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Knowledge of Yahua (IAO- Yahwah, tetragram) the main subject of the Bible was already known to non Semitic peoples which included the Greek speaking peoples. Before Paul much interaction had taken place between the Greek speaking peoples and the Hebrews. We can see for example 1. The Biblical Philistines or the sea peoples are believed to be of Greek extraction by many scholars. 2 Moses came from Egypt and various Greek philosophers including Pythagoras and Plato visited Egypt. Thus Egypt where the name Yahua first appears could be an early source of the Greek form of the tetragram IAO (see below) which appears in the earliest strata of the Old Greek Scriptures (LXX). The Pentateuch also speaks of Greece using the term Javan (ION) son of Japhet (Gen 10:2) and ION's sons Elisha, Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim, historically by the 7th BC in the time of Josiah, Israel and Greece had strong trading links. The prophet Ezekiel (27:13), Daniel (11) and Zechariah (9:13) all have prophecies indicating connections with Greece and Greek islands, thus ideas about the God of Israel and his name could have entered the Greek vocabulary in this period, while the Scriptures were still in the making, even as some information about the Greeks entered the Bible (Gordon 1965). Even as the name Yahua possibly entered the Greek world before the Old Greek (referring to the Jewish Scriptures as first translated into Greek (De Troyer 2013) so did knowledge of Moses and thus the Pentateuch. We can observe for example 1. JohnGager states regarding the knowledge of Moses among Greeks and others: Revealing is the exalted status given to Moses as a lawgiver ranking with the legendary heroes of ancient civilization. Given the time Diodorus Siculus was writing and the ultimate sources of his material, these texts would be invaluable witnesses for pagan opinions of Judaism….they reflect a long established tradition shared widely by Jews and pagans alike that regarded Judaism as a divinely revealed philosophy with Moses as its founder and spokesmen. Before Diodorus, this understanding [regarding Moses] appears in Hecataeus of Abdera, Megasthenes, Clearchus of Soli, and Hermippus. Later it will persist in Numenius, Porphyry, Celsus, and Julianii . 2 Hermippus (3rd century) in his De Pythagora states that Pythagoras himself copied the teaching of the Jews and Thracians... and introduced many points of Jewish law into his philosophy.iii(Gager 1985, p.69) iv. 3. Also Stern notes “One should remember that there is nothing surprising in the fact that Hermippus traces some Pythagorean customs to Jews, since even in the 4th century B.C.E. we encounter the opinion that the philosopher learned much Eastern lore (Stern p.93) . v4 Antonius Diogenes in his life of Pythagoras notes “Pythagoras traveled among Egyptians, Arabs, Chaldeans, and Hebrews [and that] he learned from them the science of dream interpretation”. 5 Numenius of Apamea makes the famous quote that “Plato was Moses Speaking Attic Greek”. There is also evidence that there were translations of the Scripture before what is now called the Old Greek or the LXX and of course some of these have in all likelihood later influenced the Apostle Paul's translations and citations or represent translation possibilities of the Jewish scriptures into Greek. The literary evidence includes 1. Aristobulus of Paneas a Hellenistic Jewish Philosopher (3rd or 2nd BC) prior to Philo, Alexandrian and cited by Clement and Eusebius asserts (1) that part of the Torah were translated into Greek before the LXX. (2) That these portions from the basis of the teaching of Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato.vi3. Kahle (1959) in his Cairo Genizah posits that the LXX came from a Greek Targum used in the synagogues. Thus Paul's had many options for citing Greek versions of the Jewish Scriptures or translating his own rendering into Greek. All of these interactions would have translation from the Hebrew or the Aramaic to the Greek or from Hebrew to Aramaic. The Synagogues Paul grew up in would have had interpreters or translators at every service (Lightfoot 1979), (Fitzmyer 1991) and in the Church in Corinth where at least two leaders of synagogues were a part of the
leadership of the early Jesus community (Acts 18, 1Cor 1) the models of the synagogue and the role of interpreter would have been inherited (Lightfoot 1979 [1859]). We have looked at the history of Bible translation into Greek from before Paul we now turn some aspects of the types of Text which were circulating at the time of Paul and will notice the major differences between them and the later texts which were preserved in the Orthodox and Catholic Churches under the name LXX.

**The Texts from Paul Time**

When Paul is said to be citing the Jewish scriptures we need to remember a number of extremely important points. He could be citing from a Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek text. The Hebrew and the Greek come in different “editions” (De troyer 2013). In Hebrew we have the MT and other traditions represented in Qumran (eg Samaritan Pentateuch, the text represented by the Latin Gallican Psalter of Jerome). In Greek “The best known is the so-called Old Greek Text...Very often, Codex Vaticanusvii is quoted as the oldest and complete witness of the old Greek text” (De Troyer 2013, p.49). However for some parts of the Scriptures Vaticanus (B)vi does not offer the old Greek (OG) text but a *kaige* text (De troyer 2013). This is a recension of the OG corrected towards the MT e.g Nahal Hever (ibid p.50). Thirdly there is an Antiochian or Lucanian text. This textix corrects the OG towards the MT and improves the Greek (De Troyer2013, p.50). In addition it should be noted that the main manuscripts, papyri and fragments are not from the time of Paul (first century) but are mainly from third and fourth century onwards except those we ill mention now. These include as noted Codex Vaticansus (4C), Codex Sinaiticus (4C.) and Codex Alexandrius (5C). We have versions or rescensions or older fragments of the Greek OT. These include 1. LXX P. Fouad. 266 2nd C. BC (parts of Gen. 7, and 38, Deu 17-33, tetragram written in Aramaic letter) 2. (Rahlfs 848), P. Ryl. Gk. 458 (Rahlfs 957),3. 8 Hev XIIgr (Rahlfs 943) (minor prophets tetragram written in paleo-hebrew letters) and 4Q LXX Levb (1C BC)(Tetragram in Greek letters as IAO). These early witnesses of the Greek texts have characteristics which none of the fourth century plus witnesses of the LXX have. They all without fail render a form of the Tetragrammaton. The tetragram is not replaced by the Greek noun *kurios* or even one of the *nomina sacra* which are used in the second century papyri to render divine names, but instead they all use a form of the Tetragrammaton. To put it another way no Greek biblical manuscript before the year 150AD substitutes the Greek common noun *kurios* for the divine memorial name YHWH. These early texts are very important in looking at Paul as a translator or as one quoting scriptures because they, not Vaticansus and Alexandrius are the evidence regarding Greek translation models from the time of the Apostle Paul (Piertesma 1984)x (Hylton 2013)xi and mean we cannot be certain what Paul actually wrote when in his citations in for example Gal 3:6, 1 Cor 2:16, 1Cor 14:21, Rom 4:8. In none of the most ancient witnesses is the tetragram replaced by *kurios* when translating from Hebrew. Before this evidence was made clearly available Baudissin (1929) completed a mammoth study of the substitution of *kurios* for Yahuah or the tetragram and concluded that “the ancient LXX read *kurios* for *Yhwh*” (Piertesma 1984) (Baudissin 1929). However with the publication of these older Greek witnesses in 1944 Wadell(1944) concluded that Baudissin was wrong (Kahle 1959) (Hylton 2013, p.92) . Howard (1977) in his study of the tetragram in the NT concluded “From these findings we can now say with almost absolute certainty that the divine name…. was not rendered *kurios* in the pre- Christian Bible, as so often has been thought. Usually the Tetragram was written out in Aramaic or in *paleo* Hebrew or was translated into Greek letter (Howard, 1977). This impinges directly on Paul’s possible translation approach because it indicates an area which needs more investigation since we do not have any Pauline documents with *kurios* or the tetragram from that period. Howard concludes from his study that “the NT writers when citing the LXX or the Greek OT with the tetragrammaton, would have naturally included the (Tetragrammaton in their citations” (Howard 1977) (Hylton, 2013, p. 92). The papyri of the NT and the later Greek version contain *nomina sacra* (abbreviations of divine names) of divine name like KS for *kurios* and IS for *Iesous*. They do not witness to the presence of a form of the tetragram. Thus in all the papyri witnessing to Paul writings the closest we get to a tetragram is not KS but IHS the *nomina sacra* for the name of IHSOUS. That is the later Christian texts have all substituted *kurios* and *theos* (in the form of *nomina sacra*) for the tetragrammaton (Howard, 1977) (Metzger 1981) (Hylton 2013). However from the third century onwards the OT manuscripts from then also agree with the NT manuscripts, fragments and papyri that the *kurios* and *theos* have been
substituted for YHWH. It is only when we come to fragments and witness from before 150 AD that the tetragram is present in OT fragments, but there are no witnesses regarding the Apostle Paul from this period especially not with citations of Scriptures. Because of the silence regarding this evidence we cannot conclude either way although Howard argues he can see in the later witnesses of the later manuscripts and fragments of the NT where the text has been changed to remove the tetragram and replace it with kurios or theos. In view of the fact that no manuscript before 150AD witnesses the substitution of kurios for YHWH and that הוהי and אלוהי are rarely used as substitutes for YHWH in the DSS (Howard 1977, p.72). Hylton (2013) looked at indirect evidence pointing to the presence of YHWH or it Greek rendering IAO (iota alpha omega) in writings arguing first the IAO was a rendering of YHWH (Skehan, 1957, Parson 1992, De Troyer 2005). These letters 4QLXXPapLevb (Lev 3:12, 4:27) were written in uncial script(Hylton 2013, p.92). “This new evidence strongly suggests that the usage in question goes back for some books at least to the beginning of the Septuagint rendering” (De Troyer 2005)(Hylton 2013 p.93). This would suggest that the Greek texts which Paul was either citing or from the period in which he was translating contained YHWH. De Troyer notes importantly “The appearance of IAO in the Leviticus scroll has left many scholars baffled. Is it proof that the Tetragrammaton was still pronounced in the first century?” (De Troyer 2005). Other witnesses that the environment in which Paul translated included the Tetragram indicated by Hylton include 1. The testimony to the name IAO by Diodorus of Sicily (Hylton 2013, p.93), 2. The evidence of Tertullian (160-225) and 3. Origen (185-254) regarding the presence of IAO in the Scriptures used by them in their debates: Tertullian against the Valentinians and Origen against Celsus (Hylton 2013, p.94) and 4. Origen's commentary on the name in his commentary on Jeremiah (Hylton 2013, p.94). 5. Ireneus witnesses to the presence of IAO in a Christian Gnostic baptism from the period when many Gnostic were yet indistinguishable from other Christians to outsiders (Hylton 2013, p.95). 6. Also Coptic Christian ritual texts of power using IAO and Jesus together. 7. In a prayer of a certain bishop Sosronius Bishop of Telle: “Lord IAO, Bringer of light, deliver the thief that I am looking for...and finally in the mouth of the mystic/ Gnostic Jesus of the late second century Pistis Sophia (Hylton 2013, p.95) This point is clear we are dependent on third to tenth century witnesses for the evidence on what Paul wrote but the Jewish context in which he wrote meant he would have read not kurios in his Greek texts but YHWH. If he followed the normal standard in translation from that period he would have also written the tetragram in his texts (Howard 1977) (Hylton, 2013) but we have only Old Testament Greek texts from that period and they are unanimous in their testimony to the presence of the tetragram in pre Christian Jewish texts (Hylton 2013, De Troyer 1999, Kahle 1959). Even after 150AD the names of God appear not in full but in shortened forms (Hylton 2013). Also in the transition period the second and third century we find evidence among the Christians of the use of forms of the tetragrammaton in their scriptures and rituals. In short it is clear the LXX’s versions we are consulting now to compare with Paul are not identical to the LXX texts which were present in the first century Jewish community. There is one significant additional point to make at this juncture. The use of the tetragram in Greek translation is clear but it was not used in the Aramaic targumim in that period. "In the Aramaic documents of 1 QtgJob and 1 QapGen the Tetragram never appears. In the targum it is surrogated byAMED. In lQapGen it is surrogated by אֵל, three times, אָלָה, once, and הַדֶּן once (Howard 1977 p.71). This point may be important because if Paul was simply citing a Greek text he was not translating, but if he was citing an Aramaic or Hebrew text he was translating. If citing an Aramaic Targum he may have used the Greek word theos to translate the Aramaic אֵל when he came across it. The important point regarding the evidence of the Qumran scrolls is that when they were citing scripture they including the Tetragram but when they were commenting on the text they would usually use אל to refer to God(Howard 1977, p72). With this limitation in mind we may turn to secondary literature seeking to explain the divergences between Paul's citation of the OT from the Masoretic Text and the various rescensions of the so called LXX. The question as to whether Paul was citing from a Greek Vorlage or a Hebrew or Aramaic Vorlage has to be resolved before one can decide on the kind of translator the Apostle Paul is. The problem of the differences in his citations from the manuscripts we have today whether the earlier LXX, or the later Peshitta (Aramaic), Samaritan Pentateuch, or the Masoretic have been addressed by modern scholars since Whiston(1722) the
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successor to Isaac Newton in Cambridge University. The scholarship seeks to explain systematic omissions (of words or phrases), composite quotations, submission of one word for another, changing the order of words, changes or person and number, following the LXX against the MT, agreement with Aramaic targumim or with alternative Greek translations, Acquila, Symmachus, or Theodotion.

After his encounter with Yahushua whom he "persecuteth", as Lukan Shual-Paul would have it or after God who had set him apart from his mother's womb decided to reveal his son in him, as the Galatian Paul would have it, what was his approach to translation? The field is wide open because decisions as to when Paul is citing and when he is giving a verbal parallel have not produced an academic consensus. As noted by Stanley “The question of what constitutes a “citation” is one of the most controverted issues in the modern study of ancient quotations” (Stanley 1992, p.4) Citation formula help at times but as with his contemporaries Paul gives a citation formula (e.g. As it is written gegraptia) but the words following the citation bear little resemblance to any text we have of the Scriptures, Hebrew or Greek (e.g. 1 Cor 2:9, Is. 64:4, 65:17) and at other times Paul states something with no citation formula but it appears exactly as that in the Scriptures we know of (for example ἀγαπήσεις τον πληροφόρον -You shall love your neighbor as yourself, Lev 19:18-Gal 5:14).

The problem of the number of citations (whether from Greek or translated from Hebrew or Aramaic) demonstrates the problem modern scholars have with dealing with a genius such as Paul in Messiah. Some limit the number of citations to around eighty whilst others set the number is in the hundreds. Scholars who differ on this include Ellis (1981) and Stanley (1992). Even the critical editions of the Greek NT (Nestle and UBS) differ as to whether there are quotations in such places as Rom 2:6, 4:9, 4:23, 9:20, 11:2, 1 Cor. 9:10, 14:25, 15:25, 2 Cor. 3:16, 9:7, 9:10 and Gal 2:16 (Stanley 1992, p.4). In short Paul the Apostle in regard to citation and translation of Scripture does not act in a way which modern critical scholarship can fully comprehend. It is apparent that he is definitely not citing in most cases the first century ancestor to fourth century AD Masoretic Text or Leningrad Codex. However nor does he usually cite the first century ancestor to the fourth and fifth century AD Old Greek or it's LXX versions without modification, whether Sinaiticus, Vaticanus or Alexandrius etc. We do not have the exact texts which Paul cited any more than we have first century examples of Paul letters. There have been at least four main approaches to solving the problem of the differences between Paul's citations and the MT and the present rescensions of the LXX. (1) Paul cited a first century Hebrew or Greek text “accurately”, (2) divergent words show the use of different texts, (3) variations are the result of memory quotations and (4) Paul adopts the word of the Jewish scriptures for his own purposes, rhetorically: under this head we have theological explanations, sociological explanations and literary explanations.

**Literature Review**

The issue of the differences between the MT and the Hebrew Vorlage of the so called LXX have been the subject of study of many scholars (Tov 1981). These differences are many and we find that some of the readings of the LXX have been supported by readings in the DSS fragments and manuscripts (Tov 1978, 1983), (Stanley 1992) and the Samaritan Pentateuch (Whiston 1722, Stanley 1992). The use of varieties of a Greek OT by the writers of the NT is well documented (Stanley 1992), also the many different readings of the LXX of certain Hebrew words have been documented.

**The Whiston Solution**

William Whiston who succeeded Newton in Cambridge and gave to the modern world the complete translation of the mammoth works of Josephus in his 613 page book *An Essay Towards Restoring the True Texts of the Old Testament and For Vindicating the Citations made thence in the New Testament*, set out thirteen propositions with which he sought to demonstrate the first century Hebrew text was in agreement with the first century Greek text, and that these were the texts read in first century synagogues. The Greek text was cited by the NT, Philo (Howard 1977) and others and the Hebrew made thence in the text was cited by Josephus. In explaining the differences between the present MT and the present LXX on the one hand and the texts which were in use in the first century when the Apostles travelled and debated the coming of Messiah using the Bible at that time, he argues that the testimonies of Philo, Josephus and Aristeads regarding the reception of the LXX and its use in the
Synagogue indicate that at the time the LXX and the Hebrew text must have been in agreement even if the legend about the 70 translators could not be supported it showed with what great esteem the then version of the LXX was held in the Jewish community. This respect is still reflected in later Jewish tradition regarding the face that the Torah was usually only allowed to be written in Hebrew but a special permission was given to Greek because of the beauty of the language (Maimonides, Book of Knowledge). This argument of a reliable first century translation into Greek which reflected a first century Hebrew Vorlage comes from the fact that there is no statement in the first century accusing the Christians of changing the actual Scriptures and that Paul and the Apostles would never have been able to convince Jews to join the messianic community if it was simply the case that they could be shown to be using the changed or corrupted Scripture. These accusations begin in the second century after the Rabbis changed their Hebrew Scriptures and their Greek ones to reflect that. Regarding the end of the second century and the beginning of the second Howard (1977) coincidentally notes:

By the beginning of the second century A.D. (plus or minus a few years) a textus receptus of the Hebrew Bible emerged among the Jews. In Rabbinic circles its victory over other text-types was complete, leading to the demise of rival textual traditions except insofar as they were frozen in ancient versions or maintained in sects such as that of the Samaritans. 50 Greek versions of this standard text followed in Jewish circles. The best known of these are those of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. (Howard 1977, p.72) (Cross, F, The History of the Biblical Text, p. 287-292).xiv

If the LXX had originally been different from the Hebrew then the Rabbis would never have allowed them to be read in the synagogues especially as the Hebrew Text was read first even as is the case with Aramaic Targumim in Aramaic speaking synagogues. Thus he argues the OT today and the NT in the first century and backwards are essentially the same but are not represented in the 1000AD Leningrad codex by which today most scholars read the Masoretic Text. Whiston's argues that “only through the painstaking process of textual criticism, for which the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Gallician Psalter of Jerome, and the New Testament quotations are especially valuable witnesses, can the present Greek and Hebrew texts be restored to original purity.” (Stanley 1992, p.9). In addition Whiston allows the checking of the Syriac, the Targumim, and quotes from Josephus for restoring the Hebrew text, and for correcting the LXX he allows the old Latin, the early Jewish revisions and the quotes from Philo and the early Church Fathers. The idea of the Rabbis changing not just the Greek translation but also their Hebrew vorlage in the second century comes from Origen and Jerome (Stanley 1992, p.9).

Scholars who follow a similar line to Whiston in their concerns regarding the differences include Dodd (1952).xv, Hanson (1965).xvi and Kaiser (1985). These researchers maintain Paul “remained faithful at all times to the original sense of the verses he cited, even if he did diverge on occasion (for whatever reasons) from their precise wording”(Stanley 1992, p.10). Hanson notes 'Paul never consciously 'moulded' texts. When we do find him following this or that tradition of interpretation it usually proves to be an accepted tradition, not Paul's own invention. If the present work has shown anything, it has shown that Paul often regarded his Scripture citations as proofs. Proof texts that have been arbitrarily tampered with are ineffective as proofs” (Hanson, 1965, p.147).

Whiston's position was challenged on three grounds. Carpov (1729) a contemporary of Whiston considered Whiston's historical reconstruction to be thoroughly implausible and argued for the primacy of the MT over against the Samaritan Pentateuch (Stanley 1992, p.10). Collins (1724) another contemporary noted that in the main the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek and the NT citations did not show any anti-Christian bias. Finally according to Stanley “the discovery at Qumran of Hebrew biblical manuscripts that date from before the Common era has rendered Whiston's position not only untenable but actually obsolete for modern scholars”(1992). Although Stanley rejects Whiston's proposals he does not address the charge made by Whiston, Origen and Jerome that the Rabbis had not only retranslated the Old Testament in reaction to the use of them by the Jesus movement in the proclamation of their gospel but also changed their version of the Hebrew. The idea of their being one main biblical text in the first century has been undermined by the various text traditions represented in Qumran (Stanley 1992). The text appears still to have been in flux at that
period. This of course makes the challenge of finding when Paul was citing and when he was citing and translating even more problematic.

**The Divergent Text Solution**

The next school of researchers argued that Paul when diverting from the LXX as represented in Alexandrinus (A), Vatcanus (B) and Sinaiticus (X), was following a divergent text. In the mid 19C. scholars concluded that Paul had drawn his citations in the main from the Greek Old Testament. This position would of course limit his work as a translator. According to Stanley (1992) the reason for the consensus among scholars that Paul's Vorlage was Greek and not Hebrew is that "of the roughly eighty-three biblical texts adduced by Paul in his undisputed quotations, thirty four come from places where the Septuagint is closely allied with the Masoretic text. These texts offer no evidence one way or the other as to the nature of Paul's Vorlage. Of the remaining forty nine texts, however fully forty-four follow the Septuagint at places where it diverges from the Masoretic text" (Stanley, 1992, p.67). In this group scholars sought to follow Paul in his deviations from the LXX, although assuming a Greek Vorlage (Kautzsch 1869)xviii. the argument being that the simplest solution was that he was correcting the LXX and at times bringing it closer to the Hebrew. However other scholars raise three main objections to these points: 1. Paul often follows the LXX when it diverges from the MT, 2. Paul did not correct his text from the Hebrew when it was beneficial to his argument, 3. Just a few deviations bring the wording of the LXX closer to the known Hebrew text (Stanley 1992, p.12). It is however admitted by most scholars that “Paul's quotations have been influenced by a Semitic text at some level”, but it does not appear that his main purpose was to bring them closer to the MT. Another suggested divergent text is proposing an Aramaic Vorlage Böhl (1873)xxi. Although in a few cases (e.g. Rom 12:19, 1 Cor 15:54, Eph 4:8 ) Paul ’s reading finds support in later Targumimxx “There is next to no evidence that the Semitic base presupposed in several of Paul's deviant quotations was Aramaic and not Hebrew” (Stanley, p.13). Toy's narrower thesis “that quotations that stand closer to the Hebrew should be traced to the influence of oral Aramaic renderings known through the synagogue” (Stanley 1992, p.13) (Toy, 1884)xxi did not find more favor with later investigator's however it may come up for reevaluation in light of the studies of Macnamara (1966) and others on Paul and the Palestinian targumim. These studies are of course important because they address Paul as translator of Aramaic texts.

Sperber (1940)xxii on the other hand suggested another divergent text base. He argues “the problem of divergent readings in the New Testament quotations is more apparent than real, the result of a mistaken approach to the evidence on the part of modern investigators”(Stanley 1992, p.14). The mistake of NT scholars is the assumption that Codex B (Vaticanus) gives the best readings for the NT and the Greek Vorlage. In place of this Sperber (1940) argues that “the tradition preserved in Codex A [Alexandrinus] and more fully in Vetus Latina, the citations of Theodoret, and the asterisk readings of Origen’s Hexapla”(Stanley 1992, p.14)reflect not just a corrupted version of the tradition of B but an independent translation of the Hebrew whose language can be seen for example in Rom 3:17, 9:17, 9:33, 11:4 and 1 Cor 5:13). Few scholars have accepted Sperber's position regarding the independent translation. His position however regarding what he calls the “Bible of the Apostles” offers little help where Paul diverges from the LXX tradition completely (e.g. 1 Cor 3:19, 14:21) (Stanley 1992, pp14, 189, 197-205).

Another proposal for an alternative Greek Vorlage is that of Vollmer (1895)xxiii. Vollmer underlined the agreement between several of Paul's citations and the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion (Vollmer 1895, pp23-35). For him this showed that there were independent pre Christian translations of individual books of the Scripture that circulated alongside the LXX in Jewish and Christian circles during the New Testament period (Stanley 1992, p.15)xxiv. His position has found support through the discovery of such texts as the Minor Prophets scroll Nahal Hever and fragmentary Greek texts from Qumran which showed the LXX had been subject to significant Hebraizing and other types of revision in the pre Pauline period (Howard 1977) (Piertesma, 1984) (Hylton 2013). These again indicate Paul was citing Greek Vorlage not translating from a Hebrew text. The final position under heading divergent texts is that of Koch (1986)xxv. Here it is proposed that there was an oral transmission of certain scriptures where the Scriptures were adapted
for particular use before in Jewish and Jesus movement circles before their use by Paul. Koch (1986) points to Rom 12:19, 13:9a, 1 Cor 1:31 (2 Cor 10:17), 2:9, 9:10 and 2 Cor 13:1 as examples (Koch 1980, 1986). Lindars (1961)xxvi argues more specifically that the texts “might have been used as apologetic proof texts before being fixed in their present literary settings” (Stanley 1992, p.15-16). Thus he makes a case that some of the deviant language in NT and Paul go back to an oral stage of evangelistic biblical interpretation. A similar point but based on texts for evangelists is made in the theory of Harris(1919)xxvii who posited that the early Apostles and Evangelists (that is preachers of the gospel) made testimony books for use against their Jewish opponents (Harris, 1919). This argument then which bases the differences of the NT citations not on Paul's own translation but on his use of texts or traditions which were translated before he received them. These studies do not then so much help us in understanding Paul as translator but more as transmitter of the tradition received (1 Cor 15:1-4).

The Memory Solution

The next approach used by scholarship in understanding Paul's differences from the MT and the LXX tradition mainly represented in manuscripts A, B, and.xxxviii is that he was citing texts loosely from memory and so they differed in as much as he recalled them partially. Stanley notes this is the most common explanations. Scholars supporting this position include Kautzsch(1869)xxix, Johnson (1895)xxx, Michel 1972 [1929]xxx and Ellis (1981, [1957])xxxii These scholarly use three main argument to bolster their position. 1. The difficulty of looking up multiple scrolls for a verse with no chapter and verse references 2. The central role of memorization in that period which included Rabbis who could cite the entire Hebrew Hebrew Bible by heart (Gerhardsson, 1961)xxxiii. 3. The language of the citations tend to differ from the precise words of the texts as we have them. In addition combined and conflated citations are said to point to uncertainty regarding the exact words of the text. Stanley(1992) points out that last two arguments effectively cancel one another out. If ancients were capable of memorizing Paul too could be capable of memorizing (Sanders 2011). In addition well known texts are sometimes cited “inaaccurately” whilst more obscure texts are often cited verbatim (Stanley 1992, p.17). For example Paul “loosely” quotes Gen 2:7 (1 Cor 15:45), Gen 12:3 (Gal 3:8), Lev 18:5 (Rom 10;5, Gal 3:12). Sanders in his paper 'Paul's Jewishness’ notes ‘it seems to be that on the basis of his quotations we must assume that Paul memorized the Bible in Greek, or at least large portions of it. In the surviving letters he does not quote any other source, except for one adage’ (Sanders E. P., 2011, p. 55). Sander's notes it also possible that Paul knew Hebrew but it is certain he knew Greek. This line of explanation again implies that Paul in the main was quoting from Greek sources. This approach again does not have its focus on Paul translating the texts but on the use of translated texts.

The Rhetorical Solution

The fourth approach to explaining Paul's deviations proposes that Paul adapts the biblical text to his own purpose. This argument is developed from three different perspectives, theological, sociological and literary (Stanley 1992, p. 19). Michel (1972 [1929] argues that Paul may have been led by the Spirit to give the true Christian meaning to a text. Michel developed the concept of 'charismatic exegesis' to describe the activity. In this view point Paul is said to see the Bible as a closed book which can only be interpreted by people with a certain charisma. Michel notes “According to Paul it is no longer individual verses but rather the whole Old Testament that must be understood from a Christian perspective. For this reason the apostle remains oblivious to any notion that he might be doing violence to the text” (Michel 1972, p.138) (Stanley 1992, pp18-19). Indeed one might say “The adaptations... were required to bring to light the underlying truths that the Spirit had already made known to the charismatic interpreter”(Stanley 1992, p.19). A position similar to this is taken by Christiaan Beker (1980) xxxiv In his view Paul follows Paul's apostolate and hermeneutic is of a prophetic-pneumatic character. He notes “Paul's freedom with the written Old Testament text signifies as apocalyptic-pneumatic claim of immediate access to its meaning” (Christiaan Beker, 1980, p.122). Others understand Paul's adaptation along theological lines include the early studies of Carpov(1729)xxxv who proposed that the because of the apostolic authority the freedom to adapt the text was available to Paul and the other Apostles:
Sometimes the Strength of the Argument, as taken rather from the Sense than from the Words, obliged them [the New Testament authors] to recede from the strict Tenor of the Words of the Original: Sometimes Brevity required it, when Things were to be summarily mentioned, just as much as would serve the Purpose: Sometimes a fuller Illustration that was to be added to the Words of the Old Testament by way of Explication, required it...sometimes the application of a Testimony to the present purpose, which might be properly made by changing the Words of the Prophecy a little: Sometimes a synonymous Expression wanted to be unfolded...Finally at other times we need to look no farther than the absolute Freedom and good Pleasure of the Holy Ghost, according to which he thought proper to substitute one Word in place of another (Carpzov 1729, p111-112)

Karpzov argues that the adaptations are quite normal in quotations of the kind in the New Testament and should not be seen as corruption. This approach could clearly be used even if Paul was translating.

Another theological approach sees Paul as writing in light of the eschaton. Light on this usage is seen in the writings of Qumran who display a similar phenomenon of deviation and adaptation of the biblical texts. Here the prophets are seen as saying more than they knew with their words having been locked up until the last days (1 Qhab 7:1). Stanley questions this position arguing that much that before was considered interpretive adaptation in Qumran is now seen as representing a non-Masoretic Vorlage (Silberman 1961)xxxvi (Stanley 1992, p. 2/4). Also the non Pesher documents and their citations appear to Stanley to be closer to Paul’s treatment of the Scripture, eg Damascus Document (CD) and 4Q floregilium, but in these cases the adaptation occurs when the eschaton is not in consideration.

One work which was well received was Ellis (1957) "Paul's Use of the Old Testament."Ellis carefully looks at Paul and his attitude toward and his quotations of the Old Testament, especially of the Septuagint. He makes a well-informed, discerning study of Jewish exegetical methods and Paul's exegesis of key aspects of certain parts of the Old Testament” (Kiehl, 1992). Filson(1983)xxxvii in his review of the book notes "Ellis finds that Paul quotes the OT 93 times, 51 citations agree with the LXX [22 of these differ from Hebrew], four agree with the Hebrew against the LXX, 38 differ from both"(Filson, 1983). Ellis refers to all 13 letters attributed to Paul. According to Ellis Paul saw the Tanakh as authoritative but also used as authoritative "the tradition of the apostolic Church"(Earle Ellis, 1957, p. 37) The problem of the fact that Paul differed from both the Hebrew and the LXX in 38 of the 93 citations is not seen as due to Paul having a bad memory but due to the fact that Paul had a concern "to bring out the meaning of and application of the OT passage"(Filson, 1983, p. 172) For Filson this was Earle following the midrash pesher idea of Krister Stendahl. Ellis notes that Paul is focused on determining the meaning of the text as "a part of the proper interpretation of OT history as a whole"(Earle Ellis, 1957, p. 148). However for Stanley (1992) and Longenecker (1974) the pesher type interpretation is rare in Paul (Longenecker 1974, p.130).

Sociological approaches to the way Paul uses Scriptures remove the Theological motive and the Holy Spirit and seek to show that the methods he uses are common to other groups from that period. Surenhusius (1713) investigated parallels between Paul and the Rabbinic literature. He argues “the New Testament Authors rather ‘free’ approach to the biblical text finds ample parallel in the Rabbinic sources”(Stanley 1992, p,21) That is they were following the normal Jewish practice at the time. This approach clearly ties in with the point made earlier regarding the use of forms of the Tetragrammamon in the first century Greek texts of the Old Testament. As opposed to Whiston whose argument meant the NT quotes were accurate and from a first century Greek Vorlage based on a first century Hebrew Vorlage these points accepts the deviations from the present Greek and Hebrew texts and justify them. Döpke (1829) continued this line of argumentation with a new set of comparisons with the Rabbis. Later studies maintain that although there are many variant readings among the rabbis, they did not adapt their readings. Bonsirven(1939) concluded “that the rabbis almost never adapted the wording of their quotations”(Stanley 1992, p22 n65). This position has been adopted by modern scholars such as Stendahl (1968), Ellis (1981) and Koch (1986). However Longenecker (1974) looked for parallels to Paul apparent approach in rabinic midrashim.
Another sociological approach was that of Edersheim (1971 [1896]) who argued that NT writers were used to the targums in the synagogues. After their turning to Jesus each one would have “targumed” as his disciples. The targums in that period were neither literal versions or paraphrases but a kind of interpreting translation. Stanley makes the important observation regarding Edersheim's thesis “The technique of reproducing a biblical passage within a new literary setting is quite different from the process of rendering the passage into a foreign language. Interpretation is a necessary part of translation; not so with quotations. Whether; literary citations were normally handled in a manner similar to translations (i.e incorporate interpretative elements into the very wording of the text) in the ancient world is a matter to be investigated, not assumed” (Stanley 1992, p.23).

Another sociological approach is that of Johnson (1895) who we came across earlier under the group who argue for memory as a major explanatory factor to the deviations of Paul's citations from the MT and LXX recensions. Johnson carried out a study on Paul in the context of Greco-Roman as opposed to Jewish writers. He showed that in at least three kinds of adaptation Paul may be reflecting the general Greco-Roman world. These were in omitting words, exegetical paraphrases, and combining verses during citation. Although the result of his studies are inconclusive he does raise some questions regarding the source of the citation techniques in Paul in regard to which cultural context they may have. Johnson did not cover rabbinic literature and obviously had no access to the Qumran material so his work leaves many questions unanswered. A final type of explanation of Paul's assumed adaptation of quotes for his purpose is that of the literary purpose. The main exponent of this explanation was Scott (1875). “Scott marshals a host of examples from classical writers to more recent literature to support his contention that 'truthful representation, and not verbal accuracy, was all that was required or sought” from quotations in any era” (Stanley 1992, p27). He notes that the same adaptations used by Paul and the other NT writers were used by writers in all ages. He notes that the goals of the authors “were more suitably accomplished by a transformation or a verbal adaptation of the text, than by an application of it which left its form unaltered and its sense less perspicuous” (Scott 1875, p.99).

Modern scholarship has also investigated the differences of Paul's citation of the Tanakh in Greek from the MT and from the so called LXX Hebrew Vorlage (Stanley 1992). Modern scholarship have established to their satisfaction that Paul had memorized much of if not all the Tanakh in Greek (Stanley 1992, Sanders 2012). Which exact version of versions of the Greek Testament were memorized by the Apostle Paul is uncertain(Stanley, 1992, p.340). Also many of his citations of the Old Testamentxxxviii are not referenced by citation for such as “It is written”, “What saith the Scripture?”, or “Isaiah cried out”. In addition to this Stanley after his study on citations in Paul, and early Judaism including Qumran (4Q Testimonia, 11Q Melchizedek, 4Q Patriarchal blessings, 4Qflorilegium, Manual of Discipline(1QS), War Scroll (1 QM Damascus Document (CD)) Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha, Philo ( Philo and Homer De Ebrietate, Legum Allegoria), draws in important conclusion, if limited in its significance because of the limited number of texts he studies: “In none of the materials surveyed does there appear to be any correlation between the way a quotation is introduced and the degree to which it adheres to the wording of the source text.”(Stanley 1992, p.340). Hence we cannot rely simply on citation formulation in looking at some of the aspects of Paul as a translator. A last issue we need to mention before reviewing the scholarship is one which is vital. Stanley argues two main points. 1 That Paul "actively adapted the wording of biblical quotations to communicate his own understanding of the passage in question" (Stanley 1992, p.29) and 2. That he was working consciously with in the accepted literary conventions of his day. To accomplish he analyzes each and every one of what he understands to be indisputable citations of Paul in Romans 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians. The limitations with Stanley's work as he himself admits is that he only compared Paul with a limited number of Greco-Roman writers and a few of the dead sea scrolls and with Philo and his contemporaries. Another limitation is the fact that in the Pauline literature he only included quotes from Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians. His decision as to what was a quote was very rigid and as seen above this means he covered 83 Biblical texts which were adduced by Paul of from which he argues 34 were places where Paul follows the LXX as it is closely allied with
the MT and 44 where he follows the LXX when it does not agree with MT. To show the subjectivity involved in these position we can see those of Ellis (1957) above.

Paul's citation or translation of the OT has been the subject of a number of studies in the early twenty first century in relating modern approaches to the apostle's references to the OT, Moyise (Moyise, 2010) outlines three main approaches, the intetextual approach of Richard Hays and Timothy Berkeley, the narrative approaches of Wright, Ross Wagner, Sylvia Keesmaat and Frances Watson, and the rhetorical approaches of Christopher Stanley (see above) and a new school called 'relevance theory'.

These are "literary" approaches to Paul's use of scriptures. Moyise himself takes an eclectic approach to the quotations of the Scripture in Paul where he used whatever was necessary to explain what Paul was doing. His work is an excellent introduction to modern literary approaches to Pauline literature. The beauty of literary approaches is their focus on what Paul writes himself and how it reflects his sources and the literary context into which he writes, They therefore pick up a lot more on Paul's brilliance and the amazing 'manifold wisdom of God' which one quote or allusion may point to, all of which can be missed if the scholar focuses on whether a saying is 'genuine' or not. In a literary reading all sayings take their place in understanding the plot, the characters and the themes. Because a literary reading is focused on literary features it may add a lot of ideas which are in the head of the critic and which may or may not have been consciously in the mind of Paul when he was citing or translating. It may get us close to the composite Paul represented by his composite letters [he does not often write alone] but the historical individual Paul may differ from him [the composite] in various ways. The literary approaches may in some sense be both right depending on the reader. So it may well be that what Paul rhetorically did to a quote will affect his translation and may well echo the local context of a citation for one reader and reflect the narrative context of Abraham's life for another reader. The danger of this is of course that each critic is reading his own Paul. So Stanley may assume Paul would not expect his audience to read into what he says as much as Hays would expect but what Paul does with a text is an objective thing which we can observe, for example he may say in one place 'it is written' as his fellow Pharisees might do but in another place referring to a very similar text he might say-'What does the scripture say?' These are objective exegetical keys Paul uses but what he was intending for the reader to see behind what he cites and translates is subjective to each scholar. Thus all may bring out something new and have the potential of being correct because different readers read a text differently according to what they are accustomed to look for in the text. The attention of these scholars regarding Paul and the scripture have not focused on Paul as translator of the gospel.

Dale Allison in his entry "The Old Testament in the New Testament" that the Pauline Epistles pattern of formal citations is explained by the fact that "Formal citations typically call attention to themselves for the purpose of adding authority" (Allison, Jr. 2016, p. 484)xli. He adds the important point that in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Philippians, Colossians and Philemon there are no formal citations. In Galatians there are 10 citations in the 6 chapters, but in 1 Corinthians only 14 for 16 chapters and 2 Corinthians only seven citations in thirteen chapters. Finally for him in Romans there are 48 citations in 16 chapters (that is an average of 4 per chapter). Paul cites scripture explicitly in "making controversial points or in polemical situations where opponents were also citing scripture" (Allison Jr. 2016, p.484). If Paul was indeed translating at the same time as citing the point made be Allison regarding the citations in Galatian is important "where Paul cites and discusses certain texts presumably because his adversaries had cited them to promote their different understanding of the Gospel" (Allison Jr. 2016, p.484). If this were the case clearly both Paul and the Galatian opponents were using the same scripture so that Paul could be in the position to make his unique statement "Now the promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed (spermati). He does not say to "And to seeds(spermasin)"(Gal 3:16).

Main Part: Methods of Citation and Translation

This shows us the scholarly understanding that Paul's use of the OT is based on various Greek "Vorlages. In for example a model of translation like Nida's (1959)xlii where we have source, message and receptor Paul is the source or encoder. M is the message he shares in his letters in accordance with the particular structure of first century koine Greek. R are the various communities or individuals to
which he writes. However in these cases the whole process takes place in Greek. Paul is the receptor of a message in Greek and he passes it on in Greek. At best he may be at this point considered a translation critic because he chooses which of his Greek sources to use: Old Greek, Kaige and Antiocene, Aquilas, Theodotion, and Symmachus etc. This is even the case in the argument of Whiston because Whiston recognized that there was a first century Greek form of LXX which was in accordance with a first century Hebrew Vorlage from which Paul cited (Whiston 1722). However he can an example in his writing where Paul is most definitely dealing with translation ideas (e.g 1 Cor. Πάξαλνίηεξ, "The actual masculine noun is iterated Semitic word Greek using. It is also not insignificant that Paul is Mar_14:36 The word had at least four different meanings in Greek 1. a father, 2. "Οτιδὲ ἑστευνοὶ, ἔξαπέστειλενό Θεότο Πνεῦματοῦ ύιόν αὐτοῦ εἰςτακαρδιασῆμόν, κράζων ἄββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. Gal 4:6 And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Here Paul introduces a transliteration of the word Πάξαλνίηεξ. “This Syriac or Chaldee word is found three times in the New Testament (Mar_14:36; Rom_8:15; Gal_4:6), and in each case is followed by its Greek equivalent, which is translated “father.” It is a term expressing warm affection and filial confidence.” The actual masculine noun is πατήρ but in Aramaic the definite article follows the noun. So a father πατήρ would be turned into a definite father by adding the Νι as suffix,Ν.πατήρ. Paul then transliterates the noun and its suffix. Paul then translates his transliterated Semitic word Greek using ὁ πατήρ. The Greek word Paul translates with is the nominative definite form of the koine Greek -ὁ πατὴρ(genitive-πατερος, dative-πατερι, accusative-πατερο) xlviHere Paul uses the nominative case form as vocative as can be seen from the context of the spirit crying ( κράζων) ὁ πατήρ. The normal vocative form of father in Greek is Πατερος as can be seen from its use in the Lord's prayer with the epsilon not the eta. “Πάτερημονό ἐντοίσουρανοῖς” (Matt 6:9). The word had at least four different meanings in Greek 1. a father, 2. “among the gods Jovexlvi is emphatic. Calledπατήρ” 3. It is used as a mode of address to an older person 4. in plural it refers to forefathers (LS). Paul's translation seems quite straight forward translating literally the father in Greek for the father in Aramaic, however he has also given a special function to the translation as a vocative (EDNT 1990). It is clear from the second syllable that Paul is using Aramaic and not Hebrew because in Hebrew the definite article πατὴρ precedes the noun it makes definite whereas in Aramaic the definite article πατὴρ follows it. It is also not insignificant that Paul is writing this phrase more than a decade before Mark is believed to have written his Gospel where he translates the same word the same way in the context of the prayer of Jesus to the Father regarding his will. Mar 14:36καὶ ἔλεγενάββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, πάνταδυσνατά σοι παρένεγκετο ποτήριονάπ’ ἐμοῦ τούτο, ἀλλ. οὐ τί ἔγῳ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί σοῦ. This means this is the first use of this word ὁ πατήρ in the New Testament and the first example of direct translation in the NT because Galatians is dated before any of the Gospels. In addition in Luke 10:21 Jesus uses the same Greek appellation (ὁ πατήρ) when talking to the Father, and there the article also
the article does the work of the vocative. The Syriac and the Arabic versions translate the word ἀββᾶ as our father not simply father (Gill, 1 Cor 14). 'And because you are Sons, God has sent forth his spirit into your hearts, who crieth Father, Our Father' (Gal 4:6) It is clear that here Paul in terms of his near contemporary, Cicero is translating here as an interpreter (word for word). Cicero (46BC) says regarding words he translated “I did not translate them as an interpreter but as an orator...not word for word (verbum pro verbo), but I preserved the general style and the force of the language.” (Cicero 46BC) So Cicero the Roman orator divides translators and translations into two kinds interprets and orator. We see here Paul is clearly practicing as a interpreter. He gives a literal translation of the Aramaic אב and its suffix א. We saw above the semantic range of παηήξ as given by abridged Liddell and Scott. The semantic range of ἀββᾶ is similar. “In Aramaic was originally a nursery word, part of the speech of children...with the meaning 'Daddy'. In NT times it was no longer limited to the speech of children, but was also used by grown children and was even used as a form of address for old men. Even in Hebrew texts ἀββᾶ replaced 'my father'” (Kuhn 1990). The semantic ranges then are very similar. However in the NT ἀββᾶ becomes a divine title by which the saints spoke to God. Perhaps first used by Jesus and known to us by Mark’s record of the Gethsemane prayer. Mark and like Paul and John has the practice of transliterating and translating certain Aramaic or Hebrew words to Greek (Mark 15:34, John 1:41). This practice is continued in the second century by the Christian Gnostics as seen above in the example of IAO under texts especially the baptismal formula given by Ireneus in Against Heresies and the many examples in Pistis Sophia. The term ἀββᾶ as a divine title was not used in Judaism to directly address God (Kuhn, 1990) although there is evidence that παηήξ was used (Kuhn 1990).

Paul's Most Challenging Citation: Isaiah 28:11-12
1Co 14:21 ἐληῷ λόκῳ γέγξαπηαη ὅηηἐλἑηεξνγιώ ζζνηοθαὴ ἐλρείιεζηλἑηέ ξνηοιαιέ ζσηῷ ιαῷ ηνύ ηῳ,
θαὶ νὐδ ὢν ὧησοεἠ ζαθνύζνληαί κνπ, ιέγεηΚύξηνο.

1Co 14:21 In the law it is written, With men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paul</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐνέτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐνειλεσινεντέροις λαλήσω τόλαα τοῦτο</td>
<td>With other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people</td>
<td>יִבְלָכְנִי שֵׁם</td>
<td>בָּלָקְמִי אָבָט</td>
<td>For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ οὕτος εἰσακούσονται μου, λέγει Κύριος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>διωκαυλισμόντες οὐκ ἕξειν διαγλώσσησσεῦντας, ὅτι λαλήσουσιν τῷ λαῷ τοῦτῳ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We move from ἀββᾶ the simplest and clearest demonstration of a Pauline translation to 1 Corinthians 14:21 one of the most difficult of all Paul's citations (Stanley 1992) located in the literary unit 1 Corinthians 12-14 one of the most difficult units in the Pauline corpus (Chiu 2007). Paul introduces the citation with a formal citation formula gegraptai It is written and he apparently ends the citation with legei kurios Says Yahuah. He assigns the text to the nomos law. But these words do not appear in
the Law as in the Pentateuch the closest thing to them is in Isaiah. The fact that Paul uses the Law to refer to what appears to be an Isaiah text points to Paul's Jewish background, among the Sages who use the term Torah to refer to the whole Biblical text. As Lightfoot notes “In the Law that is in the scripture: in opposition to ירהש the words of the Scribes. For that distinction was usual in the Schools” (Lightfoot 1979, p.265). This is very important for us in contextualizing Paul words on translation and interprets as from a Jewish milieu not a Gentile. He never appeals to the Law in Thessalonica or Phillipians or Philémon but in the Church whose leadership included archisynagogues leaders of synagogues who were even beaten for the faith (Acts 18). Our interest is in comparing what Paul says with what MT says although it is unlikely he is translating from there and may be using a different Hebrew Vorlage as Whiston (1722) or Macnamara (1966) would have maintained. The MT of Isaiah 28:11 begins with ר (for) but Paul leaves this out. This is typical of Paul in his citations (Stanley 1992, p.199) and of course Paul his free to cite from where he wants in the nomos, he was not working with verses as we have them today. The MT states that with stammering lips (לעגי שפת), but Paul does not give any equivalent to stammering lips, rather he says with “other tongues” eteroglossos. Then the MT adds and another tongue (בדילשף אתרגש) but Paul has “other” or “strange lips”. So we notice that Paul has a different order to the MT. MT has stammering lips and then another tongue. Paul has other tongues and the other lips. MT has another tongue or language in the singular, whilst Paul has other tongues or languages in the plural. MT then has “He will speak” (לפר לוח עידות) third person masculine imperfect piel but the subject of who is speaking is undefined and could be Yahuah or the prophet, whilst Paul specifies the subject and has “I will speak” (λαλήσω) first person and he ends the whole citation with leget kuriōs “says Yahuah”. This first person singular form is only in Paul's writing, neither the MT nor any of the LXX tradition uses this form. Then MT says “to this people” (אלהי עם זה) and Paul also says “to this people” (το ἑαυτῷ τοῦτοι). If Paul had not introduced the citation with the formal en to nomo gegraptai the statement would have appeared as a prophecy by the Apostle Paul to the Corinthian Church.

The second part of the citation which related hypothetically to Isaiah 28:12 indicates that MT and Paul go their own ways at this point. The MT says “To whom he said, This is the rest whereith ye may cause the weary to rest; and this is the refreshing: yet they would not hear.” Whereas Paul translates only: “and yet for all that will they not hear me”, saith Yahuah”. If indeed Paul was citing MT the comments of Stanley regarding the philosophy of translation represented by the words are appropriate: “if the Pauline wording does indeed reflect an earlier Jewish revision of the original LXX, it was carried out by someone one whose philosophy of translation was far from wooden” (Stanley 1992, p.198). Stanley believes but is not certain that because the LXX is so far from the MT regarding this citation and Paul's citation is closer to the MT that it is possible that there was a previous Jewish translation underlying the citation of Paul. He however is uncertain and as we have noted the term (λαλήσω) is neither reflected in LXX tradition nor in the MT and so appears to be Paul's translation from a Hebrew Vorlage somewhere in the "Law". If then it is Paul who is the translator of the text as we maintain here then Stanley's words refer to his philosophy of translation and as Stanley noted it is far from wooden (Stanley 1992, p.198). The MT and Paul seem to come together on the sentiment that those to whom the message of the tongues and the lips was addressed to those who persistently refused to listen. MT gives this sentiment by giving a message which had been previously given “This is the rest...this is the refreshing but they would not listen” Paul's sentiment is the same regarding the refusal to listen but the cumulative effect of refusals to listen is built on the fact that first Yahuah spoke with other languages and then he spoke with other lips and still they refused to listen. Whereas tongues can refer to languages lips can also refer to gossip and scornful talk. Scholars refer the prophecy to the coming of the Assyrians in 732 and finally the destruction of Samaria in 721 under Shalmeneser V and Sargon or perhaps even more appropriately with Sennacharib (705-681) and his blasphemies in 701 and finally having refused to listen under Mannasheh (697-642) they came under the Assyrian ruler Esarhaddon (681-669) the successor to Sennacharib (705-681). Thus they first heard the tongue and insults of the Assyrians in Akkadian, they however refuse to listen to that so in the time of Jehoiakim (609-597), Jehoiakin (597) and Zedekiah (597-586) they hear the tongue and mockery of the
Chaldeans, Aramaic. Ezekiel returns to the issue of the tongue and the lip (Ez 3:5, 3:6, 36:3) using the combined term שפָתָא לְשׁוֹנָא.

Eze 36:3
לֹאָכְנָה נַנּאָבָא אָמָרָא שֵׁנָא אֵיָן בֵּין שֵׁנָא שֵׁאָמָא אַכָּם מַסָּכָא לְעָוָרָא מִרְשָׁתָא לְשֹׁאָרָא הָגוֹיָא מַעֲלָא שָׁפָתָא לְשׁוֹנָא וְיַדְתָּא שָׁפָתָא לְשׁוֹנָא:

The Ezekiel expression is in parallelism:

ותעלו על־שפָתָא לְשׁוֹנָא

And you ascended on lips of talkers

ודבת־עם

and the slander of the people.

In the LXX it became

κατανέβηνεταλλημα καὶ λόγωσην καὶ θαὸς ἢ ἀλεθειαν, and ye became a by-word (prattle to the tongue),

καὶ εἰς οὐ λαβάνετιν καὶ φόνον καὶ αἰλοφορίαν, and a reproach to the nations.

Thus we see that the lip of the language is semantically a term referring to slander and reproach and scorn. If we look strictly at the MT parallel we have two construct forms שפָתָא לְשׁוֹנָא and the lip parallels the prattle. We have two feminine nouns in construct from and two masculine singular nouns in absolute. The negative meaning of prattle or slander with regard to the lips seems to connect with Paul's thought in 1 Corinthians 13:22 where he say if the Church is all together and speaking in tongues, the non-believers or uninitiated will accuse them of raving or the enthusiastic madness of the prophets in the Hellenistic period (Acts 2, Hosea 6). The motivation of the unbeliever may not be the same as the uninitiated. The uninitiated does not know what is going on because he does not know the language. The unbeliever may be negatively disposed to the community anyway because we see in Acts 18 that the unbelievers were accusing Paul of teaching the nations to worship God in a way contrary to the Law, and we see Paul concern with their accusations in this verse and chapter 14:31 when he tells the women to be silent because that was what the Law says. In a sense we see Paul acting in such a way to ensure the good reputation with the outsiders and according to his principle: To those under the law I became as one under the law... that I might save some (1 Cor 9:20). Paul's translation or interpretation here takes this ancient prophecy which was connected to Israel and the nations in the past applies to the Church and the unbeliever or uninitiated in the present. The evidence that he is citing it and not only adapting it to fit the present circumstances is the fact that he uses terminology which is not used anywhere else in his writing for example eteroglossia. But in Paul's citation it is Yahuah who is speaking with the people with other tongues not simply humans. This means Paul may be demonstrating that Yahuah is not bound to prophecy only in Hebrew but in other tongues. This indicated by the “I will speak-leleso” with the “Say Yahuah” legei kurios. There is also a textual point here in regard to the issue of texts and the name of God we raised earlier. We notice that Paul uses the noun kurios. This is supposed to be declined with a definite article ho. But Paul introduces ungrammatically with no article. This can go back to the fact that he is referring to the Tetragrammaton and so as in the Greek documents which were contemporary with Paul mention above the proper name was treated specially. In those cases the Hebrew form or a Greek equivalent of the proper name was placed in the text. We noted that something happened after 150 and kurios replaced Yahuah in many Greek texts. This legei kurios instead of the expected legei ho kurios as would be expected of a normal noun. This approach in the LXX when a proper noun is present, for example legei Moses, legei Balak. Kurios here hints there was a a proper noun in the text being translated here.

In summary we can from these two practical examples of translations by Paul that although we can not be sure what is Vorlage was, and so we cannot be sure how much he adapted the citation we can be sure, it seems that he was not simply translating words for word but with intention of causing an impact in the reader and his translation fitted into the flow of the apostolic message being communicated. We can also say that if he considered that the LXX or old Greek would do the job he wanted he would cite it, if not he might choose another version, whether Aquila or Symmachus or Thedotion or a Vorlage or translate as he felt appropriate. nWe move on to his philosophy of translation in 1 Corinthians 14.

**Paul's Philosophy of Translation**

According to Stanley (1992) none of the citations in Galatians come from a Hebrew or Aramaic Vorlage and so involve no translation. So we turn to 1 Corinthians which Paul wrote in about the year AD55 to the Greek speaking mixed Jewish and Greek congregation (1 Cor 7:19). This letter is
extremely important because Paul gives instructions regarding what we might be described as his understanding of the role and purpose of translation/interpretation. Although he is dealing with the spiritual gifts of tongues and interpretation and prophecy it is clear that his comments can apply equivalently to natural languages and translations. This possibility has even lead many students of Paul astray and thus we get mistranslations like that of the CEV: “If you speak languages that others don't know, God will understand what you are saying, though no one else will know what you mean. You will be talking about mysteries that only the Spirit understands.” Although contextually this translation cannot be correct for 1 Corinthians 14 (for example a man may pray that he may translate so we are not just dealing with a language that other people do not understand) (Robertson, 1986) it does show that here in this chapter Paul is dealing with matters of translation. This I believe is a sound comparison for four reasons. 1 According to LS the word γλώσσα has at least two meanings, the first is tongue and the second is language. This is important because one Paul's foci in the chapter is taking the speech of a person which is unintelligible to those present and making it intelligible, even as translation takes a message from one language and transforms it in such a way that it is intelligible to those speaking another language. 2 Even if Paul is talking about a gift of spiritual languages, these languages are known to some but unknown to others. Thus like a human language it needs to be translated or interpreted to be understood. 3. The semantic range of the word interpreter in Greek (διερμηνευτής in A, E, or ερμηνευτής in B liv) (and some other recensions) can include translator because it is used by Vaticanus in Genesis 42:23. Norris (2007) points to Joseph and his interpreter (έρμηνευτής) as part of the long line of interpreting and translating going back to before the LXX (Norris, 2007 p.8). Thus our focus in looking at 1 Corinthians 14:28 is not so much on the tongues speaker or the prophets but on the ερμηνευτής.

The Interpreter Translator ερμηνευτής / διερμηνευτής
1Co 14:28 But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God (GNT) ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἡ διερμηνευτής (interpreter), συγάτῳ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἑαυτῷ δὲ λαλεῖτο καὶ τῷ Θεῷ

Most scholars when studying 1 Corinthians 12-14 have there focus on its connections to 1 Cor. 12 and 13 and especially on the comparison drawn by Paul between Tongues and Prophecy (Chiu, 2007). While we are simply focused on the role of the interpreter. The words connected with 1 Corinthians with the interpreter are three: ερμηνευτής / διερμηνευτής (the interpreter), ἐρμηνεία (interpretation of tongues) and διερμηνευτέω (to interpret). The first word ερμηνευτής is the person who does the job. The second ἐρμηνεία is the verbal noun describing the work done, as in an interpretation or translation. This word occurs twice in the NT. The third term διερμηνευτέω is the verb from which the noun is derived to interpreter. Thayer (G1329) gives us two definitions of the verb which connects the terms clearly with translation: “to translate into one’s native language”. The first meaning is "to explain". Stronges (G1329) agrees with Thayer's definition of the term: to explain thoroughly; by implication to translate. Thus the role of the ερμηνευτής hermeneutes is that of a translator and thus Paul's description of his role will no doubt incorporate his philosophy of translation. The type of translation involved in this process may perhaps best be seen by Luke's use of the verb διερμηνεύω in Acts.

Act 9:36 Now there was at Joppa a certain disciple named Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas: this woman was full of good works and alms deeds which she did.

Act 9:36 Εν δέσποτης διερμηνευτηριανόμαστι Ταβιθά, ἡ διερμηνευτευμένη λέγεται Δορκάς αὐτήν πληροῦμεν πίνακα διακόνοις, ἐλεήμονον δείκνυσιν ὁ Νεκών

The name Ταβιθά (G5000) is an Aramaic name and means a gazelle (Stronges G5000). If we turn to the Aramaic word from which it came it is Strong (H6646) פִּדֵח which means a female gazelle. The name Δορκάς (G1393) on the other hand is Greek but also means a Gazelle and according to Thayer is also a feminine noun. Thus we see the verb used here in the transliteration and translation of the proper name.
from Aramaic to Greek as Paul above transliterated and translated the term father. The question then arises in what context and what milieu is the interpreter-translator working: Jewish Hellenistic or Gentile Hellenistic? It is clear that Paul had a Jewish background among the Pharisees and the tannaimand in that context whether in an Aramaic speaking synagogue the practice of translating or interpreting the Torah, also the Haftorah took place in both Aramaic and Greek (Kahle 1959)iviii (Fitzmyer 1979, 1991)lix depending on where one lived. Thus in those contexts interpreters were always present. They were however not interpreting a spontaneous message of a person receiving a revelation but the reading of the Hebrew Text. In the synagogues then interpreters were always present. The Church of Corinth had a very strong Jewish contingent from the synagogue background (Lightfoot 1979 [1859]). Paul started his meetings in Corinth next to the synagogue in the house of a God fearing Titus Justus (Acts 18:7). He moved there with Crispus the leader of the synagogue who believed in the Lord (Acts 18:8). Even as they continued there they were still seen as Jews as is found out a year and a half later when Gallio refused to rule on the dispute between Paul and the unbelieving Jews and at that time Sosthenes another chief ruler of the synagogue was also a believer. Indeed the same Sosthenes joins with Paul and writes the first letters to the Corinthians (1 Cor 1). This all points to the fact that the because of the strength of the Jewish element in the Corinthian leadership and assembly the presence of the interpreters is likely to have come from the Jewish context. In addition there is a clear tension between the nations 'pagans' around and the Corinthian assembly. Examples of this conflict can be seen in Paul talking of the connection of the saints to the ethne in the past tense: 1Co 12:2 "Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led". Thus they regulated themselves as ethne before but now they are being regulated by another principle. Secondly Paul established ἡ ἡτνος, that is courts of law independent of the local Gentiles courts which they were to avoid if at all possible (1 Cor 6:1-6, 2 Cor 13:1-2.) (Lightfoot 1979 [1859]) These courts were set up in accordance with Rabbinic tradition (Lightfoot 1979 [1859] (Hylton 2015))lx The issues which arose in the congregation for which the interpreters was the solution recognized the tension with those outsiders. Two leaders of the synagogues joined the community of saints (Sosthenes and Crispus). They clearly knew exactly how to organize a public meeting and one of them wrote 1 Corinthians with Paul. Paul was organizing the saints according to what the Law or Rabbinic tradition, which refers to more than the five books of Moses, taught. Although the local Jews who accuse Paul of teaching people to worship God contrary to the law (Acts:13), this was not his position. At least four times he appeals to the law in organizing the life of the saints in Corinth (1 Cor 7:39, 1 Cor 9:8,1King 14:21, 1 King 14:34). Thus we can turn to Paul's model of translation/
Paul's Corinthian Model for the Translator

The hermeneutes (1 Cor 14:28) in Paul's Corinthian model is at the center of two elements. We can call the first the glosselalia (foreign language speaker), on the one side and on the other side the ekklesia (the recipients of the message or in Nida's terms the receptor), speakers of Corinthian or Greek.

The Messenger and the Message

The glosselalia lxi may be up to three persons(1 Cor 14:27). They may speak their message (meaningful sounds) to the ekklesia one after the other but not simultaneously. Paul describes a number of different kinds of messages which require translating in the community: ἑνάποκαλύπτεται ἐν διαλογισμοῖς ἐν διάλογοις, ἐπιστολής, εὐαγγελίας, and εὐαγγελίας. Each of these types of message require a clear translation so as to get the appropriate response from the various categories of listener. The job of the hermeneutes is to translate the message clearly in such a manner that the receptors (Nida 1959), usually the ekklesia, are impacted as the glosselalia intended (1Cor 14:6). The effect or the fruit of the hermeneutes is determined by the clarity of the translation in the receptors language and secondly by the genre of the message being adhered to closely and finally by the impact on the receptor. The effect on the receptors (listeners) could be to be built up, to be consoled or to be exhorted to acted in a certain manner.

The Receptors

Paul uses various terms to describe the listeners. These include: ἀνθρώποι (14:2), ἐκκλησίαι (14:4), βάρβαρος (14:11) ὁ ἀναπληρωτόντοποντοῦ ιδίωτον (14:16) ὁ ἔτερος (14:17) τιθέναι στοιχείσις. In
each case here the person will not understand the message of the speaker without the intervention of interpretation or translation. The listeners vary from full fledged members of the congregation to the unbelievers who comes to visit the congregation.

In Paul's model he gives a number of metaphors to illustrate the desired result of the act of translation. Most of his images come from the world of music and he mentions the instruments. He compares understanding the messages to knowing the melody played by a flute (aulos-auleo) or a harp(kithara-kitharitze) through the distinction in notes or the clear sound of the trumpet (salpigtz) calling an army to war. All three of these words are used in the LXX to represent various kinds of instruments (Orr and Walther 1976, p.301) The translated message is considered good if: 1 it is of benefit to the listeners. This benefit can be a building up, a consoling or an exhortation. The essential element is that if the initial message was intended to build up then the translated message needs to build up. If the foreign message was to provoke an Amen the translated message should do the same. If the foreign message was to exhort people to go and fight the translated message should do the same. Similar to Jesus saying the men of the generation "were like children sitting in the market place and calling to one another, and saying We have piped for you and you have not danced, we mourned for you and you have not wept"(Luke 7:32) If we transfer this ideas of vocal translation to written translation the parallels are clear. The written translation of the Scripture should make the revelation written in Hebrew, available to the Greek reader so as to produce in the reader what it was intended for the Hebrew to produce in the reader. As Yahuah put it to Habakkuk "Write down the vision, make it plain on tablets that he who reads may run" (Hab. 2:2). If the Hebrew message was to produce running in the reader so should the Greek.

The Hermeneutus in the Corinthian

In looking further at our main subject of investigation Paul's hermeneutes we need to make a number of observation. Most of the commentators have little to say about the hermeneutes. For example Chiu (2007) wrote an almost 400 page study on 1 Cor 12-14 and is almost silent about the interpreter. On the other hand Orr and Walther (1976) note that there is a variant reading in verse 1 Cor 14: 5 which could read not “unless he interprets” but instead “unless there be one who interprets”. This connects well with 1 Corinthian 12:10 and 30 which separate the roles of glosselalia and hermeneuties (Orr and Walther 1976, 301). We have argued that the background to the organization of the groups in the Corinthian Church is Jewish not ethne. Thus we are looking at the translator in a role similar those who interpreted the haftorah in the prophets. Regarding who these were in Corinth Lightfoot makes some very important observations. Firstly he notes we are not talking about outsiders who are coming to visit the congregation but ministers of the congregation itself. Just as there were prophets in the congregation with the gift of prophecy. So were there tongues speakers and even interpreters who could interpret. 2 Lightfoot then asserts that all agree that the language into which the gloss was translated was Corinthian Greek and that all in the congregation could speak. He goes on question why a minister of the congregation would introduce a foreign language like Arabic Egyptian or Amenian when it would not bring the least benefit to the congregation? In addition why would they themselves benefit from speaking in a foreign language when they could say the same thing in their mother tongue? Heargues the Apostle would hardly allow them to speak a foreign language if they could say the same thing in Corinthian without troubling the Church or an interpreter. He then concludes “We are of the opinion, therefore, not without reason, that the unknown language which they used, or abused rather, in the Church was the Hebrew; which now of a long time past was not the common and mother tongue, but was gone into disuse; but now by the gift of the Holy Spirit it was restored to the ministers of the Church and that necessarily and for the profit of the church. We are not interested how many unknown languages they could speak, but how many they spake in the Church; and we believe they spake Hebrew only” (Lightfoot 1979 [1859], p. 258).With this idea Lightfoot then reinterprets Paul's other comments in regard to translators. Regard 1 Cor. 14:13 when Paul says let him pray that he may interpret he points out that if the speaker were for example speaking Latin or Arabic or Persian: either he understood what he spoke or he did not: if he did not, then how far was he from edifying
himself!” (Lightfoot 1979, p259). But Paul, he notes, says he who speaks in a tongue edifies himself. However “if he understood what he spake, how easy was it for him to render it into the Corinthian language!” (ibid p.259). So argues Lightfoot many people could have been equipped through study to translate those languages into Corinthian or Greek without a spiritual gift, but interpretation is listed as an “extraordinary gift”. “But let it be supposed, which we do suppose, that he spake in the Hebrew tongue, that he either read or quoted the holy text in the original language; and that he either preached or prayed in the phrases of the prophets: it suffice not to the interpretation to render bare words into bare words, but to understand the sense and marrow of the prophet's language, and plainly and fully to unfold their mysteries in apt and lively choice of words, according to the mind of God: which the evangelists and apostles by a divine skill do in their writings” (Lightfoot 1979[1859]). Thus for Lightfoot a word for word translation would not do in translating the holy scriptures. The explanation for him as to why interpretation or translation of the Scriptures was not just a natural gift but needed a special gifting in a sense as Bezalel was gifted with a Spirit of Wisdom to design the tabernacle and the ark, was because the words of the prophets include divine mysteries and cannot be simply translated according to human standards. Even if we disagree with his central thesis that the only foreign language spoken by the Corinthian ministers was Hebrew his point remains valid. He supports his argument by drawing on Jewish tradition regarding the role of interpreters or translators. This is important because we have seen that Paul is using Jewish customs to regulate the Church in Corinth and calling on the nomos. For example in regard to Paul's requirements in 1 Cor 14:27 that they speak in tongues by turn, and in verse 27 that two or three prophets were allowed to speak one after the other, he draws some interesting parallels to the customs of the Synagogue. "The Rabbin deliver. In the law one reads, and one interprets; and let not one read and two interpret. But in the prophets one reads, and two interpret. But let not two read and two interpret. And in the Hallel, and in the Book of Esther, ten may read and ten may interpret" (Lightfoot 1979 [1859]). We notice the similarity in organization terminology of the Apostle Paul "If anyone speaks in a tongue it should be by two or at most three and one interpret". Lightfoot raises the question why this focus on turns and we may ask: Why in the case of prophets is one told to stop sit down and be silent if another gets a revelation? Some scholars note this is not a logical procedure. Matthew Henry notes "But this seems unnatural…for why must one speaking by inspiration be immediately silent upon another man being inspired?" Lightfood lays out a Jewish contexts for the organizing and it is far from the scholars who try to explain tongues as having a background in pagan babbling and disorder but the opposite, it arises out of the customs of the Jewish synagogues. Lightfoot illustrates from the Rabbinic source why one and not two and why two: "The gloss is thus 'Let not one read in the law, and two interpret' much less two read. And the reason is, because two voices together are not heard". "But in the prophets let one read, and two interpret ' because the interpretation was for the sake of the women and the common people, who understood not the holy language. And it was necessary that they should hear the interpretation of the law, that they might understand the precepts: but the interpretation of the prophets they were not so accurate"(Lightfoot 1979 [1869] p.262) Thus we see that the purpose of interpretation in the Synagogues and among the rabbis is exactly that of the Apostle who was one of them. They wanted the women to understand the law so that they could do it. Paul wanted the saints to understand what the Spirit was saying to the Church, so that they could react appropriately. Paul however indicates that would should ask questions at home not in the assembly. The Ancient Rabbinic Standard of Interpretation In Kiddushin Lightfoot finds an illustration to show us a Rabbinic of interpretation.

He that interprets that thus thou shalt not testify against judgment, is a liar: for he commands that judgment be brought forth into light. But let him so interpret it. Thou shalt not restrain thyself from teaching any to enquire after judgement. So Onkelos renders it (Lightfoot, 1979, p.260)

The Rabbis held that if Onkelos added anything it was not from his own sense, but rather “the Targum was given on Mount Sinai” (Lightfoot, 1979, p260). Thus it was in line with their oral tradition that the whole Oral Torah was one Sinai including the Aramaic Targum of Onkelos. We see here that the
Rabbis understand that their approved interpretations came from Moses on Sinai. Jesus had said to his disciples to listen to the scribes and Pharisees for they sat in Moses seat. Paul was a Pharisee and came and understood that what he taught was indeed from the Law or from Moses and understood his interpretation as being divine. He however understood that his interpretation came from Messiah 2 (Cor 12:3). And the Law and the Prophets were witnesses to the revelation in Messiah (Rom 3:21).

In conclusion we can say that Paul played a very important part in the history of Bible translation. He is a witness to the many and varied Bible versions available to him in the first century. At the same time he at times practiced both almost literal Bible translation and what we might call message impact translation. His goal being that through translation the intention of the message should be carried for to a person who did not know the language. We saw that this approach arose from his background as a disciple of the Sages and as a Jew. We also saw that it is likely the Corinthian Church had a set up very similar to a synagogue and Paul organized them in some degree in line with Jewish law or Halacha which had a specific place and function for translators. We need much more research to substantiate the old by insightful ideas of Lightfoot.
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