'Lord, LORD': Jesus as YHWH in Matthew and Luke[*]

JASON A. STAPLES

*Department of Religious Studies, UNC-Chapel Hill, CB#3225, 125 Saunders Hall,
North Carolina 27599, USA. Email: jasonastaples@gmail.com*

**Despite numerous studies of the word κύριος ('Lord') in the New Testament, the
significance of the double form κύριε κύριε occurring in Matthew and Luke has
been overlooked, with most assuming the doubling merely communicates heigh-
tened emotion or special reverence. By contrast, this article argues that whereas
a single κύριος might be ambiguous, the double κύριος formula outside the
Gospels always serves as a distinctive way to represent the Tetragrammaton
and that its use in Matthew and Luke is therefore best understood as a way to
represent Jesus as applying the name of the God of Israel to himself.**

Keywords: Christology, LXX, Tetragrammaton/Tetragram, translation, Synoptic
Gospels, circumlocution

> Not everyone who says to me, κύριε κύριε, will enter the kingdom of heaven,
> but the one who does the will of my father who is in heaven will enter. Many
> will say to me in that day, 'κύριε κύριε, did we not prophesy in your name
> and cast out demons in your name and in your name do many powerful
> things?' (Matt 7.21–2)[1]

> Later the remaining virgins will come and say, 'κύριε κύριε, open for us!' (Matt
> 25.11)

> Why do you address me as κύριε κύριε and not do what I say? (Luke 6.46)[2]

---

1 All translations throughout are my own.
2 Κύριε κύριε is also attested in some manuscripts of Luke 13.25, but that reading is probably a
  secondary harmonisation with Matt 25.11.

1

> But you, κύριε κύριε, deal mercifully with me, for your name's sake, because your mercy is good. (Ps 108.21 LXX; 109.21 MT)

> Say to them, 'Thus says κύριος κύριος, "Look, I will take all of the house of Israel from the midst of the nations where they have gone, and I will gather them …"' (Ezek 37.21 LXX)

The ambiguity of the word (ὁ) κύριος, which can mean 'master' or 'sir', 'lord' in the sense of kingship, or serve as a Greek representation of the unpronounced name of the God of Israel, has provided ample fodder for numerous studies on the use of this term in the Gospels and in nascent Christianity and on the christological implications of its application to Jesus.[3] Nevertheless, despite the profusion of such studies, the instances in Matthew and Luke in which the title is doubled (κύριε κύριε) have hardly been given a second thought. Indeed, many commentaries and articles specifically addressing the few passages containing this repetition in the Gospels scarcely seem to notice the doubling,[4] and those that do mention it have typically dismissed its significance as either typical of

---

3 E.g. F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology* (London: Lutterworth, 1969) 68–135; G. Howard, 'The Tetragram and the New Testament', *JBL* 96 (1977) 63–83; J. A. Fitzmyer, 'The Semitic Background of the New Testament Kyrios Title', *A Wandering Aramean* (ed. J. A. Fitzmyer; SBLMS 25; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1979) 115–42; *idem*, 'New Testament *Kyrios* and *Maranatha* and their Aramaic Background', *To Advance the Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 218–35; M. Frenschkowski, 'Kyrios in Context: Q 6:46, the Emperor as "Lord", and the Political Implications of Christology in Q', *Zwischen den Reichen: Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft: Vorträge auf der ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies* (ed. M. Labahn and J. Zangenberg; Tübingen: Francke, 2002) 95–118; L. W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005); S. J. Gathercole, *The Preexistent Son* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006) 243–52; C. K. Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006); G. D. Fee, *Pauline Christology* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007); S. J. Beardsley, 'Luke's Narrative Agenda: The Use of κύριος within Luke-Acts to Proclaim the Identity of Jesus' (Ph.D. diss., Temple University, 2012).

4 Wilhelm Bousset goes so far as to quote Luke 6.46 with only a single 'Lord', a signal example of how thoroughly the doubling is often ignored (*Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1970) 123). For other examples, cf. D. M. Krämer, 'Hütet euch vor den falschen Propheten: Eine überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Mt 7, 15–23/Lk 6, 43–46/Mt 12, 33–37', *Bib* 57 (1976) 349–77, esp. 361; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke I–IX* (AB 28A; New York: Doubleday, 1981) 643–4; J. Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20* (WBC 35A; Dallas: Word, 1989) 309; A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13: A Commentary* (WBC 33A; Dallas: Word, 1993) 186–7; J. B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 280; Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, 111–14; Beardsley, 'Luke's Narrative Agenda', 132–4; S. J. Joseph '"Why Do You Call Me 'Master'…?" Q 6:46, the Inaugural Sermon, and the Demands of Discipleship', *JBL* 132 (2013) 955–72.

Semitic style or merely a way of marking heightened emotion.[5] Marco Frenschkowski has provided the lone exception to date, proposing that the doubling represents acclamation of Jesus as the messianic king.[6] But, as this study will demonstrate, the doubling in these passages is much more significant: the double κύριος formula would have been distinctly familiar to a first-century Greek-speaking Jewish audience as an unambiguous way to signal the presence of the Tetragram (as opposed to the more ambiguous single κύριος) in the first-century Greek Bible, suggesting that through the use of the κύριε κύριε formula both Matthew and Luke represent Jesus as applying the name YHWH to himself.

1. Κύριος and YHWH

1.1 The Tetragram in Early Greek Manuscripts

The earliest studies on κύριος in earliest Christianity argued that Christian application of κύριος to Jesus was a natural outgrowth of the LXX's typical translation of יהוה with κύριος.[7] By extension, this also implied identification of Jesus with the name of YHWH at a very early stage in the tradition. Discoveries of earlier Greek manuscripts, however, have shown that these older manuscripts tend not to include κύριος, instead employing other means of communicating the Tetragram.

For example, the original scribe of the Deuteronomy fragments of P.Fouad 266b, which date to the first century BCE, left a blank space marked by a high dot at its beginning, where a second scribe filled in the Hebrew letters for the name in Aramaic block script, filling only about half the space left by the original scribe.[8] In addition to Aramaic block script, other early manuscripts not

---

5 For the former, see Hahn, *Titles of Jesus*, 90, followed by G. Strecker, *Die Bergpredigt: Ein exegetischer Kommentar* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 172. For the latter, see e.g. U. Luz, *Matthew 1–7* (Hermeneia 61A; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989) 379.

6 Frenschkowski, 'Kyrios in Context', 108–12.

7 E.g. W. W. Graf Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte* (4 vols.; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1929) 2.15.

8 See Z. Aly and L. Koenen, *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint: Genesis and Deuteronomy* (Bonn: Habelt, 1980) 5–6. A similar phenomenon is observable in P.Oxy. IV.656 (2nd/3rd cent. CE), which has four examples of spaces left by the first hand, three of which were later filled with κύριος by a second hand. See R. A. Kraft, 'The "Textual Mechanics" of Early Jewish LXX/OG Papyri and Fragments', *The Bible as Book* (ed. O. O'Sullivan and S. McKendrick; London: British Library/Oak Knoll, 2003) 51–72, at 60–1. The oldest relevant Greek manuscript, Pap.Ryl. III.458, which dates to the second century BCE, unfortunately does not preserve an instance of the name, though one lacuna suggests either κύριος or the preservation of the Hebrew form. See C. H. Roberts, ed., *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1936) 28; Howard, 'Tetragram', 63.

transmitted by Christians preserve the Tetragram either in Palaeo-Hebrew script[9] or the Greek letters ΠΙΠΙ,[10] a degeneration of the Aramaic script that led to later Syriac copies with *pypy*.[11] A few examples have ΙΑΩ (probably derived from the Aramaic יהו) or other transliterations of the name,[12] and other solutions such as two yods (sometimes Palaeo-Hebrew)[13] or four dots are employed,[14] but as a rule these early manuscripts do not include κύριος. By contrast, the first manuscript with κύριος, according to Emanuel Tov's list, is P.Baden IV.56b, which dates to the second century CE.[15]

   On the basis of this evidence, many scholars now regard κύριος as a later Christian standardisation rather than the original rendering of the Old Greek.[16] George Howard, for example, claims that 'we can now say with almost absolute certainty that the divine name, יהוה, was not rendered by κύριος in the pre-Christian Greek Bible, as so often has been thought'.[17] Hans Conzelmann agrees, concluding: '*Kyrios* occurs only in Christian manuscripts of the LXX,

9   E.g. 8ḤevXIIgr, fully published in E. Tov, 'The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert', *The Bible as Book*, 97–122, at 112–14. This MS has become well known as a witness to the so-called *Kaige* recension, as argued in D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963). See also P.Oxy. VII.1007 (cf. B. M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981) 34).

10 This is found in some Hexaplaric manuscripts; cf. Metzger, *Manuscripts*, 35, 94–95 (with a plate). It should be noted that the Tetragrams in P.Fouad 266 look sufficiently like ΠΙΠΙ for T. Rajak, *Translation and Survival* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) 2, to judge them (mistakenly in my opinion) to be the Greek characters.

11 For fuller lists and analysis of the manuscript evidence with respect to the Tetragram, see the helpful summaries in M. Rösel 'The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch', *JSOT* 31 (2007) 411–28, at 413–19 and J. R. Royse 'Philo, Kyrios, and the Tetragrammaton', *SPhiloA* 3 (1991) 167–83, at 168–9, along with the fuller treatments in Metzger, *Manuscripts*.

12 E.g. 4QLXXLev[b], which has ΙΑΩ in Lev 4.27 and (probably) 3.12. See P. W. Skehan, 'The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism', *Congress Volume: Strasbourg, 1956* (ed. G. W. Anderson; VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957) 148–60, at 157–60.

13 E.g. P.Oxy. VII.1007 verso 1.4 (= Gen 2.8) and 2.14 (= Gen 2.18).

14 E.g. the Hebrew manuscripts 1QIsa[a] 42.6; 1QS 8.14 (quoting Isa 40.3).

15 E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 289. The Chester Beatty papyrus of Numbers and Deuteronomy, dated by Kenyon to the first half of the second century CE, is the other earliest witness, though the ΚΥΡΙΟ[Σ] found in 4Q126, a small fragment from an unknown text, serves as a reminder that our evidence is itself fragmentary.

16 Cf. E. Tov, 'The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert', *The Bible as Book*, 97–122, at 112–14; Howard, 'Tetragram'; W. G. Waddell, 'The Tetragrammaton in the LXX', *JTS* 45 (1944) 158–61. P. W. Skehan 'The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint', *BIOSCS* 13 (1980) 14–44, agrees that κύριος is probably not the earliest reading but argues that 'as far back as it is possible to go, the Kyrios term is employed in these books for both יהוה and אדני, on the basis of the spoken Adonay that stood for either separately ... This cannot have come about as exclusively the work of Christian scribes' (38).

17 Howard, 'Tetragram', 65.

and not in Jewish ones ... Thus the Christian use of κύριος cannot be derived from the LXX. The reverse is in fact the case. Once the title began to be used, it was found again in the Bible.'[18] Thus Conzelmann turns the older argument that the title had originated in the LXX on its head, arguing that the application of κύριος to Jesus originally derived from pagan usage and was eventually read back into the LXX by Christians equating Jesus with God. Albert Pietersma and Martin Rösel, however, have more recently renewed the argument for the originality of κύριος, contending that the early manuscripts preserving the name in Hebrew were the result of an archaising and Hebraising trend during the second century ʙᴄᴇ and pointing to specific translation decisions that make less sense if one presumes that the preserved Tetragram was original,[19] a conclusion echoed by Robert Kraft.[20]

1.2   *What is Read: Going Beyond What is Written*

In any case, these older manuscripts validate the witness of Origen and Jerome that the oldest and most reliable Greek manuscripts of their day represented the Tetragram in Hebrew characters rather than writing κύριος.[21] But more importantly, both Origen and Jerome testify that κύριος was substituted for the Tetragram when these Greek texts were *read*, though Jerome notes that some more ignorant readers said *pee-pee* upon coming to these unfamiliar characters.[22] Their testimony highlights the importance of distinguishing between what is *written* in manuscripts and what was *read*; indeed, as Larry Hurtado

---

18 H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1969) 83–4. Cf. also P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1959²) 222.

19 A. Pietersma, 'Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX', *De Septuaginta* (ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox; Mississauga, ON: Benben Publications, 1984) 85–101; Rösel, 'Reading and Translation'.

20 R. Kraft, 'Format Features in the Earliest Jewish Greek Literary Papyri and Related Materials' (paper presented at the Papyrological Congress, Vienna, 2001, http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak/jewishpap.html).

21 Origen: καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων Ἑβραίοις χαρακτῆρσι κεῖται τὸ ὄνομα Ἑβραικοῖς δὲ οὐ τοῖς νῦν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀρχαιοτάτοις. φασὶ γὰρ τὸν Ἔδραν ἐν τῇ αἰχμαλωσίᾳ ἑτέρους αὐτοῖς χαρακτῆρας παρὰ τοὺς παραδεδωκέναι (PG 12.1104Β). Jerome, *Prologus galeatus* (PL 28.594–5): *nomen Domini tetragrammaton in quibusdam Graecis voluminibus usque hodie antiquis expressum litteris invenimus.*

22 Origen, *Selecta in Psalmos* 2.2 (PG 12.1104B4–9): ἔστι δέ τι τετραγράμματον ἀνεκφώνητον παρ᾿αὐτοῖς, ὅπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πετάλου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἀναγέγραπται, καὶ λέγεται μὲν τῇ Αδωναΐ προσηγορίᾳ, οὐχὶ τούτου γεγραμμένου ἐν τῷ τετραγραμμάτῳ. παρὰ δὲ Ἕλλησι τῇ Κύριος ἐκφωνεῖται. Jerome, *Ep.* 25, *Ad Marcellam* (CSEL 54.219): *[Dei nomen est] tetragrammum, quod* ἀνεκφώνητον, *id est ineffabile, putauerunt et his litteris scribitur:* iod, he, uau, he, *quod quidam non intellegentes propter elementorum similitudinem, cum in Graecis libris reppererint ΠΙΠΙ legere consueuerunt.* Cf. Fitzmyer, 'Semitic Background', 122–3.

observes, the special treatment of the name within Jewish manuscripts served 'to signal readers to pronounce a reverential substitute-word'.[23]

A fragment of Aquila's translation from the Cairo Geniza palimpsest manuscripts features a 'palaeographical accident' that further witnesses to this practice.[24] Although the Tetragram is normally preserved throughout these fragments, there is at least one instance (2 Kgs 23.24) in which a scribe lacking space at the end of a line replaces the Tetragram with KY, thereby confirming that this community of Greek-speaking Jews read κύριος when coming across the Tetragram.[25] Although late, this witness (which also attests κύριος in a Jewish manuscript) is nevertheless instructive, especially since other evidence suggests the אדני/κύριος circumlocution for the Tetragram had already long been in practice by the first century CE.

1.3 *Evidence for an Early Κύριος Reading*

The first and most obvious evidence for Jews reading (if not writing) κύριος in place of the Tetragram in the first century is that furnished by the New Testament authors themselves, since, as Rösel points out, 'the citations of the New Testament require at least that κύριος or אדני had been uttered when the Scriptures of Israel were read aloud and studied'.[26] Fitzmyer similarly protests: 'If κύριος = יהוה is a device found only in Christian copies of the OT, where did Luke get it when he quoted Deut 6.5 [using κύριος]?'[27] In addition, the idea that Christians read a christological title adopted from pagan terminology for rulers back into the LXX only to have later Jews adopt the same substitution for יהוה is implausible to say the least. It is more likely that the New Testament authors built on an established tradition, with κύριος already the most common Greek surrogate for the name by that time.

---

23 L. W. Hurtado, 'The "Meta-Data" of Earliest Christian Manuscripts', *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean* (ed. Z. Crook and P. A. Harland; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007) 149–63, at 158. Cf. also Fitzmyer, 'Semitic Background', 122–3; Royse, 'Kyrios', 177; Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 22.

24 F. C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila: From a MS. Formerly in the Geniza at Cairo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897) 16.

25 Ibid., 16. Cf. Royse, 'Kyrios', 76; Fitzmyer, 'Semitic Background', 122; J. Reider, 'Prolegomena to a Greek–Hebrew and Hebrew–Greek Index to Aquila', *JQR* 7 (1917) 287–366; F. Dunand, *Papyrus grecs bibliques (Papyrus F. Inv. 266)* (RAPH 27; Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1966) 51. Similar abbreviations are found in the second-century CE manuscript P.Oxy. IV.656 (Göttingen #905; Gen 14–27) which has two instances of blank spaces, to which a later hand added KΥ in one case (= Gen 24.42) and either KY or KYRIE in the other (= Gen 24.31), and the third-century manuscripts P.Oxy. VIII.1075, which has KΣ on line 12 (Exod 40.35), and P.Oxy. IX.1166, featuring abbreviations on lines 11 and 24 (Gen 16.10, 11). Cf. Fitzmyer, 'Semitic Background', 137–8.

26 Rösel, 'Reading and Translation', 425. Cf. also Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 22–3.

27 Fitzmyer, 'Semitic Background', 121.

The New Testament evidence does not stand alone. The first known interdiction against pronouncing the name aloud actually comes in the LXX version of Lev 24.16, where the Hebrew prohibition, 'he that blasphemes (נקב) the name of YHWH will surely be put to death', is altered to an explicit prohibition of speaking the name: 'He that names (ὀνομάζων) the name of the Lord, let him die the death.' This verse thus serves as an early witness for the non-pronunciation of the name in the Greek tradition, as it is difficult to envision those who thus understood speaking the name to be prohibited promptly pronouncing it as they read.[28]

For his part, Philo consistently treats κύριος as the Greek equivalent of the Tetragram, and his use of κύριος cannot be explained away as having been amended by the Christian scribes who transmitted his corpus, as this would have required not only the systematic alteration of his citations and allusions involving κύριος but also reworking 'considerable parts of his treatises', including frequent comments on the etymologies of κύριος and θεός.[29] Even Howard, who argues that κύριος was a later Christian innovation in the LXX, concedes:

> [Philo's] weaving together of biblical quotation and exposition at times leaves hardly any doubt that Philo was perfectly capable of using κύριος as a surrogate for the Tetragram within his exposition. It may then be that our earliest witness to this particular Greek substitute for the divine name in an expositional reference is Philo.[30]

On this basis, James Royse concludes that although Philo's copies of the Pentateuch may have preserved the Tetragram in Hebrew characters, 'Philo's own written use of κύριος is consistent with his having read such texts and having pronounced the Tetragrammaton as κύριος'.[31]

Josephus also shows knowledge of κύριος as a substitute for the Tetragram, though he uses it only twice, instead preferring δεσπότης when referring to the deity. The two instances of κύριος as a divine address are intriguing, as one is found in a scripture quotation in a high priestly letter (A.J. 13.3.1 §68) and the other in an invocation by King Izates, a convert to Judaism (A.J. 20.4.2 §90),

---

28 Rösel, 'Reading and Translation', 418. J. F. Hobbins, however, has suggested that this interdiction only applied to the full name, while abbreviated versions of the name such as ΙΑΩ, יהו or יה (which often appeared in theophoric names at any rate) did not fall under this prohibition ('The Splendid Iao: The Identification of Helios with Iao, the God of the Jews', http://ancienthebrewpoetry. typepad.com/ancient_hebrew_poetry/2009/05/the-splendid-iao-the-identification-of-helios-with-iao-the-god-of-the-jews.html).

29 Royse, 'Kyrios', 173–5.

30 Howard, 'Tetragram', 71.

31 Royse, 'Kyrios', 183. Rösel, 'Reading and Translation', 425 n. 28 protests that the evidence for a preserved Tetragram in Philo's scriptures is flimsy but further confirms Royse's overall point about Philo's reading and use of κύριος. Cf. also N. A. Dahl and A. F. Segal, 'Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God', JSJ 9 (1978) 1–28, at 1.

indicating both that he knows of the word as a circumlocution and that these instances for some reason allow for a different language than elsewhere in his works, where he avoids the term.[32] Indeed, Josephus elsewhere informs us that it is not lawful for him to disclose the name revealed to Moses to his audience, which Fitzmyer argues 'undoubtedly influenced his use of δεσπότης on various occasions'.[33]

Other Greek witnesses of κύριος for the name include Aristobulus and the citation of Deut 7.18–19 in the *Letter of Aristeas* 155.[34] The prevalence of κύριος in other Hellenistic Jewish writings not translated from a Hebrew *Vorlage* such as the *Wisdom of Solomon* or 2 Maccabees is also a strong indicator that this term was a familiar surrogate for the Tetragram by the time these books were written.[35]

1.4 *Adonai YHWH: Problematic Redundancy*

But it is actually the scribal difficulties caused by the phrase אדני יהוה that serve as the best evidence for the antiquity of אדני or κύριος as euphemisms in place of the name. Koog Hong explains:

> The *Adonai* euphemism can be traced by examining how אדני יהוה is rendered in textual transmission – that is, whether it is faithfully retained or altered to a form that reflects an attempt to avoid the putative redundancy. אדני יהוה, 'my Lord YHWH', is a straightforward title. Were it not for the redundancy, this title in itself presents no need for any modification in its oral and written transmission.[36]

This combination (and its variants) occurs 319 times in the Masoretic Text, of which a striking 217 are in Ezekiel, most often in introductory or concluding formulae. Lawrence Boadt observes the presence of this phrase in much older traditions and prophetic utterances and argues that Ezekiel is thus reviving 'this archaic usage on a large scale in his oracular style', appropriating the 'traditional solemnity of [אדני] as a title for [YHWH]' and 'hearken[ing] back to a recognized effectiveness in the union of the two terms'.[37] Although Hebrew and Greek do

---

32 Josephus elsewhere explains that κύριος is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew אדון (*A.J.* 5.2.2 §121). Fitzmyer, 'Semitic Background', 121–2 notes that Christian alteration is unlikely in these two cases.

33 *A.J.* 2.12.4 §276. Fitzmyer, 'Semitic Background', 121 (cf. also 122–3). Similar reticence to use the name or its various euphemisms with Gentiles is seen elsewhere, with the epithet 'most high' more commonly preferred when communicating with outsiders, as suggested by the synagogue inscriptions cited in Hobbins, 'The splendid Iao'.

34 Cf. Rösel, 'Reading and Translation', 424–5 and the citations there.

35 Rösel, 'Reading and Translation', 424–5.

36 K. P. Hong, 'The Euphemism for the Ineffable Name of God and its Early Evidence in Chronicles', *JSOT* 37 (2013) 473–84, at 479. Cf. also Rösel, 'Reading and Translation', 412–13.

37 L. Boadt, 'Textual Problems in Ezekiel and Poetic Analysis of Paired Words', *JBL* 97 (1978) 489–99, at 496.

show some tolerance for repetition of names in the vocative (e.g. 1 Sam 3.4; Luke 13.34; Acts 9.4), with the repetition typically functioning as a 'pathos formula' signalling a highly emotional context,[38] אדני יהוה is exceptional in that it is not restricted to circumstances of direct address, often causing exactly the sort of repetition typically avoided in Hebrew or Greek,[39] as signalled by the various methods for managing this special compound in the textual tradition.

Telltale alterations of this formula can be found as early as the book of 1 Chronicles, which never retains אדני יהוה from parallel passages in 2 Samuel, replacing it with either a single יהוה or אלהים or (on two occasions, 1 Chron 17.16, 17) with the Palestinian *qerê*, יהוה אלהים.[40] Hong observes that there is 'no other way to account for this unusual replacement', since the Chronicler replaces a formula widely used in invocations with one that is not.[41] He observes that this substitution became 'a rather usual scribal practice' by the time of the Targumim,

> in which אדני יהוה of the MT was completely replaced with יהוה אלהים. Even the single title אדני was replaced by יהוה. The result is the complete loss of the distinction between אדני and יהוה אלהים in the Targumim.[42]

These alterations attest אדני as a surrogate for the Tetragram at least by the time of the composition of Chronicles,[43] lending indirect support to the originality of the κύριε reading for the Old Greek.[44] That the Palestinian *qerê* appears in the great

---

38 For doubling as a pathos formula, see H. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric* (Leiden/ Boston: Brill, 1998) §§612–18, esp. 612. For examples of doubling in contexts of extreme pathos, see Luke 8.24; 2 Kgs 2.12; 8.5; Ps 22.1; Mk 15.34 // Matt 27.46. Frenschkowski, 'Kyrios in Context', 109 also lists several instances of doubling the epiclesis to the deity in Greek literature, and E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981⁷) 136–7, 463 gives numerous examples of the doubling of names in various cultic and magical contexts. The Hebrew construct to express superlatives similarly repeats a title but subordinates one cognate to the other, e.g. 'king of kings', 'lord of lords' etc.

39 Note how Philo handles the unusual repetition of ἄνθρωπος in Lev 18.6 (a translation of איש איש, a Hebrew idiom for 'each person of …') in *Gig.* 33–4, indicating how striking such repetitions would be to a Greek ear.

40 Hong, 'Euphemism', 481–4. As Hong points out, even if this alteration arose from the Chroniclers' *Vorlage*, it still predates the translation of the LXX and puts the אדני euphemism at a very early stage.

41 Hong, 'Euphemism', 483.

42 Hong, 'Euphemism', 483–4.

43 Chronicles has been dated from the late sixth century to the Maccabean era (*ca.* 160 ʙᴄᴇ), but a growing majority now puts the date sometime in the fourth century. Cf. R. W. Klein, *1 Chronicles* (Hermeneia 13; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006) 13–16, 31–7; K. Peltonen, 'A Jigsaw without a Model? The Date of Chronicles', in *Did Moses Speak Attic?* (ed. L. L. Grabbe; JSOTSup 37; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 225–73; I. Kalimi 'Die Abfassungszeit der Chronik – Forschungsstand und Perspektiven', *ZAW* 105 (1993) 223–33.

44 Hong, 'Euphemism', 484.

Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaᵃ) on two occasions (50.5; 61.11) indicates that the scribes of the Dead Sea Scroll community similarly attempted to avoid the repetition created by the compound אדוני יהוה when both words are vocalised the same way.[45]

Septuagintal difficulties with this formula also indicate that some of the early Greek translators treated κύριος as the equivalent for both Hebrew words. LXX Genesis, for example, chooses δέσποτα (15.2) and δέσποτα κύριε (15.8) in the two places the combination appears – which in turn are the only two places in Genesis where the word δέσποτης appears.[46] The Exodus translator chooses different solutions that nevertheless reveal the same distaste for repetition, opting for κύριου τοῦ θεοῦ in the first case (23.17).[47] This was not a viable option in the second case (34.23), however, since the phrase 'the God of Israel' immediately follows the problematic double formulation, so the translator instead omits one κύριος. This use of the single κύριος eventually became the most common solution for rendering אדני יהוה and its variants elsewhere in the LXX (196 times in Rahlfs), though given the tendency of some early manuscripts to leave a space where the Tetragram appears (e.g. P.Ryl. III.458), one wonders whether many of these examples of a single κύριος were the result of such spaces (or perhaps dots or some other placeholder) eventually dropping out in the process of transmission. Versions of the Palestinian qerê also appear twenty-four times in the LXX, all in the prophets except the aforementioned Exod 23.17.[48]

Pietersma regards all these examples as showing 'beyond a shadow of a doubt not only that *adonai* and the Tetragram were taken to be equivalent to *kyrios* but also that this equivalency was expressed in written form'.[49] I am less convinced that this equivalence was necessarily written, but these instances do indicate attempts to avoid a repetition of κύριος at an early stage in the Greek tradition.[50]

---

45 On the handling of the name and its circumlocutions in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see M. Rösel, 'Names of God', *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 600–2; Howard, 'Tetragram', 66–70; Skehan, 'Divine Name', 14–28.

46 There is some textual support for an additional κύριε in 15.2, though the shorter reading seems more likely original. The Jeremiah translator also renders the doublet with this phrase on two occasions (1.6; 4.10), with δέσποτης again nowhere else occurring in the book. See also Jonah 4.3.

47 Pietersma, 'Kyrios or Tetragram', 95: 'What we see immediately is that the translator rather than repeating *kyrios*, has opted for the so-called Palestinian *qere*, which was apparently known in Egypt as early as the third century BC.'

48 In the New Testament, κύριος ὁ θεός (without a possessive pronoun or another modifier) also appears in Luke 1.32 and Rev 1.8, 22.5. Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ occurs six times in Revelation, though in the LXX that phrase tends to translate יהוה אלהי הצבאות. Rev 18.5 appears to echo Isa 51.22 with its use of κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ κρίνων and thus should not be understood as an example of the Palestinian qerê.

49 Pietersman, 'Kyrios or Tetragram', 96.

50 Hong, 'Euphemism', 482. Cf. also S. Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (BEATAJ 9; Frankfurt: Lang, 1989) 20–41, esp. 39; M. Rösel, *Adonaj, warum Gott 'Herr' genannt wird* (FAT 29; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) 184–5.

Hong's restrained conclusion with respect to the textual data seems best: 'It is equally plausible and more practical to suggest that there were multiple, competing renditions – of course including κύριος, θεός, and other special forms – among which κύριος later happened to emerge as a dominant rendition.'[51]

2. Κύριος Κύριος in the Greek Bible

It can therefore be established that, regardless of what is found on the pages of our earliest manuscripts or was originally written in the Old Greek, κύριος was read in place of the Tetragram from a very early date and certainly by the first century. What matters for the purposes of this study, however, is that the use of κύριος as a circumlocution for יהוה introduced ambiguity when the Bible was read aloud – except, of course, when the repetition was retained in translation, at which point the presence of the Tetragram in the text was evident. The scribal reserve towards repetition observed in the transmission history further highlights just how distinctive the double κύριος sounded when it was retained. The distinctiveness of this repetition is further reinforced by the fact that *in every extant example in pre-Talmudic Jewish literature outside the Gospels, the double κύριος serves as a Greek rendering of* אדני יהוה.[52]

 Moreover, despite the prevalence of other solutions for representing אדני יהוה, instances of the distinctive κύριος κύριος are plentiful, particularly in the vocative, which Pietersma notes is 'the only case in which a double *kyrios* was to become usual in the LXX'.[53] Eighteen of the twenty-three incidences of the

---

51 Hong, 'Euphemism', 478–9; cf. Rösel, 'Reading and Translation', 417. K. De Troyer, The Pronunciation of the Names of God: With Some Notes Regarding nomina sacra', *Gott nennen: Gottes Namen und Gott als Name* (ed. I. U. Dalferth and Ph. Stoellger; RPT 35 Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 143–72 argues that θεός was the original Greek rendering (159–64), but Hong, 'Euphemism', 478 n. 23 disagrees: 'It is also likely that to read יהוה as θεός was only a second option – i.e., due to redundancy.' Cf. also Rösel, 'Reading and Translation'; J. W. Wevers, 'The Rendering of the Tetragram in the Psalter and Pentateuch: A Comparative Study', *The Old Greek Psalter* (ed. R. J. V. Hiebert, C. E. Cox and P. J. Gentry; JSOTSup 332 Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 21–35.

52 The only example of κύριε κύριε not clearly serving as a rendering of אדני יהוה of which I am aware is found in b. Hullin 139b, where R. Kahana describes Herodian doves cooing קירי קירי (κύριε κύριε) – aside from one dissenter who protests that it should instead be קירי בירי ('κύριε is a slave') before promptly being slaughtered. *Pace* Frenschkowski, 'Kyrios in Context', 109, there is no indication in this passage that the phrase is being used as an acclamation of King Herod. Rather, 'Herodian doves' simply designates birds kept in captivity, as discussed in E. Schürer, G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 ʙᴄ–ᴀᴅ 135)*, vol. ɪ (London: Bloomsbury, 1973; repr. 2014) 310 n. 77. In any case, this passage is both too late and too unclear to be of any value for assessing the use of double κύριος centuries earlier.

53 Pietersma, 'Kyrios or Tetragram', 96.

double formulation not found in Ezekiel occur in the vocative, including five instances in the Psalter,[54] coinciding with the usual invocational aspects of the Hebrew combination.[55] A second similar solution found in the Deuteronomistic History is also noteworthy, as the eight instances of κύριέ μου κύριε interpret the final yod of אדני as a first-person pronominal ending ('*adoni*') but still also preserve the double vocative.[56] In any case, the repetition in such passages as these is distinctive:

> κύριε κύριε, you have begun to show your strength, your power, your mighty hand, and your high arm to your servant; for what God is there in heaven or on the earth who will do as you hast done, and according to your might? (Deut 3.24; 'O Lord GOD' NRSV)

> And I said, 'Not so, κύριε κύριε! They say to me, "Is not this that is spoken a parable?"' (Ezek 20.49)

> If you observed lawlessness, κύριε κύριε, who could stand? (Ps 129.3 LXX; 130.3 MT)

In all, the double κύριος occurs eighty-four times in Rahlfs' LXX, including eleven times in the Psalms and seven times in the Minor Prophets and Jeremiah. It appears an additional five times in Jewish pseudepigrapha, four in the *Testament of Abraham* (9.4; 10.6, 9, 11) and once in the *Apocalypse of Moses* (= *Life of Adam and Eve*) 25.3.[57] Of these references, only 2 Macc 1.24, 3 Macc 2.2 and Esther C2 (13.9 = 4.17b) are from works originally written in Greek, and each of these is an invocation to the God of Israel clearly echoing the translation of אדני יהוה elsewhere in the Greek Bible. The double κύριος also occurs once in Philo, at *Conf.* 173, which suggests that Philo read the double formulation in his Torah.[58] Ezekiel, which contains nearly three quarters of the occurrences of אדני יהוה in the Hebrew Bible, contains the κύριος κύριος repetition a remarkable

---

54 Although our LXX lacks the doubling, the version of Ps 34.22 known to Alexander Numenius in the second century CE apparently had κύριε κύριε, as he uses it as an example of ἀναδίπλωσις. See *Anonymus Seguerianus* in L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1853–6) III.182.24. The doubling could be explained as such in this poetic verse, but numerous instances in Ezekiel (i.e. 'thus says Lord Lord') and elsewhere cannot be so explained.

55 E.g. Deut 3.24; 9.26; Judg 2.1; 6.22(A); 16.28(A); 1 Kings 8.53; Pss 67.21 (68.21 MT); 108.21 (109.21MT); Jer 51.26 (44.26 MT). The prevalence of the vocative may be construed as in keeping with Boadt's observations about the invocational aspect of the Hebrew phrase. Cf. Skehan, 'Divine Name', 35.

56 Judg 6.22(B); 2 Sam 7.18, 19 (2x), 20, 22, 7.28, 29. These examples from 2 Samuel 7 are incidentally the same invocations 1 Chronicles alters, as discussed above.

57 Of these, *Apoc. Mos.* is from a Hebrew exemplar, while the original language of *T. Ab.* is uncertain.

58 Cf. also *Plant.* 47, which has a double κύριε separated by ἁγίασμα.

fifty-four times (only once in the vocative), with forty-nine of these appearing in the middle portion of the book (chs. 21–39),[59] concentrated in restoration passages of special interest to early Christians. For example:

> For thus says κύριος κύριος, 'Look, I will seek out my sheep, and will visit them ... And I will bring them out from the Gentiles and will gather them from the countries ... I will feed my sheep, and I will cause them to rest; and they shall know that I am κύριος.' Thus says κύριος κύριος. (Ezek 34.8–15 LXX)
>
> 'You are my sheep, the sheep of my flock, and I am κύριος your God', says κύριος κύριος. (Ezek 34.31 LXX)

The double formula occurs throughout these central passages in Ezekiel, in which κύριος κύριος promises to come down and shepherd his people, giving them a new heart and a new spirit and restoring the relationship between himself and his people.

It bears repeating that this double formulation specifically arose to designate the distinctive Hebrew אדני יהוה and was employed despite a scribal tendency to eschew repetition. Similar repetition of a title is uncommon, but this double formulation serves a valuable purpose in removing any ambiguity that could result from a single κύριος, which could refer to a human being or simply the title or metonym 'Lord' rather than the name. The double κύριος thus distinctively marks the presence of the name to the Greek reader, making it clear that the formula in question is directly referring to the God of Israel by the special name. To return to the sentiments of Boadt and Skehan, it appears this double formula is employed to call out the 'traditional solemnity' of the אדני יהוה formula as much as possible in the Greek translation.[60]

59 Numbers based on *Accordance Bible Software 10.2* (Orlando: Oak Tree Software, Inc., 2013) searches of Rahlfs' critical edition, which primarily relies on Codex Vaticanus. LXX Ezekiel demonstrates the difficulty scribes had with the awkward repetition presented by the *qerê* for this phrase, with the middle section almost exclusively employing κύριος κύριος, the first twenty chapters preferring the single κύριος, and chs. 40–8 employing mainly κύριος ὁ θεός. This peculiar distribution has led some to posit three separate translators for the book. See L. J. McGregor, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel* (SCSS 18; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985) 5–19; cf. also Hong, 'Euphemism', 480. Interestingly, P.Beatty 967 lacks the double κύριος, employing only the single κύριος and fifteen instances of κύριος ὁ θεός, none of which occur in the later manuscript tradition; see Skehan, 'Divine Name', 35–7. However, J. Ziegler, 'Die Bedeutung des Chester Beatty-Scheide Papyrus 967 für die Textüberlieferung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta', *ZAW* 61 (1948) 76–94 argues that these examples represent secondary alterations in the process of transmission.

60 Boadt, 'Textual Problems', 496. Cf. Skehan, 'Divine Name', 35. See nn. 37 and 55 above.

3. Κύριε Κύριε in the Gospels

There can therefore be little doubt that a Greek audience accustomed to the frequent occurrence of the double κύριος in Ezekiel and the vocative κύριε κύριε elsewhere in the Greek Bible would hear[61] a jarring echo when reading the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.[62] By contrast, modern interpreters unaccustomed to the double 'Lord' in their Bibles outside these passages have tended to be deaf to the echo. Ferdinand Hahn, for example, dismisses the doubling as merely 'a typically Semitic characteristic', which does little to explain why such a characteristic would appear only in these specific passages.[63] Ulrich Luz, on the other hand, cites the rhetorical commonplace of 'doubling' (geminatio) in both Semitic languages and Greek as a way to mark language as 'especially expressive and imploring',[64] while François Bovon suggests that it signals 'reverence or affection',[65] and Frenschkowski argues that it represents the heightened context of a royal acclamation.[66] This view of the double κύριε as representing little more than an impassioned equivalent to a single κύριος has become a default position among interpreters, more assumed than argued at this point.[67] Nevertheless, although it is true that geminatio sometimes does function as a pathos formula,[68] a closer examination of the passages themselves shows that the doubling is better understood as echoing a familiar way of unambiguously rendering the name of Israel's God in the Greek Bible.

3.1 Matthew 7.21–2 and 25.11

The pathos interpretation does not adequately explain the double formulation in Matt 7.21, which provides no narrative context implying pathos or desperation on the part of the speaker. Whereas the doubling in Matt 7.22 or 25.11

---

61 In the ancient world, where reading was almost always aloud, 'readers' and 'hearers' are nearly the same thing. See H. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) 203–42.

62 *Pace* Frenschkowski, 'Kyrios in Context', 109, who asserts, 'We also have not the slightest hint the call [sic] might have any kind of tradition-historical connection with the Septuagint rendering of YHWH', when in fact the doubling provides precisely that.

63 Hahn, *Titles of Jesus*, 90. Cf. also G. Strecker, *Die Bergpredigt: Ein exegetischer Kommentar* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 172; F. Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50* (Hermeneia 63A; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002) 253 n. 57, citing H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (4 vols.; Munich: Beck, 1924) I.943; II.258.

64 Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 379.

65 Bovon, *Luke 1*, 253 n. 57.

66 Frenschkowski, 'Kyrios in Context', 111–12.

67 This is easily observed by noting the frequency with which interpreters gloss the phrase with an exclamation point. E.g. H. D. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Hermeneia 54; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 456; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 254; Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, 112.

68 Cf. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, §§612–18.

could be dismissed as merely signalling heightened emotion as suggested by Luz, there is no indication of heightened emotion or affection in the statement 'not everyone who says to me κύριε κύριε' (7.21). Rather, this saying treats κύριε κύριε as an address or invocation expected to grant access to the kingdom. In this way, 7.21 prepares the reader to understand the other appearances of the double form in 7.22 and 25.11, where it is similarly employed (though in contexts in which it could more easily be dismissed as doubling to signal pathos) as a means by which the speaker hopes to enter the kingdom.[69] It is also surely no accident that Matt 7.21–2 involves the first uses of κύριος referring to Jesus in the Gospel after using that term eleven times to refer to God before this passage. The use of the double form for the first application of κύριος to Jesus thus ensures that the reader does not miss the theological implications of that term, signalling that this κύριε is not a rudimentary 'sir'.[70] By using the double form here, Matthew thereby sets the tone for when characters call Jesus by the more ambiguous single κύριος later in the Gospel.

Such blurring between the name of God and the name of Jesus is reminiscent of the Christ hymn of Philippians 2, in which Jesus is 'given the name above every other name [=יהוה] so that every knee will bow at the name of Jesus' (2.9–10). Remarkably, Matt 7.21–2 presumes a context in which some believe that calling upon Jesus as κύριε κύριε grants entry to the kingdom of heaven, an idea almost certainly tied to the application of Joel 2.32 (MT/LXX: Joel 3.5) to Jesus, 'whoever (LXX: πᾶς ὅς) calls on the name יהוה (LXX: κυρίου) will be saved', in precisely the way Paul does in Rom 10.9.[71] This confession of κύριος Ἰησοῦς was certainly the characteristic Pauline confession (Rom 10.9; cf. Phil 2.11; 1 Cor 12.3; 16.22),[72] but it was not limited to Pauline communities and appears to have been common across the earliest Christian communities (cf. Rev 22.20–1; Jas 1.1). In this context, the added intertextual weight of the distinctive double κύριος in Matt 7.21–2 further reinforces Hagner's judgement that 'Matthew's community can hardly have failed to think here of the primary Christian confession, that Jesus is Lord'.[73]

69 As noted by W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew* (AB 26; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974) 302, the parable of the virgins 'unequivocally equates [Jesus'] ministry with God's visit to claim his own'.

70 See R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 293.

71 See Betz, *Sermon*, 546–7. As noted by L. W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2003²) 93–125, such 'calling upon the name' of Jesus indicates worship and invocation than one would direct towards God. Cf. also M. V. Novenson, *Christ among the Messiahs: Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012) 107.

72 As Novenson notes, κύριος is '"the" new title for the person of Jesus in the Pauline epistles', occurring twenty-six times in the seven undisputed letters (*Christ among the Messiahs*, 17).

73 Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 187.

Matthew's Jesus, however, cautions that not everyone (οὐ πᾶς) who does so will enter the kingdom *unless* s/he pairs this confession with obedience.[74] *Pace* the suggestion of Hans Dieter Betz, there is no indication that invoking Jesus in this manner is at all inappropriate or that 'this repetition comes under the verdict of verbosity considered improper for worship'.[75] On the contrary, it is striking that the phrasing of Matt 7.21 does not oppose but instead presumes the legitimacy of applying the name to Jesus and implicitly embraces the confession 'Jesus is κύριος' – those not entering the kingdom are not rebuffed for improper worship or verbose prayers but rather for their ἀνομία (7.23) despite their presumably correct invocation. One would not say, for example, 'not everyone (οὐ πᾶς) who blasphemes will enter the kingdom of heaven' but rather 'no one (οὐδείς) who blasphemes ...' since blasphemy is the thing keeping one out of the kingdom. To say that 'not everyone' who invokes Jesus as κύριε κύριε will enter the kingdom (7.21) presumes that many who do so will indeed gain access to the kingdom as expected – provided they do not invalidate their confession with lawlessness. The point of the passage is therefore that calling upon Jesus as YHWH, though indeed associated with entering the kingdom, will be insufficient for entry into the kingdom of heaven unless that confession is paired with obedience – a sentiment standing in harmony with Matt 5.17–20, where Jesus warns that he came to fulfil the Torah, not annul the obligation of obedience.[76] Or, to put it another way, Matt 7.21–3 argues that confessing 'Jesus is κύριος' with one's mouth is not sufficient for final vindication or salvation.

Verse 22 further underscores the connection of the double κύριος with the divine name, revealing that, as with the names of other deities or angels in the ancient world, the κύριος κύριος formula can be invoked to perform works of power (cf. the casting out of evil spirits by the 'name of κύριος Jesus' in Acts 19.13). Indeed, the condemned protest that they have performed cosmic acts of power (δυνάμεις) such as exorcism and prophecy 'in your name' (7.22), which might initially be assumed to be 'Jesus'. But these prophetic exorcists do not address him as 'Jesus' but rather as κύριε κύριε, implying that the latter is the

---

74 Betz, *Sermon*, 546: 'What is denied, therefore, is an illusionary expectation stated as a false saying of Jesus that would read: "Everyone who says to me 'Lord, Lord!' will enter into the kingdom of the heavens".'

75 Betz, *Sermon*, 542.

76 Betz, *Sermon*, 546–51 argues that Matt 7.21–2 polemicises against Gentile believers who call Jesus κύριος but do not obey the Torah, though he also rightly notes that Paul himself 'would agree that Christians who have nothing to offer in the last judgment except the cry "Lord, Lord!" have no chance of escaping condemnation' (547), since Paul similarly presumes the need for obedience guided by the love command, which Matthew also puts at the centre. A proper understanding of the double κύριος as referencing the confession of Jesus as κύριος in the context of 'calling upon the name κυρίου' further strengthens this argument, though it need not only apply to Pauline or Gentile Christians but rather to any who do not adequately live up to what Matthew regards as proper obedience.

name invoked to perform these powerful acts. Significantly, whereas 7.21 under-mines the 'pathos formula' explanation for the doubling, 7.22 undermines Frenschkowski's argument that the doubling represents acclamation.[77] Instead, the doubling in 7.22 occurs in the context of a protest and implies prior use of the formula to perform works of power. Notably, all three applications of the double κύριος to Jesus in Matthew imply a context of final judgement after Jesus' exaltation and are therefore consistent with the exaltation paradigm of Matt 28.18, 'all authority in heaven and earth has been given to me' (cf. also Phil 2.9–10). Similarly, in Matt 7.21 Jesus immediately refers to his father in heaven after labelling himself κύριε κύριε, a reminder that his claim to the name is acquired from his father.

3.2 Luke 6.46

Unlike the Matthean passages, the Lukan version does not occur in a clearly eschatological context.[78] Rather than referencing a future time in which (third person) people will say κύριε κύριε to him, Luke's second-person present form gives the impression that Jesus is directly addressing the reader, thus retrojecting the reader's confessional and liturgical perspective back into the text, with Jesus directly warning of the consequences of disobedience regard-less of confession. The second-person form is consistent with Lukan preferences elsewhere in the double tradition (e.g. the Beatitudes), and the saying corre-sponds well with Luke's tendency to push the use of κύριος and other indications of Jesus' post-resurrection exaltation back into the time of Jesus' ministry.[79] Betz's suggestion that the doubling of κύριος represents 'a caricature of a formal devo-tional habit' and critiques the 'absurdity' of the disciples' repeated address of Jesus as κύριος therefore gets things precisely backwards,[80] as Luke nowhere

---

77 Frenschkowski, 'Kyrios in Context', 108–12. In fairness, Frenschkowski only deals with Q (that is, Luke) 6.46 and never discusses Matt 7.22.

78 Hahn, *Titles of Jesus*, 91; cf. also Joseph, 'Master', 964. Bovon, however, cautions against con-cluding that an eschatological context is absent from the saying simply because it is not overtly stated (*Luke 1*, 253).

79 Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 202–3 refers to this 'retrojection' as 'a form of Lukan foreshadowing'. See Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, for a fuller analysis of Luke's use of κύριος and its connec-tion to post-exaltation Christology. Given the match between this version and Lukan proclivi-ties, there is reason to question whether Luke's version is indeed more original, as argued by e.g. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 90; H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, vol. I (Freiburg: Herder, 1969) 379–80; G. Schneider, 'Christusbekenntnis und christliches Handeln: Lk 6, 46 und Mt 7, 21 im Kontext der Evangelien', *Die Kirche des Anfangs: Festschrift für Heinz Schürmann* (ed. R. Schnackenburg, J. Ernst and J. Wanke; EThSt 38; Freiburg: Herder, 1978) 9–24; Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 643; Betz, *Sermon*, 253; C. M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (London: Black, 2004) 214–15; Joseph, 'Master', 962; H. T. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005) 306; Frenschkowski, 'Kyrios in Context', 107. On the Lukan version as a secondary abbreviation, see Hahn, *Titles of Jesus*, 91.

80 Betz, *Sermon*, 636.

suggests that addressing Jesus as κύριος is improper and indeed pushes in exactly the opposite direction throughout the Gospel. In addition, Luke 6.46 does not critique the address of Jesus as κύριε κύριε but rather the incongruity between this address (which is implied to be proper) and not doing what Jesus says. Luke's use of the double κύριος at this early point in the narrative also seems to confirm that the frequent application of the single κύριος to Jesus elsewhere should be understood as echoing the divine name in much the same way in which Matt 7.21-2 sets the tone for other uses of κύριος later in that Gospel.

The Lukan construction of the saying also makes it even clearer than the Matthean examples that the doubling of κύριος does not signal pathos. Indeed, the saying does not occur in the context of emotive dialogue. Instead, Luke 6.46 uses καλέω with direct object and complement (the vocative taking the place of the usual accusative complement),[81] which is a construction for addressing or designating a person by a title or name.[82] That is, the Lukan saying treats κύριε κύριε as a specific metonym or title by which Jesus is invoked: 'Why do you address me as κύριε κύριε and not do what I say?' Coupled with the fact that in the Lukan version Jesus demands the obedience one would expect to be directed towards God (contrast Matt 7.21-2),[83] Luke's treatment of κύριε κύριε as a specific form of address – one that echoes a way to unambiguously represent the divine name in the Greek Bible – is best understood as an application of the divine name to Jesus. There is no reason, however, to regard the double form as a way of marking 'prayer rather than confesson', as Bovon suggests,[84] since there is no evidence that the earliest Christian communities tended to repeat κύριος in their devotional or liturgical practices.[85] Moreover, prayers addressing Jesus as κύριε in fact assume the confession 'Jesus is κύριος', making the distinction between the two contexts moot from the perspective of Luke 6.46. Betz's suggestion that κύριος is used here 'not in the higher christological sense but as

81 As M. M. Culy, 'Double Case Constructions in Koine Greek', *JGRChJ* 6 (2009) 82–106, at 82 n. 2 explains, '[t]he vocative does occasionally appear in object-complement constructions with a verb of identification. In such instances, it replaces whatever case would have been expected in the complement.' See also BDAG 502 (1.b), which also understands the vocative as taking the place of the second accusative in this case. John 1.38 provides another example: εἶπαν αὐτῷ ῥαββί. Luke's use of the vocative – the case of 'calling' (κλητική) – with καλέω also further emphasises what Jesus is being called here (thanks to Stephen Carlson for this point).

82 E.g. Luke 20.44 // Matt 22.43; Matt 23.8, 9; John 10.35; Rom 9.25; Heb 2.11; 1 Pet 2.7; 3.6. Cf. also the use of καλέω in Luke 1.32, 59, 62; John 1.42. Were Luke 6.46 merely reporting speech rather than declaring a title, one would expect a single object (1 Sam 3.4; Deut 5.1; Tob 4.3; Luke 5.32) or a verbal form such as λέγων (e.g. Luke 18.38; 23.21) rather than an object + complement construction.

83 Cf. Hahn, *Titles of Jesus*, 91.

84 Bovon, *Luke 1*, 253–4. For the opposite view, see Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, I.381.

85 Bovon defends his suggestion by appealing to the use of the single κύριος to address not only God the father but also Jesus, essentially ignoring the significance of the doubling (*Luke 1*, 254).

appropriate for an honored person of higher rank such as teacher' is even less probable.[86] Instead, the doubling is best understood as a way to eliminate the potential ambiguity of a single κύριος by echoing both the double κύριος formula familiar from the Greek Bible and the early Christian confession of Jesus as κύριος, thus ensuring that the reader understands this application of κύριος in the higher christological sense, amounting to addressing Jesus by the divine name.

Conclusions and Implications

Both Matthew and Luke have chosen in these passages to use the distinctive double form of κύριε that elsewhere always serves to represent the name YHWH in Greek texts. These repetitions of κύριε would certainly ring in the ears of an audience accustomed to the double κύριος referring to the name in the LXX and are difficult to explain if not echoing that phenomenon. Given the distinctiveness of the double κύριος and the way these sayings are used in Matthew and Luke, it is hard to escape the conclusion that these verses thereby place a self-referential use of the divine name on Jesus' lips, an echo any first-century reader familiar with the Greek Bible would be unlikely to miss.[87]

Such applications of the name to the exalted Jesus amount to calling him God, a figure to be obeyed and worshiped alongside God the father, regardless of whether or how such status was acquired or shared.[88] In this respect, the presentation of Jesus in these passages appears comparable to that of Philippians 2 and the creedal statement of 1 Cor 8.6, in which Paul expands upon the Shema to talk of 'One God, the father ... and one κύριος, Jesus Christ'. Similarly, through their use of κύριε κύριε, Matthew and Luke each presume (and accept) a context in which Jesus is already being identified and addressed with the name of the God of Israel (having a sort of *Verbindungsidentität*), the κύριος κύριος who promised to come and shepherd his people and give them a new heart and a new spirit. Unfortunately, since modern translations of the Hebrew Bible avoid the repetition, modern readers are unaccustomed to the distinctive resonance of this repetition of κύριος/Lord. As a result, we have become deaf to this echo, lacking the ears to hear Jesus' claim to the divine name in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

---

86 Betz, *Sermon*, 664.
87 This also suggests that English translations should render the phrase 'Lord Lord' (or 'Lord LORD'), not 'Lord, Lord'.
88 Cf. Hurtado, *One God*, 93–128; Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 202–3, 365.