cliché or that Paul remembered this OT context and realized its suitability for his argument. This latter is decidedly to be preferred when one, apparently unnoticed, fact is observed.

In 1 Cor. 14:21f a group of unbelievers were seen to be repulsed by glossolalia with the result that they mocked the community. In both the OT and NT contexts of the quoted OT passage an act of God had the effect of hardening men in unbelief. Also, in 1 Cor. 14:25, the OT and NT contexts concerned an act of God which brought men to confess His greatness. In the OT this act was Israel's reestablishment. In the NT it was the act of Christian prophecy but the results were similar in that both groups of men glorified God. Thus the quotations in 1 Cor. 14:21 and 14:25, both from Isaiah, show a contrast which was very much a part of the experience of the early church: the rejection of God's message by Israel (1 Cor. 14:21)
and its reception by the nations (1 Cor. 14:25). This is even more clear given the Pauline conception of the Church as the New Israel and the recipient of the ancient promises. While one would not assert that the readers would have been alert to the connection between these two OT passages, the link was clearly a part of Paul's conceptuality and meditation on the place of glossolalia in the early Church.
### ISAIAH 49:8, 2 CORINTHIANS 6:2

#### Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נָאַ</td>
<td>οὖτως</td>
<td>λέγει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַוְר</td>
<td>λέγει</td>
<td>λέγει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָטַ</td>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>י'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַב</td>
<td>καρφ</td>
<td>καρφ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יוֹר</td>
<td>δεκτῷ</td>
<td>δεκτῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִגְתִּי</td>
<td>ἔπηκουσά</td>
<td>ἔπηκουσά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שָׁא</td>
<td>σοῦ</td>
<td>σοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַב</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִע</td>
<td>ἐν</td>
<td>ἐν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּר</td>
<td>ἡμέρα</td>
<td>ἡμέρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַוְש</td>
<td>σωτηρίας</td>
<td>σωτηρίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַוְרַ</td>
<td>ἐβοήθησά</td>
<td>ἐβοήθησά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַנְתִּי</td>
<td>σοῦ</td>
<td>σοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this passage.

#### Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX notes that 233 reads ταδε for οὖτως. 538 and Coptic adds the ο θεος (αγιος, Bohairic) τω (του, Coptic) ἵσαραλ from Isa. 49:7 while Clement adds ο ρυσαμενος ἵσαραλ from Isa. 49:7. Augustine adds Israel. נ alone reads σου for σοι and 147 reads δε. α' and Origen read ἐν καρπω εὐδοκίας, Chr.
New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that λέγει γάρ καὶ ρω is read by Ν Β Κ D and Ε Κ Λ Π αι fere omn (sed 37. διὸ λέγει καὶ ρω) f vg. syr utr sah Cop. καὶ ρω γάρ λέγει is read by D* F G d e g go Sedul. F replaces σοι by σου.

Textual

Paul reproduced the LXX tradition with only the possible deletion of κύριος if λέγει γὰρ is not seen as an IF. Λέγει is equivalent to quotation marks when used without a subject and is a common form of quotation.¹ We take λέγει γὰρ as the IF therefore Paul's quotation begins after the λέγει κύριος of the LXX.

Contextual

In Isa. 49 the prophet is seen to be giving a divine vindication for his ministry. Though his mission was not yet accomplished and Israel was not then gathered² God would still glorify Himself through His servant. Isaiah was promised that he would be a light to the Gentiles,³ an object of worship of kings and princes,⁴ and a covenant of deliverance for the earth.⁵

¹See Ro. 15:10; Eph. 4:8.
In 2 Cor. 6 Paul exhorted his readers not to receive the grace of God in vain. This exhortation was based on the preceding words of 2 Cor. 5 where the reconciling work of God was explained. The Corinthians were to follow the example of their ministers in bringing full glory to their works by taking full advantage of the grace offered them.

Hermeneutical

2 Cor. 6:2b As a Comment on vs 2a. It is possible that the whole of 2 Cor. 6:2 was a quotation from a previous source due to its inclusion in a parenthetical manner.¹ On the other hand the latter part of vs 2 is best seen as an interpretation of the quotation much along the lines of the pesher type of exegesis commonly found at Qumran.² Paul very plainly stated that the present was a day of salvation and acceptableness but it is not convincing to hold that he identified the day spoken of in reference to Isaiah with the present time of his readers. One would expect that Paul, if he had been seeking to make a pesher interpretation would have utilized the article of reference before καὶ ρήθαι and ἡμέρα in his commentary of 2 Cor. 6:2b. As it is, Paul left his exposition as indefinite as the quotation. His use of

¹Ellis, PUOT, p. 143, n. 3.
²Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 211.
νῦν pinpoints the time of another day of salvation, most likely with reference to the existent church age,\(^1\) the time intervening between the date of the letter and the return of Christ. The νῦν has the content and quality (anarthrous χαίρως and ημερὰ) of a day of salvation, not necessarily the day spoken of in Isa. Another indication that the commentary is not a strict pesher is the use of εὐπροσδέκτος. This strengthened form implies that the present was a "very good" time. If the time of Isaiah's aid was δέκτος then the time of God's grace in Christ was termed εὐπροσδέκτος.\(^2\)

Pauline Adaptations. Whether the Apostle or someone else wrote the commentary on the quotation, the OT passage itself was used by Paul to point out a similarity of then and now in God's work of aiding mankind.\(^3\) The

\(^1\)See Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 191. Acts 17:30. Bruce, P&J, p. 65, stresses that Paul's understanding of God's salvific acts was no "mere theological scheme, intellectually constructed," but rather an experiential fact of life which gave shape to Paul's mission to the Gentiles. Paul's νῦν is a clear example of the γραφή drawing its meaning from the present. This was part and parcel of the rabbinic method; a method which could be used to secure radically differing results. Dietzfelbinger, PAT, p. 35, writes that "das Verständnis des χαίρως geht also sowohl bei Paulus als auch im Spatjudentum der Vergegenwärtigung der γραφή voraus, setzt sie erst in Gang und bestimmt sie in ihrem Inhalt und ihrem Ergebnis."

\(^2\)Qumran has preserved the sense of good will in the Hymn Scroll, Hymn Z vss 14-15: "Thou alone hast created the just and established him from his mother's womb unto the time of good will that he may be presented in Thy Covenant. . . ." See Dupont-Sommer, EWQ, p. 246.

\(^3\)Bultmann, 2 Kor., p. 169, notes "Mit der rabbinischen Exegese aber stimmt Paulus überein, wenn er das
day that God acts for the benefit of man was man's day of salvation. The simile carries with it the sense of God's sovereign choice of the day in which He would act, therefore this element of the quotation was elaborated by the apostle as a basis for exhortation. The Isaiah Targum also makes the passage contemporary in its exhortation:

Thus saith the Lord, at the time that ye do my pleasure I will receive your prayer, and in the day of distress I will raise up salvation, . . .

If God had chosen a time to bring aid to man, who was man to disregard the offer or be tardy in making full use of it? Indeed it was the thought of receiving the grace of God in vain that prompted the mention of the OT passage in the first place. Paul used the passage to substantiate his exhortation.

This is an example of the IF introducing the word of God. The OT passage was spoken by Yahweh. The LXX reads λέγει κύριος but this did not find its way into the λέγει κύριος saying of the NT, possibly in this case because Paul equated the LXX κύριος in the passage with

---

Wort textgemäss als eschatologische Weissagung der Heilstat auffasst." J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit OT Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the NT," New Testament Studies 7 (1960-61), p. 316, also views this quotation as a "modernization" of an OT text to a current situation.

1Stenning, TI, p. 166. 21 Cor. 6:1.

3Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 190, conjectures that "the passage may have occurred to St. Paul because of the resemblance of his own case to that of the Prophet."
his Θεος of 2 Cor. 6:1, 4 rather than Christ. Here again is seen the identification of the Church with the true Israel. The recipient of grace in the OT passage was Israel but with Paul it has become the Church. The continuity of God's responses to His chosen people is again part of Paul's conceptuality.
ISAIAH 49:13, 2 CORINTHIANS 7:6

Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄλλ']</td>
<td>δο</td>
<td>παρακαλῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δυ</td>
<td>ἠλέησεν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>τὸν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαὸν</td>
<td>αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>τοὺς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταπείνους</td>
<td>τοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαοῦ</td>
<td>αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρεκάλεσεν</td>
<td>ἡμᾶς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this section.
Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX notes that Eus. demonstratio evangelica reads υπογος for ὁ θεος and that the second αυτου is omitted by Q^txt^-26 449-770 and the Bohairic.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf lists no variants for this section.

Textual

This passage is a clear allusion rather than a quotation. It finds its affinities with the OT passage in the combination of the use of the verb παρακαλέω, ὁ θεος, and τοὺς ταπεινοὺς.

Contextual

The OT context is the same as for the quotation in 2 Cor. 6:2. Here the Lord has brought the restoration of His creation and comfort to His people. Paul, in his context, was defending himself and showing that he was truly concerned about the Corinthians. One such demonstration was his reaction to the news which Titus brought from Corinth.

Hermeneutical

The OT passage was used in a proverbial manner.¹

¹Isa. 49:13 is used in the Mekilta, Shirata on Ex. 15:7-8, Lüsterbach, Mek. II, p. 53, to refer to the earth rejoicing over the redemption of Israel.
What, in Isa. 49:13, was a description of the Acts of God in a particular historical situation became in 2 Cor. 7:6 a general description of the character of God signifying His customary response to the meek, or, more to Paul's point, to the meek of believing Israel. The transference of God's actions upon Israel to those upon the Church is a common occurrence and here again Paul identified himself and his co-workers\(^1\) with the people\(^2\) of the Isaiah passage. The continuity of deity is clear. Continuity of piety is implied in the adoption of \(\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\o\varsigma\) for the Christian community.

\(^1\)\(\eta\nu\iota\varsigma\).

\(^2\)\(\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\ \lambda\alpha\omicron\omicron\omicron,\ \text{LXX.}\)
### Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah 55:10</td>
<td>Isaiah 55:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יתננו</td>
<td>δὗ</td>
<td>ἐπιχορηγοῦν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>השך</td>
<td>σπέρμα</td>
<td>σπέρμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שךך</td>
<td>τῇ</td>
<td>τῇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>סטוית</td>
<td>σπειροντι</td>
<td>σπειροντι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כככ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρτον</td>
<td>ἀρτον</td>
<td>ἀρτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὶς</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρῶσιν</td>
<td>βρῶσιν</td>
<td>βρῶσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χορηγῆσει</td>
<td></td>
<td>χορηγῆσει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πληθυνεῖ</td>
<td></td>
<td>πληθυνεῖ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸν</td>
<td></td>
<td>τὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σπόρον</td>
<td></td>
<td>σπόρον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑμῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td>ὑμῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὔξησει</td>
<td></td>
<td>αὔξησει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὰ</td>
<td></td>
<td>τὰ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hosea 10:12</th>
<th>Hosea 10:12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εῶς</td>
<td>εῶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νησὶ-ὐ</td>
<td>τοῦ ἐλθεῖν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for the Isa. passage and neither does BHK for the Hosea pericope.

Septuagintal Variants

Isa. 55:10

Δώσετι is read for όω by A-26 (δυση) and 198. σπειραντι is read by the Lucianic sub-group 62-147-233 91 544 and Justin.

Hos. 10:12

The GLXX notes that 130-311 of the Catena sub-group read ου ελθειν while Q*-198 and Cyr of the Alexandrian group read ου ελθη. The Lucianic sub-group 46-86-711 with LaS Bo Syh Th. Tht. Spec. transpose γεν δικ ambient but the main Lucianic groups 22-36-48-51-231-719-763 and 62-14 read ουμεν δικ γεν. B 130-311-239-613 410 read ημεν while 106 and Aeth read ουμων.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that σπειρα is read by Ν Κ D b et Ε Κ L P al fere omn Chr 682 Cyr glaph 228 Euthal cod
There is no need to give a highly detailed comparison of how Paul conflated the OT passages because of the lack of both an IF and, therefore, a lack of specific appeal to biblical authority. But the Isa. passage is nearly exactly quoted. The only difference being Paul's

1Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 239.
reading of ἐπιχορηγῶν for ἑαυτοῦ.

Contextual

Isa. 55:10

The immediate context is the great invitation to the banquet of Yahweh.¹ The Davidic promises would be fulfilled² but men must still seek the Lord in repentance. The passage which Paul quoted was illustrative of how God's word would permeate its object and achieve its end just as the rain permeates the earth achieving the sustenance to him who sows and eats.

Hos. 10:12

The broad context is that of impending judgment on the Northern Kingdom. The immediate context concerns the judgment on Ephraim.

The Corinthian context is the same as for the Prov. 22:8, 2 Cor. 9:9 quotation.

Hermeneutical

Isa. 55:10 was used in MR³ regarding the heavenly origin of all things. It is again used in MR⁴ to argue that all was created from the earth alone. Paul used the quotation in quite a different way. Menzies suggests that these OT texts had been previously used in Paul's way "among people who regarded almsgiving as a principal

means of grace."\(^1\) It is not evident, however, that the Corinthians were having such a problem nor would Paul let such a problem go without specific mention and correction. At any rate, what Paul spoke of was not the source of righteousness but its fruit (γενήματα, vs 10). The offering was continually called a ministry (διακονία) rather than a righteousness. Paul took the physical aspects of the Isa. 55 passage and used them in a figuraiive way to describe the manner in which God would cause the Corinthians to abound in good works. Paul's point was that the Corinthians must see that God would provide for them even when they gave up their goods to others. God would not only give them seed (material goods) to give away but would also put bread on their tables to meet their own daily needs.

Regarding σπέρμα and σπόρον Plummer writes that the distinction is important. He sees the former to be literal seed but σπόρον "used of the gifts which must be scattered generously, and which God will supply and augment."\(^2\) There is no such distinction inherent within the words. They were used interchangeably in Philo\(^3\) and

\(^1\)Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 67.

\(^2\)Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 263.

virtually always translate γῆ in the LXX. In Paul both words are used synonymously and both show a preference for the figurative sense.¹ This use by Paul is methodologically the same as in Isa. 55 where the rain and its effects were figures of the productive word of God. In both places the seed and bread are figures or illustrations of the effectual provisions of God. The actions of God are in Isa. 55 related to the surety of His saving work with Israel whereas the actions of God in 2 Cor. 9:10 result in the increase of righteous deeds by the believers. The Hosea passage is an allusion to the context of sowing and reaping of righteous deeds. The words in Paul's quotation may only have a fortuitous similarity.²

The Isa. passage does not attribute the provisions of rain and harvest to Yahweh but Paul has used it ascriptively of God. This is an OT phrase which had become a religious cliché. The combination with Hosea 10:12 furthered the agricultural motif begun by Paul in 2 Cor. 9:6. Both passages are theologically charged. Hosea used the farming imagery with reference to moral living after repentance. Isa. used the divinely ordained

¹Schulz, TDNT VII, pp. 545-46.
processes of nature to illustrate the effectiveness of God's utterances. This was also within the context of repentance followed by God's promised blessing. Both passages relate to the nation Israel. While not a chain quotation, these passages follow upon Paul's quotation of Psa. 112:9 in 2 Cor. 9:9 and are directly related to it in the sowing and righteousness motifs as well as in the general 2 Cor. context of aiding the poor. 2 Cor. 9:10 is therefore a wish, based on Scriptural concepts, that the Corinthians would recognize God's ongoing provision for them and respond to that by freely sharing their goods.
**Textual Display**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isa. 64:3</td>
<td>Isa. 64:4</td>
<td>καθώς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γέγραπται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡμέρα</td>
<td>ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑμιλία</td>
<td>οὐκ ἡκούσαμεν</td>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑμνοῦν</td>
<td>οὗτε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡμῶν</td>
<td>οἱ διδασκόμενοι</td>
<td>διδασκόμεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡμιθνία</td>
<td>εἰλίου</td>
<td>εἰλίευν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰδιός</td>
<td>θεόν</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φυσών</td>
<td>πλὴν</td>
<td>οὐκ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπενακάρυτον</td>
<td>οὐδὲ</td>
<td>οὐκ ἡκουσεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa. 65:16</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γὰρ</td>
<td>τα</td>
<td>ἐπι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἑργάζεται</td>
<td>ἔργα</td>
<td>καρδιάν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσέχει</td>
<td>σου</td>
<td>ἀνθρώπου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>οὐκ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer. 3:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀνέβη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγει</td>
<td>α ποιήσεις</td>
<td>οῦσα ἡτοίμασεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγει</td>
<td>δο θεὸς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βεβαίω</td>
<td>τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν</td>
<td>τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The underlinings show affinities between LXX & NT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isa. 64:4</td>
<td>ελεον</td>
<td>αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Isa. 65:16: . . . καὶ συν ἀναβήσεται ἀυτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν. . . .

Jer. 3:16 . . . συν ἀναβήσεται ἐπὶ καρδίαν. . . .

### Masoretic Variants

**Isa. 64:4** (:3 MT)

BHS notes the LXX plural of ἕκουσαμεν and suggests ὃς πλῆθος as the Hebrew underlying Paul's quotation.¹

**Isa. 65:16**

BHS lists no variants.

**Jer. 3:16**

BHS lists no variants.

### Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX shows that A* alone omits θεον πλην σου. 564 omits θεον. The Hexaplaric sub-group 109-736 omits the σου after ἐργα. In place of α 22-48-51-231-763 62-147 90-130-311 36-93-96 -233 403-613 544 770 and Theodoret read αληθινα και. 534 and possibly 565 read ποιετος for

---

τοιριας. 22-48-51-231-763 62-147 90-130-311 36-93-96
-233 538 770 and Theodoret follow υπομένουσιν with δε
while 106 and the Sahidic add σοι. Ἔλεος is read by 86*-106
147-233 198 239-306 403-613 407 538 544: cf. 16:5.
Τὸν ἑλεον is read by 565. σ' reads τοὺς προσδοκώσαν
αὐτον. The three read ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ ἑδεν (Q) for οὐδε-
εἶδον.

Isa. 65:16

Αὐτῶν is transposed with επὶ τὴν καρδιάν in 106
22-48-51-231-763 36-93-96 the Syrohexapla and Hieronymus.
Homoioteleuton occurs with the καρδιάν of vs 17 in 90-130
-311.

Jer. 3:16

Οὐχ is preceded by οτι in 26 239 410 544 Sahidic
and by et in the Arabic Armenian which equals MT; οὐδε μη
is read by Pseudo-Chrysostom. Εἰς is given for επὶ by
Pseudo-Chrysostom. Theodoret reads καρδιαν. Τὴν καρδιαν
αὐτῶν is given by Q, Pseudo-Chrysostom, Sahidic plus the
Bohairic. 26 adds αὐτῶν; the Arabic adds ὑμῶν.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that A B D E F G L etc. read
ἑδεν while C P etc. read ὑδεν. ἄν is read by (P\textsuperscript{46} Nestle)
Κ D E F G L P al omnvid, Polyc\textsuperscript{mart} 393 Clem\textsuperscript{625,659}
Or\textsuperscript{2,564,809} et\textsuperscript{3,361} Const\textsuperscript{7,32,2} etc. Item quae d e f g r
vg Or\textsuperscript{1,154} et\textsuperscript{2,300,667} et\textsuperscript{3,44} etc. οσσα is read by A
B C vid Clem\textsuperscript{393} (-οσσα ητοιμασεν τοὺς υπομενουσιν αὐτον) al.
Textual

Past Efforts to Locate the Source of the Quotation. The location of the precise Old Testament passage or passages which Paul quotes has presented a continual problem for interpreters. Their conclusions may be classed under three headings. The first is that the quotation was not taken from the OT.

An Extra-biblical Source. J. A. Fitzmyer offers this quotation as an example of the "use of well-known introductory formulas to cite a passage which is not found in the Old Testament."\(^1\) Origen, in his commentary on Mat. 27:19, identifies the Apocalypse of Elijah as Paul's source.\(^2\) Hammerton-Kelly\(^3\) favors a lost Jewish Apocalypse as the source. Resch sees the authoritative source behind Paul's quote to be a word of the Lord.\(^4\)

Of Indeterminate Origin. The second position asserts that the source of Paul's quotation is not

---

\(^1\) Fitzmyer, NTS 7:304. See also Bertil E. Gärtner, "The Pauline and Johannine Idea of 'To Know God' against the Hellenistic Background," New Testament Studies 14 (1967), p. 215, who avows that the quotation is "certainly not from the Old Testament."

\(^2\) Johannis Drusius, TA IEPA ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ (Franekeræ: Exudgebat Aegidius Radacus, 1588), p. 115, also.

\(^3\) Hammerton-Kelly, PWSM, p. 114.

\(^4\) Resch, Ag., pp. 27; 110. But this is effectively refuted by Pierre Prigent, "Ce que l'œil n'a pas vu, 1 Cor. 2,9," Theologische Zeitschrift 14 (1958), pp. 423-24.
recoverable. Ellis notes this as one of a group of passages which can be described as "merely quotations of substance whose source is conjectural."\(^1\)

**Free Rendering of Isa. 64:4.** The third major position is that Paul freely rendered the Isa. 64:4 passage. Toy asserts\(^2\) that Paul only took the general concept from Isaiah.\(^3\)

According to Héring the IF "must introduce a textual quotation" though Isa. 64:4 only has a slim correspondence.\(^4\) Grosheide and Barrett also hold that the quotation was from the OT but that its exact location is unknown.\(^5\) Barrett favors Isa. 64:4 and 65:16 and concludes that Paul either had a text differing from the MT

\(^1\)Ellis, PUOT, p. 35. Bruce, 1\& 2 Cor., p. 39, states that the IF implies a source from an authoritative work "but the document cannot be identified." Wendland, Kor., p. 24, also pleads ignorance as to the source.

\(^2\)Toy, QNT, p. 171. Randolph, TPNT, p. 31, in characteristic fashion, finds the sense agreeable to the Hebrew Isaiah, excludes an apocryphal source due to the IF, and concludes that the Hebrew text was probably corrupted by Jewish influences and that Paul found his reference in a "more correct copy." Gough, NTQ, p. 323, echoes Randolph.

\(^3\)Johnson, QNTO, p. 152, locates the quotation in Isa. 52:15, and says it is "identical with the quotation in sense and similar to it in language."

\(^4\)Héring, 1 Cor., p. 18. Also Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 41. It is noteworthy that in classics one finds that a purposely free quotation of material was a kind of "sign of mastery" over the source. cf. Stendahl, SSM, p. 157.

\(^5\)Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 66 and Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 73.
or inaccurately quoted from memory. Robertson\(^1\) concludes that Isa. 64:4 was the source of the quotation and states that "Paul quotes with great freedom, often compounding different passages and altering words to suit his purpose."\(^2\)

Commenting on Isa. 64:4, Jerome disagrees with Origen's conclusions regarding the Apocalypse of Elijah being Paul's source and notes that the passage also occurs in the Ascension of Isaiah. Epiphanius, in Heresies 42, states that the Apoc. of Elijah quotes also from Eph. 5:14. This immediately raises the probability of the use of 1 Cor. 2:9 as well. Also, the Isa. 64:4 quotation is only present in the Latin Ascension of Isaiah, which is a later work.\(^3\) The quotation is absent from the earlier Ethiopic version which itself also underwent Christian redaction. Lightfoot\(^4\) dates the Apoc. of Elijah and the Ascension of Isaiah in the second century.

Another recent contender for the source of the quotation has been the Testament of Jacob, but here again

\(^1\)Robertson, 1 Cor., pp. 41-42. See also Clement of Rome (34.8).

\(^2\)Ellis, PUOT, p. 35, notes 1-4, provides an overview of the past research into the quotation's source. See also Feuillet, TD 14:145.

\(^3\)Thackeray, RPJT, p. 241.

\(^4\)Lightfoot, NEP, p. 177. Also Resch, Ag., p. 27.
the evidence points toward the borrowing by the Testament of Jacob from 1 Cor. 2:9.¹ The Testament's list of the punishments of sinners was influenced by Rev. 21:8; the "fearful" character of judgment derives from Heb. 10:26−31; and the description of the blessings of the righteous is from 1 Cor. 2:9.² Paul was therefore not dependent on the Testament of Jacob.

Pseudo-Philo (LAB) has a most interesting coincidence of thought and words in XXVI 12. The general context³ concerns precious stones, made by God to replace those of the pagan Amorite idolatries, which are placed in the house of God with the tables of the Law and later moved to the Temple. After the Temple was destroyed the stones were deposited, in the place from whence they came, to be reserved until the end time. This is "that place which eye hath not seen nor ear heard neither has it come up into the heart of man."⁴ When the stones are once again brought into the world the sun and moon will

¹Von Nordheim, ZNW 65:112-120, finds a common source behind the Testament and 1 Cor. 2:9. Hofius, ZNW 66:140-142, gives compelling evidence for the conclusion that the Testament borrowed from 1 Cor. 2:9. He also can demonstrate its borrowing from the NT writings, as diverse as Mt., 1 Cor., Ro., Heb., and Rev.

²Sparks, H. F. D., "1 Kor. 2:9 A Quotation From The Coptic Testament of Jacob?" Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 67 (1976), pp. 275-76.

³James, BAP, p. 157.

⁴This is quoted in the Latin in Thackeray, SPJT, p. 244. Thackeray dates LAB c. A.D. 70.
no longer be needed. The phrase was therefore current in the first century Judaism in Palestine and may represent a Jewish anthology in oral and written form.

With this brief survey in mind, there is a general consensus that the quotation has at least some affinities with Isa. 64:4. We conclude that Paul freely quoted from the conceptuality of the Isa. passage.

The Relation of Paul's Text-form to the LXX and MT. The LXX of Isa. 64:4 differs in several ways from the MT. A few pertinent changes are: the verb "to hear" is changed from third common plural to second plural; ἀκούσαντες is omitted; eye is made a plural; ἡμῶν is an addition; καὶ τὰ ἑργα σου ἀ is an addition; ἔστησά is changed to second person singular; ἐλεοῦν is an addition. The LXX either expanded the Hebrew rather freely or worked from a text other than an MT type.

With Paul the subject "we" of the LXX and "they" of MT has been changed to "things which," (α). Α first serves as an accusative of εἰδεν and ἢμουσεν then as nominative for ἀνεβη and thirdly in the accusative in

1Cf. Isa. 60:19-20.

2Thackeray, SPJT, p. 245. This rendering is also found in a Jewish collection cited by Ellis, (PUOT, p. 36, n. 12, continued from p. 35) which bears the title Mikropresbutikon, Basle 1950 [sic] (The date should read 1550). This aligns with the theory that the passage had a first century circulation.

3Harrison, IOT, p. 798.
apposition to ὑπάλληλον. The order of "seeing" and "hearing" is reversed. ὑπάλληλον is anarthrous (and singular as in the three) as in the Hebrew. Paul's verbs of seeing and hearing are in third singular.

If Isa. 64:4 was used as the key text then καὶ εἶπεν ἀνέβη is an insertion. ἡ τοιμασία is in third singular as is the Hebrew. ἀγαπῶσαι and αὐτοῦ are interpolations. If this is a representation of Isa. 64:4 it is certainly a free one. Of course "if Paul had a variant Greek text closer to his quotations, a textual solution is not improbable for 1 Cor. 2.9." While not conclusive, Paul's reading of ὑπάλληλον ὅπως εἶδεν is very close to the three's reading of ὑπάλληλον ὅπως ἠδειν and may be evidence for an early Greek OT reading differing from the LXX.

A comparison of 1 Cor. 2:9 with Isa. 64:4 does show, however, a correspondence of several important terms in the first third of the quotation: ἁκούω, ὑπάλληλον and ὁρῶ. The aorist of ἁκούω comes last in the word order of the three in 1 Cor. 2:9. The tense of the two verbs remains the same with a change to the singular number in Corinthians.

1Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 40, finds this syntax "not at all violent."

2Ellis, PUOT, p. 36. Of course, such a statement almost goes without saying and could apply to most all of the quotations which vary from the LXX or MT.
There is no textual correspondence in the middle section (καὶ ἐπὶ ... Ἀνέβη) with Isa. 64:4. This phrase has strong similarities with Isa. 65:16 and Jer. 3:16 though the particle/verb and preposition/noun syntax is reversed in Corinthians.

The last part of 1 Cor. 2:9 shows the least affinity with Isa. 64:4 although the syntactical similarities should not be overlooked. Both passages commence with a relative pronoun and verb, followed by a dative of indirect object in the article, a verb of the same number, and a substantive in the accusative case. This syntactical similarity included in the same passage as the first part of the quote establishes a sufficiently plausible textual relationship when one is considering what appears to be a freely adapted quotation.

The problem, then, of locating Paul's Old Testament source stems not so much from lack of clear indication, which is evidenced by the common identification of the quotation as Isa. 64:4 with 65:16-17 or Jer. 3:16, but from a propensity to view the quotation in total as a near exact representation of another written source. With Paul's tendencies toward paraphrase and expansion, a forcing of the quote into such a rigid framework is unnecessary.

Contextual

Wisdom. Paul, in continuing the discussion of
the superiority of God's wisdom over man's, considered the wisdom which was only spoken among the wise.\(^1\) Paul gave the marks of God's foolishness in the world in chapter 1 and he commenced chapter 2 by showing how his ministry was conformed to the foolishness of the cross.\(^2\) He has already called the foolishness of the cross σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ in 1:21; θεοῦ σοφίαν in 1:24; and σοφία ἡμῶν in 1:30 thus establishing the ground for what he says in 2:6. The key term μυστήριον had been applied in 2:1 to the message which Paul proclaimed to the Corinthians. It would seem, then, that when Paul mentioned a wisdom spoken ἐν τελεῖοις he has receptivity in mind rather than a spatial and secretively exclusive sense. This is borne out by his ψυχικός/πνευματικός exposition. This section\(^3\) follows the description of Paul's preaching and was designed to show why his words could possibly be rejected or misunderstood. If Paul's way was the way approved by God, why wasn't it more in evidence and more universally accepted? Paul's answer evidences both an apologetic and a hortatory purpose and tactic.

There is an interesting comparison of conceptuality with Paul in Mt. 13:14-15 which mentions Isa. 6:9-10

\(^1\) 1 Cor. 2:6ff.

\(^2\) Note the similar terms in 1 Cor. 2: ἀσθενεία, vs 3; σοφίας, vs 4; δυνάμεως, vs 4; the whole of vs 5 is reminiscent of 1:17b.

\(^3\) 1 Cor. 2:6-16.
in reference to seeing, hearing and perceiving in the heart. The context concerns Israel's rebellious attitudes. Matthew displayed a similar division as Paul between those to whom the message of God was hidden and those to whom receptivity had been given. Both Isa. 6:9-10 (Mat.) and 64:4 (Paul) were used in polemical ways to explain why the Gospel was hidden from Israel yet known by the Christians.¹ This reinforces the understanding of the rulers as being humans.

The Rulers of the Age. Paul pointed out that the rulers of his age had no share in true wisdom because it was embodied in a mystery from which the rulers themselves were excluded. Knox and Schmithals view these rulers as angels rather than men and find this confirmed by 1 Cor. 15:24.² Allen³ sees the rulers to be supernatural in view of the Psa. 23:7 LXX connection of rulers and glory. It seems, at best, that 1 Cor. 15:24 includes both human and angelic-demonic rule in its general statement of πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν. Death was one such enemy to be subjected and this is

¹See also Mt. 11:25-27 and Lk. 10:23-24.
neither a terrestrial nor extra-terrestrial being according to Paul. Bornkamm asserts, in a study of Ro. 13, that ἐξουσία has a purely political meaning in the singular and plural and is parallel to ἀρχοντες which equal earthly rulers. These words only describe demonic powers with explicit additions in the NT. G. H. C. Macgregor takes the best of both and concludes that Paul included both the cosmic and human executives. The connection with 1 Cor. 1:26 and 2:8 implies men. The concept of seeing and hearing are explicable only if related to humans.

Wesley Carr notes that the rulers in Wisdom are human and that the καταραγομένων of 1 Cor. 2:6 refers to "decline into unimportance" not destruction. In Baruch,

1 See Eph. 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:13; Dan. 10:13; 1 Pet. 1:12; Ro. 8:38; Col. 2:15; 1 Thess. 2:15.


4 Carr, NTS 23:33-35, endorses Thackeray's 9th Ab homily connection as best explaining the inclusion of the ἀρχοντες. See Bar. 3:9-4:4 for just such a homily.
as always in wisdom literature, the rulers are human. Thus Paul had men like Pilate, Herod, Caiaphas in mind.\(^1\) The context also indicates human leaders whose\(^2\) ignorance was that of the plan of God through the Cross. Thus the rulers' ignorance of this mystery was demonstrated by their treatment of Christ.\(^3\) Verse 9 was designed to show that the rulers acted in accord,\(^4\) \(καθὼς\), with what was written in an authoritative document and that this action was a direct contrast (\(ἀλλὰ\)) with the condition supposed by vs 8. After having supplied the condition of the rulers' actions towards Christ in vss 8-9, Paul then proceeded to illumine the medium through which the mystery was revealed: the Spirit. This both explains why the rulers did not know the wisdom of God and why it was possible for the believer. The basic elements of the context are: 1) the wisdom-mystery of God; 2) the ignorance of the rulers; 3) the spiritual medium for knowing God's wisdom. The quotation was designed to illustrate number two.

\(^1\) Carr, NTS 23:21. Lk. 12:11 uses rulers in a human sense. For τοῦ ἀνῶνος τούτου see 1 Cor. 1:20 and 2 Cor. 4:4.


\(^3\) 1 Cor. 2:8.

\(^4\) The fact that καθὼς is part of the IF does not dilute its adverbial force of manner.
Paul could not escape from relating his argument to the crucifixion of Christ. He saw man's attitude to Christ to be dependent on his use of true wisdom, which was to be equated with the pure word of the cross. The elements of Paul's thoughts had been the cross, the worldly-wise, and true wisdom. In this section the apologetic function surfaces as Paul showed why the rulers rejected true wisdom and used them as a foil for those that had the wisdom revealed to them. This contrast was central to Paul's developing argument.

The Isaiah Context. In Isa. 64:4 the prophet cried out to Yahweh in the midst of the turmoil surrounding the fall of Israel. While the precise date of this oracle is not obtainable its context clearly shows a desire on the part of the writer for God to manifest Himself as in days past and his reason, as given in Isa. 64:4, was because of the great length of time which had elapsed since the people had seen God visibly in action. The idea was that an appearance of Yahweh would end the ignorant animosity of the adversaries and would cause the nations to tremble in acknowledgement of God's presence.

Isa. 65:16 presents a context of punishment for Israel's enemies and blessedness for Israel in the new

---

1 Cor. 2:10.  
2 Isa. 64:3.  
3 Isa. 64:2.
heaven and earth. Troubles will be forgotten and not come to mind, vs 16, and all the former things will be forgotten, vs 17.

Jeremiah 3:16 also looked ahead to the messianic reign but referred to the forgetting of the ark of the covenant because Jerusalem itself would become the throne of the Lord.\(^1\)

The Isa. 64:4 passage is most appropriate to the Corinthian context. Paul had in mind the rebellious acts of the Jewish rulers while Isaiah speaks of the need for the nations to tremble at His presence. The components of ignorant rulers and the need for divine revelation apply to both contexts.

Hermeneutical

IF Used Only for OT Writings. It is to be doubted that Paul ever uses an introductory formula to refer to non-canonical writings, unless this instance should be the exception.\(^2\) J. A. Fitzmyer, on the other hand, says that "it is much more likely that the introductory

\(^1\)Jer. 3:17.

\(^2\)Henry Owen, The Modes Of Quotation Used By The Evangelical Writers Explained And Vindicated (London: J. Nichols, 1789), pp. 12f, has noted that IF are only used to point to biblical citations. Ellis, PUOT, pp. 35-37, notes that "the presence of an IF raises the inference of an immediate or ultimate OT source." Prigent, TZ 14:421-22. Lightfoot, NEP, p. 177. Johnson, QNT, p. 152. Bonsirven, EREP, p. 320. Questionable passages concerning IF: 1 Cor. 2:9; Eph. 4:8, 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:45b; 1 Tim. 5:18b.
formulae were at times used loosely also of other literature which served some didactic or ethical purpose.”¹ Textual and contextual factors have shown that the OT is the source of this quotation and the IF is therefore an additional support for this conclusion. It remains to be seen what were the forces at work in the selection and alteration of the passage to fit the context of 1 Cor. 2.

One assumes that the quotation was inserted not to confuse but to enlighten and would therefore be identifiable to at least some of its readers. This being the case it is sufficient to see the general identity with a passage such as Isa. 64:4 until further textual discovery should convince one to look elsewhere. The general identification is clear enough considering the implications of the introductory formula and Paul's tendency to alter his texts.

Jewish Usages. Another tendency is the influence of the Rabbis. Since Paul is known to freely adapt his quotations,² an approach which sees this particular one to be more free than others seems reliable. The fragmentary nature of the quotation which may imply the unquoted section of the OT verse can be ascribed to Paul's rabbin-

¹Fitzmyer, NTS 7:304.
²See Appendix II and III, Ellis, PUOT, pp. 155ff and 186ff.
ical (Judaistic) training.\(^1\) Davies states that "the language that he [Paul] used in 1 Cor. 2.9 to describe the blessedness of the age to come was evidently traditional in Judaism."\(^2\) In Sifre, Num. xxvii 12, sec. 135 and Targum this passage is given an eschatological interpretation.\(^3\)

This quotation may have been part of an earlier tradition which was taken over by Paul.\(^4\) The setting for the passage's development was the synagogue liturgy.\(^5\) The first and last parts of the quotation are found separately or in reverse order in various Jewish and Christian literatures. Prigent's examples of the separate quotation of the first part are from later Christian writers such as Hegesippus, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Theophilus of Antioch. The minor variations in these quotations show

\(^{1}\)Ellis, PUOT, pp. 45-46. However, Orr, 1 Cor., p. 157, queries that if Paul was manufacturing a quotation why not make one that fit his grammatical context better?

\(^{2}\)Davies, PRJ, p. 307.

\(^{3}\)Scroggs, NTS 14:47, n. 4, writes: "Thus Paul varies the text in the same direction as it was, apparently, customarily done by the Jews of his day. In both structure and content the passage can be seen without too much difficulty as a free midrash by Paul."

\(^{4}\)Prigent, TZ 14:416.

\(^{5}\)Feuillet agrees with Prigent, TZ 14:428, at this point, TD 14:145.
an independence from Paul as their source. The examples
Prigent gives of the book a presentation of the passage
are statedly dependent on Paul. The Jewish evidence
for a parentage with 1 Cor. 2:9 is drawn from a third
century Midrash on Prov. 13:26 and Siphre, Num. 27:12.
From this Prigent concludes that Paul was neither the
compiler nor inventor of 1 Cor. 2:9. However, Siphre and
the Midrash do not take the thought or syntax much beyond
the Hebrew, none adds the "upon the heart" phrase, and
none have "love" for "await." While Paul may well be
dependent upon a Jewish source, the evidence brought by
Prigent does not make this conclusive. Also, Paul's use
of the passage is primarily related to earthly, rather
than the heavenly, blessings referred to in the Jewish
literature. Grosheide views this as a possible hymn of
Old Testament texts quoted by Paul but favors the opinion
that Paul quoted the LXX of Isa. 64:4 "for the first and
last part of the quotation and Isa. 65:17 for the
middle."^1

---

1Prigent, TZ 14:417. Lightfoot, NEP, p. 177, how-
ever, sees them to be more like Paul than the LXX.

2Donald A. Hagner, The Use Of The Old And New
Testaments In Clement Of Rome (Leiden: E. J. Brill,
1967), p. 204, has shown regarding 1 Cor. 2:9 that Paul
was dependent on the LXX and that Clement was dependent
on Paul.

3Also Bauer, ZNW 50:108. See Ro. 8:28; 1 Cor.
8:3; Psa. 96:10; 144:20 for "those loving God."

4Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 66. Feuillet, RB 70:63,
finds nonverbal affinities of sense between this passage,
Pauline Conflation of OT Texts. While the middle section of the quotation has strong affinities with Isa. 65:16 and 17, it is doubtful that Paul was quoting them. For Paul to have been consciously quoting Isa. 65:16 or 17 he then would have divided Isa. 64:4 in two parts and inserted the phrase in the middle. This would certainly not be unique in Paul's editing of quotations. Paul, in five quotations, Ro. 3:15-17, 9:27-8, 10:6-8, Eph. 6:2-3, and 1 Cor. 2:16 simply omits the central portions, quoting the first and last parts. Therefore the fact that he omits the central part of Isa. 64:4 is not unusual.

Less common in merged or chain quotations is the interpolation of one quotation into the middle of another in A-B-A form. This is only found in Ro. 9:33 and 11:8. In Ro. 9:33 a portion of Isa. 8:14 is placed into a quotation of Isa. 28:16. In Ro. 11:8, Isa. 29:10 is inserted after an arrangement of the εψωμεν and δ θεος from Deut. 29:4. Therefore it is part of Paul's procedure to merge one quotation into the middle of another.

Ecclesiastes 1:10 Ben Sirach and Job 28 and concludes that Paul is developing a theme from Old Testament sapiential literature. Job 28:27 uses ἔνωμαι very similarly to 1 Cor. 2:9. Feuillet writes, p. 144, that "even if the text definitely depends on OT and Jewish sources, it still must be explained primarily by its immediate context." It would be difficult, however, to be able to clearly and consistently separate the sapiential from the apocalyptic in the NT. See Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 82, n. 75, for the overlapping of prophecy and wisdom in the OT. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 82, opts for the apocalyptic label as does Wendland, Kor., p. 24.
Three factors, however, militate against the middle of 1 Cor. 2:9 being a quote from Isa. 65:16 or 17. First, the contexts from which the Old Testament passages of Ro. 9:33 and Ro. 11:8 are drawn are compatible with their use in Romans but the context of Isa. 65:16-17 is not relative to its use in Corinthians. It is a thesis of this paper that it is unlikely that Paul shows a total lack of regard for Old Testament context.

Secondly, if 1 Cor. 2:9 is a midrash-type presentation, a general reference to the Old Testament passage is all that is necessary and the rest of the quote may be merely Paul's elaboration. Jacob Lauterbach notes that often in the use of OT quotations in the Mekilta the interpretation is founded on the part of the passage which is not included in the commentary. The sign "..." is given to signify "etc." He writes:

There are also instances in which the real proof is derived not from the cited passage itself but from the context of the scriptural passage which makes it evident that the sense of the cited passage is such as to furnish the proof required by the midrash.\(^1\)

It is not necessary, therefore, that every part of the quotation passage have an exact Old Testament counterpart.

Thirdly, the phrase ἐπὶ γαρ διὸν ... ἄνεβη

\(^1\)Lauterbach, Mek. I, p. lx. A similar point is made by Dodd regarding the context-pointer qualities of NT quotations.
appears to be a simple idiom rather than a quotation.\(^1\) Stephen, quoting Ex. 2:11-12 in Acts 7:23, uses ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν when referring to Moses' decision to visit his people Israel. The Greek phrase is not part of the language of Ex. 2, however. It was merely a part of Stephen's exposition. This phrase is a Semitic idiom for "come to mind" or "to think of." \(^2\) 'Ἀναβαίνω translates twenty-one Hebrew words. \(^2\) It is found in conjunction with ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν in Isa. 65:16; Jer. 3:16; 28 (51):50; 39 (32):35; 51 (44):21; Ezek. 38:10 and means "to come to mind" in all cases. As this is a literal translation of the Hebrew, it is a Semitic idiom which had come over into the Greek. The synonymous nature of the idiom with the Hebrew רכז is clearly seen in the chiastic synonymous parallelism of Jer. 51:50 (28:50 LXX).\(^3\)

Since this is an idiom, it is probable that Paul, after noting the rulers' lack of perception by ear and eye, simply added in midrashic style the third possibility for gaining knowledge, the human imagination, rather than consciously conflating another OT passage.

---

\(^1\) Lightfoot, NEP, p. 176, calls this a "Hebrew expression." See Acts 7:23; Jer. 3:16; 34:21; 51:50.

\(^2\) H& R I, p. 70.

\(^3\) יְהַבֵּין מְאֹדָתְךָ וְגִמְלֶיתָךְ וְיִרְשֵׁשׁלוּ מִיּוֹתְם, MT LXX μηθοσθε τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἱεροσολύμων ἀναβητώ ἐπὶ καρδίαν οὐμῶν.
Summary. Paul's use of the passage coheres with the sense of the OT context. Clemen writes that "der Prophet meint die Gottesoffenbarung in der Erlösung aus dem Exil, Paulus die Erfüllung dieses Vorbildes in dem neutestamentlichen Heil."\(^1\) Woods, on the other hand, finds it to be unfitting to the context in its awkward construction because Paul quoted it as a unit rather than composing it at hand.\(^2\) Resch argues that because the quotation is so foreign to the context of Isaiah and cannot be found there, it must be from a lost work.\(^3\) Lindars sees this section, 1 Cor. 2:6-16, to be shaped around the "widely used" Isa. 6:10.\(^4\) Because he was not quoting for proof,\(^5\) but rather for illustration, he was not so concerned with literal accuracy.\(^6\) While one would not go so far as to say that the ἄδικως makes the question of justice to the original meaning "irrelevant"\(^7\) the

\(^1\)Clemen, GAT, p. 191.
\(^2\)Woods, HDB IV, p. 186.
\(^3\)Resch, Ag., p. 125. See James Hardy Ropes, "Die Sprüche Jesu Die In Den Kanonischen Evangelien Nicht Überliefert Sind," Texte Und Untersuchungen 14, no. 2 (1896), pp. 19-22, for a refutation of Resch's view regarding 1 Cor. 2:9. No ET is available.
\(^4\)Lindars, NTA, p. 246. \(^5\)Johnson, QNT, p. 153.
\(^7\)Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 66.
modal nature of the quotation is sufficiently true to the OT context to clearly link the blindness of those who crucified Christ with the ignorance bewailed by Isaiah.  

This both illustrated why the rulers acted as they did and supports the concepts of revelation and wisdom being developed by Paul in the broader context. The use of Θεός throughout 1 Cor. 2:7-10 shows a continuity of deity between the Testaments in Paul's mind.

The quotation was used, therefore, to show why the rulers were ignorant of God's intentions in Jesus as Messiah and why they crucified Him. It also has an aspect of exclusivism which was then developed in vs 10. The idea was that those who were loving God would know what He had prepared. The use of αγαπώσων rather than the LXX ὑπομενον των directly related to Paul's contrast of the attitude of those who crucified Christ with that of the Christians. Paul parted company with the Jewish and

---

1With regard to Rabbinic interpretations of Isa. 64:3, Johannes Bapt. Bauer, "... ΤΟΙΣ ΑΓΑΠΩΣΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 50 (195), p. 110, writes: "Jedenfalls wird aus dem altjudischen Verständnis der Jesajastelle klar, dass Paulus diese Interpretation ablehnen müsste. Also fasst er den Text ganz behutsam neu, indem er unmissverständlich den echteren, tieferen Sinn unterlegt: nicht die selbstgerechten oder die Gesetzeskundigen, sondern die, die das ware Gesetz der Leibe leitet, das sind diejenigen, auf die die Verheissung wirklich Zutrifft. Die Wendung, die er dafür sahlt, passt einerseits auch auf die alttestamentlichen Frommen, wie Abraham, anderseits nimmt sie dem zeitgenossischen Verständnis die Spitze, noch mehr, sie lasst die Verheissung nicht nur für das Judenvolk, sondern für alle götthingegebenen Menschen gelten."
later Christian traditions which used Isa. 64:4 as an example of heavenly blessings. Paul's quotation referred to the word of the Cross which offered both present and future benefits and highlighted the inability of men to know these things without divine enablement.
Textual Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT (9:23)</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָיֹ אֵֽלֶּ֑ה</td>
<td>ἀλλ'</td>
<td>ἔνα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָאָרֹֽב</td>
<td>ἔν</td>
<td>καθός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְהֹוָֽה</td>
<td>τούτῳ</td>
<td>γέγραπται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִנְחֹֽלֶּ֑ל</td>
<td>καυχάσθω</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַנְחֹֽלֶּ֑ל</td>
<td>καυχώμενος</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַשָּֽכָל</td>
<td>συνίειν</td>
<td>καυχώμενος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֵּֽל</td>
<td>καֵֽי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֵֽז</td>
<td>γενώσχειν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָד</td>
<td>δί</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֵּֽי</td>
<td>ēγώ</td>
<td>ἔν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָפֵֽל</td>
<td>εἰν</td>
<td>κυρίῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִנְחֹֽלֶּ֑ל</td>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>καυχάσθω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masoretic Variants

BHS offers no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX notes that Clement in his epistle to the
Corinthians reads οὐ καυχῶμενος εν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω for Jer. 9:24. This appears to be a conformity to the reading of 1 Cor. 1:31 unless a textual solution be supposed.\(^1\) Swete notes that Q omits η; N in the first corrector reads με after γυνώομεν.

**New Testament Variants**

Tischendorf lists no variants for this passage. Nestle notes that \(^{P_{46}}\) and Tertullian read θεω in place of κυρίῳ which is possibly an attempt to translate and identify the Hebrew פֶּה.\(^2\)

**Textual**

Paul inverted the order of the participle and hortative of the LXX and replaced τοῦτο with κύριος which occurs later in the LXX passage. ἐν κυρίῳ appears between the verb and the verbal. This "near-quotation"\(^3\)

\(^1\)Lightfoot, NEP, p. 169, cf., also Hagner, OTCR, p. 204.

\(^2\)Recently George Howard, "The Tetragram And The New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature 96 (1977), pp. 63-83, has put forth a theory that the NT autographa contained either the Hebrew or an Aramaic or Greek transliteration of the divine name and that in the late first and early second centuries these were altered to read μЋ or Σ ثن. Howard asserts that such changes were not consistent thereby creating the uncertainty as to whether the Father or Son is in view in any given instance. In light of this radical thesis the question of who inserted κυρίῳ, Paul or a later editor, may have to remain an open one. Howard avoids dogma and admits his thesis needs much further study and verification.

\(^3\)Bruce, 182 Cor., p. 36. Eduard Böhl, Die Alttestamentlichen Zitate Im Neuen Testament (Wien:
is at variance with the LXX and the MT, both of which agree. One exception to this agreement might be in the idiomatic LXX translation of -\(\text{ON} \ ?\) by \(\text{ALLA}\), however, both terms express a similar adversative concept.

**Contextual**

This quotation is taken from the message delivered by Jeremiah in the temple gate. He criticized Judah's cultic worship in chapter 7 and in chapters 8-10 he spoke of the future destruction of the southern kingdom. A call is given in Jer. 9:12 for the wise man to give a reason why the land perishes, but the answer is given instead by the Lord. The people had forsaken His law and were walking in their own ways. Verses 23-24 are a summation of the call to the people which focused them on the heart of the matter: not their own might but the character of the Lord and His deeds were His delight.

In Jer. 9:23 ὁ σώφος is a subject repeated from 9:12 and relates to the concept at hand in 1 Cor. 1. This quotation forms the climax of a complex and detailed elaboration of the reason why God had chosen to act in the foolishness of the Cross. The first thing to come to Paul's mind when confronted with the problem of factions

---

Wilhelm Braumüller, 1878), p. 211, makes the questionable assertion that the Volksbibel gave Paul the authority to use this as a "herrlichen Zitat." Cerfaux, RHE 27:528, concludes that the Jeremiah passage, when compared with 1 Reigns 2:10LXX and 1 Clement 31:1, is the primitive reading.

1Jer. 7:1f.
was the centrality and implications of the cross of Christ.\(^1\) The word of wisdom made void the cross.\(^2\) The word of the cross was really the power of God\(^3\) and made ineffectual the opinions of Jew and Greek. As an example of this the believers were shown to be of low stature and origin in society.\(^4\) God's reason was to make ineffectual the items and concepts held high by unbelieving men. This is cataloged in vss 27-28. The purpose of this was to level all men before God.\(^5\) The quotation gave the proper authority to this assertion and brought the reader back to the centrality of Christ. For the wise man in the last days of Judah and in first century Corinth the object of boasting remained the same. \(\Delta χαλασμόν \) also occurs in 1 Cor. 1:30 and in Jer. 9:24. Both occurrences refer to the acts of God on earth, the latter in general morality, the former in the act of Christ.

**Hermeneutical**

The Old Testament quotation has the command to boast followed by the content of the boast. The New Testament precedes the command to boast with the specific

\begin{align*}
1 \text{ Cor. } 1:13. & \quad 2 \text{ Cor. } 1:17. \\
3 \text{ Cor. } 1:18-19. & \quad 4 \text{ Cor. } 1:26ff. \\
5 \text{ Cor. } 1:29. &
\end{align*}
of the boast.\(^1\) The participial phrase of Jer. 9:24\(^2\) of the LXX, \(\delta\) ποιῶν \(\kappa.\tau.\lambda\)., delineates the basic content of knowing and understanding the meaning of the phrase "I am Lord." Paul, in 1 Cor. 1:30, delineated "the Lord" by an adjectival relative clause, \(\delta\zeta\) \(\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\eta\eta\) \(\kappa.\tau.\lambda\). In both contexts the boasting was to center on the things of God. In Paul's case the Lord was to be equated with Christ. This brought a soteriological conception to bear in that self-righteousness was repugnant to God whether in Jews or Gentiles.\(^3\) In Corinthians, a principle of boasting was taken from one context and applied to a similar problem.

Paul had several concepts in mind which had a determinative hermeneutical effect on this chapter. He concluded that pride was at the heart of the factions; that this pride was being cloaked in the guise of wisdom; and that the cross had lost its central hold on their thoughts and actions. Thus the quotations are grouped around wisdom and boasting. It is interesting to note that these are not mere word associations but relate to a consistent and pre-conceived historical framework of

---

\(^1\) 1 Cor. 1:30.

\(^2\) Not included under the Textual Display section.

\(^3\) Wendland, 1 Kor., p. 21. Clemen, GAT, p. 189, calls \(\epsilon\nu\ k\upsilon\omega\) "die Principalursache alles Heils. . . ."
thought. The OT context is quite appropriate, especially with regard to the pairs of words in Jer. 9:23 LXX. ¹

While the historical setting of the OT and NT contexts differ in their specifics, the problem is quite similar. The solution is a principle, drawn "par une simplification réductrice, de Jérémie" and is a "déduction simple, par conversion négative, dirait-on en logique mineure."² This method of moving from the concrete situation of Jeremiah to a universal and abstract in 1 Corinthians is a legitimate and oft seen Pauline method.³

This portion of 1 Corinthians displays affinities with the Baruch Homily on wisdom.⁴ C. K. Barrett⁵ thinks the relation to Baruch is possible while F. F. Bruce thinks it "quite doubtful."⁶ If Paul used such a homily it would probably have been taken from the Haphtorah for the day of Ab 9 and would have had Jer.

¹Orr, 1 Cor., p. 156. Jer. 9:23 LXX: ἡ καυχάσω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ καυχάσω ὁ ἴσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ καυχάσω ὁ πλοῦσιος ἐν τῷ πλοῦτῳ αὐτοῦ.

²Bonsirven, EREP, p. 298.

³Bonsirven, EREP, p. 327.


⁵Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 51.

⁶Bruce, 1ē2 Cor., p. 37.
9:22ff as his sermon text.¹ Note the correspondence of σώφοι, δύνατοι, εὐγενεῖς of 1 Cor. 1:26 and 1:27 for τὰ ἀντιγράφα. Note also the use of ξενός, κρύα and δικαιοσύνην in Jer. 9:24 LXX and σοφία, δικαιοσύνη, ἀγιασμός απολυτρώσις in 1 Cor. 1:30.

What we observe in this use of the Old Testament is the extraction of a principle; to all appearances a valid one. When one speaks of drawing a principle, the question of validity always remains open. A principle is here considered valid in terms of Pauline thought only. Validity occurs when a consistency from the OT to the NT is adduced on the basis of the identification of the God of the OT with the God of the NT as expressed in His work in Jesus as the Messiah. Of course, for Paul, Yahweh of the OT was his God and what He said in the OT was valid for Paul's day, even apart from Jesus as Messiah. Therefore continuity of deity is essential and Jesus as Messiah provides a focus for OT thought. This principle was then applied by Paul to the Corinthian situation by a climactic reference to the specific Old Testament source. His aim was neither to reproduce the Old Testament context nor its specific words, but rather to adapt the sense of

¹Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 61. The Haftorah (Hebrew haphtarah, "conclusion") is the lesson in the Prophets read after the reading in the Law. Such lessons may be dated as early as 168 B.C.; J. H. Hertz, ed., The Pentateuch And Haftorahs (London: Humphrey Milford, 1928), p. 434.
the passage in at least two ways. First, he provided enough words and syntax to point the way clearly to the Old Testament reference. Second, he translated the meaning into the Corinthian situation. This becomes more apparent upon examining the introductory formula.

"Iva should be taken as a particle of result, indicating that the logical outcome of what Christ became, 1 Cor. 1:30, was to end in men's boasting. The IF may either be an anacoluthon or an ellipsis with γένσται understood.¹ Possibly Paul has taken up the LXX κώριος and identified Him with the Christ.² However, it is also possible that κώριος refers to ὁ θεός. P* reads θεός for κώριος and Paul’s context shows that God the Father is the active agent. The use of ίνα throughout this passage³ indicates the purpose and result of the actions of the Father. It could follow, therefore, that the ίνα of vs 31 stands in reference to God as well because ίνα is to be related to the γεννηθήν of vs 30 which, while having Christ as the passive subject, views God as the active agent, ἀπὸ θεοῦ. Also vs 29, which serves as a paraphrastic statement of the quotation, has

¹Lightfoot, NEP, p. 168. For ellipsis after ίνα see Ro. 4:16, Gal. 2:9, 2 Cor. 7:13. Friedrich Wilhelm Maier, "Ps 110,1 (LXX 109,1) Im Zusammenhang Von 1 Kor 15, 24-26," Biblische Zeitschrift 20 (1932), p. 139, discusses γιοί as an IF.

²Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 54.

³vss 27-28.
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ος as the subject. Thus the sense of the quote would normally follow this line of thought also.\(^1\) It appears that Paul used the word κύριος from the end of the LXX passage as a summary of what he omitted.\(^2\) Therefore, it is nearly certain that Paul's κύριος is the same as his θεός throughout 1 Cor. 1.

The Hebrew boast was in the knowing of Yahweh and the ἐν τούτῳ of the LXX follows this sense. For Paul to replace τούτῳ with κύριος is a significant alteration and makes Turpie's remark all the more telling: only after one has seen the character of God displayed in His acts can one truly "glory in the Lord."\(^3\) If κύριος be equated with Christ, Paul added his mystical sense of union with Christ to the intellectual aspect of boasting. This takes the force of the quotation a step further than the original. It would demonstrate how the principle, valid in the Old Testament, is not only valid for New Testament morality but is also wholly compatible with Paul's soteriology. This is a clear use of the OT for Christian morality. The equation of κύριος with Yahweh of the OT shows continuity of deity between the Testaments as well as piety. This call to worship is not a "Golden Word"

\(^1\) However, the ἐν of the quote may take on a new meaning in association with the ἐν κριστῷ of vs 30.

\(^2\) i.e. συνέειν καὶ γενώσειν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι... . .

\(^3\) Turpie, OTN, p. 68.
for illustrative effect but is tied into the very sub-
structure of Paul's theology and piety.
JEREMIAH 9:24, 2 CORINTHIANS 10:17

Textual Display*

Masoretic Variants*

Septuagintal Variants*

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that L (qui talia saepe habet)
47* al read ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Textual*

Contextual1

Paul in chapter 10 once again defended himself and his apostleship. The immediate context concerns Paul's assertion that he was within his own allotted sphere of missions when he ministered to the Corinthians and that he had not trespassed into the work of another. He would not boast in another man's work.2

Hermeneutical

It is very probable that Paul's use of ἐν αὐτοῖς.3

*See on previous section, pp. 341-43.

1For the OT context see on previous section,

22 Cor. 10:16.

in 2 Cor. 10:15, 16 led his thoughts to the proverb-type remark of vs 17. Paul, in vs 18, clarified his interesting line of thought. The glorying in the Lord mentioned in vs 17 was not, in this case, centered on what the Lord was or had done soteriologically, but rather meant glorying in the content of the Lord's commendation. This appears not to be an eschatological concept so much as a tangible reality: men's labors. Paul equated a successful ministry with the commendation of the Lord. Paul's use of the OT has moved far from the Jeremiah context, most likely as a result of the proverbial form the quotation had assumed through the years, but his identification of ἱππίος with the God of the OT shows a continuity of deity.

Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965), pp. 645-49, notes that the concept "to boast" can be synonymous with "to trust" in Jewish thought, e.g. Psa. 97:7 and Jer. 42:17. With reference to Jer. 9:22ff he notes that this refers both in the Jer. and 2 Cor. contexts to "the true boasting which consists in self-humbling before God. . . .," p. 645. This element of trust is primary to Paul, Philo (e.g. Sepc. Leg. I 311) and the OT.

¹Κύριος in this case may mean God Himself but, as Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 290, writes "it is remarkable with what readiness N.T. writers transfer what in O.T. is said of Jehovah to Jesus Christ, and this may be a case in point."

²vs 15a.
TEXTUAL DISTINCTIONS IN 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS

1 CORINTHIANS

It remains to be seen if the OT passages quoted in 1 and 2 Corinthians open the possibility of discerning a particular text-type used by Paul. That agreements with one or another LXX witness may be Christian modifications of the LXX, especially when the evidence is sparse and late, has already been considered.

Summary Of Textual Evidence

A summary of the evidence previously given will give a broad picture regarding the OT text used by Paul to function as a basis for the textual conclusions of Part Three. Generally, the OT passages represented in Paul's quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. have no severe critical problems surrounding their textual history. The implications of this will be seen below. The critical LXX editions list few or no variants for Psa. 94:1 (1 Cor. 3:20). Dt. 25:4 (1 Cor. 9:9), shows only a corrected itacism and a variant reading of Justin. Dt. 32:1 (1 Cor. 10:20), shows two minor variants. Psa. 24:1 (1 Cor. 10:26) has minor variants. Psa. 110:1 (1 Cor. 15:27), notes that the Sahidic and Paul of Tella have minor
variants. Isa. 22:13 (1 Cor. 15:32) shows only minor variants. With such uniform MSS witness it is almost assured that any variants in these quotations have arisen from Paul's own hand.

Other quotation passages have a more complex set of variants. In 1 Cor. 1:19, the LXX variants basically concern the addition of either αὐτων and συνετῶν by the bulk of the Lucianic groups for the former and by Eusebius, V and a minor Lucianic witness, 93, for the latter. Eusebius, with 564txt and 301, also reads ἀδετῆσον for κρύφω. If Eusebius was following Paul at this point, he nevertheless deviates from him regarding the above-mentioned uses of αὐτων. The major LXX witnesses Ν Β Α and others, are mirrored in Paul's quotation except for his use of ἀδετῆσον.

In 1 Cor. 1:31 the LXX has no major variants and only minor ones in Q and Ν, with Clement offering the only witness to Paul's form. Once again the LXX text is well attested but Paul has loosely paraphrased, most assuredly on his own. In 1 Cor. 2:9 Paul's quotation is textually related to Isa. 64:4 only in the loosest fashion. The most significant LXX variant is the reading of ἄληθίνα καὶ by the Lucianic groups.

The LXX of Isa. 40:13, used in 1 Cor. 2:16, has variants which involve the transposition of συμβούλος αὐτοῦ and omission of αὐτοῦ; a φ for δς; a dialectic preference of συμβίβασει to συμβίβα; an αὐτο for αὐτοῦ.
Paul left out the middle of the quotation and quoted the first and last parts verbatim. Major witnesses from the Alexandrian, Hexaplaric, Lucianic and Catena groups read συμβεβασει with Paul. B is a notable exception.

The single variant of Job 5:13 (1 Cor. 3:19) is the addition of αὐτῶν to φρονῆσαι by A which Paul displays as well. Paul has also changed the words of the main verb and the object of the preposition.

While one cannot be too rigid in claiming that Paul used Dt. 22:24 for his source in 1 Cor. 5:13, it seems that Paul only changed the mood and number of the main verb. The predominant LXX variants, none of which agree with Paul, also center on the verb.

Paul agrees with the main LXX witnesses in 1 Cor. 6:16, in his inclusion of ω λύο. Only a few LXX MSS omit the phrase.

For the quotation of Nu. 14:16 (1 Cor. 10:5) the few variants, none of which are read by Paul, concern the verb. Paul's only deviation concerns the voice and person of the verb. Due to Paul's quite free paraphrase of Isa. 28:11-12 in 1 Cor. 14:21, the LXX variants, as they exist, do not prove helpful in pointing towards a hermeneutical pattern in the apostle.

Only minor variants surround the quotation of Isa. 45:14 (1 Cor. 14:25) but Paul provides a form either closer to the Hebrew or an accurate paraphrase of the Greek OT.
Gen. 2:7 (1 Cor. 15:45) finds only minor variants in the LXX and is accurately reproduced in syntax and words by Paul. He has, however, inserted an adjective before and a proper name after ἀνθρωπος.

The merged quotation of Isa. 25:8 and Hos. 13:14 (1 Cor. 15:54-55) shows three word substitutions by 613 and 93, and Syh Q for the Isaiah passage and there are several variants in the Hosea portion. Paul agrees with the 6' reading in Isaiah but not in Hosea. He agrees with the main LXX witnesses with the exception of word order and the substitution of νικος and ἡβατε. He does not use the Lucianic rendering νικη.¹

Among the variations listed above several call for a close comparison. A textual phenomenon of special interest with regard to the OT text-type of Paul's quotations is the change from κρῆς to ἁθετήσω in 1 Cor. 1:19. The OT evidences for ἁθετήσω are 564txt, 301 and Eusebius' commentary on Isa. 29:14. 564 is a tenth century catena witness; 301 a ninth century witness for the Alexandrian type; and the GLXX assigns Eusebius to the Hexaplaric group. This change however, may well be a later Christian harmonization to the NT. Paul's OT quotation of 1 Cor. 2:16 also agrees with 564 regarding the reading of σωματοσκελιος. This orthographical preference is shared

¹1 Cor. 1:19; 14:25; 15:54-55 clearly show a greater or lesser divergence from the Lucianic group.
by many MSS, $\kappa^a$ A V and Q$^{mg}$ among others.

As a convincing indication that 564 and 301 display a text-type used by Paul, one would expect to find a more consistent agreement between 564 and 301 throughout Paul's OT quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. This is not the case, however. In the 1 Cor. 2:16 quotation, 564 stands alone in reading $\phi$ for $\delta\zeta$ and is also unique in reading $\tau\omicron\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$ $\tau\omicron$ $\lambda\alpha\nu$ rather than $\tau\omicron$ $\lambda\alpha\nu$ $\tau\omicron\omicron\nu$, which is not followed by Paul in 1 Cor. 14:21. A further disagreement of 564 with Paul's quotation is the omission of the article before $\theta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ in Isa. 45:14 which Paul includes in 1 Cor. 14:26. Also in 1 Cor. 2:16, 564 disagrees with Paul in reading $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$ for $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\nu$. Of course this applies both ways: if 564 is not generally prone to alter its OT quotation in accordance with Paul, a textual solution better accounts for the single conformity with 1 Cor. 1:19.

Clement, in his Epistle to the Romans, used the same quotation form as Paul in 1 Cor. 1:31, when quoting $\textit{[\text{LXX variants]}}$ Jer. 9:24. Clement appears to have harmonized his OT quotation to the NT form rather than to have used an independent LXX text-type.

In 1 Cor. 2:9, there are two important textual similarities. Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, 34:8, gives a reading nearly identical to that of Paul. If he was influenced by the NT quotation, he also had the LXX in mind judging by his use of $\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu$.
Also in LAB 26:12 is another close approximation to Paul's quotation.

While no known MSS of the LXX read σοφόν for ἄνθρωπων in Psa. 94:11, several NT MSS read ἄνθρωπων for σοφόν in Paul's quotation in 1 Cor. 3:20. One assumes that the minuscule MSS 3, 33, 614 and others reflect a tradition which sought to bring Paul's quotation into conformity with the LXX text on hand.

With regard to 1 Cor. 9:9 and Paul's quotation of Dt. 25:4, one can be fairly certain that Paul did not find κῆρυμεν in his Greek Bible. Philo reads κῆρυμεν also but this may be a later Christian interpolation in Philo rather than evidence for a text-type used by Philo and Paul.

In 1 Cor. 15:45 σ' and θ' include ἄνθρωπος though in a position transposed from that of Paul. While this does supply an added verbal coincidence with the Pauline quotation there is no indication that σ' and θ' point to a type used by the apostle.

1 Cor. 15:54 was shown to have a marked agreement with θ' and a lesser agreement with σ'. The use of νίκη, Hosea 13:14, by 22c, 130, 311, 534 and others points to a text-type used by Paul. 22 is dated in the 11th to 12th centuries. 130-311 form a catena sub-group dating in the 12th century for 311 and the 12th to 13th for 130. 534 is an independent catena witness from the 11th century. The GLXX indicates that νίκη is a late correction of 22
which originally read διασήκη. Διασήκη is the reading of
the primary Lucian witnesses with the exception of 36.
The correction of 22 away from the Lucianic reading
could either have been corrected using the NT MS of
1 Cor. or, more probably, an OT MS of Hosea.

Textual Similarities

A chart of the variants in 1 Cor. is as follows.¹

| 1 Cor. 1:19 | ἀσεσθῶ for πρύσω |
| 1 Cor. 1:31 | free paraphrase |
| 1 Cor. 2:9  | free paraphrase |
| 1 Cor. 2:16 | shortened quotation |
| 1 Cor. 3:19 | alternate translation |
| 1 Cor. 3:20 | σοφῶν for ἀνθρώπων |
| 1 Cor. 5:13 | ἔξαπατε for ἔξαπατες |
| 1 Cor. 6:16 | identical |
| 1 Cor. 9:9  | ἀπωμόκες for φιμόκες |
| 1 Cor. 10:5 | κατεστράθησαν for κατέστρωσεν αὐτούς |
| 1 Cor. 10:7 | identical (itacism of πιεῖν) |
| 1 Cor. 10:20| θοιοςαν for ἐθοιοσαν |
| 1 Cor. 10:26| identical |

¹The OT quotations are described either as identical; close paraphrase (where the verbal and syntactical similarities show a close following of the Greek OT); alternate translation (where the verbal and syntactical relations differ radically from the Greek OT but the sense is nearly identical); free paraphrase; shortened quotation (where one section is missing from an otherwise verbatim quotation). Where the difference is only the substitution or addition of a word or two, the words in question are given
1 Cor. 14:21 free paraphrase
1 Cor. 14:25 alternate translation
1 Cor. 15:25 close paraphrase
1 Cor. 15:27 alternate translation
1 Cor. 15:32 identical
1 Cor. 15:45 ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος ἀδὰμ for ὁ ἀνθρώπος
1 Cor. 15:54-55 alternate translation (θ’) and close paraphrase

The special points of agreement in 1 Cor. with the Greek OT witnesses are as follows:
1 Cor. 1:19 564\text{txt} 301 Eus.
1 Cor. 1:31 Clement
1 Cor. 2:9 Clement to Cor. 34:8, LAB 26:12
1 Cor. 2:16 564 and many others
1 Cor. 9:9 Philo
1 Cor. 15:45 Philo
1 Cor. 15:54-55 θ’ and to a lesser degree Q and Syh.
Possibly νίκη (Paul νίκος) of the Lucian group.

Looking back over the first chart one finds that there are four identical quotations, six single word substitutions, four alternate translations, two close paraphrases, three free paraphrases, one two-word addition, and one shortened quotation. Out of the twenty-one OT passages quoted, then, nine quotations are quite different from the mainstream of the LXX tradition while twelve follow it rather closely.
In the second chart, one sees that the witnesses for the peculiar readings of Paul's OT quotations are, in the main, late and open to the possibility of conformation to the NT. There also lacks any substantial group of witnesses which appears consistently throughout the quotations. Those readings supported by Philo, LAB and Theodotion are given special consideration in the next section.

**2 CORINTHIANS**

**Summary Of Textual Evidence**

It is a previously accepted conclusion that Paul's quotations from the OT agree in the main with the LXX tradition as opposed to being *ad hoc* translations from the Hebrew or adaptations of Aramaic Targums. This section will, like that for 1 Cor. attempt to discern any special agreement of Paul's quotations with particular strands of the Greek OT.

In the 2 Cor. 3:16 (Ex. 34:34) quotation, the presence of ἐπιστρέψῃ for the LXX ἔσεσθαι finds no LXX textual support. However, Targum Pseudo Jonathan on Ex. 33:7 has a very close affinity of sense. Further research may confirm an early date for the targumic pericope in question thereby increasing the possibility that it was known to Paul.

In 2 Cor. 4:13 the absence of the disputed καί, which is not included by Nestle or the UBS texts, would leave a verbatim quotation.
In 2 Cor. 6:16-18 Paul shows an affinity with the Lucianic group\(^1\) by reading \(\alpha\omega\tau\omicron\nu\) in the Isa. 52:11 quotation rather than \(\alpha\omega\tau\eta\varsigma\). The \(\kappa\alpha\iota\) before \(\Delta\phi\rho\omicron\varsigma\theta\eta\eta\tau\epsilon\) in Isa. 52:11 is supported by Q, 88, Syh, 22\(^C\) and others and is also read by Paul.

For the Leviticus and 2 Samuel quotations of 2 Cor. 6:16-18 textual trends are apparent and a short digression will show how firmly and accurately the underlying LXX text was present either in Paul's mind or before his eyes.

Due to the complex textual relationships of the OT passages to Paul's use of them a scaled-down comparison will show how methodically the OT texts were adapted. The Ezek. 37:27 passage is also included due to the similarities it bears to 2 Cor. 6:16. Just the portions of 2 Cor. 6:16-18 which directly compare with the OT are given here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>2 Cor. 6:16b</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\kappa\alpha\iota)</td>
<td>(\kappa\alpha\iota)</td>
<td>(\kappa\alpha\iota)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota)</td>
<td>(\varepsilon\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota)</td>
<td>(\varepsilon\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\vartheta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron)</td>
<td>(\alpha\omega\tau\omicron\nu)</td>
<td>(\alpha\omega\tau\omicron\nu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron)</td>
<td>(\theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron)</td>
<td>(\theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\kappa\alpha\iota)</td>
<td>(\kappa\alpha\iota)</td>
<td>(\kappa\alpha\iota)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)GLXX: 22-48-51-231-763+90-130-311+36-93-96-86\(^C\) 534 Cypr.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Lev. 26:12</th>
<th>2 Cor. 6:16b</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Ezek. 37:27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὑμεῖς</td>
<td>αὐτοὶ</td>
<td>μου</td>
<td>λαός</td>
<td>αὐτοὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εσεσθε</td>
<td>ἐσονται</td>
<td>μου</td>
<td>λαός</td>
<td>ἐσονται</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paul's use of αὐτῶν is obviously dependent on the plural αὐτοῖς in the first part of Paul's quotation. The ὑμῖν of Lev. 26:12 has been adjusted by Paul to fit the ἐν αὐτοῖς of his previous line. The same would hold for Paul's καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐσονται; the αὐτοὶ reflecting the 3rd pl. pronoun motif which begins the quotation; the ἐσονται likewise with regard to the 3rd pl. ending. Paul's ἐνοικήσω may have arisen from the κατασκήνωσις of Ezekiel. In this case, then, the passage aligns with Ezekiel and Paul's ἐμπεριπατήσω would be only a rather oblique allusion to Lev. 26:12. The context of Ezek. 37:27 fits the temple and purity image of 2 Cor. 6:16. The Ezek. context is the eschatological temple whereas the Lev. is past historical. The Lev. passage might be preferred due to it being in the Law, but the commonly seen threefold Law, Prophets and Writings configuration does not apply because the third quotation is from a

1ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς.
prophetic book, 2 Sam. While the 3rd pl. idea may be attributed to the Ezek. passage the genetival use is clearly from Lev.1

LXX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isa. 52:11b</th>
<th>2 Cor. 6:17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εξέλθατε</td>
<td>εξέλθατε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ειν</td>
<td>ειν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέσου</td>
<td>μέσου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτῆς</td>
<td>αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(καὶ)</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αφορίσθητε</td>
<td>ἀφορίσθητε</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As has been noted, the Lucianic group supports αὐτῶν for αὐτῆς in Isa. 52:11b and Q 88-Syh 22-93-456 564 393 544 Eus. comm et ecli include the καὶ. Therefore this passage has not been adapted internally to fit its new context but follows an early text-type.

LXX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Sam. 7:14</th>
<th>2 Cor. 6:18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δοσομαι</td>
<td>δοσομαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτῷ</td>
<td>ομίλω*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὶς</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πατέρα</td>
<td>πατέρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτὸς</td>
<td>ομείλες*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1ομίλω and μοι as contrasted with the αὐτοῖς and μου of Exekiel.
In the case of 2 Cor. 6:18 we can clearly see a systematic alteration of 2 Sam. 7:14. The case remains the same but the words are changed, in the first three (*) instances, to the second person plural and the fourth word (*) becomes a plural. The shift from third to second plural is occasioned by the \( \varepsilon \sigma \vartheta \varepsilon \) of 2 Cor. 6:17. Here the case of \( \upsilon \upomicron \nu \upsilon \) seems to be dependent upon the LXX \( \mu \omicron \) and follows the case of the \( \alpha \omicron \tau \omicron \phi \) which it replaces. While the word is changed, the case schema of the original is maintained.

We have in these examples, therefore, clear evidence of a knowing and systematic adaptation of the text of the LXX to a Christian usage. The variations are not memory slips but are often textually accountable. This quotation has the marks of a thought-out and carefully-constructed theological position. All three OT passages are the direct utterances of Yahweh thus the fitting and specific IF, \( \kappa \alpha \delta \omicron \varepsilon \iota \nu \pi \nu \omicron \omicron \omega \omicron \delta \omicron \sigma \iota \iota \delta \omicron \sigma \iota \). The theological framework is nowhere clearer than in the 2 Sam. 7:14 quotation where the LXX third singular was in
reference to Solomon but in 2 Cor. 6:18 it has been changed to apply to the readers themselves. This is confirmed by 2 Cor. 7:1 where this is identified as one of the promises which the readers were presently having.

The quotation of Ex. 16:18 in 2 Cor. 8:15 was seen to have an affinity with n, Arm and Boh in placing οὔκ ἐπλεόνασεν after πολύ and with AΦ Philo and σ′ by reading διέγον for ἔλαττον. The wider geographical spread represented by n, Arm and Boh is surprising enough to be noteworthy.

While the quotation of Psa. 112:9 in 2 Cor. 9:9 displays no textual distinctions it is proper to note that there is a conformation of the NT version back to the LXX in F G K 6 39 42 f g vgcle Aeth by the addition of τοῦ αἰῶνος.

Paul's use of σταθήσεται for στήσεται in his quotation of Dt. 19:15 in 2 Cor. 13:1 is also reflected in A F M N and others. The omission of the second ἐπὶ στῶματος is also in b d f m n w Arm. and others. The absence of the second μαρτύρων is also in b f m w. These witnesses are important due to their geographical divergence, Africa and Europe, and their underlying text-types, e.g. Alexandrian for the Bohairic and Caesarean/Koine(?) for the Armenian.

Textual Similarities

A chart of the variants in 2 Cor. is as follows:

2 Cor. 3:16 free paraphrase
2 Cor. 4:13 identical
2 Cor. 6:2 identical
2 Cor. 6:16 free paraphrase
2 Cor. 6:17 identical
2 Cor. 6:18 close paraphrase
2 Cor. 7:6 allusion
2 Cor. 8:15 ὅλιγον for ἐλαττον
2 Cor. 8:21 expanded quotation
2 Cor. 9:7 free paraphrase
2 Cor. 9:9 identical
2 Cor. 9:10 ἐπιχορηγῶν for ἕφ
2 Cor. 10:17 free paraphrase
2 Cor. 13:1 shortened quotation
σταθήσεται for στήσεται

The chart above indicates that out of fourteen OT quotations four are identical, two are single word substitutions, one is a close paraphrase, one is a shortened quotation, one is an expanded quotation, four are free paraphrases, and one is a clear allusion. Six of the fourteen follow the LXX quite closely while eight vary in differing degrees.

The special points of agreement in 2 Cor. with other witnesses are as follows:
2 Cor. 3:16 Pseudo Jon. Ex. 33:7 (sense affinity only)

2 Cor. 6:17 a) Lucianic group: 22-48-51-231-763
+90-130-311+36-93-96-86° 534
b) Q 88-Syh 22°-93-456 564 393 544

2 Cor. 8:15 a) n Arm. Boh.
b) Aα Philo σ'

2 Cor. 13:1 a) A F M N and others
b) b d f m n w Arm and others
c) b f m w

A cursory comparison of these special points of agreement with those for 1 Cor. shows a few common trends. Apparent in 2 Cor. is a much more striking and textually varied set of agreements compared with the relatively sparse links of 1 Cor. The appearance of the readings of 564 in 1 Cor. is seen again in 2 Cor. as is some further agreement with Q and Syh. It is also of note how the Old Latin and Lucianic groups are apparent in the above chart.

Conclusion

On textual grounds, therefore, the question of an early Palestinian Greek OT must remain open. One might suppose that if Paul gained the bulk of his biblical training in Jerusalem or Tarsus he would have used a standard OT text in his schooling and that this type of text would surface most often in his quotations. Because one does not find a peculiar non-LXX text surfacing con-
sistentely, the long-standing conclusion remains that the apostle used a predecessor reading much like the OT portions surfacing in 1°BA. If he used the various texts which would have been available to him at different places on his journeys then one would also expect to see an observable difference in the text of his OT quotations from book to book. This is not the case. What one does find is that Paul basically agrees with the best LXX witnesses, therefore Paul's Greek OT either avoided or, more certainly, preceded many of the variants now apparent in the critical apparatus of the LXX and presents evidence of an early text-type.

The text Paul used implies that the Egyptian Greek OT had come to Palestine with few corruptions and that in Paul's circles this was the Greek Scripture that was the object of study and memorization. If Paul received his training in the mainline circles of first century Judaism one may conclude that the LXX was the Greek Textus Receptus of that period. Therefore the nature of Paul's Palestinian Greek OT is not of the nature of a recension but of an Egyptian Greek OT with scattered variants. The next section will consider this last aspect.

1See the discussions in Frederick G. Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible (London: Duckworth, 1937), pp. 47-50.
PART III

CONCEPTUAL AND TEXTUAL CONCLUSIONS

Part Three of this paper relates the issues raised in the Part One survey from Harnack to Ulonska concerning continuity between the Testaments to the textual and hermeneutical insights gained in Part Two. In doing so, several conclusions concerning the use of the OT in the NT will be made. The first issue, continuity between the Testaments, will be limited to conceptual relationships. Such relationships are fundamental and formative to the textual and theological linkages between the OT and NT. The second issue concerns the formulations of OT texts for Church usage in the pre-Pauline Christian tradition. This is a logical outgrowth from a conception of continuity. The issue of testimonies will be examined in 1 and 2 Cor. according to the theories of J. R. Harris and C. H. Dodd. The third and final issue is a consideration of what contribution the detailed examination of the OT text-forms in 1 and 2 Cor. can make to the understanding of the Greek OT in first century Palestine.¹

¹While the theories of Cross, Barthélemy, and others are evaluated, at present Barthélemy's school provides the surest footing, thus the terminology used will
CONCEPTUAL CONTINUITY BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS

INTRODUCTION

One primary aim of this paper is to investigate the substructure conceptualities which were formulative to the early Christian manipulation of OT texts. This section seeks to bridge the gap between the superficial parallels of thought between the Testaments and the systematization of deeper structure which occasioned the text forms.

Concerning the intention of OT words in passages such as 1 Cor. 9:1f; 10:11, Christian Dietzfelbinger writes:

Worte des Alten Testaments, in einer bestimmten geschichtlichen Situation gesprochen, gelten als Worte, die schon von ihrem ursprünglichen sinn her gesehen die gegenwärtige Situation meinen und deuten.¹

An underlying hermeneutical vector accounts for the above mentioned phenomenon which forms the central link in the continuity between the Testaments. The first Christians understood a marked continuity between the work of Jesus as Messiah and the content and intent of the Hebrew Scriptures. Such unanimity is not apparent today. Jasper, in a survey of the continuity-discontinuity predominantly follow his definitions.

¹Dietzfelbinger, PAT, p. 34.
debate, holds that the category of promise is the "best 'theological' link we can discover." To the early Christians theirs was not a new religion purely fulfilled in the Messiah. The apparent newness, interpreted as such by opposing Jewish leaders, was attributed to their basic misunderstanding of Scripture, not to any imported novelty of Jesus' followers. Jesus came to fulfil, not destroy. Thus began the Church's apologetic process of displaying the true interpretation of the Bible to Jews and Gentiles alike. Behind this process of interpreting present events in terms of OT history lay the conviction that there was no discontinuity between the God of the OT and the God of the New. Paul's OT-NT link was essentially the promise and faithfulness of God and secondarily historical continuity or a series of events.

THE PERSON AND ACTS OF GOD

The essence of continuity between the Testaments for Paul was therefore the Person and activity of God. Without this fact his coincidences of language and thought

---


2Goppelt, Int. 20:322. Dodd, AS, p. 138, notes that the NT writers built upon the prophets' understanding of history.
lose much of their importance. Conceptual affinity is organic to the continuity of deity.¹

This theological link is best seen in Paul's specific references to God's activity in the Past. God is seen in the act of creation;² the superintendence of Israel in the wilderness;³ and in the land itself.⁴ Paul's application of these activities of God to the Corinthians has its basis in the fact that the same God ruled their lives and made the same moral demands.

Topically, this theological link is seen in Paul's discussion of the subject of wisdom;⁵ generosity in the ministry;⁶ divine acts of judgment;⁷ and acts of hope and salvation.⁸ These topics are structured upon the acts of God accomplished or prophesied in the OT,

¹Carrez, RSPT 55:92, writes that "si le Dieu Père de notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ cesse d'être le promoteur mystérieux et puissant du mouvement qui traverse l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testaments, de ses événements salutaires" then one cannot legitimately speak of an essential affinity.

²1 Cor. 15:45.
³2 Cor. 8:15; 3:16; 1 Cor. 5:13; 10:5, 7, 20.
⁴1 Cor. 14:21.
⁵1 Cor. 1:19, 31; 2:9, 16; 3:19-20; 2 Cor. 3:16.
⁶1 Cor. 9:9; 2 Cor. 8:15, 21; 9:7, 9-10.
⁷Temporal: 1 Cor. 5:13; 10:5, 7; 14:21.
Eschatological: 1 Cor. 14:25, 27; 15:54-55.
⁸2 Cor. 4:13; 6:2, 16-18; 7:6.
thereby linking the same God from Israel's past history up to her final restoration. Finally, the fact that, for Paul, the Church was the new Israel clearly shows his unbroken line with Yahweh of old.

THE PLAN OF GOD

The understanding of the early Church that the God of the OT was indeed at work in Jesus the Messiah would in itself presuppose that what God had said in the OT regarding the Messiah could be seen and identified in the past and present experience of the Christ. The salvific plan of God had been carried out. The second thread of continuity in the minds of the NT writers was therefore that of the plan of God for history. The NT insists that such identification and continuity was not an invention of the Christian exegete or a twisting of OT history. With regard to 1 Cor. 10:11a Samuel Amsler writes:

L'apôtre insiste sur le fait que ce sont les événements eux-mêmes, tels qu'ils se sont historiquement déroulés et tels qu'ils nous sont rapportés dans l'Écriture qui correspondent providentiellement aux réalités eschatologiques (1 Cor. 10:11a).

This assertion of historicity is intertwined with the above-noted continuity of the person of God between the Old and New covenants.

The moral plan of God is implied in the imperatives

1Amsler, ATE, pp. 57-58.
attached to most of the OT quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. but
the most clearly enunciated passages concerning God's
historical plan are seen in the promises for Israel's
new age. In 1 Cor. 15:27, 54-55, Paul adopted the
prophecies concerning God's ultimate subjection of all
hostile foes. In 2 Cor. 6:16-18 the nation was offered
sonship and the continual presence of God. In 2 Cor. 7:1
Paul called these offers promises (ἐπαγγελίας) for the
new Israel, the Church. Thus the Church was placed into
the ongoing plan of God for His chosen people.

Jesus As The Christ

Introduction. The plan of God and its resultant
continuity between the Testaments is best seen in the
assertion that Jesus of Nazareth was Israel's long-
awaited Messiah to whom the OT prophecies concerning God's
anointed one could be ascribed. This formed Paul's pre-
understanding by which he approached the interpretation of
the OT.1

1Carl Michalson, "Bultmann Against Marcion," from
The Old Testament And Christian Faith, ed. W. Anderson
(London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964), writes concerning pre-
understanding in general: "Preunderstanding is a method
of putting questions to a body of historical material
where the questions originate in one's own concern for
living. Where that occurs, the material cannot be an
indifferent object of investigation;" p. 52. Prosper
Grech, "The 'Testimonia' And Modern Hermeneutics," New
Testament Studies 19 (1973), pp. 320-21, notes that this
understanding "is a subjective one, but it is not arbi-
tary, it is hermeneutical." See Geoffrey Turner, "Pre-
Understanding And New Testament Interpretation," Scottish
Journal of Theology 28 (1975), pp. 241-42, for this dis-
cussion in relation to the problem of historie and
geschichte.
Much of Paul's OT interpretation, therefore, cannot be understood on the basis of his Jewish training or Hellenistic assimilations alone. Of course Paul retained much of the literary and conceptual forms of Judaism but the center of his life and methodology was no longer the Law but the Messiah.¹ It is, of course, both instructive and necessary to understand the cultural and religious affinities of Paul's hermeneutic with Hellenistic Judaism. These, however, are not the only two options available for reconstructing his hermeneutical assumptions. Paul's own religious experience as well as that of the Christian community played major, if not decisive, roles in the shaping of his apperception of Scripture. One must meet Paul at the self-avowed² center of his life and thought in order to represent accurately his use of the OT.

Paul's religious experience was encapsulated in the concept that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ. Some practical expression of what this identification meant for Paul are found in the Corinthian correspondence.

¹C. K. Barrett, "Paul's Opponents In II Corinthians," New Testament Studies 17 (1970-71), p. 254. Geza Vermes, CHB I, p. 199, writes concerning midrashic commentary that its "point of departure was no longer Torah itself, but contemporary customs and beliefs which the interpreter attempted to connect with Scripture and to justify." Vermes calls this "applied exegesis" and notes that this seemed to accompany the emergence of various religious factions, p. 221. This is clearly seen in the early Christian community's apologetic and exegetical efforts.

²Phil. 1:21a.
Basic and formative conceptions which are found throughout all of Paul's letters relate to the resurrection of Jesus, the Damascus road experience of Paul, and these events functioning as a ground for OT usage. These three aspects will be viewed in relation to 1 and 2 Cor.

The Resurrection of the Christ

For Paul, the understanding of the true identity of Jesus was, above all, grounded in and revealed through the resurrection. This was fundamental to the very inception and existence of the Church.¹ This event became the anchor for the faith of the new community and also radically altered its study of the Bible. While the form of the study was, in the main, midrashic, the new community interpreted the OT both according to the content of the teaching of Jesus and by the amazing post-Easter experiences of the Apostles.² The resurrection became a sign-

¹Holtz, TL 99:27, writes: "Vor allem aber ist ein Ereignis gewesen, das in der Gemeinde von allem Anfang an die Gewissheit gegründet haben muss, im Anbruch der Endzeit zu leben, ein Ereignis, das geradzu de Geburtsstunde der Gemeinde gewesen ist. Das was die Erfahrung der Auferstehung des gekreuzigten Jesus."

²Gerhardson, MM, p. 331. Lindars, NTA, pp. 27-28, finds that this perspective makes the interpretive alteration of passages necessary and valid. Fitzmyer, NTS 7:297-333, finds no equivalent of Christian fulfillment or realization motifs in Qumran's use of the OT. The basic outlook of Qumran was the forward look to the future while Christianity was characterized by the backward look to Israel's history.
pointing the early Church to an interpretive path which, in ever widening circles, would come to encompass much of the OT and direct the community's present exuberance and future hopes.

The resurrection of Christ caused Him to become (ἐγεννησθεν, 1 Cor. 1:30) the wisdom, righteousness and redemption of God, thereby making Him the ground and focus of all boasting (1 Cor. 1:31). Though no OT examples are supplied in 1 Cor. 15:3-4, this passage shows that the resurrection was according to an OT pattern. The fact that no OT passage is used in 1 and 2 Cor. to support Christ's resurrection shows that Paul was not called upon to defend the event. As distinct from the gospels, Paul was occupied with bringing the OT to bear on the actions of the Church as God's new and elect people, rather than to support the actions of Jesus on earth by OT verses. Paul's words in 1 Cor. 15:3-4, however, presuppose the type of detailed exposition of Christ's life such as we find in the gospels. While no OT quotation is mustered to substantiate Christ's resurrection in 1 and 2 Cor. the OT basis is ubiquitous and presupposed.

The Damascus Road Experience of Paul. Paul himself plainly stated that his appreciation of Jesus as the Christ had its genesis outside of Damascus. This was the inauguration not only of a totally new religious exper-
ience but also of a totally new hermeneutical understanding of the OT.\footnote{Leonhard Goppelt, "Paulus Und Die Heilsgeschichte: Schlussfolgerungen Aus Röm. IV Und I Kor. X. 1-13," New Testament Studies 13 (1966), p. 42.} What was once for Paul an open-ended religious history of the acts of God in Israel became an identifiable summation: the Messiah had come and He was Jesus. Paul now had a history which included the key to its meaning. The thesis and antithesis involved in Jesus' claim to be Messiah was only synthesized for Paul in the personal experience of Jesus as Messiah and the hermeneutical conformation of the OT data around this experience. Ragnar Bring writes concerning Paul's conflict:

Für ihn stellt sich die Frage, was Jesus bedeutet. Als Pharisäer hat er ihn als einer Verführer angesehen, nach Damaskus als den Messias und den Sohn Gottes.\footnote{Ragnar Bring, Christus Und Das Gesetz (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), p. 159.}

In answering the question as to the meaning of Jesus, Paul displayed his hermeneutical assumptions and methods. While stressing the Damascus road experience in the formation of Paul's OT interpretation, however, one must not overlook the importance of Paul's Jewish affinities. Gerhardsson strikes a proper note of caution regarding methodology:

Was the apostle so logical in his theory and so gifted in his practice that he could base his entire thought and action on one doctrinal point, so that we are
able to solve the historical problems connected with his life simply by a process of deduction from his soteriological focus? ¹

The corrective to this error will be a separation between theological perspective and theological-exegetical method. While Gerhardsson's conclusions differ from this writer's, such a methodological distinction has been found to be helpful.

A Ground for Interpretation. In discovering for himself how Jesus could be the Messiah, Paul entered into a circle of students in the Church at large who were searching the Scriptures to find answers to the same question. ² In this stream of interpretation the reality of Christ's presence in the believers' experience brought a new immediacy to the OT. This is exemplified in Paul's use of καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ and ἡμέρα σωτηρίας as that which had already come. ³ This formed the perspective by which Paul both viewed and understood the OT. C. H. Dodd and L. Goppelt believe that Christ Himself inaugurated this method of interpretation before the crucifixion and

¹Gerhardsson, T&T, pp. 29-30.

²Amsler, ATE, p. 10, writes: "Poser le problème de l'interprétation de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Eglise chrétienne signifie le poser sur cette base précise que Jésus de Nazareth est bien le Christ annoncé et promis dans l'Ancien Testament."

³Holtz, IAT, p. 26, notes that "die Thora im 'jetzt' der Gerechtigkeitsoffenbarung ohne das Gesetz (weil im Christusglauben) zu ihrem Ziel kommt, sagt Rom 3,21 ausdrücklich." Cf. Mat. 11:13 and Jn. 5:46b.
they are not alone.¹

The presentness and immediacy brought about by the realization that Jesus was the Christ meant that the redeeming work of Yahweh was now centered in Jesus.² As 2 Cor. 3:16 shows, the hermeneutical key to OT interpretation was the identification of Jesus as Messiah. Only there, according to Paul, could the veil be lifted from men's minds enabling them to receive the wisdom of God. Thus the redemptive promises of the OT could be applied to Jesus in His past and present act and the context of the OT became that of the Christian Gospel based on the death and resurrection of Jesus.³ This contemporizing is seen at Qumran by the community's adoption of names like


³Grech, NTS 19:319.
camp, הָגְמוֹן, community, תֹּם, and teacher of righteousness, רְשָׁע הָרוּם, to show how Scripture had been fulfilled in their existence. Just how Paul applied his Heilsweg approach to the OT in 1 and 2 Cor. will be seen below.

Paul, to be sure, used the OT to bring a divine comment to bear on a practical problem at hand. 1 and 2 Cor. are practical letters which systematically spoke to various issues in the Church. Paul had evaluated the Church problems against a well defined understanding of what was the proper procedure for the Christian community. One would suppose that he had worked out biblical reasoning for the major points of his new belief during the years prior to his first visits to Corinth. If this be accepted, Paul would have had a background from which to draw when faced with the problems of the Corinthians. One would also assume that he spent some time in consideration of the matter before he commenced composing his reply.

What is of prime importance is the centrality of Jesus as Messiah in Paul’s thought. It is not enough for

---

Paul to have known that the Messiah was to come. The radical shift came when Jesus was declared to be this Messiah. O. Michel, in his classic study of Paul and the OT, wrote "dass im Mittelpunkt aller Auslegung Christus stehen muss. Das lehrt uns Paulus."\(^1\) Thus the OT did not lose its power for Paul but rather the opposite; it was strengthened.\(^2\)

It may be said, at the outset of this discussion of the OT passages referring to the Messiah in 1 and 2 Cor., that Paul's Christocentric hermeneutic in no way blurs the Father's ultimate supremacy. 1 and 2 Cor. are highly Father-centered and behind each act of the Messiah is the inaugurating power of the Father. The OT passages referring to the Messiah fall into three categories: 1) The new way of salvation; 2) The new Israel; 3) The reign of the Messiah. Behind all three, God the Father stands as originator.

The New Way of Salvation. The content of Paul's wisdom was the crucified Messiah.\(^3\) By this wisdom, which was foolish in the eyes of the world, God destroyed false human wisdom.\(^4\) The boasting, encouraged by the OT quota-

\(^1\)Michel, P&SB, p. 212.
\(^2\)Harnack, ATPB, p. 124.
\(^3\)Χριστὸν ἔσταυρωμένον, 1 Cor. 1:23.
\(^4\)As per the quotation of 1 Cor. 1:19.
tion of 1 Cor. 1:31, is focused on the act of God by which He caused the Messiah, Jesus,\(^1\) to become the true wisdom of God. The OT asserted that man should boast in Yahweh and His acts. Paul asserted that man should boast in Yahweh\(^2\) and His acts in the Messiah. Here is seen the typical Pauline continuation of an OT moral principle as elaborated by the specifics of the New Covenant.

The Messiah also became the means by which the plans of God were revealed to the new community.\(^3\) The argument had been established that no man could know the thoughts of God except His own Spirit. The OT quotation of 1 Cor. 2:16 reinforced this fact. For Paul, however, the Messiah formed the link with the mind of God. The anointed One was anointed with the Spirit of God and had graciously bestowed this Spirit to men. This also reinforces the fact that the ωνομ of the quotation was Yahweh and not His Messiah.

The eschatological aspect of the new way of salvation is seen in 1 Cor. 15:54-55. The resurrection of Messiah had become the paradigm for Paul's discussion of the believers' resurrection.\(^4\) 1 Cor. 15:45 shows the

---

\(^1\)Χριστός Ἰησοῦς, 1 Cor. 1:30.
\(^2\)Χριστός, 1 Cor. 1:31.
\(^3\)1 Cor. 2:16.
\(^4\)1 Cor. 15:12ff.
continuity of the human race with the Second Adam as well as the discontinuity, but the pattern of human resurrection would follow the Messiah's. According to the Church as the new Israel conceptuality, 1 Cor. 15:54 was drawn from the Isaiah passages referring to the restoration and bliss of the Jewish nation. Thus these few OT quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. show that the basic structure of Pauline soteriology followed the lines of faith in the long-awaited Messiah, now known to be Jesus of Nazareth, and the appropriation of Israel's promises by the new elect of God, the Church.

The Church as the New Israel. Specifically, the quotations which indicate that Paul saw the Church as the new Israel of God are found in the application of the wilderness motif to Christian piety. As the community of God, the Church was to keep pure¹ and cast out the evil among its ranks. The idolatry of the wilderness was to be avoided.² The support of the ministry received the Sinaitic Law authority.³ The equal provision of manna became a lesson in Christian generosity.⁴

Examples of faith and thanksgiving were drawn

¹ 1 Cor. 5:13. ² 1 Cor. 10:7.
³ 1 Cor. 9:9. ⁴ 2 Cor. 8:15. No OT quotation is provided but the Messiah is presented as being present with Israel in the wilderness in 1 Cor. 10:4.
from the Psalms. The divine judgment and presence with
the nation Israel continued within the Church in tongues
and God's presence among the members of the Church.

The Reign of Messiah. Christ's reign is
explained in 1 Cor. 15:25, 27 from the perspective of the
subjection of His enemies. The Messiah was reigning in
order to consummate His kingdom by glorifying His elect,
bringing His enemies to nought, and delivering the king¬
dom over to the Father. The OT quotation provided the
framework for these assertions.

CONTINUATION OF OT PIETY

Having discussed the person and plan of God, the
third understanding which would give rise to the hermen¬
eutical results of continuity between the Testaments is
that of the God-man relationship. The basic element of
the manward side of this intercourse was, for Paul, still
faith and obedient trust. Even in light of the soterio¬
logical revolution which took place in the theology of
the Christian community, the essence of piety was never¬

---

1 Cor. 10:26; 2 Cor. 4:13.
21 Cor. 14:21, 25. 31 Cor. 15:23.
41 Cor. 15:24b. 51 Cor. 15:24a.
62 Cor. 4:13. Braun, ATNT, p. 30, writes: "Die
wirkliche Klammer zwischen beiden Testamenten leigt viel¬
mehr in der Art, wie Gott und Mensch verstanden sind. Der
Mensch soll dass Rechte tun im Gehorsam, in Trauen...
theless still grounded in and extended from the OT history. This is seen in the explicit quotations where there is a real parallel between Israel and the Church.¹

**TYPOLOGY**

The understanding of the God-man relationship and the continuity of the person and design of God resulted in a distinctive hermeneutic: typology. This was a central and exegetically determinative conceptuality in Paul's thought.² Typology is not an exegetical procedure, but rather a way of thinking about the relationships between the present and the OT text.³ In this approach to the OT the historical and religious continuity could be maintained without allegorizing the former or spiritualizing the latter. Goppelt contrasts Paul with others on this very point:

Das sich Paulus zur Stützung seiner Lehre der typologischen und nicht wie Philo oder Origenes der allegorischen und symbolischen Schriftdeutung bedient, ist ein Zeichen dafür, dass es hier nicht um Gnosis, sondern um Glauben nicht um eine verfügbare Erlösungsidee oder vorfindliche mystische Erfahrung (der "geist" ist nie naturhaften Habitus), sondern um heilsgeschichtliche Glaubewirklichkeit geht.⁴

---

¹Manson, OTTJ, p. 331. This is seen in 1 Cor. 1:19; 2:9; 3:19-20; 9:9; 15:54-55.

²Goppelt, Int. 21:315. See Ro. 4:23; Gal. 3:8; 1 Cor. 10:6. Smith, UOTN, p. 37, n. 93, says Goppelt, Int. 21:239, goes too far in seeing typology as the dominant form of the NT use of the OT.

³Baker, TTOB, p. 258. ⁴Goppelt, Typ., p. 163.
Such an approach was a manifestly historical appeal both to the type and antitype. The NT claim to continuity was based on the historical phenomena ¹ of God's acts in Israel.

There is a difference between the use of typology in the Gospels as over against Paul. The former have a distinct use of typology for "Heilsgeschichte" whereas Paul's primary use was for "Heilslehre." ² Woolcombe notes that there are two types of typological method; one which is a method of exegesis and the other which is a method of writing. The former is based on etymological considerations while the latter is based on an apparent historical connection. ³ Both forms are seen in the Gospels and Paul. Another distinction can be made from

¹Paul Beauchamp, "L'Interprétation Figurative Et Ses Présupposés," Recherches De Science Religieuse 63 (1975), pp. 299-312, sees the historical-typological link to be the two creations; the new creation fulfills and illuminates the old. Samuel Amsler, "Le Dernier Et L'Avant-Dernier," Recherches De Science Religieuse 63 (1975), pp. 385-96, constructs the link from Christ as the "last event" to the OT as the penultimate event which when reread in light of the last event gains its meaning. See also Goppelt, ATE, p. 19, and most recently, Baker, TTOB, pp. 239-68.

²Goppelt, Typ., p. 154. This distinction, however, may be more finely drawn between Romans (Heilsgeschichte) and 1 and 2 Cor. (Heilslehre). However, as was said above, p. 73, this is a more functional than objective distinction and one which most likely was not an active object in the first century mind.

the use of τοῦτος in the NT as both a matrix and its impression.¹

The matter of Christology also relates to the historical continuity and typological interpretation of the Testaments. As the fullness of God, Christ was the focus and basis of typology. Goppelt writes:

Die Antitypen sind, gleich den Typen, nicht irgende welche weltimmanenten Ausserlichkeiten, sondern die Grundzüge des vollendeten Gottesverhältnisses.²

Each typological reference is ascertained, not by allegory, but by reference from events in the OT to events that happened to Christ and His community. Amsler describes the difference of typology from allegory:

Pour Paul, la dépendance des types à l'égard des antitypes n'exprime donc pas la participation metaphysique des premiers aux seconds, mais l'anticipation historique des seconds par les premiers. A leur tour, les types ne sont pas seulement les "figures" des antitypes; ils en sont les "préfigurations": la relation typologique est une relation historique ou temporelle.³

This historical and temporal correspondence is based on

¹In Ro. 5:14 and 1 Cor. 10:6 the word refers to an impression but in Ro. 6:17 and Phil. 3:17 it denotes a pattern or model. Note Acts 7:43-44 for the use of τοῦτος incorporating the only two places when it is used in the OT (Amos 5:26; Ex. 25:40); cf. Woollcombe, ET, p. 61.

²Goppelt, Typ., p. 244.

event\(^1\) rather than on the artificial affinity of allegory which misses the true intent of the object of the allegory.\(^2\) The root of Paul's interpretation is found in

---

\(^1\)Lampe, ET, p. 14. This use of event must be distinguished from Goppelt's use, Typ., p. 256, where he says a work becomes allegory when it points to a fulfillment of event rather than to a definitive something else. Goppelt refers to the essential features of God's actions rather than the outward form of the events. Vermes, CHB I:410-11, writes that typology "looks not to the fulfillment of a prediction, but to the recurrence of a pattern" though prophecy and pattern are frequently intertwined. Friedrich Büchsel, TDNT I:260, shows the contrast of allegory: "It occurs with a certain regularity where an authoritative tradition is outstripped by development but is neither discarded nor interpreted historically." Büchsel's conclusion is that there is no difference in principle but only in kind between Palestinian and Alexandrian allegorising. This includes Paul, p. 263, though Christianity does form a new beginning in the field. Michel, PëSB, p. 110, on the other hand, asserts the essential historicity of Palestinian typology and says that Paul did not allegorise in the true sense.

\(^2\)R. E. Nixon, The Exodus In The New Testament (London: The Tyndale Press, 1963), p. 11. The end product of Philo's allegory did have practical significance, however. Lala Kalyan Kumar Dey, The Intermediary World And Patterns Of Perfection In Philo And Hebrews (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975), SBL Dissertation Series, p. 12, has shown how Philo had various patterns of thought which rendered comprehensible the customs of the OT for Hellenistic concepts. With regard to the changeability of titles and functions for the intermediary world Dey writes: "This pattern of identifications and correlations is a part of the hermeneutics of Philo, through which stories in the OT acquire eternal and therefore contemporary significance." These patterns of thought are held to be the key to Philo's thought as contrasted with studies which merely study the synthetic and genetic use of words and passages, p. 17. This has implications for the study of Paul's use of the OT. It was Paul's conceptuality, not his methodology, that allowed him to contemporize the OT for the use of the Church.
the historical content of the last things as seen in Christ whereas Philo "reinterpreted historical events as symbolizing processes in the human soul. . . ."¹

Typology was appropriated because of the presuppositions of continuity in the early Church. An apocalyptic perspective may account in part for Paul's doctrine of aeons which stands behind his typology.² However, TB Sanhedrin 97a also mentions aeons: one period of 2,000 years of Law to be followed by 2,000 years of Messianic rule and M Tamid 7:4 mentions 2,000 years of Sabbath rest. This implies that the Law was temporary until the days of Messiah would begin.³ Lampe even suggests that

¹Schoeps, Paul, p. 233. Dey, IWPW, p. 17, notes a process of conceptuality at work in Philo which has implications for the understanding of Paul's hermeneutic as well. In a discussion of how logos, archangel, prophet, and angels become mediators between God and man, creation and creator, Dey writes: "The manner in which Philo introduces these features of the intermediary world in that they are interjected into contexts which as such are not concerned with the question of creation reveals a pattern of thought in Philo. This pattern in respect to creation and mediation is triggered by an "associative" mode of exposition (i.e., word-associations). . . . One of the keys to the understanding and interpretation of Philo would be to locate patterns of thought which are triggered by means of associative terms in the process of his exposition of the passages of the OT." This insight is strikingly similar to that of Kadushin, CAM, in his study of early Jewish thought. See also Daniel Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutic In Palestine (Missoula, Montana: Society Of Biblical Literature And Scholars Press, 1975), pp. 49-86.

²Schoeps, Paul, p. 42.

"all indications show that it was a process initiated by Christ himself." Goppelt points out an approach taken by the NT writers:

Die ntl Typologie Frage nicht: Welchen Sinn hat jene atl Geschichte oder Einrichtung? Sondern sie vergleicht Jesus und das in ihm erschiene Heil mit den atl Parallelen und stellt fest, was sich daraus für das Neue und von hier aus unter Umständen für das Alte ergibt.

It would be understandable for the community to compare its memories of Jesus with the Scripture to find correspondences. With such a concept of continuity this was to be expected.

This was carried out consistently even to the point where the OT became the authority over personal opinion. That is not to say that there were not commonly understood beliefs regarding the Messiah prior to Jesus. The fact is that these pre-Christian beliefs had to be subjected to the new light brought by Jesus and the Spirit after Him.

Regarding 1 Cor. 10:11, Michel stresses that the OT receives its meaning from the endtime. However, the content of the end time is somewhat shaped by the OT as

---

1 Lampe, ET, p. 25.
2 Goppelt, Typ., p. 243.
3 For example the NT shows current questions regarding the origin of Messiah from Nazareth, His crucifixion and plans for the Kingdom.
4 Michel, P&SB, p. 134.
well.¹ The content of such interpretation was not achieved by mere grammatical exegesis alone. A typological relationship was ascertained by the discovery and interpretation of the truth and reality to which the texts testified.² Thus an interpretational key arises based both on the concept of continuity, a concept not foreign to Judaism, and on the concept of progressive revelation.

Each time an IF is used in 1 and 2 Cor. an event correspondence is implicit. The grammatical functions of the particles or adverbs which may be included in the IF serve to strengthen this correspondence. Ulonska,³ asserts that the link is only illustrative and contains no theological or historical implications but this runs counter to the pervasive mind-set of Jewish interpretation from earliest times. Paul's Jewish training gave him the sense of the importance of Torah in all aspects of life. Torah was more than illustration, it was a continuing

¹Goppelt, Typ., p. 244 writes: "Die Typologie is keine hermeneutische Method, welche nach bestimmten Regeln Deutungen ermittelt, sondern eine pneumatische Betrachtungsweise, welche im Blick auf die Heilsvollendung von Fall zu Fall in der vorlaufenden Heilsgeschichte deren Typen erkennt."

²Amsler, TAT, p. 17. D. Otto Schmitz, "Das Alte Testament Im Neuen Testament," from Wort Und Geist (Berlin: Im Furche-Verlag, 1934), p. 72, notes that the foundation of the OT in the NT was "eine eigentümliches Doppelverhältnis heilsgeschichtlicher Dialektik, das seine einheitliche Bestimmtheit aus der neuen Heilssituation empfängt."

³Ulonska, FAZA, passim.
history of the acts of Yahweh. It was not referred to as an expendable illustration but as the legitifying foundation of any position. To quote the OT was to bring divine authority to one's statements.

Thus the underlying basis of typology for Paul was God's continuing presence. To say ἐνα καθώς γέγονεν (1 Cor. 1:31a) relative to boasting in Jeremiah's day, was to assert that the same was true in Corinth because Yahweh and His Torah were the same now as they were then. Therefore, one aspect of the typological connection is the ongoing continuity of deity.

It has been mentioned throughout the paper that Paul's use of the OT in 1 and 2 Cor. is based on historical event (typology) rather than on allegory. This is clearly seen in the classification of typological subjects in 1 and 2 Cor. We are using the word type in its broadest sense of "example."¹ All of these subjects are based on acts of God in history which, in varying degrees, are used as indicators of God's character or man's obligations to God and the community.

The typology of Paul was based on the history of Israel but also was infused with a progression in revelation's content. Progressive revelation was already

inherent in Judaism's expectation of the future restoration of Israel. The concept of unfulfilled prophecy implied that a time would come when the prophecy would occur in history and at that point the prophecy would be understood in new ways in the light of being fleshed out in all its historical and experiential specificity. To speculate a little, it is not conceivable that a Jew would, when his Messiah arrived in time and space, find new insights into old passages which he had viewed as Messianic and would find that new ones had come to light in view of his now more perfect understanding of what Yahweh had in mind for the restoration. This, in essence, is what occurred for Paul when Jesus became the Messiah. Old passages took on new meaning and entire new sections were seen to be relative to God's redemptive and national purposes. Amsler writes:

\[\text{Ainsi la relation providentielle, historique et christocentrique qui les lie est-elle toujours, dans l'herméneutique paulinienne, une relation progressive.}^1\]

Such insight was viewed as revelational based on the personal and structural continuity of God's work in history.

To have such a perspective was a radical confrontation to the norms of Judaism. To assert that Scripture was a testimony to the Gospel but was recogniz-

---

1Amsler, ATE, p. 60. See D. L. Baker, Two Testaments, One Bible (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976), pp. 76-79, for a history of the term "progressive revelation" from the early twentieth century to the present.
able as such only after the fact was, in relation to current Judaism, "une révolution copernicienne."1 Judaism concerned itself with making Torah applicable to daily life but without adding to or taking away from it2 while Christianity offered not only a new interpretation of the Law but added to the revelational content of religion as well.

Renard has remarked that the most important aspect of the divergence between Judaism and Christianity was just such a development of progress in revelation as accomplished and centered in Jesus.3 While it is not always easy, one must ask when Paul was centered on the continuity of Scripture and when was he centered on the discontinuity. Carrez questions if this is simply an unordered "processus charismatique eclectique" which functions situationally in varying circumstances as Paul brings OT quotations to bear.4 However, not only did Paul see a direction in history, which he shared with his

1Amsler, ATE, p. 97.


3Renard, SPCI II, p. 210. This controversy was not to remain outside the camp of Christianity as second century Marcionism demonstrates.

fellow countrymen, and not only did he see a significance to this history, which was also shared, but he had received the specificity of that signification. There is a distinction between the Epistles of Paul which view the Church in relation to its meaning vis-a-vis Christ rather than the coming of Christ to the Church as in the Gospels. Thus the subject of typology with Paul was not so much the Person of Christ but His Church as His members.  

It would appear, then, that typology was an inductively appropriated perspective which was given a lasting invigoration by the resurrection experiences of the Church. Such a perspective demonstrated the unity of revelation. Dietzfelbinger concludes regarding Paul's use of one instance of typology, that of the Abraham history:

Damit hält er die Kontinuität zwischen Alten und Neuen Testament fest und darin die Kontinuität des Weges Gottes mit der Menscheit; damit hält er aber auch fest die Einheit der Offenbarung.  

Michel claims that to understand Paul aright when he

---


2Goppelt, Typ., p. 154.

3Dietzfelbinger, PAT, p. 41. He remarks that in the use of Scripture the assumptions and goals serve the facts rather than the other way around, p. 35.
speaks of the Church as Israel$^1$ and the true temple$^2$ will provide the perspective "dass der ganze altestamentliche Ritus typologisch auf des Christentum hinweist."$^3$

Finally, the historical moorings subsequent to and inherent in typological thought acted as an apologetic force and doctrinal guard.$^4$

**SPIRIT AND LETTER**

To identify Jesus with Messiah did not in and of itself become Paul's only key to interpreting aright the OT. The Holy Spirit had a central place in the life and thought of the community not only in charismatic and evangelistic experiences but also in noetic enlightenment regarding the true understanding of Scripture. In light of the assumption that Jesus was the Messiah the concept of Spirit became the hermeneutical basis by which Paul made the documents of the old covenant applicable to

---

$^1$Ro. 9:6; Gal. 6:16; 1 Cor. 10:8.

$^2$1 Cor. 3:6; 1 Cor. 5:7; Ro. 1:21.


$^4$Ephraim E. Urbach, "Halakah And History" from Jews, Greeks and Christians, ed. Robert Hammerton-Kelly (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), p. 120, writes: "There is no doubt that the interest taken in history and events of the past is considered to be important in the development of the Halakah insofar as they serve as a source and guide for its permutations and insofar as they teach man his way in his life and behavior."
the new. It is the detailing of what Spirit means both in theory and practice that causes difference of scholarly opinion.

Michel says that to describe religion as Book- or Spirit-religion must stop for Christianity because "das neutestamentliche Verständnis der Heiligen Schrift fordert, dass die Wortreligion immer Geistreligion ist." The Damascus road experience was not an occasion for Paul to break with the authority of the νοημα but, to the contrary, to seek after a new understanding of his Bible.

Harnack asserts the priority of the Spirit when he concludes that Paul did not use the OT as a "Quellen- und Erbauungsbuch" for the young churches but grounded his teaching in the Gospel and its accompanying Spirit. This concept is based on the view which sees the OT as used basically in the Law-Gospel debates with the Jews and therefore is not a norm for Paul's teaching or methods. Harnack traces the use of the OT throughout

---


2Michel, P&SB, p. 137.

3Michel, P&SB, p. 137.

4Harnack, ATPB, p. 137.

5For a discussion of Harnack's thesis as modified by Michel, P&SB, and others, see Ellis, PUOT, pp. 28-33.
six pauline letters\(^1\) and concludes that the Apostle had not given the OT to the church or the pagans as simply an "Erbauungsbuch."\(^2\) In these letters Paul does not use express OT citations as the basis of his authority but rather asserts the living Word of God, i.e. the Gospel. Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians contain many uses of the OT introduced by IF while no such usage is found in the previous six Epistles.\(^3\) Both Michel and Harnack imply an important methodological factor: Whatever Spirit and Letter may mean, they must first be defined in the terms of the early church and not according to modern hermeneutic.

The original intention of the Law was to call men into obedience to the will of God and this is compatible with Ro. 3:21 and the Gospel of God. Only when the original intention of Torah was twisted to promote works to gain divine favor was the law identical with the letter.\(^4\) The Jew would view the law from the hermeneutical perspective of "letter" which Paul called a veiled

---

\(^1\) Thackeray, RPJT, p. 192, writes to the contrary that for Paul, "the Bible is constantly regarded as a lesson-book for Christians."

\(^2\) 1 & 2 Thess.; Col.; Phil.; Philemon; Eph.

\(^3\) Harnack, ATPB, p. 128.

\(^4\) See above n. 1.

mind in 2 Cor. 3. Thus the Spirit takes on a hermeneutical function as well. This function is of course defined and directed in accordance with Paul's christology. Kasemann's description of letter-spirit is similar to Schneider's "realistic" classification. Schneider writes that a formalistic use implies that letter is the literal sense and spirit is the Spiritual or typological meaning. The realistic use is where γράμμα equals the Mosaic law itself, not a sense of it, "lacking any internal force to give help towards its advance" which is now annulled in the Gospel and where πνεῦμα is the indwelling and actualizing presence within the believer. 

Paul's use of Ezekiel and Jeremiah in 2 Cor. 3 certainly added a new dimension to the anticipated work of the Spirit but remains within its possibilities. Paul, however, supplies insights which were never imagined by Ezekiel or Jeremiah such as the heart of stone becoming equal to the mosaic law and the spirit becoming the manner of Christ's working in the Church. It is obvious


3Richardson, EQ 45:211. 3Collange, E2C, p. 50.
from such passages as 2 Cor. 3:4, Gal. 3:24 and Ro. 2:29; 7:6 that Paul had gone beyond strictly logical and historical developments of the OT as expressed in the Messiah Jesus. Paul had also developed the "logique du mystère du Dieu, c.à.d. de la logique surnaturelle des réalités divines."¹ The spirit-letter matrix contributed to this.² This incorporates the spirit-letter configuration into the gospel-law tension and implies that Christ is the Spirit who both judges and justifies. The fact that Jesus was the Messiah was mediated through insights into the OT given by the living and present Spirit.

The hermeneutical role of the Spirit pervades several of the uses of the OT in 1 and 2 Cor. The discussion of wisdom in 1 Cor. 1:18-31 has prepared the way for the OT quotation of 1 Cor. 2:9 which expressly declares the hiddenness of God's plans. The quotation is immediately followed by the assertion that the Spirit had revealed those things to the Christians. Thus the new revelation in the Messiah could only be known through the interpretive medium of the Spirit. 2 Cor. 3:16 continues the discussion of the hiddenness of God's wisdom and the rebellious attitudes of the Jewish nation. The OT quota-

¹Renard, LATP, p. 213.
²Käsemann, POP, p. 164, finds the hermeneutical key to Paul's understanding of the OT to be his belief in justification. Note also Ro. 4 and 2 Cor. 3:7ff; 10:5-13.
tions asserted that a turning to Yahweh would bring enlightenment regarding the true nature of God's wisdom as expressed in Torah. Paul's point was his freedom as an apostle and it was the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:17) that brought him freedom and enlightenment.

Summary

The use of OT quotations in 1 and 2 Corinthians enunciates the central continuity between the OT and Corinth to be the character of God as particularly manifest in His work through the Messiah. The resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth was central to His acclamation as Messiah. The quotations emphasize both a historical and a pneumatic conceptuality. The historical conceptuality emerges from the frequent use of OT history as a moral guide for Christian piety and displays a typological, therefore historically grounded, way of thought. The pneumatic conceptuality relates to the often mentioned necessity for divine revelation through the Spirit of Messiah in order to understand God's message to the new Israel, the Church. The newness of Paul's application provides a certain discontinuity with the accepted interpretive conclusions of his Jewish contemporaries, but finds solid continuity with the historical sense of the OT.
TEXT FORMULATIONS IN THE PRE-PAULINE
CHRISTIAN TRADITION

TESTIMONIES

Methodology

This discussion of testimonies will be limited to a presentation of the necessary methodology for testing the hypothesis in 1 and 2 Cor. Much has been written\(^1\) on this subject since Hatch remarked that the Church may have adopted the Jewish practice of assembling collections of OT Scriptures.\(^2\) J. R. Harris' theory that the Church's testimony collection was in Greek and in one book\(^3\) has not found complete approval but his thoughts in

---


\(^2\) Edwin Hatch, *Essays In Biblical Greek* (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1889), p. 203. Dodd, AS, p. 25, says that Harris' book was the starting point, in Britain at least, of the modern study of the use of the OT in the NT.

\(^3\) J. R. Harris, *Testimonies, I* (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1916-20), pp. 109; 116-17. Plooij, who supports Harris, writes, STB, pp. 26-27, that the testimony book was in Aramaic and developed very early in the Palestinian Church. This early formulation of the details and basis of Christianity leaves no room for a later development by Hellenistic Christianity. Plooij, STB, p. 34, suggests that Jesus Himself inaugurated this testimony conceptuality.
modified form still have relevance today. There may be no a priori reason why the Church could not have had testimony literature but what is debatable is the documentation used as proof for such an assertion.\(^1\) It is always possible, given the common source of the OT, that striking similarities might occur with nothing but a coincidental and irrelevant relationship.\(^2\) F. C. Burkitt conjectures that Matthew made notes and proof-texts for his writing, possibly the Logia of Papias, on the basis of the agreement of Matthew's OT quotations with the MT against the LXX.\(^3\)

Michel, on the basis of the lateness of the evidence for testimonies, writes that it is always questionable whether the texts had their origin in the early strata of Christianity or if one should seek their source in a later time.\(^4\) He feels there is little hard evidence for the testimony hypothesis and that Paul had nothing besides the OT.\(^5\) Of course Michel's objection regarding

---


\(^2\)Knox, SPCJ, p. 126. \(^3\)Burkitt, GHT, pp. 125-27.

\(^4\)Michel, P&SB, p. 40 \(^5\)Michel, P&SB, pp. 43, 54.
early testimonies may have been met by the finds in Qumran cave 4.  

With reference to 4Q Test. Fitzmyer concludes that "it resembles so strongly the composite citations of the NT writers that it is difficult not to admit that Testimonia influenced certain parts of the NT."  

Paul's tendency to use composite quotations from the OT is later seen in the peculiarities of Rabbinics. This tendency of the NT writers is the primary reason for setting forth a testimony hypothesis, and the phenomenon of composite quotations finds its best examples in Paul's writings.  

Paul's belief in the essential unity of the OT must also be seen as fundamental for the concept of testimony collections.

---


2 Fitzmyer, ESB, p. 86.

3 Fitzmyer, ESB, pp. 65-66. See Ro. 15:9-12, 2 Cor. 6:16-18.
A methodology for recovering the evidence of testimonies must begin by locating a composite citation. Second, one looks for possible false attributions of one text to another author. Third, one seeks any textual variants which may occur in another citation or which vary from the usual form. Fourth, and hardest to prove, when one finds an author who presents a chain of texts under a common concept and aim which is not manifest from each text individually, then one has reasonable proof of the use of a testimony.¹

One common characteristic of the composite quotations is that they are all used with reference to the key-events in the NT tradition and therefore must have been intentionally used. This may be related to Dt. 19:15 and its implication that two or more witnesses (in this case Scriptural) are needed to establish a fact.² When one applies this five-point methodology to OT quotations one finds a lack of numerous composite citations that are repeated in the NT and Patristic writings.³

¹Prigent, EBar, p. 28.
³Fitzmyer, ESB, p. 85, points out that the Isa. 28:16; Psa. 118:–22; Isa. 8:14 sequence in Mat. 21:42; Ro. 9:31; 1 Pet. 2:6–8 and Ep. Abr. 6,2,4 has so many differences that a one source theory becomes highly questionable. Kraft, JBL 79:350, concludes in his study of Barnabas that Harris' theory is too simple for the com-
Testimonies In 1 And 2 Cor.

The first step in locating a testimony in 1 and 2 Cor. is to isolate the composite citations. Isa. 25:8 and Hosea 13:14 are combined in 1 Cor. 15:54-55 and Lev. 26:11-12, Isa. 52:11 and 2 Sam. 7:14 are combined in 2 Cor. 6:16-18. There are no false attributions of authorship present in these two groups of quotations. There are no peculiar and repeated textual variants. These two catenae are not quoted by other authors, however, which removes any firm foundation for their use as testimonies. Though various single quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. are found in other writers, these provide no support for the testimony theory as presented by Harris. The Patristic quotations which agree with Paul have been shown to be dependent on him rather than on a third testimony-type source. What is apparent is a use of the OT along the lines of the theses of Dodd and Lindars.

plexities of the citations. The possibilities remain that a complete scroll of Isaiah may have been used for some references, midrashic commentary material is also present, and that short testimony pages may have been used "each of which had its own organizational theme, yet all of which were related by means of their similar exegetical mentality." Lindars, NTA, p. 50, also sees a "common stock of exegetical material" to lie behind the writings of Peter, Paul, and the letter to the Hebrews.

1The 2 Sam. 7:14 quotation appears in Heb. 1:5.
THE TEXT-PLOT THEORY

C. H. Dodd's theory, as presented in AS, has not gone unchallenged. One recent and serious objection comes from Albert C. Sundberg. In two tables he shows the spread and concentration of the OT quotations as well as the relative importance of the OT for each NT book. Sundberg concludes that his tables do not show any "real concentration of New Testament references to particular passages of the Old Testament." This is also the conclusion of Kraft regarding a similar study of the OT quotations in Barnabas.

1 Dodd's text-plots are as follows: 1) Apocalyptic-Eschatological, Joel 2-3; Zech. 9-14 (primary); Dan. 7; Mal. 3:1-6; Dan. 12 (secondary); 2) Scriptures of the New Israel, Hosea; Isa. 6:1-9:7; 11:1-10; 28:16; 40:1-11; Jer. 31:10-34 (primary); Isa. 29:9-14; Jer. 7:1-15; Hab. 1-2 (secondary); 3) Scriptures of the Servant of the Lord and the Righteous Sufferer; Isa. 42:1-44:5; 49:1-13; 50:4-11; 52:13-53:12; 61; Psa. 69; 22:31; 38; 88; 34; 118; 41; 42-43; 80 (primary); Isa. 58:6-10 (secondary); 4) Unclassified Scriptures; Psa. 8; 110; 2; Gen. 12:3; 22:18; Dt. 18:15, 19 (primary); Psa. 132; 16; 2 Sam. 7:13-14; Isa. 55:3; Amos 9:11-12 (secondary).


3 Sundberg, NT 3:272-73.


5 Kraft, JBL 79:341.
One serious weakness of Sundberg's study is that he uses the Nestle 1948 tables as the source for OT quotations and therefore lists many "citations" from not only the Thessalonian epistles but also from Revelation. The numerous allusions to the OT contained in these two books are hardly to be ranked with the explicit OT quotations upon which Dodd based his conclusions. The statistics of Sundberg's study are therefore heavily weighted with misleading data. His specific study of the six citations of Psa. 22 in the NT demonstrates, however, that the citation of the OT does not of itself automatically serve as a pointer to the larger OT context.\(^1\) We have noted several quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. that had become proverbial in nature and were not used with reference to their context. They do not conflict with their original contextual sense.\(^2\)

Dodd's thesis, however, primarily affirms that text-plots confirm contextuality as opposed to the atomizing influence seen in Qumran and later Rabbinics.\(^3\) Paul's

---

\(^1\)Sundberg, NT 3:276f. Dodd, AS, p. 126, notes that the intended sections were understood as "wholes, and particular verses or sentences were quoted from them rather as pointers to the whole context than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves. . . . But in the fundamental passages it is the total context that is in view, and is the basis of the argument."

\(^2\)1 Cor. 1:31; 2:9b; 15:32; 2 Cor. 7:6; 8:21; 9:7; 10:17.

\(^3\)Dodd, AS, pp. 107f.
use of the OT in 1 and 2 Cor. confirms this. Paul did not ransack the OT for proof-texts but rather worked within a consistent framework of context.

One has an almost innate sense that context should play a leading role in the interpretation and, especially, application of any given passage. One also feels that to ignore or to give no indication of being aware of context is a sign of an inaccurate, if not tendentious, exegesis. It is this sense of contextual morality that has given rise to an article like that of S. L. Edgar which pushes for a direct relation between the Dominical historicity of a saying in proportion to its contextual fidelity. Edgar's thesis is that Jesus was more conscious of context than later gospel writers, therefore, those uses of the OT ascribed to Jesus which are observing of OT context are closest to His actual words. Richard Mead replies that one should not use modern methods of exegesis to make requirements upon the Bible. The evidence that respect for context is apparent "as a function of only certain kinds of O.T. uses suggests quite plainly that historical contextuality was not

---

cherished on principle in New Testament times."¹ Working within the limits of the Gospels, high respect for context is found in passages where there is either a text being commented upon, "a solid basis for valid inferences," or in a situation of argument or attack by hostile questioners.² This means that respect for context was directly related to the function which the passage served the NT writer.

Mead finds that this high regard for contextuality is especially notable in situations where an inner circle's thoughts are challenged. Most frequently, the inner circle may "think that certain assumptions and forms of demonstration stand beyond question."³ However, Paul, in 1 and 2 Cor., does not evidence such an unrestrained proof-texting. Dodd's method is to ask if the NT quotation was an "organic outgrowth" of the OT or just an "arbitrary reading into a passage of a meaning essentially foreign to it."⁴ At Corinth there was certainly


²Mead, NTS 10:287. Irenaeus, who primarily quoted to meet the arguments of his opponents, tended to quote exactly or nearly so and is almost wholly free from loose paraphrase; Swete, IOTG, p. 414.

³Mead, NTS 10:289, concludes: "In general, therefore, we should expect unrestrained proof-texting to flourish in groups marked by strong inner consensus shielded with an impenetrable parochialism."

⁴Dodd, AS, p. 133.
an inner circle of believers as well as opponents who challenged Paul.

Besides the influence of the addressees of the letter on the context, Paul's literary form also had its effect. The pesher material of Qumran provides an example of atomization of an OT text which results in a disregard for its context and conventional readings. This is also a possible result from midrashic literature.\(^1\) But, as a whole, Paul's use of the OT is more conservative than later exegesis at the end of the first century.\(^2\) Perhaps James Barr has best pointed the way by stating that one should not use modern contextual guidelines but see the OT quotations "against the context of what the early Christians were doing with them."\(^3\) It may be asserted, contrary to Barr, that in 1 and 2 Cor. Paul displays evidence of a contextual awareness and fidelity.

\(^1\) Lou H. Silberman, "Unriddling The Riddle," Revue De Qumran 3 (1961-62), p. 332. Wilfred L. Knox, St. Paul And The Church Of Jerusalem (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1925), passim, maintains that Paul shows the same disregard for the original meaning and context as did his contemporaries.

\(^2\) Herbert Braun, "Das Alte Testament In Neuen Testament," Zeitschrift Für Theologie Und Kirche 59 (1962), p. 21, writes that the OT was basically used in the NT "in der Konkretion seiner Situation."

\(^3\) James Barr, Old And New In Interpretation (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966), p. 142. This is spoken against the theory of C. H. Dodd.
This has been demonstrated in Part Two. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the OT context itself was the formative factor in the selection of the specific verse to be quoted. This is not to deny that several of Paul's quotations may show signs of previous compilation but rather to assert that Paul, and whatever aspects of tradition he adopted, allowed himself to be guided by the OT context. His soteriology did not run rampant over the historical particulars of the OT. Therefore, Dodd's concept of a basic set of OT contexts which exercised a control over the NT utilization of specific texts is supported.

Text-Plots In 1 And 2 Cor.

Paul did not use any of the passages in Dodd's first group. This is understandable because when, in 1 Cor. 15, Paul spoke of the future it concerned the event of resurrection, which finds no explicit OT support.

From Dodd's second group, Paul has used Hos. 3:14 (1 Cor. 15:55) to refer to the ultimate absence of death. Hos. 10:12 (2 Cor. 9:10) is used to speak of God's gracious provisions for man. Isa. 29:14 (1 Cor. 1:19)

---

1This is a point of continuing controversy. For example, Doeve, JHSG, p. 29, and Stendahl, SSM, pp. 190ff., see no difference between NT and later Rabbinic exegesis while William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation Among The Sectaries Of The Dead Sea Scrolls," The Biblical Archaeologist 14 (1951), pp. 60-62, 73, sees a wide gulf separating the two. Marbury, OTTT, p. 161, says that Paul's use of the OT is essentially not rabbinic at all.
illustrated the hidden quality of God's mind from men.

The Servant of the Lord Scriptures in 1 and 2 Cor. are Isa. 49:8 (2 Cor. 6:2) and Isa. 49:13 (2 Cor. 7:6) and speak of the salvation and comfort of God. This was particularly fitting for Paul's context of concern for the Corinthians as well as Titus. However, there is no use of these passages with reference to the Servant of the Lord.

The fourth grouping of Dodd's text-plots is the unclassified corpus. Paul's use of Psa. 8:6 (1 Cor. 15:27) and Psa. 110:1 (1 Cor. 15:25) could easily be classified under group three in that they refer to the kingdom of the Anointed One.

A brief comparison of 1 and 2 Cor. with Romans shows that in Romans Paul's OT quotations are limited to Dodd's groups two and three, the New Israel and Servant of the Lord. Also, in Romans Paul's OT is presented in a more formal manner and more to the point and essential purpose of each text-plot. In 1 and 2 Cor. the OT passages do not always relate to the thrust of the text-plot even though the verses are part of the group. Therefore Paul has used the OT differently in 1 and 2 Cor. than in Romans. Romans shows a use of formal evidence while 1 and 2 Cor. shows a situational application. This is due to the different life settings of the two correspondences rather than to a different attitude to the OT by the
apostle. In Romans and 1 and 2 Cor. Paul used the OT as the voice of Yahweh and His Messiah.

While the text-plot theory with its contextual argument provides an essential and accurate understanding of the coherent use of the OT in early Christianity, it does not account for the use of every Scripture within the plots. Behind the original and progressive accumulation of OT texts used by Paul stands the formative conceptuality that God was actively working in the Church. This gave Scripture the potential to make a contribution to all areas of life, not simply to four general topics.
INDICATIONS OF A PALESTINIAN GREEK OT
IN 1 AND 2 COR.

With the textual and conceptual perimeters previously defined, can one now expect to find some indications of the earliest strata of the Old Greek (proto-Lucian or -Theodotion) in the OT quotations in 1 and 2 Cor.? Such readings are, at best, difficult to discern. Many readings previously thought to be proto-Lucian must now be seen as the Old Greek (OG) stratum of Lucianic tradition in $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$.\(^1\) Also, a reading which does not agree with the MT or B has little relevance for discerning proto-Lucanian readings in the later prophets and hagiographa. Following Barthélemy's scheme, the Palestinian Hebrew-based OG underlies the ψαλιε revisions to the Babylonian Hebrew, but readings which do not equal MT B are still of questionable value with reference to Lucianic readings in the major prophets.

The vast majority of research in the KAIGE recension (KR) and proto-Lucian has been done in Reigns. In those books it is becoming increasingly more convincing when a particular text-type is delineated. In the Pentateuch, Psalms and Major Prophets, however, one is

hard pressed to define with certainty KR or proto-Lucian and yet the majority of the quotations in 1 and 2 Cor., as in the rest of the NT, fall within these books. The work of the GLXX has clarified the textual families reflected in the MS evidence but comprehensive works dealing with the translational tendencies of each book are not yet available. With these limitations in mind this study will seek to discern any indication of the use of a Greek OT which has affinities with the types generally assigned to a text-type which early on developed a reading characteristic of the Palestinian locale. Whether such readings follow the characteristics of KR or proto-Lucian may not be clearly answered at this time. In spite of these present methodological limitations some insight can be gained.

Textual Affinities According To The Old Testament Books

Isaiah. In the quotation of Isa. 22:13 (1 Cor. 15:32) there are no GLXX nor BHS variants and Paul reproduced the LXX exactly. This phrase had evidently acquired the status of a proverb and therefore passed into all known traditions in the same Hebrew and then Greek form. The quotation of Isa. 25:8 (1 Cor. 15:54) has long been recognized as having affinity with Theodotion. Within the framework of Cross and Barthélemy's work there is indication of a proto-Theodotionic reading; that is to say, that Paul shows the pre-Hexaplaric OG at this point.
The Hebrew tradition presents a virtually united presentation of the Pi'ēl reading of $y^7_2$. This is reflected in the LXX κατεπέλευ. Another tradition translated $y^7_2$ as a Pu'āl. This is seen in the Syriac (wntbl'), the Theodotionic reading from Q and 1 Cor. 15: 54. There is no indication that the versions have been harmonized with Paul at this point, therefore Paul reflects an early first century version. This is further strengthened by the reading είς νυκε. θ α' and the Syh have this reading. If chronological priority is given to the θ' form it appears that it was later taken up by Paul and used by α' and the Syh. σ' substituted the more common and idiomatic είς τάλαος.

John Grindel\(^1\) has shown that the translation pattern $ηκολ/είς νυκος$ is a characteristic of the KR. In LXX\(^2\) Isa $ηκολ$ is normally translated as είς τον αιωνα\(^2\) but may also be translated in other ways though none of them is είς νυκος.\(^3\) Thus there is a degree of freedom in how the phrase is translated in Isaiah and also in Jeremiah.\(^4\)

---


\(^3\)Isa. 25:8, τοχυειν; 57:16, δια πάντος; 34:10, εις χρόνον πάλιν.

\(^4\)Grindel, CBQ 31:500.
This contrasts with Job and Psalms where it virtually always translates as εἰς τέλος.\(^1\) Grindel calls the 1 Cor. 15:54 passage a quotation from KR.\(^2\) He has also established the dependence of α’ on KR for εἰς νῦνος.

Because this is an early first-century reading which does not agree with the MT (in a book where a proto-MT basis is present) nor with the OG tradition, it can be attributed to an early Palestinian textual tradition; though it may be better to say 'translational' tradition due to the fact that no Hebrew non-MT basis is indicated. E. Ellis\(^3\) says that a rendering in 1 Cor. 15:45 of εἰς νῦνος represents a "moot point" as to whether Paul found the phrase in his text or whether his text influenced the versions of Θ’ and α’ and concludes that the rendering is probably a creation of the early church's doctrinal and liturgical formulations. The present evidence shows that this text was part of his Greek OT and that he was faithful to his version.

In Isa. 28:11-12 (1 Cor. 14:21) a Syriac reading indicates a possible Hebrew basis for Paul's use of λαλήσω which differs from the LXX and the MT. The underlying

---

\(^{1}\)Except Psa. 49:20, αἰῶνος; Grindel, CBQ 31:500.

\(^{2}\)Grindel, CBQ 31:501, n. 11. See also Jer. 50:39 (27:39 LXX), Lam. 5:20; Psa. 49:10; Job 36:7.

\(^{3}\)Ellis, PUOT, pp. 194-95.
Hebrew of Paul's version appears to have read ἡλία (as does the Syriac). This section of the quotation (καλησον τῷ λαῷ τοῦτῳ) is in conformity with a text-type and is not an ad hoc Pauline adaptation. This is further strengthened by the reading of Aquila. A Theodotionic reading is not extant at this point. However, giving weight to the early first century reading of Paul indicates that Aquila may have adopted the tradition which Paul reflects. This appears to have been the case in Aquila's reading of Isa. 25:8. In passing we may be reminded that the λέγει κύριος sayings of Paul seem to indicate a pre-Pauline early Christian form which reflect text-forms sometimes agreeing with the LXX and other times showing affinities with α' or θ'. Therefore more weight should be given to the concept that 1 Cor. 14:21 is not a Pauline ad hoc formulation.

In Isa. 29:14 (1 Cor. 1:19) Paul follows A Q N B against the Lucianic groups and V by not including the double use of αὐτοῦ (V αὐτῶν). Paul's version preceded this Lucianic correction to the OG. His only variant from the OG tradition, the use of ἐθέτησον for κρύψω, gives no evidence for an early Palestinian text-type. The reading of κρύψω by Justin gives probability to the occurrence of an ad hoc (either from a memory slip or a purposeful alteration) substitution of ἐθέτησον by Paul.

The use of Isa. 40:13 (1 Cor. 2:16) is, for all practical purposes, an exact representation of the OG.
Paul's word order (taken from Ro. 11:34 σὺμβουλος αὐτοῦ) shows his version varied from Ν B V and the major Lucianic and Catena witnesses. Paul shows negligible affinity with α' (who reads the more fitting to Paul's context, πνεῦμα) and Θ'. The dialectic distinction shown in the Pauline use of συμβιβάσει for συμβιβάζει shows the presence of the reading to be distinguished from Q and B, with Q as an especially pure representative of the OG, which reads -βάζει while QMS reads -βάσει with Να A V and most Lucianic witnesses. Given the priority chronologically of Paul's reading, this is a possible early stratum of Lucian's text.

Isa. 45:14 (1 Cor. 14:25) and 49:13 (2 Cor. 7:6) are allusive and offer no basis for the present consideration. Isa. 64:4 (1 Cor. 2:9) is quoted so freely that it also has no clear affinities with any known text group. Isa. 49:8 (2 Cor. 6:2) has only one minor variant in the quoted portion in GLXX and Paul agrees with the OG exactly.

In Isa. 52:11 (2 Cor. 6:17) Paul's agreement with A B regarding ἐξελθατε against V QC and most of the Lucianic witnesses shows the influence of the OG while the ἄφησθε reading for ἀπεσθε of B V 88 clearly shows later Hexaplaric influence. The second important variant in the Isa. 52:11 quotation, Paul's use of αὐτῶν for LXX αὐτῆς, shows that this is an early reading in the Lucianic
strata of witnesses. The underlying Hebrew may have read a feminine plural whereas the MT reads singular as does the LXX. Or this may be a translational preference of the version Paul used. In Isa. 55:10 (2 Cor. 9:10) the GLXX presents only minor variants and Paul quoted the Greek OT exactly (ἐπιχωρήγων is not considered to be part of the quotation).

For the book of Isaiah, therefore, Paul reproduces the OG tradition in the main. There are several readings, however, which diverge both from the OG and MT traditions. One may conclude that this represents a conformity to another text-type which would have been current in Palestine and Syria while Paul was being educated. Due to the present state of MSS evidence and methodology for determining the text-types of LXX MSS one cannot be dogmatic regarding the implications of this tendency. This does not appear to be evidence for a thorough-going Palestinian Hebrew Vorlage but is more likely a Greek OT text revision dependent on a translational preference. The point is that Paul's Isaiah quotations show some evidence of a text-type other than the Alexandrian and MT traditions.

Hosea. In the Hos. 13:14 quotation (1 Cor. 15:55) there was a great fluidity in the early forms as shown by the reading for the LXX δικη, which Paul renders νικος: Aquila reads δηματα; Symmachus πληγη; Theodotion δικη.
Paul followed the OG text. The Three read ἔσομαι, ἔσομαι, and ἔσται respectively as a targumic addition to the LXX ποι. Paul's text had avoided (preceded?) the Theodotionic influence at this point though his text also differs from the LXX in word order. In reading νίκος Paul finds no other MSS support. Only one Lucianic witness and three catena MSS and a few others read νίκη.

Νίκος is a later form of νίκη from around the first century B.C. Both words may translate ΜΧΙ in the Greek OT but never ΙΔΤ.

It is interesting that the MSS do not preserve the later Greek form νίκος and this shows that they have not been harmonized to Paul. Paul either updated the form of his Greek OT, substituted the νίκος from the preceding Isa. quotation or found the text-form as is in its testimony-like form. Especially noteworthy is the fact that 22 reads νίκη. This is a later correction to an important Lucianic witness which originally read ἐξαθηκη with the major Lucianic group. Against what was 22 corrected? The rather allusive use of Hos. 10:12 (2 Cor. 9:10) shows Paul following a text word order that agrees with the OG tradition against a majority of Lucianic witnesses. But the pronoun ὅμων (LXX ὅμην) shows the translation of Θ by a genitive rather than a dative, though MSS evidence (106 Aeth) is slight for ὅμων in the Greek OT.
Ezekiel 37:27 (2 Cor. 6:16). Here again, in this possible source for Paul's quotation, is seen the use of 7 being translated by the genitive case only in the Lucianic versions whereas the majority of the others take the dative case. The MT reads ὅν, the LXX αὐτοῦς and Paul reads αὐτῶν. This may be a translational preference of proto-Lucian (or the OG, Tov). Paul's word order ἑςονταὶ μου displays the early reading which V Q and the majority of Lucianic witnesses support against B. B also shows a genitival reading for ἃν in this case. Ezek. 37:16 and 38:7 show that the Lucianic groups alone display this genitival tendency, although this is not a completely consistent phenomenon as is evidenced by the ἃν = σοι in Lucian of Ezek. 37:18.

Proverbs. Paul's quotation of Prov. 3:41 (2 Cor. 8:21) agrees with the OG after account is taken of the effect of Paul's hermeneutics in the text-form (hermeneutical retroversion) and there are no MT or SLXX variants. While there are no variants for the Prov. 22:9 quotation (2 Cor. 9:7) the allusive quality of the text offers no evidence for a particular form.

Job. The single Job quotation, 5:13 (1 Cor. 3:19) varies from all known text-forms except for one agreement (αὐτῶν) with A.

Psalms. All the Psalm passages quoted by Paul in 1 and 2 Cor. have no GLXX variants and agree with the OG
exactly, except for one (1 Cor. 15:27) which agrees after hermeneutical retroversion and 1 Cor. 15:25, which is a close adaptation. This agreement among the Greek MSS is striking in contrast with the fluidity of traditions seen in the Isaiah quotations.

2 Samuel. The single 2 Sam. quotation has only one minor GLXX variant and Paul agrees with the OG after hermeneutical retroversion.

Pentateuchal Quotations. Paul's quotations from Genesis, after retroversion, agree with the LXX exactly. The Ex. 32:6 quotation (1 Cor. 10:7) has only one variant and that is in Justin. Paul quotes exactly. Ex. 34:34 is an allusion. Ex. 16:18 (2 Cor. 8:15) shows a mixed tradition. Paul's word order finds witness in n (a possible Lucianic witness) Arm. and Boh. while his ὀλίγον is witnessed by A and Symmachus.

The Nu. 14:16 (1 Cor. 10:5) quotation has only one LXX variant and Paul quoted exactly.

The first two Dt. quotations, 22:24 and 25:4, (1 Cor. 5:13, 9:9) after hermeneutical retroversion agree with the OG tradition. Dt. 32:17 is used allusively. Dt. 19:15 (2 Cor. 13:1) shows signs of Pauline adaptation and is witnessed by various MSS such as 72 314 19 108 and others which are not at present clearly classified according to text-form, one exception being n (75) which has Lucianic readings. However, major Uncials attest Paul's
reading of σταθήσεται (A F M V W and others). The passive (σταθη) is also found in Mt. 18:16, and may witness to an early Palestinian Hebrew reading in Pu'al. Mt. 18:16 is a pure f reading. The general cast of this passive reading in the NT is one different from the Alexandrian trend and differs from the MT as well.

Conclusions

What is striking about the Pentateuchal quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. is their very close fidelity to the OG tradition. The Pentateuchal quotations adhere to what appears to be a pervasive and ancient Greek tradition while the Isaiah quotations show an early Palestinian influence away from B and MT. The Psalm quotations also clearly show a unified tradition and do not appear to be affected by local text-forms. The proto-Lucianic revisions to the Pentateuch appear to play no part in 1 and 2 Cor. Cross and Barthélemy stress that this revision was a process and sporadic in its effect. In considering Paul's chronological relationship with the Lucianic and other variants Paul's particular text-forms either precede the proto-Lucianic revisions or, following Tov's multiple OG theory, represent one of two (or more?) OG forms.

One might, at first blush, hold that Paul was closer to the OG in the Pentateuch and Psalms because he knew them the best. While this may be true, the Greek OT
MSS themselves show that the OT pericopae Paul used were more consistently transmitted than those derived from other parts of the LXX. It would appear from the quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. that the Pentateuch and Psalms were known to Paul in a tradition closely aligned with the Egyptian (Cross) or Antiochian (Barthélemy) but that the prophetical books circulated in text-forms based on foundations differing from the Egyptian. There is no clear indication that the quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. show the effects of a non-MT Vorlage though KR-type readings are present. Cross writes that the formula Lucian ≠ B, MT only applies in the Pentateuch and former prophets because an Egyptian Hebrew text underlies B and the MT is assigned to Babylon, leaving all other readings dependent on a Palestinian Hebrew basis, differing from the MT.

For the major and minor prophets, Cross asserts that the Hebrew under B is Palestinian. If, with Barthélemy, one gives up the idea of an Egyptian Hebrew basis for B and says that the Palestinian Hebrew is the basis of B, then Lucianic readings are difficult to distinguish from B itself and anything that differs from the MT could be a Palestinian reading. While differences may have arisen in the Hebrew in Egypt from its Palestinian parent text, these do not appear in Paul's 1 and 2 Cor. quotations.

As has been said earlier, a first century control, such as Qumran, is needed and helpful for a study such as
this. In the books where little has been done to isolate early Palestinian readings, the quotations of 1 and 2 Cor. can act as such a control in the absence of Qumran evidence. Such has been done in this study and the evidence illuminates early variants in first century Palestine from the Greek OT tradition (LXX) but also emphasizes the relative purity with which the Pentateuch and Psalms existed in Paul's day.

This study has shown that the OT was used by Paul for more than just polemic against the Jews (Harnack) but also formed the basis for the guidance of Christian piety and morality. Braun's arguments for complete discontinuity between the Testaments is not supported from the evidence in the Corinthian correspondence. These letters show use of the OT based on two factors, the second being an organic extension of the first. The first is a continuity of deity and the second is a promise-fulfillment schema. The latter presupposes the former and cannot exist without it. Thus the works that stress the salvation-historical relationship between the Testaments (Michel, Dodd, Goppelt, Dietzfelbinger) find support in 1 and 2 Cor. A strictly apologetic origin of Paul's use of the OT, such as Lindars presents, is therefore inadequate at this point.

Ulonska's three questions\(^1\) may now be answered as

\(^1\)Cf. p. 79 above.
far as 1 and 2 Cor. are concerned. Paul did in fact treat his hearers as acquainted with OT. This is apparent from his IF alone, not to mention Paul’s frequent examples from Israel’s wilderness wanderings. Paul could not have been with the Corinthians for long before he would have fully explained his gospel "according to the Scriptures." This course of study alone would provide an acquaintance with the OT sufficient to appreciate Paul’s quotations, not to mention the undoubted influence of the Synagogue community from which many converts came.

Ulonska’s second question was whether Paul used a salvation-historical schema. It has already been sufficiently demonstrated that Paul did use such a conceptuality. Ulonska’s aversion to this fact stems from his emphasis on the newness of Paul’s religion to the exclusion of linkage with OT piety. Ulonska is convinced that Paul’s near expectation of the Parousia made any need for historical structure redundant.¹

Therefore Ulonska answers his third question concerning Paul’s obligations to his OT materials in the negative: Paul only used the OT for illustration, not for authority. This view is an echo of Harnack’s observations. The position need not be either/or but rather both/and.

Ulonska's overemphasis of the illustrative function of the quotations has overlooked, first of all, the significance of the IF within the context of Judaism and, secondly, the overt connection of the God of the OT both with the OT events and with their contemporary significance. The OT was more than contemplative material and did in fact transmit elements of piety.

In conclusion, this study has shown that in 1 and 2 Cor. Paul has used the OT in close connection with its historical context. In doing so the Apostle showed no evidence of picking and choosing among text-types to find a suitable reading for his theology but, on the contrary, faithfully used the Greek OT text at hand. His sometimes quite free adaptations do not destroy the the essential historical sense of the passages but rather illuminate their meaning by the light of Paul's messianic beliefs. For these beliefs to be supported without warping or denying the OT context and without fabrication of the OT text is to primarily discover just what one would expect from the direction and essence of Paul's arguments: that the work of Yahweh in the Messiah Jesus formed a continuous and logical outgrowth of His character and acts in OT history.
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