

## Durham E-Theses

---

*The new covenant : The promise and its fulfilment;  
an inquiry into the influence of the new covenant  
concept of Jer 31.31-34 on later religious thought with  
reference to Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament.*

Y.K. Yu

---

### How to cite:

Yu, Y.K. (1989) The new covenant : The promise and its fulfilment; an inquiry into the influence of the new covenant concept of Jer 31.31-34 on later religious thought with reference to Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

---

### Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/943/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](https://etheses.durham.ac.uk) for further details.

# Abstract

## **The New Covenant: The promise and its Fulfilment An Inquiry into the Influence of the New Covenant Concept of Jer 31.31-34 on Later Religious Thought with Particular Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament**

This thesis examines the question of whether the members of the Qumran community on the one hand and the early Christians on the other were convinced that the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31 was being fulfilled in their respective communities. Further, it compares the new covenant concept in the NT with that in the DSS and considers whether the new covenant motif sheds light upon the relationship between the Old and New Testaments.

The thesis is divided into four parts. Part 1 examines the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff and the covenant concept in the post-exilic biblical writings (ch. 1), then the covenant concept in 1 and 2 Maccabees, Jubilees and the Psalms of Solomon (ch. 2). It is necessary to examine Jer 31.31ff itself in order to see how the announcement of this promise is to be understood in context. A consideration of the covenant concept in the post-exilic biblical writings, and in 1 and 2 Maccabees, Jubilees and the Psalms of Solomon is called for in an attempt to determine whether the covenant concept in these writings reflects the idea of the new covenant in Jer 31. This first part may provide a background for understanding the distinctive nature of the new covenant concept in the DSS and the NT.

Part 2 considers the new covenant concept in the DSS. Chapter 3 argues that the term "new covenant" in the DSS indicates that the Qumran community was convinced that the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31 was being fulfilled within their own community. Chapter 4 considers the distinctive nature of the new covenant.

Part 3 investigates the new covenant concept in the NT. Chapter 5 examines the new covenant concept in the cup-words at the Last Supper and in 2 Cor 3 and the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, and argues that the Synoptic writers and Paul showed a dependence upon the new covenant theme of Jer 31.

The concluding part is divided into two. The first section compares the distinctive nature of the new covenant concept in the NT with that in the DSS. There are similarities and dissimilarities between them. The second section considers the promise of the new covenant and its fulfilment in the DSS and in the NT in order to determine to what extent this theme throws light on the relationship between the Old and New Testaments. This study argues that strong continuity exists between the Old and New Testaments.

# The New Covenant: The Promise and its Fulfilment

An Inquiry into the Influence of the New Covenant Concept  
of Jer 31.31-34 on Later Religious Thought  
with Particular Reference to  
the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament

by

Young Ki Yu, B.Sc., B.D., Th.M.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of  
the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in  
the University of Durham

January 1989



- 6 JUL 1989

## Declaration

I confirm that no part of the material offered previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or in any other university.

signed.....*Yong Lu*.....

Date.....*20th Feb 1989*.....



## Copyright

This copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

## Table of Contents

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Acknowledgments . . . . . | vii |
| Abbreviations . . . . .   | ix  |
| Introduction . . . . .    | 1   |

### Part 1

|                                                                                                                       |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1. The Promise of the New Covenant and the Covenant Concept<br/>in the Post-exilic Biblical Writings . . . . .</b> | <b>10</b> |
| 1.1 The New Covenant in Jer 31.31-34 . . . . .                                                                        | 10        |
| 1.1.1 Jer 31.31-32 . . . . .                                                                                          | 12        |
| 1.1.2 Jer 31.33-34) . . . . .                                                                                         | 17        |
| 1.1.3 Summary . . . . .                                                                                               | 28        |
| 1.2 The Covenant Concept in the Post-Exilic Biblical Writings . . . . .                                               | 29        |
| 1.2.1 God's Faithfulness to the Covenant . . . . .                                                                    | 30        |
| 1.2.2 The Emphasis on the Law and the Temple . . . . .                                                                | 32        |
| 1.2.3 The Return from the Exile and the Question of the Fulfilment<br>of the New Covenant . . . . .                   | 38        |
| 1.2.4 Summary . . . . .                                                                                               | 42        |
| <b>2. The Concept of the Covenant in 1, 2 Maccabees,<br/>Jubilees and the Psalms of Solomon . . . . .</b>             | <b>43</b> |
| 2.1 The First and Second Book of the Maccabees . . . . .                                                              | 44        |
| 2.1.1 The Transgressors of the Law and the Lawless . . . . .                                                          | 45        |
| 2.1.2 The Pious Jews . . . . .                                                                                        | 51        |
| 2.2 The Book of Jubilees . . . . .                                                                                    | 58        |
| 2.2.1 The Covenant Relationship between God and Israel . . . . .                                                      | 59        |
| 2.2.2 The Distinction between the Apostates and<br>the Searchers of the Law . . . . .                                 | 62        |
| 2.2.3 The Eschatological Renewal of the Covenant . . . . .                                                            | 70        |
| 2.3 The Psalms of Solomon . . . . .                                                                                   | 72        |
| 2.3.1 The Distinction between the Righteous and the Sinners . . . . .                                                 | 73        |
| 2.3.2 The Eschatological Hope of the Fulfilment of<br>the Covenant Promises . . . . .                                 | 77        |
| 2.4 Summary and Conclusion . . . . .                                                                                  | 80        |

### Part 2

|                                                                                                     |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>3. The New Covenant in The Dead Sea Scrolls</b>                                                  | 83  |
| 3.1 The New covenant in the Land of Damascus                                                        | 85  |
| 3.1.1 The Land of Damascus                                                                          | 85  |
| 3.1.2 The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus                                                      | 88  |
| 3.1.3 The New Covenant Community and<br>the Teacher of Righteousness                                | 93  |
| 3.2 Biblical Interpretation of the OT Prophecy                                                      | 99  |
| 3.2.1 Fulfilment of OT Prophecy                                                                     | 100 |
| 3.2.2 The Pesher Method of Interpretation                                                           | 102 |
| 3.2.3 Absence of the Interpretation of Jer 31.31ff                                                  | 103 |
| 3.3 The Establishment of the Everlasting Covenant                                                   | 106 |
| 3.3.1 The Root for Planting                                                                         | 107 |
| 3.3.2 The Revelation of the Hidden Things and Mysteries                                             | 110 |
| 3.3.3 The Forgiveness of Sins                                                                       | 117 |
| 3.4 Comparison of the New Covenant in the Dead Sea Scrolls with<br>the New Covenant in Jer 31.31-34 | 120 |
| 3.4.1 Dissimilarity                                                                                 | 120 |
| 3.4.2 Similarity                                                                                    | 121 |
| 3.5 Summary and Conclusion                                                                          | 124 |
| <b>4. The Distinctive Nature of the New Covenant in the DSS</b>                                     | 127 |
| 4.1 Entry into the (New) Covenant                                                                   | 128 |
| 4.1.1 The Voluntary Nature of Entry                                                                 | 131 |
| 4.1.2 Separation from the Men of Falsehood                                                          | 133 |
| 4.1.3 The Four Distinct Stages of Entry into the New Covenant                                       | 135 |
| 4.1.4 The Emphasis on Purity                                                                        | 138 |
| 4.2 The New Covenant and the Concept of the Law                                                     | 145 |
| 4.3 The New Covenant and the Concept of the Temple                                                  | 151 |
| 4.3.1 The community and the Jerusalem Temple                                                        | 152 |
| 4.3.2 The Community as a Spiritual Temple                                                           | 154 |
| 4.3.3 The Community's Function of Atonement                                                         | 158 |
| 4.3.4 The Presence of God in the Community                                                          | 162 |
| 4.4 The Eschatology of the New Covenant in the Dead Sea Scrolls                                     | 165 |
| 4.4.1 The Messianic Era                                                                             | 166 |
| 4.4.2 The Renewal of the Covenant of the Perpetual Priesthood                                       | 166 |
| 4.5 Summary                                                                                         | 169 |

### **Part 3**

|                                                                                        |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>5. The New Covenant in the NT</b>                                                   | 171 |
| 5.1 The New Covenant at the Last Supper                                                | 172 |
| 5.1.1 The Blood of Jesus and the New Covenant                                          | 174 |
| 5.1.2 The Forgiveness of sins                                                          | 186 |
| 5.2 The Outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost                                          | 190 |
| 5.3 A Servant of the New Covenant (2 Cor 3.6)                                          | 195 |
| 5.3.1 The Contrast between Tablets of Stone and<br>Tablets of Human Hearts (2 Cor 3.3) | 195 |
| 5.3.2 The Letter kills (2 Cor 3.6)                                                     | 205 |
| 5.3.3 The Spirit Gives Life (2 Cor 3.6)                                                | 216 |
| 5.3.4 The New Covenant and Abrogation of the Law?                                      | 221 |
| 5.4 The New Covenant in Hebrews                                                        | 226 |
| 5.5 Conclusion                                                                         | 230 |
| <b>6. The Distinctive Nature of the New Covenant in the NT</b>                         | 232 |
| 6.1 The New Covenant and Forgiveness of Sins                                           | 233 |
| 6.1.1 The Epistle to the Hebrews                                                       | 233 |
| 6.1.2 The Pauline Epistles                                                             | 242 |
| 6.1.3 Luke-Acts                                                                        | 248 |
| 6.1.4 Synopsis                                                                         | 253 |
| 6.2 The New Covenant and the Law                                                       | 255 |
| 6.3 Entry into the New Covenant Community                                              | 265 |
| 6.4 The New Covenant and the Christian Community as a Temple                           | 272 |

### **Part 4**

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| <b>Conclusion</b>         | 280 |
| 1. Comparison             | 280 |
| 2. Promise and Fulfilment | 288 |
| <b>Bibliography</b>       | 295 |

## Acknowledgments

In bringing these years of research to an end, I would like to thank many people and organizations to whom I owe a special debt of gratitude for their unfailing support.

I would like, first of all, to express my deepest thanks to my supervisor Professor James D. G. Dunn. His constant support, encouragement, guidance and direction throughout the development of the thesis have made possible its completion.

I am greatly indebted to Professor O. Betz, Professor C. Cranfield, Professor H. Kee, Dr. W. Moberly, Dr. R. Hayward and Dr. G. Dragas for their comments on parts of the thesis. I am very grateful to Professor Betz for reading the first draft of the thesis and for his critique of it. I am also grateful to Professor Cranfield for giving his time to help me on a number of matters. Dr. Hayward has been kind in giving timely advice in the final stages of the thesis. However, I alone remain responsible for the views expressed here.

I give my thanks to Dr. G. Maier who offered me accommodation at Bengel-Haus in Tübingen and to Professor J. Murphy-O'Connor who gave me the opportunity to carry out research at the Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem. My gratitude must also extend to the staff at the University Library and the Computer Centre in Durham, to friends in the Department of Theology in the University of Durham (Jong-tai Lee, Deuk-Hoon Park, Lung Lo, John Chow, Bruce Longenecker, Nicholas Taylor, Dennis Stamps and his wife, Helen, and Dr. Don Garlington) and at Tübingen (Dr. Dong Joo Lee, Rev. Sung Jong Oh and Hae-Kyung Chang). I am also appreciative of the friendship and advice of Professor Seyoon Kim, Eui-Won Kim, Seock-Tai Sohn and Rev. David M. Lee.

Research is not possible without financial support. My gratitude is hereby expressed to the Korean Christian Mission Center, the Langham Trust, the Clifton Fund as well as many Korean churches (in Korea: Mok-min, Kang-Byeon, Nam-Seoul, Hwa-Pyeong, Hwa-Sung, Ram-Won, Youngdong Jae-il and Sung-Saeng; in the USA: the Korean United Church of Philadelphia, the First Korean Church of Washington, D.C., the Korean Bethel Church of New York and the Korean Christian Mission organization of Philadelphia). I would particularly like to thank the Korean Christian Mission Center for awarding me the Torch Scholarship for five years. I have to thank the faculty members of Hapdong Presbyterian Theological seminary in Korea for their support which encouraged me to undertake this

research. I am also indebted to the Ev. Koreanische Missionsgemeinde in Berlin and Hamburg, and to the Korean Church of Jerusalem. Unfortunately it is not possible to name all the individuals to whom I am greatly indebted.

I and my family will remember the fellowship at Langley Park Baptist Church and at the Durham congregation of the Presbyterian Association in England. We owe immeasurable thanks to Brian and Brenda Norton, Paul and Helen Cook and Freda Blunt. Mr. and Mrs. Norton must be singled out for a very special thank you. We will never forget their love and care in Christ.

Finally on a personal note, I would like to thank my family and my wife's family for their prayers and support. I have to thank my wife, Bong Soon and my children, Jin Deok, Jin Sun and Jin Hyun for their prayers, encouragement and for their love.

I dedicate this volume to the memory of my parents and the late Rev. Prof. Yune Sun Park, my spiritual father and teacher.

## Abbreviations

|              |                                                                                             |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>ALUOS</i> | <i>The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society</i>                                      |
| AB           | Anchor Bible                                                                                |
| APOT         | <i>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English</i> , ed. R. H. Charles |
| AnBib        | Analecta Biblica                                                                            |
| ASTI         | <i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>                                          |
| ASNU         | Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis                                                  |
| ATANT        | Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments                                   |
| BA           | <i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>                                                               |
| BASOR        | <i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>                                |
| BDB          | Brown, Driver and Briggs, <i>Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>            |
| BDF          | Blass, Debrunner and Funk, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament</i>                      |
| BJRL         | <i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>                        |
| CB           | The Century Bible                                                                           |
| CGTC         | Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary                                                        |
| CBQ          | <i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>                                                          |
| CBQMS        | Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series                                                |
| DSS          | Dead Sea Scrolls                                                                            |
| DSSE         | G. Vermes, <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls in English</i>                                           |
| EQ           | <i>The Evangelical Quarterly</i>                                                            |
| EKKNT        | Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament                                      |
| EvT          | <i>Evangelische Theologie</i>                                                               |
| ExpT         | <i>The Expository Times</i>                                                                 |
| GHA          | Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten                                                             |
| HNT          | Handbuch zum Neuen Testament                                                                |
| HTKNT        | Herders Theologische Kommentar zum Neuen Testament                                          |
| HTR          | <i>Harvard Theological Review</i>                                                           |
| IB           | Interpreter's Bible                                                                         |
| ICC          | International Critical Commentary                                                           |
| IDB          | Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible                                                       |
| IDBSup       | IDB Supplementary Volume                                                                    |
| Int          | <i>Interpretation</i>                                                                       |
| JAAR         | <i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>                                          |
| JB           | Jerusalem Bible                                                                             |
| JBL          | <i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>                                                       |
| JETS         | <i>Journal of Evangelical Theological Society</i>                                           |
| JJS          | <i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>                                                            |
| JQR          | <i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>                                                              |
| JSJ          | <i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>                                                     |
| JSNT         | <i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>                                           |
| JSNTS        | Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplements                                     |
| JSOT         | <i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>                                           |

|                  |                                                                                                                                                      |
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| JSOTS            | Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplements                                                                                              |
| JSS              | <i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>                                                                                                                    |
| JTS              | <i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>                                                                                                                |
| MNTC             | Moffatt, New Testament Commentary                                                                                                                    |
| NASB             | New American Standard Bible                                                                                                                          |
| NCB              | New Century Bible                                                                                                                                    |
| NICNT            | New International Commentary on the New Testament                                                                                                    |
| NIGTC            | The New International Greek Testament Commentary                                                                                                     |
| NovT             | <i>Novum Testamentum</i>                                                                                                                             |
| NovTS            | Novum Testamentum, Supplement                                                                                                                        |
| NTD              | Das Neue Testament Deutsch                                                                                                                           |
| NTS              | <i>New Testament Studies</i>                                                                                                                         |
| OTL              | Old Testament Library                                                                                                                                |
| OTP              | <i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , ed. J. H. Charlesworth                                                                                     |
| PEQ              | <i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>                                                                                                               |
| PPJ              | E. P. Sanders, <i>Paul and Palestinian Judaism</i>                                                                                                   |
| RB               | <i>Revue Biblique</i>                                                                                                                                |
| RGG <sup>3</sup> | Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Tübingen, 1957-63                                                                                              |
| RQ               | <i>Revue de Qumrân</i>                                                                                                                               |
| RSR              | <i>Religious Studies Review</i>                                                                                                                      |
| SANT             | Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament                                                                                                                |
| SBLDS            | SBL Dissertation Series                                                                                                                              |
| SBLMS            | SBL Monograph Series                                                                                                                                 |
| SCS2             | <i>1972 Proceedings: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the Society of Biblical Literature Pseudepigrapha Seminar</i> |
| SJT              | <i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>                                                                                                                  |
| SNT              | Studien zum Neuen Testament                                                                                                                          |
| SNTSMS           | Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series                                                                                                   |
| Str-B            | Strack-Billerbeck, <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash</i>                                                                       |
| SUNT             | Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments                                                                                                              |
| TDNT             | <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , eds. Kittel and Friedrich                                                                       |
| TDOT             | <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> , eds. Botterweck and Riggren                                                                     |
| THKNT            | Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament                                                                                                      |
| TNTC             | Tyndale New Testament Commentary                                                                                                                     |
| TRE              | Theologische Realenzyklopädie (1977ff)                                                                                                               |
| TU               | Texte und Untersuchungen (zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literature)                                                                             |
| TynB             | <i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>                                                                                                                              |
| TZ               | <i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>                                                                                                                      |
| VT               | <i>Vetus Testamentum</i>                                                                                                                             |
| VTSup            | Vetus Testamentum, Supplements                                                                                                                       |
| WBC              | Word Biblical Commentary                                                                                                                             |
| WMANT            | Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament                                                                                         |
| WJT              | <i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>                                                                                                               |
| WUNT             | Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament                                                                                                 |
| ZAW              | <i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>                                                                                            |



*ZNW*        *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*  
*ZThK*        *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

## Qumran: Dead Sea Scrolls

CD        Cairo (Genizah Text of the) Damascus (Document)  
1QM        *Milhamah (War Scroll)*  
1QpHab    *Pesher on Habakkuk* from Qumran Cave 1  
1QS        *serek hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)*  
1QSa        Appendix A (*Rule of the Congregation*) to 1QS  
1QSB        Appendix B (*Rule of the Congregation*) to 1QS  
4QFlor     *Florilegium* (or *Eschatological Midrashim*) from Qumran Cave 1  
11QTem     *Temple Text* from Qumran Cave 11

## Introduction

---

A study of the new covenant concept should contribute to an understanding of the theme of promise in the OT and its fulfilment in the NT. The purpose of the thesis is to study the promise of the new covenant and its fulfilment in the NT in order to shed some light upon the relationship between the old and new covenants, and the Old and New Testaments. The term “new covenant” (MT: *b<sup>e</sup> rît ḥādāšāh*; LXX: *καὶνὴ διαθήκη*) occurs only once in the OT and infrequently in the NT. The single instance in the OT of the term “new covenant” occurs in the announcement of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31-34. It next appears in at least four places in the Cairo Document, an important document of the Qumran community (CD 6.19; 8.21; 19.33; 20.12; cf. 1Qp Hab 2.3).<sup>1</sup> Finally, the term can be found in a variety of NT writings (Lk 22.20; 1 Cor 11.25; 2 Cor 3.6; Heb 8.8, 13; 9.15; cf. Mt 26.28; Mk 14.24).

Apart from these occurrences the term has not been found in Jewish literature. It is interesting to see that there was no use of the term “new covenant” in the renewal of the covenant between God and Israel in the post-exilic biblical or extra-biblical literature. The fact that the Israelites did not use the term “new covenant” when renewing their covenant with God may indicate that they distinguished their renewal of the existing covenant from the idea of a new covenant in Jer 31.31ff. If this is so, then the appearances of the term in the DSS and in the NT would seem to be significant. Accordingly, investigation is required to determine the extent to which the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff is reflected in the new covenant concepts in the DSS and the NT.

It is generally accepted that the appearances of the term “new covenant” in

---

<sup>1</sup> If the lacuna after the word “new” in 1Qp Hab 2.3 is regarded as “covenant”, the term occurs five times in the DSS.



the DSS and the NT indicate that the members of the Qumran community on the one hand and the early Christians on the other were each convinced that the promise was being fulfilled among themselves. If this view is correct, then it raises some interesting questions. First of all, how did this one passage come to be understood as being fulfilled in two different groups of people? What was it that caused each group to come to this understanding? Secondly, what is the distinctive nature of the new covenant in the DSS and in the NT? What do the new covenant concepts in the DSS and in the NT have in common, and what features distinguish them from one another? Thirdly, if these communities regarded themselves as the new covenant people, how did they accept others into their community who did not belong to them? Furthermore, if the early Christians believed that the promise of the new covenant was being fulfilled in themselves, how does the "new covenant" motif shed light upon our understanding of the relationship between the Old and New Testaments?

There have already been a number of comparative studies of the DSS and the NT which have sought to provide answers for most of the questions raised above.<sup>2</sup> However, there are two major reasons for the present study. The first

---

<sup>2</sup> For instance: F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London, 1961[56] - the number inside the square bracket [ ] indicates either the year of the first edition or the original edition); *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (London, 1959); K. Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (London, 1958; cf. New York, 1957); H. Rowley, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (London, 1957); C. Rabin, ed., *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Jerusalem, 1958); F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (New York, 1958); J. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of Christianity* (New York, 1959); O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, WUNT 6 (Tübingen, 1960); M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the NT* (London, 1961); A. Jaubert, *La notion d'alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne* (Paris, 1963); R. F. Collins, "The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its Comparison with the New Testament", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 39 (1963), 555-594; W. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible* (New York, 1964); B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Covenant*, SNTSMS 1 (Cambridge, 1965); J. Murphy-O'Connor, ed., *Paul and Qumran* (London, 1968); G. Klinging, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* SUNT 5 (Göttingen, 1971); J. Charlesworth, ed., *John and Qumran*, (London, 1972); G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (London, 1977); M. Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letter of Paul*, SNTSMS 53 (Cambridge, 1985).

is that even though comparative studies of the DSS and the NT are already far advanced, some areas need further exploration in order to provide more precise answers to some of the questions raised above. Secondly, in recent years certain scholars have challenged the view that the Qumran community and the early church were each convinced that the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled in their communities.<sup>3</sup> The most recent detailed work in this area has been carried out by Philip R. Davies and Erich Grässer .

Davies, in his book *The Damascus Covenant*, insists that the new Qumran community, which emerged as a result of conflict within the parent community, defined itself "as the community of the new covenant, in order to distinguish itself from the continuing community which clung to the original 'Damascus covenant' and did not accept the Teacher".<sup>4</sup> Similarly, Erich Grässer, in *Der Alte Bund im Neuen*, opposes the idea of a close relationship between the new covenant of Jer 31 and the new covenant of the NT.<sup>5</sup> He insists that no one can seriously assert that the new covenant in Paul and Luke are to be understood in relation to Jer 31.31ff, because "vor allem sagt Jer 31 nicht darüber, dass die neue Diatheeke in irgendeiner Weise mit Blut zu tun habe".<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, he uses Räisänen's words to argue that "if Paul intended a reference to Jer 31 in 2 Cor 3.3 or 3.6, it is 'all the more conspicuous that he *omits* what Jer 31 says about the law'." <sup>7</sup> In

---

<sup>3</sup> i). The DSS: P. R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*, JSOTS 25 (Sheffield, 1983); R. F. Collins, "Berith-Notion", 555-594; R. Schreiber, *Der Neue Bund in Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation of Tübingen University, 1955).

ii). The NT: E. Grässer, *Der Alte Bund im Neuen. Exegetische Studien zur Israelfrage im neuen Testament*, WUNT 35 (Tübingen, 1985); V. Wagner, "Der Bedeutungswandel von b<sup>e</sup>rit ḥādāšāh bei der Ausgestaltung der Abendmahls Worte", *EvT* 35 (1975), 538-544; C. Wolff, *Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum*, TU 118 (Berlin, 1976); H. Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, WUNT 29 (Tübingen, 1983). Their claims have not yet been examined seriously, but will be discussed at appropriate points in the following chapters.

<sup>4</sup> Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 177. I shall examine his claims and offer a critique of them in chapter 3.

<sup>5</sup> Grässer, *Bund*, 115-126.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 119. His claims will be discussed in chapter 5.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 81. He quotes the second part of the statement above from Räisänen's *Paul*, 245.

the light of Davies' and Grässer's claims, it is necessary to examine whether one can hold to the view that new covenant themes in the DSS and the NT are after all indebted to the promise of Jer 31.31ff. Before undertaking that task, however, an examination is necessary of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff.

Chapter 1 makes this examination of the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31 and the covenant concept in the post-exilic biblical writings. 1.1 investigates how the announcement of the new covenant in Jer 31 can be understood in context. My aim here is to provide a criterion for determining how far the new covenant ideas in the DSS and in the NT reflect the new covenant of Jer 31. Thus in this section discussion is limited to examining what the announcement of the new covenant is and how that announcement can be understood in context. The announcement of the internalization of the law and of the forgiveness of sins will be the two main considerations here.

In 1.2 three important questions will be asked concerning the covenant concepts in the post-exilic biblical writings. First, how do the authors of these writings apply the earlier covenant relationship between God and their forefathers to the exile and to themselves? Secondly, what is the distinctive nature of the covenant concept in these writings? Thirdly, do the covenant concepts in these writings reflect the new covenant of Jer 31?

Chapter 2 will examine the concept of the covenant in 1 and 2 Maccabees, the Book of Jubilees and the Psalms of Solomon in order to provide a background against which to gain a better understanding of the distinctive nature of the new covenant in the DSS. These particular writings are chosen as a sample of the Jewish literature of the period not only because of limitations of time and space but because they can provide us with examples of the covenant concept contemporary with the Qumran community. Again it will be asked how the authors of these writings understood the covenant relationship between God and

Israel. Did they maintain a view similar to that in the post-exilic biblical writings? What emphasis did they give to the law and the temple while maintaining their status as covenant people?

Further questions are raised concerning the idea of eschatological renewal of the covenant (Jub 1.15ff; Pss Sol 17.21, 32; 18.5ff) and the distinction between the righteous and the sinner. Do the eschatological renewal of the covenant in Jub 1.15ff and the eschatological hope of the fulfilment of the covenant promise in the Psalms of Solomon (17.21, 32, 42; 18.5ff) indicate that the authors understood the eschatological renewal and the eschatological hope as the fulfilment of the covenant theme of Jer 31? Similarly, are there sectarian tendencies in the distinction between the concept of the faithful covenant keeping Israelites in Jub 23.26 and the righteous and the sinner in Pss Sol 13.11ff? My aim is to determine whether sectarian tendencies are apparent in these writings, and if they are, whether they provide a background for the concept of new covenant found in the DSS.

The new covenant in the DSS will be examined in chapter 3. Here it will be argued that the term “new covenant” in the DSS indicates that the members of the Qumran community were convinced that the prophecy of the new covenant of Jer 31 was being fulfilled within their own community. In fact, there is no evidence in the DSS that the Qumran community interpreted Jer 31.31-34 by the *peshar* method to prove that the prophecy of the new covenant had been fulfilled within the community. Accordingly, in order to ascertain the view that the Qumran community believed that the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31.31-34 was being fulfilled among its own members, community, I shall examine, first of all, the various contexts in which the term “new covenant” occurs and whether these contexts indicate that the community believed itself to be the fulfilment of the promise of Jer 31.31ff (§3.1). Secondly, I shall examine key religious ideas of the Scrolls and whether these ideas also witness to such a fulfilment (§3.2).

When examining the religious ideas of the Scrolls, the sect's interpretation of OT promises and the establishment of the everlasting covenant in CD 3.13f must be considered. The importance of an examination of the sect's interpretation of OT promises arises out of two points. The first is that the sect's claim that OT promises were already being fulfilled in the history of their movement may indicate that the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31 was included in this claim, even though there is no interpretation of Jer 31 in the DSS themselves. The second is that an understanding of the community's claim that God had established the everlasting covenant with the members of the sect makes possible a comparison between the new covenant in Jer 31.31-34 and the everlasting covenant in CD 3.13f with particular reference to the importance of the law and the forgiveness of sins.

The distinctive nature of the new covenant in the DSS is to be considered in chapter 4. Four areas will be examined in order to establish how the members of the Qumran community distinguished themselves as new covenant people.

The first area concerns entry into the new covenant (§4.1). The second area is the relationship between the new covenant and the law (§4.2). The significant issues here are these: (1) Why did the sect make such close connections between the new covenant and the revelation of the hidden things of the law, and between the new covenant and the Sabbaths? (2) What was the new interpretation concerning the Sabbath?

The third is that of the sect's concept of the temple (§4.3). The community's attitude towards the Jerusalem temple has been debated. Nevertheless, it has been generally recognized that the sect was convinced of the defilement of the Jerusalem Temple and ultimately rejected the Jerusalem Temple cult, regarding their own community as a spiritual temple. For the present study three main questions can be raised: (1) How did the sect replace the function of the Jerusalem

temple, if they rejected the Jerusalem cult? (2) If the community did regard itself as a spiritual temple, in what way did they do so? (3) How closely did the sect connect the spiritual temple with the new covenant?

The last area of investigation concerns the eschatological tension between the contemporary situation of the community and the future messianic era (§4.4). This tension emerged because some unfaithful members of the new covenant community left and joined the outsiders who were living in the land of Judah (CD 19.33-20.1; 20.10-12). This was particularly difficult for the sect because they were convinced that they were living in the last days (1QpHab 2.5-6). The important question discussed here is how the sect attempted to solve this tension.

Chapter 5 examines the relationship between the new covenant of Jer 31.31-34 and the new covenant in the NT. As mentioned above, the need to reconsider this view derives from the fact that some scholars are opposed to the idea of the close connection between the two. My main concern is to examine whether the NT passages, where the term “new covenant” occurs, and the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, reveal a dependence upon the new covenant theme of Jer 31.31ff.

5.1 examines the new covenant concept in the passages narrating the Last Supper (Lk 22.20; 1 Cor 11.25; cf. Mt 26.28; Mk 14.24). 1 Cor 11.23-26 shows that the early church believed that Jesus established the new covenant at the Last Supper, anticipating the shedding of his blood (i.e. his death) on the cross. It is necessary to make clear that my intention is not to investigate how Jesus established the new covenant at the Last Supper, but rather to investigate how the early church understood that the new covenant at the Last Supper had a close connection with the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff. I shall argue this on the basis of the fact that the forgiveness of sins is a fundamental element not only in the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff but also in the new covenant established at the



Last Supper.

5.2 considers the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost and whether this can be understood in terms of the fulfilment of the new covenant in Jer 31.31-34. The consideration here is based on the following facts: a) the Spirit was given on the day of Pentecost; b) Pentecost in the NT is connected with the Feast of Weeks; c) at Pentecost the disciples were baptised with the Spirit and thereby entered into the new age, the fulfilment of Israel's eschatological hope.

5.3 examines 2 Cor 3.6, where Paul asserts that he is not "a servant of the letter" but "a servant of a new covenant". My concern is to examine whether Paul's assertion points to a close connection with the new covenant in Jer 31.31-34. Here I shall argue for such a close connection on the basis of the fact that the new covenant people are expected to keep the law in the Spirit. It is not necessary to examine whether the new covenant in the Epistle to the Hebrews indicates a close connection with that of Jer 31.31ff, as even Grässer accepts that the concept of the fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophetic promise of a new covenant in the covenant of Christ (*Christus-Diatheke*) occurs in Hebrews.<sup>8</sup>

In chapter 6, the distinctive nature of the new covenant will be discussed in four areas: the forgiveness of sins, the law, entry into the new covenant community and the temple.

In relation to the forgiveness of sins (§6.1) my aim is to investigate to what extent the NT writers concerned understood the forgiveness of sins in terms of the fulfilment of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff.

Since I will argue in chapter 5 that the new covenant in 2 Cor 3 indicates that the new covenant people keep the law, in 6.2 I shall proceed to consider whether

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 108-109. However, he insists that there is no continuity between the first covenant and the new covenant in Hebrews. He claims that even with the help of Jer 31 a bridge can by no means be built to the second covenant. His claim will be discussed in chapter 6.

and how Paul's understanding in 2 Cor 3 that the new covenant people can keep the law in the Spirit accords with the other Pauline epistles, and whether similar ideas can be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews and Luke-Acts.

To enable comparison with the Qumran community, in 6.3 I shall examine the question of how the NT writers who use the concept of the new covenant understand entry into the new covenant.

Finally, in order to complete the comparison with the DSS I shall inquire whether there is any connection between the new covenant and the concept of the temple in the same NT writings.

In the last part, I shall compare the distinctive features of the new covenant in the NT with those of the new covenant in the DSS with particular reference to forgiveness of sins, the law, entry into the new covenant and the temple. Finally it will be appropriate to offer a few considerations on the promise of the new covenant and its fulfilment in the DSS and in the NT for the purpose of determining the extent to which they shed light upon the relationship between the Old and New Testaments.

## Chapter 1

### The Promise of the New Covenant and the Covenant Concept in the Post-Exilic Biblical Writings

---

This chapter is divided into two sections: the new covenant in Jer 31.31-34 (§1.1) and the covenant concept in the post-exilic biblical writings (§1.2). The central thrust is the new covenant in Jer 31.31-34. This is a highly significant passage, because it is only here that the actual term “new covenant” (MT: *bʿ rīt ḥādāšāh*; LXX: *καὶνὴ διαθήκη*) occurs in the OT. The aim of this first section (§1.1) is to elaborate upon the announcement of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff. This is because both the term and the idea of the new covenant expressed here seem to shed light upon an important theme, namely, the relationship between the Old and New Testaments. In the second section (§1.2) attention is concentrated on the covenant concept in the post-exilic biblical writings. The aim here is to investigate whether the covenant concept in the post-exilic biblical writings reflects the new covenant concept of Jer 31.31ff.

#### 1.1 The New Covenant in Jer 31.31-34

This section examines the announcement of the new covenant in Jer 31.31-34, which is considered in two sub-sections. The first sub-section (vv. 31-32) is the announcement that Yahweh will make a new covenant with his people to replace the covenant made with their forefathers (§1.1.1). The second subsection (vv. 33-34) is the description of the distinctive nature of the new covenant (§1.1.2). It indicates both continuity and discontinuity between the old and new covenants. It is necessary to clarify that in this section discussion is limited to elaborating

on what the announcement of the new covenant is and how that announcement can be understood in context, as my main concern here is to investigate not the origins and composition of the passage but its meaning in its ancient historical context in order to determine to what extent the new covenant ideas in the DSS and the NT reflect this new covenant concept.<sup>1</sup>

Jer 31.31-34 is set in the context of the Book of Comfort (30-33), the theme of the promise of God for the restoration of Israel.

“Behold, days are coming”, declares the Lord, “when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, (v. 32) not like the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day I took them out of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Opinions vary as to the authorship and the date of Jer 31.31-34. Against the view that this passage belongs to the prophet Jeremiah, some scholars have raised the question of authorship of this passage on the basis of the Deuteronomistic languages in the passage and of its prosaic style. In the following references we can see various opinions on the authorship and the date of this passage: H. D. Potter, “The New Covenant in Jeremiah 31.31-34”, *VT* 33 (1983), 347-357; P. R. Ackroyd, “The Book of Jeremiah - Some Recent Studies”, *JSOT* 28 (1984), 47-59; R. P. Carroll, *Jeremiah* OTL (London, 1986), 613-614; J. Untermyer, *From Repentance to Redemption: Jeremiah's Thought in Transition*. *JSOTS* 54 (Sheffield, 1987), 91-93.

It is interesting to see that R. Carroll favours the view that this passage belongs to a post-exilic date on the basis of the fact that “the Deuteronomists do not themselves at any point in their writings propose a new covenant, not even in the late piece on the restoration of Israel in Deut 30.1-10” (*Ibid.*, 613). If this is so, then a similar question can be raised against Carroll's view because in the post-exilic Jewish writings except for the DSS there is no occurrence of the term “new covenant”. Whether Carroll recognizes this or not, he admits that “a dogmatic position is to be avoided” and “the question of authorship hardly affects the meaning of the statement” (*Ibid.*); cf. R. P. Carroll, *From Chaos to Covenant. Uses of Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah* (London, 1981). 216.

Those who advocate that this passage belongs to the prophet Jeremiah suggest differences between this passage and the idea of the Deuteronomists: (a) the basis of the new covenant is divine pardon, while the Deuteronomists demand repentance; (b) Jer 31 looks to the future, while the Deuteronomists meditate on the past; (c) it renders obedience to the Torah possible; (d) it says more than that Israel must love Yahweh: it reveals how God will impart knowledge of himself to the people; (e) the covenant would no longer be enforced from without through learning and indoctrination (G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* 2. ET (London: SCM, 1965). 224f; R. Martin-Achard, “Quelques Remarques sur La Nouvelle Alliance chez Jeremie”, in *Questions Disputees d'Ancien Testament. Methode et Theologie*, ed. C. Brekelmans (Leuven, 1974), 141-164; M. Weinfeld, “Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel”, *ZAW* 88 (1976). 28ff; H. D. Potter, “New Covenant”, 350-351).

Untermyer, against Nicholson's claim that Jer 31.28 is a reworking of the conditional dtr. promise of salvation found in Jer 18.7-10 on the basis of similar terminology such as *ntš*, *ntš*, *bd*, *r*“, *nt*“, *bnh*, maintains that Jeremiah himself links together the four roots, *ntš*, *ntš*, *bnh*, *nt*“ (*Repentance*, 92; cf. R. Bach, “Bauen und Pflanzen”, in *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen* (Neukirchen, 1961). 23).

land of Egypt, My covenant which they broke, although I was a husband to them,” declares the Lord. (v. 33) “But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days”, declares the Lord, “I will put My law within them, and on their heart I will write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. (v. 34) “And they shall not teach again, each man his neighbor and each man his brother, saying, “Know the Lord”, for they shall all know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them”, declares the Lord, “for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin I will remember no more” (NASB).

It is probably true that this passage originally existed as a separate unit.<sup>2</sup> It now appears in a collection which comprises the whole of chapters 30-31 under the common theme of the promise for the future. These two chapters are bound together not only by their common theme, but also by a common introductory phrase: “for behold, days are coming, declares the Lord” (*hinneh yāmîm bā’îm nē’um-yhwh*) (Jer 30.3; 31.27, 31, 38).

#### 1.1.1 Jer 31.31-32

The promise of the new covenant begins by announcing, “Behold, days are coming, declares the Lord”. This introductory formula is found frequently in the book of Jeremiah, where it refers to times of judgment (Jer 7.32; 9.25; 19.6) as well as to times of salvation (Jer 23.5, 7; 30.3; 31.27, 31, 38; 33.14). It is clear that here this formula refers to the promise of salvation in the future. In Jer 30.3 the phrase “Behold, days are coming” relates to the return of the Israelites from Babylon: “For, behold, days are coming, declares the Lord, when I will restore the fortunes of My people Israel and Judah” (Jer 30.3). The same phrase in Jer 31.27 is connected with the repopulation of the land by Israel and Judah: “Behold, days are coming, declares the Lord, when I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man and with the seed of beast” (Jer 31.27).<sup>3</sup> In Jer 31.38 the phrase refers to the rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem

---

<sup>2</sup> J. Bright, “Exercise in Hermeneutics: Jer 31.31-34”, *Int* 20 (1966), 192.

<sup>3</sup> J. Thompson, *Jeremiah*. NICOT (Grand Rapids, 1980), 578; Carroll, *Jeremiah*. 608.

which will remain forever.

Jer 31.31 shows that the phrase relates to the new covenant. It refers to unspecified times in the future. However, it is clear that the new covenant will be established “after those days” (v. 33). The phrase “after those days” is unique to this passage in the OT.<sup>4</sup> Interpretations are various. Perlitt refers it to the “dark present”.<sup>5</sup> Carroll refers it to “the coming days of restoration *after which* *bʿrît ḥādāšāh*, a new covenant will be enacted”.<sup>6</sup> Bright translates it as “when that time comes”, which makes it equivalent to “days are coming” (v. 31).<sup>7</sup> Bright’s translation is preferable because both phrases are related to the new covenant. The phrase “those days” probably, then, refers to the time of tragedy and suffering, including the present days, before the establishment of the new covenant.<sup>8</sup> Thus the phrase “after those days” here could be understood as a reference to the return from the exile.<sup>9</sup>

Jeremiah’s own day was a day of judgment and destruction because of Israel’s wilful disobedience. Jeremiah had already come to the conclusion that Israel could not and would not repent (Jer 5.1-9; 6.27; 17.9f). Thus he announced the judgment and urged Israel to submit to it. Accordingly, what was proclaimed here can be understood not as a progressive improvement of the situation by Israel itself, but a radical new beginning in the future, which God would initiate. The text does not indicate exactly when this will happen. The only answer is that it will happen “after those days”. However, the expression “declares the Lord” affirms the authority and certainty of this promise. The expression is found four times in this passage (vv. 31, 32, 33, 34). The repetition of this

<sup>4</sup> W. E. Lemke, “Jeremiah 31.31-34”, *Int*, 37 (1983), 183.

<sup>5</sup> Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament*. WMANT 36 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969), 180.

<sup>6</sup> Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 610.

<sup>7</sup> Bright, *Jeremiah* AB 21 (Garden City, New York, 1965), 277.

<sup>8</sup> Bright, “Exercise”, 194; Unterman, *Repentance*, 96f; cf. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie*, 180.

<sup>9</sup> C. L. Feinberg, *Jeremiah* (Grand Rapids, 1982), 220. He specifies it “after the return from exile”.

expression (twice in the first section at the beginning and the end, and similarly in the second section) strongly stresses the divine promise that God will establish a new relationship with his people.<sup>10</sup>

The announcement of the new covenant presupposes the Israelites' breaking of the previous covenant.<sup>11</sup> It is clear that "My covenant which they broke" refers to the Sinai covenant, made with his people on the journey out of Egypt. Israel had acknowledged God's gracious deliverance from bondage and had committed herself to keeping the covenant (Exod 24.3, 7). It is to be noted that the verb *pārār*, which is used to describe the breaking of the covenant, is found in the Book of Jeremiah only in connection with the word *b<sup>e</sup> rîṭ* (Jer 11.10; 14.21; 31.32; 33.20, 21). It is significant that in each instance "man" is the subject of the verb and "God's covenant" is the object of the verb.<sup>12</sup>

Jer 11 explains how the Israelites broke the covenant which Yahweh had

---

<sup>10</sup> B. Anderson, "New Covenant and the Old", in *The Old Testament and Christian Faith: A Biblical Discussion*, ed. B. Anderson (New York, 1969), 230.

<sup>11</sup> It is necessary to clarify this statement, because the historical origin of the covenant in the OT is a matter of controversy among OT scholars (D. McCarthy, *OT Covenant* (Oxford, 1972); E. Nicholson, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the OT* (Oxford, 1986)). However, this controversy hardly affects our present study. Even if we allow that the covenant concept may have been a result of the Deuteronomistic movement, this does not disprove that the covenant concept was already known to the Israelites at the time of Jeremiah, since the Deuteronomistic movement was not later than Jeremiah.

Interestingly, even Nicholson, who advocates the view that the covenant concept was developed under the Deuteronomistic movement, says that "the evidence of the book of Hosea is crucially significant, for it indicates that the notion of a covenant was known already in the mid-eighth century BC" (Nicholson, *God*, 187). Hosea prophesies that God will make a covenant for them (Hos 2.16-23). He uses the term "covenant" not only here but also elsewhere (Hos 6.7: 8.1). It is to be noted that his figure of marriage is closely connected with the description of God as the husband of Israel in the announcement of the new covenant (Jer 31.32). It is also noteworthy that Hosea uses father-son imagery to describe the relationship between God and Israel. This is used in relation to the promise to David in 2 Sam 7.14 and is reflected in 2 Sam 23.5 which names God's covenant with David (Ps 89.3).

This same imagery is also used in the description of Moses' first act as the deliverer of the Israelites: Moses commands Pharaoh, "Israel is my firstborn, ... let My son go" (Exod 4.22f). Hosea's use of the family relationship to vivify the intimate covenantal relationship between the gracious God and his beloved people may indicate that the covenant concept was not alien to the Israelites at the time of Jeremiah.

<sup>12</sup> E. Kim, *An eschatological Examination of the New Testament Based on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1981), 27.

made with their ancestors when he brought them out of the land of Egypt.<sup>13</sup> Jer 11.7f shows that the forefathers of the inhabitants of Jerusalem had violated the commandments of the covenant. Furthermore, vv. 9f points out that the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem at the time of Jeremiah had broken the Sinaitic covenant. The phrases "this day" (v. 5) and "this covenant" (vv. 6, 8) confirm this point.<sup>14</sup> What is significant is the fact that they had turned back to the iniquities of their ancestors and had refused to hear the words of the Lord (v. 10; cf. 6.16). It is not difficult to see that Jeremiah was convinced that the Israelites, like their ancestors, would not be able to keep the commandments of the law and return to the Lord because they walked in the stubbornness of their

<sup>13</sup> And the Lord said to me, "Proclaim all these words in the cities of Judah and in the street of Jerusalem", saying, "Hear the words of this covenant and do them". For I solemnly warned your fathers in the day that I brought them up from the land of Egypt, even to this day, warning persistently, saying, "Listen to My voice". Yet they did not obey or incline their ear, but walked each one in the stubbornness of his evil heart; therefore I brought on them all the words of this covenant, which I commanded them to do, but they did not. Then the Lord said to me, a conspiracy has been found among the men of Judah and among the inhabitants of Jerusalem. They have turned back to the iniquities of their ancestors who refused to hear My words, and they have gone after other gods to serve them; the house of Israel and the house of Judah have broken my covenant which I made with their fathers (Jer 11.6-10).

<sup>14</sup> Bright, however, claims that Jeremiah's use of the term "this covenant" refers to Josiah's covenant rather than the ancient Mosaic covenant. He says: "Does 'this covenant' refer to that made under Josiah, or simply to the ancient Mosaic covenant? Now, to be sure, one ought not to draw too sharp a distinction here, since Josiah's covenant was viewed as a ratification and reactivation of the Mosaic covenant as described in Deuteronomy. But in all probability it is Josiah's covenant that is referred to here. The expression "this covenant" suggests a recent and specific covenant, rather than an ancient well-known covenant made at Sinai" (J. Bright, *Jeremiah*, 89).

Recently, S. Sohn, drawing attention to the similarity between Jer 11.2-5 and Exod 19.3-6, maintains that the covenant form described in Jer 11.2-5 agrees with the form of Exod 19.3-6 (S. Sohn, *The Divine Election of Israel* (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1986), 235-237.). What he observes in both passages is the fact that "the commandments of Yahweh that Israel must keep and obey are set forth (protasis), and then the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel is promised (apodosis)" (*Ibid.*, 235-236). In the case of Jer 11.2-5, Jeremiah was first commanded to listen to Yahweh's covenant words and then speak to the people of Israel (v. 2). As the confirmation of the oath of the people, Yahweh promised them the land of Canaan. The same procedure can be seen in Exod 19.3-6. Moses was commanded to speak to the sons of Israel what he heard from Yahweh (vv. 3, 6). As the confirmation of the oath of the people, Yahweh promised that they would be "Yahweh's own possession," "a kingdom of priests" and "a holy nation".

Furthermore, he observes that Jeremiah related the ordinance of the release of Hebrew slaves after six years of service in Exod 21.2-11 to the Sinai covenant (Jer 34.13-14) and proclaimed that the Israelites transgressed the Sinai covenant because they did not release the Hebrew slaves (Jer 34.13-17) (*Ibid.*, 237).



hearts (Jer 5.1-6; 13.23; 17.1, 9). Thus the announcement of the breaking of the covenant indicates that under the Sinaitic covenant the reason why the people could not maintain the covenant relationship with God was that they would not and could not keep the law.

The first part also announces the reunion of the house of Israel with that of Judah (cf. 31.6; 50.4; Ezek 37.15f). The mention of Israel and Judah in connection with the promise of the future events (Jer 30.3; 31.27) also supports the idea of the reunion of the two nations in the future. In v. 33 the phrase "the house of Judah" is not repeated after the phrase "the house of Israel". The absence of "the house of Judah" (*'et-bêt y<sup>e</sup>hudāh*) in v. 33 does not indicate that its presence in v. 31 is a later addition or vice-versa.<sup>15</sup> Rather, it indicates that once the two nations unite as one, the names of both nations no longer need to be mentioned.<sup>16</sup>

In relation to the reunion of Israel and Judah under the new covenant, it is important to note that in Jeremiah, the term "remnant" is used both for those who are driven out of Judah (Jer 23.3; 31.7; 44.12, 14, 28) and for those who remained in Judah (Jer 40.11, 15; 42.2, 9). However, interestingly, the concept of the people of God is applied only to those who were driven out and brought back later: "my flock" (Jer 23.3); "thy people" (Jer 31.7). Nicholson recognizes this point: "Chapters such as 24 and 40-4 make it clear that the *remnant* of the nation with whom and through whom the future of God's people would be brought about were those who had been exiled to Babylon rather than those who had remained in the homeland or the group of exiles who fled to Egypt after the assassination of Gedaliah (ch 24.8)".<sup>17</sup> Therefore, it is not necessary to assume that the reunion of Israel and Judah indicates that the new covenant people

<sup>15</sup> It is to be noticed that *b<sup>e</sup>nê* is used in stead of *bêt* in a few mss (see BHS p. 721).

<sup>16</sup> Anderson, "New Covenant", 238.

<sup>17</sup> Nicholson, *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-25* (Cambridge, 1973), 191; cf. G. F. Hasel, *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah* (Berrien Springs, Michigan, 1980[72]), 392f.

would be the Israelites as a whole.

### 1.1.2 Jer 31.33-34

The announcement of a new covenant leads to the question: what are the essentially new things that are “not like” (v. 32) and are “no longer” (v. 34) similar to the Sinai covenant? In connection with this question the particle *kî* has an important role. Anderson points out that it has two main usages in this oracle.

The first is adversative: it marks the transition from the description of the new covenant by contrast (“not like”) to the positive description of its content. The second and main usage is climactic: it rounds off and brings the oracle to a conclusion by announcing the divine act that will establish the new relationship.<sup>18</sup>

The particle *kî* does not occur in the first part. However, it occurs three times in the second part. It is probably used to make a contrast between the two covenants and to emphasize the newness of the new covenant. It is also clear that the distinctive newness of the new covenant is stressed not only by the particle but also by the word *lô'* in v. 32 and v. 34. Four areas are discussed here: i) the inward inscription of the law; ii) the unmediated knowledge of God; iii) the forgiveness of sin; iv) the promissory characteristic. A further question raised here is v) the continuity between the old and the new covenant.

#### *i). The inward inscription of the law*

The new covenant will be an inward relationship with God through his writing the law on the hearts of his people: “I will put my law within them, and on their hearts I will write it” (v. 33).

First of all, the announcement that Israel had broken the covenant must be

---

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 230.

the background of the inward inscription of the law. It seems clear that for Jeremiah even Josiah's reform could not establish a full relationship between God and Israel, but was limited to an external reform which gave the Israelites a false sense of security.

The author of the Second Book of Kings describes the disastrous state of Judah under king Manasseh, the grandfather of Josiah (2 Kgs 21.1-9; cf. 23.4-14). Manasseh did "what was wrong in the eyes of the Lord, in following the abominable practices of the nations which the Lord had dispossessed in favour of the Israelites" (2 Kgs 21.2). The writer describes Manasseh as the worst king ever to sit on David's throne and declares that his sin alone was enough to explain the catastrophe that befell the nation (2 Kgs 21.10-15; 23.26f; cf. Jer 15.1-4). Therefore, it is conceivable that those who resented Manasseh's policy welcomed Josiah's reform. In these circumstances, Josiah launched the most sweeping reform in all of Israel's history.

Josiah's reform was genuine enough (2 Kgs 23.3). However, even in the days of Josiah the reform was not enough to effect a radical change in the hearts of the Israelites. The reform was an enforced one. Further, many Israelites did not respond with true repentance for their rebellion against God's commandments, but rather with the desire to avoid the imminent judgment of God for their disobedience to the law. The reform certainly had its opponents. The author of the Second Book of Kings records that many priests "never came up to the altar of the Lord in Jerusalem but used to eat unleavened bread with the priest of their clan" (2 Kgs 23.9). Consequently, the reform could not fundamentally change the hearts of the people.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Bright, *Covenant and Promise* (London, 1976), 136: "there is reason, indeed, to suspect that the reform, for all its thoroughness and the zeal with which it was carried out, never cut deeply into the attitudes and conduct of the people but, like other reforms at other times and places, tended to stop with externals. It seems to have resulted in the forced suppression of pagan cults and practices, and in heightened religious activity, but in no general return to godliness and righteousness in obedience to the stipulations of Yahweh's covenant".

What is important to note here is the fact that Jeremiah warned his opponents and all the Israelites, because when they thought that they were keeping the stipulations of the law, they were in fact violating them. Jeremiah's opponents insisted that they were wise and had the Torah with them (Jer 8.8a). Jeremiah replied that they made it into a lie (Jer 8.8b). Whatever Jeremiah's attitude toward Josiah's reform may have been in the beginning, he eventually became completely disappointed with what the reform had accomplished.<sup>20</sup> The failure of the reform may provide the background for Jeremiah's claim that some external compliance with the law intensified a false sense of security in the minds of the Israelites (Jer 5.12, 30f; 6.14f; 8.10f).

This failure may also provide the reason why Jeremiah urged a genuine return to God involving an inner commitment to the covenant stipulations and with evidence of circumcision of the heart (Jer 4.3f). The call for circumcision of the heart stresses the hardness of the Israelites.<sup>21</sup> Circumcision of the heart itself refers to a radical change of man's inner life.<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless, the call for circumcision of the heart was not properly responded to by the Israelites. They were still stubborn and did not listen to the Lord (Jer 5.23; 11.8; 16.2). The result of Josiah's reform and of Jeremiah's own ministry seemed to convince Jeremiah that Israel itself was not able to maintain the covenantal relationship with God, since the wicked heart would not and could not keep the law (Jer 3.17; 7.24; 9.14; 11.8; 12.2; 13.23; 17.1, 9f).<sup>23</sup>

Secondly, the method by which this internalization would be accomplished must be considered. Even though there is no mention of how God puts his law on their hearts in this passage, three possibilities can be suggested.

---

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 135ff; H. D. Potter, "New Covenant", 350.

<sup>21</sup> Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 159.

<sup>22</sup> Thompson, *Jeremiah*, 215.

<sup>23</sup> Nicholson, *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapter 26-52* (Cambridge, 1975), 71.

First, this internalization could be understood in terms of a new law. This view, however, does not seem to accord with v. 33. In fact, v. 33 does not specify the content of the law, nor speak of a new law,<sup>24</sup> but announces the placing of God's law (my law) in the hearts of the new covenant people by God himself. The designation, "my law" (*tôrātî*), clearly indicates that the torah of the new covenant is nothing but the same torah upon which God established his covenant at Sinai.<sup>25</sup>

The second way is to understand this as a placing of the law within the heart. There are several passages in the Psalms, where the law is within the heart (Ps 37.31; 40.8; 119.34; cf. 119.11; Deut 6.6; 30.6, 14). In these contexts the notion of the law being within the heart is related to keeping the law. Carroll observes that there are some elements of internalization in the book of Jeremiah.

The account of Jeremiah's call (1.4-10) presents the prophet as having interiorized his commission. No occasion is provided for the event; in fact it is not even described as an event but as Jeremiah's awareness that he is called to be a prophet. In one of the soliloquies he is represented as saying: "Thy words were found, and I ate them, and thy words become to me a joy and the delight of my heart".<sup>26</sup>

However, differences can be noticed between the passages in the Psalms and the new covenant passage of Jer 31 in relation to internalization of the law. In the Psalms the internalization is limited to certain individuals and, furthermore, there is no explicit mention of God with regard to the internalization. On the other hand, in the new covenant of Jer 31 the internalization is not limited to certain individuals but includes all the Israelites from the least to the greatest and this will be accomplished not through human efforts but by God himself.

The third possibility is to understand this internalization in connection with

---

<sup>24</sup> J. Coppens, "La Nouvelle Alliance en Jer 31.31-34", VT 18 (1963), 15; W. C. Kaiser, "The Old Promise and the New covenant: Jeremiah 31.31-34", JETS 15 (1972), 11-23.

<sup>25</sup> Unterman, *Repentance*, 98-102.

<sup>26</sup> R. P. Carroll, *Chaos*, 223.

the announcement that the fear of God will be placed in the Israelite's hearts in order to establish an everlasting covenant between God and Israel. In Jer 32.39-40 God will put the fear of himself in the Israelites' hearts so that they will never turn away (cf. Jer 24.7; Exod 20.20; Deut 4.10; 31.12).<sup>27</sup> In context the fear of God will be given to those who return from Babylon in order to establish an everlasting covenant between God and them. (Jer 32.37-41). The placing of the fear of God in the heart results in the keeping of the law by the Israelites (v. 40; cf. Jer 5.23f).

This understanding seems to accord well with the promise of the inward inscription of the law (v. 33). This announcement will be accomplished by God without any mediator, whether human or angelic. Unterman comments, "the regiving of the torah will not be accompanied by a revelation which affects the senses of sight and hearing".<sup>28</sup> It is important to note that in the new covenant the heart is the place where God writes his law. In the OT the term "heart" is used not only as the seat of the emotions but also as the seat of volition and of moral life.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, as the conception of "heart" in the OT is centred more on volition than on emotion (e.g. Isa 10.7),<sup>30</sup> the implication is that putting the law in their hearts indicates that God will give them the desire and ability to keep the law. Therefore, the promise of internalization can be understood in terms of God's creative act of changing the hearts of the new covenant people so that they can keep the law. Henceforth they will voluntarily keep the law and not break the new covenant because obedience flows from within their hearts.

This understanding gains further support from Ezekiel's proclamation of the work of the Spirit in terms of the new heart. The prophet Ezekiel says,

---

<sup>27</sup> O. P. Robertson, *The Christ of the Covenant* (Phillipsburg, NJ, 1980), 276.

<sup>28</sup> Unterman, *Repentance*, 98.

<sup>29</sup> F. Baumgärtel, "καρδιά", TDNT III, 606-7; R. C. Dentan, "Heart", IDB IV, 549-550.

<sup>30</sup> W. L. Holladay, IDBSup (1976), 624.

Moreover, I will give you a new heart and put a new spirit within you; and I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you and cause you to walk in my statutes, and you will be careful to observe my ordinances. And you will live in the land that I gave to your forefathers; so you will be my people, and I will be your God (Ezek 36.26-28; cf 11.19-20) (NASB).

The promise of a new heart in Ezek 36 is closely related to keeping the law (Ezek 11). It is likely that Ezekiel understands that the ideas of writing the law on the heart and of putting the fear of God in the heart, indicate the same thing; that is, that in the new covenant people will keep the law by the power of the Lord. Consequently, it is not difficult to think that Ezekiel may well be expressing the announcement of keeping the law as the result of the putting the law in the heart in terms of "giving fleshly heart" so that the Israelites will keep the law.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, what is worth noting here is the fact that the covenant formula (my people and your God) is used to describe the new situation when people will keep the law (v. 38).<sup>32</sup> The words of 37.23ff show that Ezekiel understands this new situation to be closely associated with the establishment of an everlasting covenant between God and his people. Thus the internalization of the law in Jer 31.33 can be understood in terms of the giving of a fleshly heart so that the new covenant people will keep the law.

The promise of the internalization of the law (v. 33) might be understood in the light of the notion of the law being within the heart in the Psalms (Ps 37.3; 40.8; 119.34) and it is also possible that the Psalms might relate the notion to the new covenant concept. However, the fact that the internalization of the law in v. 33 includes all the Israelites from the least to the greatest may indicate that even though the notion found in the Psalms might provide a basis to understand

---

<sup>31</sup> W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2. Hermeneia, ET (Phila, 1983), 248-49; W. Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1-19*. WBC 28 (Waco, Texas, 1986), 164. Zimmerli remarks: "Jer 31.31ff had referred to the putting of the law in the human heart. Ezek 36.27 speaks of putting the spirit there and in this way goes beyond Jer 31 and allows Yahweh to participate directly in man's new obedience" (*Ibid*).

<sup>32</sup> W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2, 249.

this promise, the internalization can not be understood in accordance with this alone. Here we may conclude that the internalization of the law can be understood in relation to the fear of God being placed in the heart for the observance of the law.<sup>33</sup>

*ii). The unmediated knowledge of God*

In the new covenant everyone has unmediated knowledge of God. Verse 34 says, "they shall not teach again, ... for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them". It is conceivable that v. 34 implies that in the new covenant the relationship between God and his people will be an immediate one, for his people in the new covenant will live in the personal knowledge of God.<sup>34</sup> It is not possible to say precisely how this dispensing with the need for teachers under the new covenant is to be understood.

Nevertheless, the Hebrew word *yādā'* in v. 34c shows that the lack of a need for teachers is due, first of all, to the fact that in the new covenant all the people know God. The use of this verb seems to be significant because it is used in the OT with reference to covenant recognition of Israel by God.<sup>35</sup> *yādā'* here may indicate that the new covenant people know God as their covenant God: "I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (v. 33). In Jeremiah "to know God" (or not to know God) is closely related to obedience (or disobedience) to the torah (Jer 2.8; 4.22; 9.24; 10.25).<sup>36</sup> In relation to this it is worth noting that the dispensability of teaching results from the internalization of the law within the heart.

Secondly, the next appearance of the word *yādā'* in v. 34d indicates that the

---

<sup>33</sup> This point will be discussed further when I examine how . this announcement <sup>could</sup> be understood later literature.

<sup>34</sup> Anderson, "New Covenant", 235.

<sup>35</sup> H. Huffmon, "The Treaty Background of Hebrew YADA", *BASOR* 181 (1966), 31-37.

<sup>36</sup> Unterman, *Repentance*, 76-82.



lack of a need for teachers is related to the forgiveness of sin. Since the iniquity of the people is forgiven and the internalization of the law enables the new covenant people to keep the law, the necessity of teaching in order to know God will become superfluous.<sup>37</sup> In connection with this it is interesting to see that for Jeremiah teachers were deceiving others by their false teaching. Jer 8.8a shows a group of people who were proud of their knowledge of the law: "we are the wise and the law of Yahweh is with us". However, Jer 8.8b makes it clear that for Jeremiah they falsified the law: "but behold, the lying pen of the scribes". The scribes were the handlers of the law, probably also the teachers of the law,<sup>38</sup> yet for Jeremiah the people who lived in Jerusalem "hold fast to deceit" (Jer 8.5).<sup>39</sup>

Therefore, the announcement that there will be no necessity for teachers may be understood not only in connection with keeping the law but also in connection with the knowledge of God being no longer the privilege of a certain group of people. The phrase "from the least of them to the greatest of them" may also suggest that no one will teach others from a superior position and be able to deceive them.

*iii). The forgiveness of sins*

In the new covenant the iniquity of the people will be forgiven by God: "I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin I will remember no more" (v. 34). How is this announcement of the forgiveness of sin to be understood? Jer 31.31ff does not refer to the means by which forgiveness of sins will be accomplished. However, the question of how such forgiveness of sins might be achieved can be considered in the light of what is said about forgiveness of sins elsewhere in the OT.

---

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 102.

<sup>38</sup> J. P. Hyatt, "Torah in the Book of Jeremiah". *JBL* 66 (1941), 386. He maintains that those who handled the law were the same group of the scribes (cf. H. D. Potter, "New Covenant," 352).

<sup>39</sup> H. D. Potter, "New Covenant", 353.

First of all, God's forgiveness of sins could be understood in relation to his loving kindness (*hesed*) and grace (Exod 34.6f; Num 14.18; Ps 51.1-2; 103.11f; Joel 2.13; Jonah 4.2; Mic 7.18). Forgiveness of sin in these passages is based on God's gracious attitude towards his covenant people.<sup>40</sup>

Secondly, forgiveness of sins could be understood in connection with animal sacrifices in the temple. This announcement, however, could not simply be understood in relation to animal sacrifices because the "sin offering" (*ḥāṭṭā't*) and "guilt offering" (*'āšām*) of Lev 4 and 5 are explicitly for unwitting, i.e. unintentional, sin (Lev 4.2; 5.15), and are not concerned with the forgiveness of sins in general. Thus their relationship with Jer 31.34 is not immediate.

Further, the claim that sin (*ḥāḥḥā't*) is engraved on the tablet (*lūah*) of heart (*lēb*) (Jer 17.1, 9) seems to indicate that the forgiveness of sins could not be understood in connection with animal sacrifices. Jer 13.23 says "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" As Potter notes, what Jeremiah points out here is not that sin is accumulated on the skin, but that "once acquired it is impossible to escape it".<sup>41</sup> In relation to this it is worth noting what H. Weippert has to say. Observing the close connection between sin and the heart in Jer 5.20-25 and in Jer 17.1,<sup>42</sup> he maintains that the removal of sins from the heart is not through the blood of offerings because the blood of sin offering cannot wash

---

<sup>40</sup> R. W. L. Moberly argues that God's forgiveness of the sins of the covenant people is based on his character of mercy by pointing to God's forgiving Israel in Exod 32-34. He remarks: "A central concern of Ex 32-34 is sin and forgiveness. When Israel sins, can this mean the end of the covenant? If not, then on what terms can the covenant be renewed and continue? The answer of 34.9 is that the terms lie entirely in the character of God. The point that is made by the forceful *ky* is that Israel has not changed but remains as sinful as at the time of making the calf. Any change which could herald something other than their being cast off must therefore be on the part of God. The people remain sinful; yet not only do they receive from God the judgment they deserve, but also they receive the grace and mercy they do not deserve. God will show mercy, a mercy experienced supremely in his accompanying presence, because it lies within the character of God not only to inflict judgment but also mercy - even to a continuing sinful people" (*At the Mountain of God. Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34*. JSOTS 22 (Sheffield, 1983), 90).

<sup>41</sup> Potter, "New Covenant", 351.

<sup>42</sup> H. Weippert, "Das Wort vom Neuen Bund in Jeremiah 31.31-34", VT 29 (1979), 342f.

the sins engraved on the tablet of their hearts, instead it is smeared on the horn of the altar.<sup>43</sup>

H. D. Potter summarizes Weippert's observation: "*lēb* occurs three times in 5.20-25. In v. 21 the people are senseless (*'ēn lēb* parallel *sākāl* "foolish"). Without *lēb* the organs of sense (eyes and ears) are useless. In v. 24 the fact of Yahweh's munificence does not penetrate the people's consciousness (*lēb*), while in v. 23 the reason for the people's apostasy is their stubborn and rebellious heart (*lēb sōrēr ûmôreh*). ... It seems clear that here [Jer 17.1] we have a reference to the act of atonement involving the sacrifice of an animal some of whose blood was smeared on the horns of the altar. So deep-seated was the nation's sin that it had become engraved on the very horns of the altar where the blood of the sin offering which was supposed to wipe away sin was smeared".<sup>44</sup> He concludes

The thought of Jeremiah may well have been as follows: as long as the Law is written merely on the tablets of stone, so long will sin be written on the tablets of the heart, and so long will forgiveness be impossible. Man's offerings cannot compensate for his sin. In order for God to forgive he must erase the sin written on the heart and replace it with the Law.<sup>45</sup>

Thirdly, it is important to note that forgiveness of sin here is connected with a certain specific time, "after those days" (*'āḥārê hāyyāmîm hāhēm*) (v. 33). Jer 50.20 says that "in those days and at that time, search will be made for the iniquity of Israel, but there will be none; and for the sin of Judah but they will not be found; for I shall pardon those whom I leave as a remnant". Jer 50.5 shows that the phrase "in those days and at that time", when God will forgive the iniquity of Israel, is closely related to an everlasting covenant (v. 5), which would seem to be the same as the new covenant of Jer 31.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>43</sup> Weippert, "Neuen Bund", 346.: "Im Falle der eingemeisselten Verfehlung reicht die Sühnekraft des Opferblutes aber nicht aus; die tief eingravierte Schrift lässt sich nicht abwaschen, die Altarhörner werden zum sichtbaren Zeugen gegen das Volk.

<sup>44</sup> H. D. Potter, "New Covenant", 351.

<sup>45</sup> Potter, "New covenant", 352.

<sup>46</sup> Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 825.

In conclusion, Jeremiah's understanding of the problem of sin which is rooted in the heart (Jer 17.1, 9f; cf. 13.23) and the fact that the sins of Judah will not be found "in those days and at that time" (Jer 50.20) may indicate the distinctive feature of the forgiveness of sins in the new covenant. Whereas in the old covenant the forgiveness of sins was given to the people who remained sinful,<sup>47</sup> in the new covenant God will forgive the sins of his people and, furthermore, their sins will no longer be found. This understanding must be related to the announcement of the internalization of the law, because God will forgive the sins written in the heart and replace it with the law<sup>48</sup> so that they never turn away from God (Jer 32.39f). In other words, in the new covenant the sins of the people will not be found (Jer 50.20).

*iv). The promissory characteristic*

The promissory characteristic of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff seems to be significant (vv. 31f, 33f). The verb *kārát*, a technical term of covenant making, is used in the imperfect sense both in v. 31 and v. 33. This use of the imperfect contrasts the new covenant with the covenant which God had made with their forefathers, because it relates the new covenant to the future. C. Westermann says, "the real significance of the new covenant lies in the fact that here the covenant is included in the promise".<sup>49</sup> It is not possible to ascertain precisely what Jeremiah thought concerning the time when the promise was to be fulfilled.<sup>50</sup>

*v). Continuity between the old and new covenants*

Jer 31.31-34 shows both the newness of the new covenant and continuity

---

<sup>47</sup> See above p. 25 n. 40.

<sup>48</sup> Potter, "New covenant", 352.

<sup>49</sup> C. Westermann, "The Way of the Promise through the OT", in *Old Testament and Christian Faith*, 218-219.

<sup>50</sup> The question of the fulfilment of this promise will be dealt with in Ch. 3 (the new covenant in the DSS) and Ch. 5 (the new covenant in the NT).

between the old and the new covenants. These two elements are interrelated in this promise. Since the newness of the new covenant has already been considered, only continuity will be dealt with here. Several aspects of continuity can be seen in this passage.

First of all, it was God who had established the old covenant at Sinai and would establish the new covenant. The phrases, “I will make a new covenant” (*w<sup>e</sup>kārāti b<sup>e</sup>rīt ḥādāšāh*), “the covenant that I made” (*b<sup>e</sup>rīt ’āšer kārāti*) and “declares the Lord” (*n<sup>e</sup>’um-yhwh*) indicate this point.

Secondly, just as the old covenant had been, so would the new covenant be made between God and his people by God’s gracious initiative: “I will make my covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah” (v. 32). The purpose of the new covenant is nothing less than the re-establishment of the broken relationship between God and his people: “I shall be your God and you shall be my people” (Jer 7.23; 11.4; 30.22; 31.1, 33; 32.38; cf. Exod 6.7; 19.5-6; 2 Sam 7.24; 2 Kgs 11.17; Ezek 11.20; 14.11; 36.28; 37.23, 27).<sup>51</sup>

Thirdly, while the mode of its administration will be different, the substance of the law will be the same: “my law”. As mentioned above, the law of the new covenant is not a new torah but the same torah which God gave to Israel at Sinai. The difference lies in the fact that the new covenant people will keep the law because God will put it in the heart.

Fourthly, while the visible mode of forgiveness is probably different, it is still true that God will forgive their sins: “I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin I will remember no longer”.

### 1.1.3 Summary

The new covenant passage in Jer 31.31-34 can be divided into two. In vv. 31-

<sup>51</sup> R. Smend characterizes this phrase as the covenant formula (*Bundesformel* (Zurich, 1963). 26-27); cf. T. Raitt, *Theology of Exile: Judgment/Deliverance in Jeremiah and Ezekiel* (Phila., 1977), 194-200).

32 “when the days are coming”, Yahweh will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. The fulfilment of this new covenant could be related to return from the exile on the basis of the phrases “days are coming” and “after those days”. With regard to the reunification of Israel and Judah it is to be noted that the concept of the covenant people of God is applied only to those who are driven out and brought back. Accordingly, it cannot be assumed that the reunion of the house of Israel and of Judah indicates that the new covenant people will be the Israelites as a whole.

Verses 33-34 show both the newness of the new covenant and continuity between the old and the new covenants. The distinctive new features of the new covenant in Jer 31 are as follows: (a) the law is put in their hearts, which indicates that God will give them the desire and ability to keep the law, (b) there is no need of a teacher, which may indicate that the relationship between God and his people will be an intimate one so that they live in the personal knowledge of God, (c) God will forgive the sins of his people (d) the new covenant will be fulfilled in the future.

However, continuity between the old and new covenants also can be discerned in Jer 31.31ff: a) the same God, b) the same people (Israel), c) the same relationship (your God and my people), d) the same law (my law) and e) similar forgiveness of sins by God.

## **1.2 The Covenant Concept in the Post-Exilic Biblical Writings**

The aim of this section is to examine whether the covenant concept in the post-exilic biblical writings reflects the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff. Three questions will be considered. First, how do the authors apply the covenant relationship between God and their forefathers to the exile and to themselves? Secondly, what are the characteristics of the covenant concept in these writings? The third

question raised here is whether there is any evidence of the fulfilment of the new covenant in these writings, since a relationship could be suggested between the return of Israel from exile and the anticipation of the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant. In order to answer these questions discussion will be focused on the following three issues: (1) God's faithfulness to the covenant (§1.2.1), (2) the emphasis on the law and the temple (§1.2.2) and (3) the return from the exile and the question of the fulfilment of the new covenant (§1.2.3).

### **1.2.1 God's Faithfulness to the Covenant.**

One of the common characteristics of post-exilic biblical writings is that even though the writers point out the sins of Israel both in the past and in their own times (Ezra 9.6-7; 9.13a; Neh 1.6b-7; cf. Zech 1.2-6a; Mal 2.10-12), they are convinced that the covenant relationship between God and Israel still continues because God has bound himself to Israel by it (Neh 9.5, 6; Hag 2.5; Zech 9.11). When Ezra hears of intermarriage between Israelites, including priests and Levites, and foreigners, he confesses the sins of Israel in his prayer.

“O my God, I am ashamed and embarrassed to lift up my face to Thee, my God, for our iniquities have risen above our heads, and our guilt has grown even to the heavens”. “Since the days of our fathers to this day we have been in great guilt, and on account of our iniquities we, our kings and our priests have been given into the hand of the kings of the lands, to the sword, to captivity, and to plunder and to open shame as it is this day” (Ezra 9.6-7; cf. 9.10) (NASB).

He continues by saying, “what has happened to us is a result of our evil deeds and our great guilt” (Ezra 9.13a). It seems to be evident that he understands the exile as the consequence of their own and their forefathers' sins, the breaking of God's commands (Ezra 9.14a).

Similar confessions can be seen in Nehemiah's prayer and in other writings (Neh 1.6b-7; cf. Zech 1.2-6a; Mal 2.10-12). These writings also indicate that

religious and moral laxity existed in the post-exilic Jewish community, not only during the interruption of the construction of the temple, but even after the completion of the temple. Haggai warns the people who say “the time has not yet come for the Lord’s house to be built” (Hag 1.2), that the barrenness of the land has resulted from the interruption of the construction of the temple (Hag 1.5-11). Malachi points out religious negligence even after the completion of the temple (Mal 2-3; cf. Hag 2.14-15). He decries the priestly disorder, the problem of mixed marriage and the nonpayment of tithes. Malachi, demanding repentance and reverence for God (Mal 2.5; 4.6), announces, “God will come and strike the land with a curse” (Mal 4.6).<sup>52</sup>

On the other hand, these writings indicate that the covenant relationship still continues between God and Israel in spite of the sins of Israel. Nehemiah points out that the Abrahamic covenant is the foundation of the covenant relationship between God and Israel and provides the basis of the conviction that the covenantal relationship still exists between them even in the face of their failure to keep the laws given through Moses (Neh ch 9). According to Neh 9, after listening to the Book of the Law of Moses, the people confess that God chose Abram and made a covenant with him to give his descendants the land: “thou didst give them just ordinances and true law, good statutes and commandments” (Neh 9.13c) and “thou didst tell them to enter in order to possess the land which thou didst swear to give them” (Neh 9.15). Furthermore, their confession strongly implies that the covenant of promise and love continues to be effective towards Israel despite their stubborn disobedience (Neh 9.16ff).

Continuity in the covenant relationship between God and them can be seen

---

<sup>52</sup> Bright illustrates the state of the situation: “Priests, bored by their duties, saw nothing wrong in offering sick and injured animals to Yahweh (Mal 1.6-14), while their partiality in handling the law had debased their sacred office in the eyes of the people (Mal 2.1-9). ... Nonpayment of the tithes (Mal 3.7-10) forced Levites to abandon their duties in order to make a living (Neh 13.10f)” (Bright, *A History of Israel* (London, 1960), 378).



from the writers' interpretation of the significance of the return from the exile. They regard the event as a gracious act of God. Ezra 1.1 indicates that "the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia to make a proclamation" of the return of the Jews to Jerusalem. The phrase "stirred up the spirit of Cyrus" shows that Ezra is convinced that the return from the exile has come from divine motivation.<sup>53</sup> Ezra also points out that the very fact of the return is the fulfilment of the promise to Jeremiah (Ezra 1.1ff; cf. Jer 25.11ff; 29.10) and the confirmation of God's steadfast love to Israel (Ezra 9.8f). Similarly, the return from exile and the rebuilding of the temple has led Nehemiah to confess "thou hast fulfilled thy promise" (Neh 9.8) and to call God one "who dost keep covenant and loving-kindness" (Neh 9.32). Furthermore, according to Ezra, one important purpose of the return from the exile is the rebuilding of the temple of the Lord in Jerusalem (Ezra 1.3f). He says that the people, laying the foundation of the temple of the Lord, sang to the Lord: "He is good, for his loving-kindness is upon Israel forever" (Ezra 3.11; cf. Ps. 107.1; 118.1,29; 2 Chr 5.13; 7.3; 20.21). Zechariah strongly implies that God himself dwells among his people in the temple in Zion (Zech 1.16; 2.10-13; 8.3; cf. Neh 1.9).

In short, it is fair to say that for these writers the covenant relationship still continues between God and them, even though they, along with their forefathers, transgressed the law.

### **1.2.2 The Emphasis on the Law and the Temple**

The aim of this sub-section is to argue that the case for continuity in the covenant relationship between God and the Jews can be supported by the emphases in these writings on the observance of the law and the importance of the

---

<sup>53</sup> R. Bowman comments: "the expression 'stirred up the spirit', used especially in later Hebrew, describes divine motivation, often indicating God's control over Gentiles (cf. 1 Chron 5.26; 2 Chron 21.16-17; 36.22; Jer 51.11; Hag 1.14) (*Ezra*. IB 3 (New York, 1955), 570).

temple.

*i). The emphasis on the observance of the law*

In the post-exilic biblical writings, a strong emphasis can readily be seen on the observance of the law of Moses. Adherence to the law, first of all, is stressed in order to preserve the national identity. Ezra warns the people severely against intermarriage with the people around them (Ezra 9.1, 14) and points out that “the people of Israel and the priests and the Levites have not separated themselves from the peoples of the lands, according to their abominations” (Ezra 9.1). Again, he describes the surrounding people as those who “commit these abominations” (Ezra 9.14). It is important to note that those who celebrate the passover are “the sons of Israel who returned from the exile and all those who had separated themselves from the impurity of the nations of the land to join them, to seek the Lord God of Israel, ate the passover” (Ezra 6.21). Therefore, the emphasis on adherence to the law must be understood primarily in terms of the distinguishing mark of the Israel as the covenant people of God. The national identity of Israel seems to be closely related to their religious purity as the covenant people of God.

Secondly, expounding the law has an important role in the covenant-renewal in these writings (cf. Ezra 7.10 ; 10.1; Neh 8.8). In connection with some Levites instructing the people in the law, Nehemiah says, “they read from the Book of the Law of God, making it clear and giving the meaning so that the people could understand what was being read” (Neh 8.8). Even though we are not sure of the exact implication of the rendering “making it clear and giving the meaning” (*m'pōrāš w' sōm šekel*), it may indicate a translation of the law into Aramaic, section by section, and an exposition of it for the peoples' understanding.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> R. J. Coggins *The Book of Ezra and Nehemiah* (Cambridge, 1976), 109. He comments: “one traditional view is that the law written in Hebrew was translated into Aramaic paraphrases of the Old Testament, known as Targums, was ascribed to Ezra by the later Jewish rabbis and 13.24 might suggest that knowledge of Hebrew was imperfect by this time. Alternatively, the word translated ‘clearly’ might imply a division into short paragraphs; the function of

The expression “to study the words of the law” (*ʾēhās kîr ʾel-dib<sup>e</sup>rê háttôrāh*) in v.13 also indicates something more than simple reading and passive listening. L. H. Brockington suggests that “the Hebrew verb [to study] may mean ‘to get a full insight into the implications of the words’ - as we might say ‘their relevance to the contemporary situation’.”<sup>55</sup> This expositional reading is supported by the fact that the Book of the Law was the object of Ezra’s “eager search”, his study of it made him a ready teacher and his teaching of the law convinced contemporary audiences (Ezra 7.10; Neh 8.3).

The people’s immediate response to the reading, their worshipping of the Lord (Neh 8.6; 9.3), the celebration of the feast of tabernacles (Neh 8.13-18), and the confession of their sins and of the love of God (Ezra 9.5ff), implies that the reading includes the exposition of the law, applying it to the contemporary situation. As mentioned above, the writers understand the exile to Babylon as a consequence of the sins of Israel, the breaking of God’s commands which were given through Moses (Ezra 9.10-14; Neh 1.6-7). Ezra implies that, if the people break the commands of God, God will destroy them, even the remnant (Ezra 9.14).

Close relationship between the law and the covenant can also be found in Neh 8 and 9. When the Israelites assembled in the square before the Water Gate in the seventh month, Ezra read the Book of the Law of Moses and all the people listened attentively to the Book of the Law (Neh 8.1ff). This procedure continued for several days: “he [Ezra] read from the book of the law of God daily, from the first day to the last day” (Neh 8.18). The result of this event is described in chapter 9. On the twenty fourth day of the same month, the Israelites gathered together, fasting and wearing sackcloth, and confessed their own sins and the

---

the Levites would then be to explain the implications of each section in turn, that is to say, something akin to exposition”.

<sup>55</sup> L. Brockington, *Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther*. CB (London, 1969), 168.

wickedness of their fathers. They also confessed that, in the midst of the sins of Israel, God who made a covenant with Abraham had kept his covenant of love until their own day.

The covenant-renewal ceremony in Ezra 9-10 is directed against the violation of the law on mixed marriages (Ezra 10.3). It is not Ezra but the people who make a covenant with God and it is they who take an oath to do what have been suggested (Ezra 10.3-4). The covenant-renewal in Neh 8-10 is directed against the disobedience of the commands of the law, particularly the violation of the observance of the sabbath (cf. Neh 10.31f) and the responsibility to the house of the Lord (cf. Neh 10.32ff.). Here again, it is not Nehemiah the leader but the people who are making a covenant, putting it in writing (Neh 9.38-10.1). They bind themselves with a curse and an oath to follow the law of God given through Moses and to obey carefully all the commands, regulations and decrees of the Lord (Neh 10.29). The observance of the sabbath and the responsibility to the house of the Lord are related not only to the keeping of the law but also to the maintenance of the covenant relationship with God. The people's willingness to keep the law indicates that they regard this as faithfulness to the covenantal relationship with God and the only way to maintain their status as the covenant people of God.

*ii). The emphasis on the importance of the temple*

The writers' emphasis on the importance of the temple can be discerned in the following points: a) the significance of the reconstruction of the temple; b) the glory of the temple in the future; c) a close connection between the temple and the covenant.

a). The writers emphasize the significance of the reconstruction of the temple. First of all, they point out that God took the initiative in the actual rebuilding

of the temple. Ezra remarks that God stirred the heart of Cyrus king of Persia and the hearts of the Israelites for the rebuilding of the temple. Haggai says that God stirred up the spirit of the whole remnant of the people including Zerubbabel and Joshua (Hag 1.13). Zechariah encourages the people by telling them that the temple will be rebuilt by the power of the spirit of God (Zech 4.6; cf. Hag 2.3-5). All these writers make it clear that the rebuilding of the temple, even if it seems to be undertaken as a result of human endeavour, is made possible by God's will and by the working of his Spirit.<sup>56</sup>

Secondly, the significance of the rebuilding of the temple can be seen in Ezra's record of the words of Cyrus, "rebuild the house of the Lord, the God of Israel; he is God who is in Jerusalem" (Ezra 1.3). Clearly for Ezra the reconstruction of the temple indicates that God dwells among his people in Jerusalem (Ezra 3.10ff).

Thirdly, the rebuilding of the temple is related to the divine blessing (Hag 2.6ff). Haggai announces that God will grant peace in this place, the temple (Hag 2.9). He makes a sharp distinction between the situation before and after the laying of the foundation for the reconstruction of the temple. He points out that the barrenness of the land has resulted from the desolation of the temple (Hag 1.5-11). After the laying of the foundation, he declares, "Do consider from this twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, from the day when the temple of the Lord was founded, consider: Is the seed still in the barn? Even including the vine, the fig tree, ... it has not borne fruit. Yet from this day on I will bless You" (Hag 2.18-19). The same kind of thought can be found in Zechariah (Zech 8.9ff). This is like the divine blessing seen in God's answer to the prayer of Solomon immediately after the dedication of the first temple (2 Chron 7.11ff).

---

<sup>56</sup> In Ezekiel that rebuilding is implicitly the work of God and his divine agent (Ezek 40.2ff; 43.10ff; cf. Ps 127.1).

b). The prophet Haggai expects the glory of the temple in the future. Haggai admits that the new temple seems to be nothing compared to the glory of the former temple (Hag 2.3). He, however, announces that the glory of the present house will be greater than the glory of the former house (Hag 2.9).

There are two questions to be considered here. When will the glory of the present house be greater than the glory of the former house? In what sense is this so? These two questions are closely related. It is generally thought that Haggai expects the glory of the temple to be realized when the reconstruction of the temple has been completed. It is obvious that the glory of the house is linked with God's dwelling in the rebuilt temple in Zion (Hag 1.8; Zech 2.14), just as it was linked in the former temple (2 Chron 7.1ff). However, what is important to note here is the fact that Haggai further relates the glory of the temple to the treasures of all the nations which will be brought to the temple in tribute (Hag 2.7). Similarly Zechariah declares "Many nations will join themselves to the Lord in that day and will become my people" (Zech 2.11). These two passages indicate not only that all the nations will recognize Israel's greatness and bring honour to Jerusalem, but also that many nations will share with Israel in salvation as the people of God.<sup>57</sup>

Here the realization of their expectation is related both to the completion of the reconstruction of the temple and the inclusion of many nations among the people of God. Haggai and Zechariah see the reconstruction of the temple as the beginning of the realization of the glory of the temple. Moreover, they think that this glory will be consummated in the future when the nations will be included among God's people. The promise of the glory of the temple is a central feature of the eschatological hopes of the post-exilic Jewish community.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> R. E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Oxford, 1965), 123-125.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 125.

c). Malachi links the temple with the covenant. He announces that God will come to his temple (Mal 3.1) and regards God's coming as the coming of the messenger of the covenant, using the promise as a warning of judgment and salvation to the people.<sup>59</sup> He points out that the people have profaned the covenant of their fathers (Mal 2.10ff) and he pronounces the judgment of God upon the people of Israel because of their defiled offerings. Nevertheless, Malachi remarks that the primary concern of the messenger of the covenant is not total destruction but the restoration of the relationship between God and Israel. The phrase "the Lord will come to his temple" indicates the importance of the temple in a restoration of the relationship between God and Israel.

Furthermore, Malachi points out that one of the messenger's tasks will be to refine the people, particularly purifying the Levites, so that the offerings of Judah and Jerusalem would be acceptable to the Lord (Mal 3.2-4). It is probably true that Malachi understands the commissions of the messenger in relation to the covenantal relationship between God and Israel. He warns the priests that they have already broken the covenant of Levi and thus will be under the judgment of God (Mal 2.8-9). He also points out that the people have profaned the covenant of their fathers (Mal 2.10ff). Another aspect is to be seen in Malachi's statement that God's name will be great among the nations, from the rising to the setting of the sun, and that in every place incense and pure offerings will be brought to his name (Mal 1.10-11).

### **1.2.3 The Return from the Exile and the Question of the Fulfilment of the New Covenant**

Ezra 1.1 indicates that the return is the fulfilment of "the word of the Lord

---

<sup>59</sup> S. L. McKenzie and H. W. Wallace suggest that reference to a messenger of the covenant comes near the beginning of the unit 2.17-3.5. They maintain that this unit consists of a judgement oracle (2.17-3.5) followed by a salvation oracle (3.7-12) with v.6 as a transition ("Covenant Themes in Malachi". CBQ 45 (1983), 550).

by the mouth of Jeremiah". However, the phrase "the word of the Lord" here may not refer to the promise of the new covenant but only to the promise of the return from Babylon after seventy years (Jer 25.11f; 29.10; cf. Dan 9.2). As far as the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31 is concerned, there is no evidence of any claim that the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31 was fulfilled in the post-exilic Jewish community. In the post-exilic biblical literature there is neither any occurrence of the term "new covenant" nor any indication of the fulfilment of this promise. Three points can be suggested to support the view that there is no idea in the post-exilic biblical writings that the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled in the post-exilic Jewish community.

First of all, in these writings there is no indication of the necessity of a new covenant relationship between God and the Jews. The authors emphasize that even in the face of their own and their fathers' failure to observe the law the covenant relationship still exists between God and themselves (Ezra 9.6-7; Neh 9.5-6, 15; Hag 2.5; Zech 9.11). In fact, their return from Babylon is not regarded as an occasion for establishing the new covenant but as proof of the continuity of the covenant relationship between God and them (Ezra 9.8; Neh 1.10; cf. Exod 32.11).

Secondly, there is no evidence of the internalization of the law by God. The emphasis on the observance of the law may be suggested as evidence that the post-exilic Jews understood the promise of the new covenant to be fulfilled in their own community. It is true that the Jews who returned from the exile tried to observe the law. However, what stirred them to observe the law was not the internalization of the law according to the new covenant of Jer 31 but their willingness to maintain their covenant relationship with God, which he had established with their forefathers. Furthermore, these writings put a strong emphasis on teaching and studying the words of the law. The authors emphasize the observance of the law because their fellow Jews violate the law. Hence it is



difficult to regard their emphasis on the observance of the law as evidence that they regard the return from exile as the fulfilment of the new covenant of Jer 31.

Thirdly, Malachi points out that the post-exilic Jews violate the covenant. In Malachi 1.6-14 the prophet accuses both priests and people of covenant violations: the sins of the priests (vv. 6-8) and the sins of the people (v. 14) are noted. Furthermore, he specifies three covenants which they violate: (a) the covenant of Levi (Mal 2.4-9), (b) the covenant of the fathers (v. 10) and (c) the covenant of marriage (v. 14).<sup>60</sup> Whereas the priests violate the covenant of Levi (Mal 2.8), the people violate the covenant of fathers (Mal 2.10) and the covenant of marriage (Mal 2.14). The prophet says that such people have wearied the Lord (Mal 2.17). However, the people ask, "How have we wearied (him)?" "Everyone who does evil is good in the sight of the Lord and he delights in them", or "Where is the God of justice?" The prophet answers that the God of justice is coming in judgment (Mal 3.1).

Of great importance here is the fact that God's judgment is closely related to the coming of the messenger of the covenant (Mal 3.1).<sup>61</sup> It is interesting to see that while the people are looking forward to the coming of the messenger of the covenant, the writer emphasizes that this coming is not in the first place for salvation but for judgment (Mal 2.17-3.5) and afterwards for salvation for those who return to Yahweh (Mal 3.7-12). It was a time of prosperity for the wicked so that the people were expecting the messenger of the covenant. Whatever the covenant here refers to, the expectation of a messenger of the covenant indicates that the people do not believe that the promise of the new covenant has already been fulfilled in their own community.

---

<sup>60</sup> McKenzie and Wallace, "Covenant", 549-563.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 553-555; R. L. Smith maintains that the covenant here refers to the new covenant spoken of in Jer 31.31ff, because "this certainly would fit into the messianic or eschatological interpretation of 3.1-3" (R. L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, WBC 32 (Waco, Texas, 1984), 328).

In these writings there is no clear evidence of a sense of the fulfilment of the promise in the post-exilic Jewish community. In fact, the new covenant is not mentioned. It might be possible that these writers were unaware of it. However, Ezra's understanding of the return as the fulfilment of the promise to Jeremiah (Ezra 1.11ff; cf. Jer 25.11ff; 29.10; Dan 9.2) may indicate that they are indeed aware of it,<sup>62</sup> in which case various possibilities can be suggested as to why they do not mention it in their writings.

First, they may disagree with the idea of the new covenant or may not find any necessity for it. This may be so, since they are convinced that the covenant relationship still exists between God and them even in the face of their failure to keep the laws which were given through Moses (Neh 9; Hag 2.5; Zech 9.11). Secondly, they may regard their own study of the Tora and subsequent keeping of it as the fulfilment of the promise and the means by which the tora has come to be written on their hearts. Thirdly, their silence may indicate that they are anticipating the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant to be sometime in the future.

No definitive answer is possible. Nevertheless, we can comment on these three points. The first point is less plausible because, as we have seen above, they are convinced that what Jeremiah promised is not his own promise but God's promise. The second point is also less plausible because their contemporary situations do not accord with the promise to any great degree, as I have shown above. On the basis of this understanding, we may conclude that as far as the post-exilic biblical writings are concerned, the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff is

---

<sup>62</sup> Cf. R. Bloch, "Midrash", in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice*, vol. 1, ed. W. S. Green (Missoula, 1978), 37: "The general tendency of the biblical writers to ground themselves in their predecessors is well known: Isaiah referred to Amos; Jeremiah shows the influence of Hosea as well as Isaiah; Ezekiel, in addition to his relation to the Holiness Code, made use of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and especially Jeremiah. This tendency is noticeably increased in the post-exilic literature. The inspired writers of this period, like their contemporaries, had a thorough knowledge of the former Scriptures and especially of the Torah, which was at the center of the life of the community".

waiting for its fulfilment in the future.

#### **1.2.4 Summary**

In the post-exilic biblical writings the exile and the return from the exile are understood in relation to the covenant relationship between God and Israel. The authors of these writings point out that the exile was the result of their sins and those of their fathers. Nevertheless, they are convinced that God has still bound himself to Israel because God has been faithful to his covenant which he had made with their fathers. They see the return from the exile as evidence of the continuity of the covenant relationship between God and Israel.

They emphasize the observance of the law and the significance of the reconstruction of the temple. There is a close relationship between keeping the law and both maintaining national identity and religious purity as the covenant people of God. In connection with the emphasis on the temple, it is expected that the glory of the temple is to be realized at the time of the completion of the reconstruction of the temple. However, the glory of the temple also relates to the inclusion of many nations among the people of God. The reconstruction of the temple is understood as the beginning of the realization of the glory of the temple and this glory will be realized in the future when the nations will be included. Furthermore, Malachi's understanding of the link between the covenant and the temple is significant. He sees the temple as the focal point of the covenant relationship between God and Israel.

It is also interesting to see that even though Ezra indicates that the return from the exile is the fulfilment of the promise of Jeremiah (Jer 25.11f; 29.10), in these writings there is hardly any evidence that the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31 was thought to be fulfilled in the post-exilic Jewish community.

## Chapter 2

### The Concept of the Covenant in 1 and 2 Maccabees, Jubilees and the Psalms of Solomon

---

The authors of the post-exilic biblical writings stress that even the exile was a result of their sins and the sins of their forefathers, God still bound himself to Israel because of his faithfulness to the covenant made with their forefathers. The writers emphasize the keeping of the law as well as the importance of the temple. These characteristics are also clearly in evidence in the books of 1 and 2 Maccabees, Jubilees and the Psalms of Solomon. These writings are contemporaneous with the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>1</sup> Even though there are other writings which

---

<sup>1</sup> 1. 1 and 2 Maccabees.

i). 1 Maccabees records the history of the Hasmonaean dynasty from the time of the deeds of the zealous Mattathias against Hellenization to the death of Simon the Hasmonaean. G. W. E. Nickelsburg's impression is that 1 Maccabees is dated to be between 104 and 63. He maintains that it was very likely composed during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus as propaganda against the opponents of the Hasmonaean - i.e. against the Pharisees and the Essenes (*Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (London, 1981), 88).

ii). 2 Maccabees is an abridgement of an earlier work of one Jason of Cyrene, who wrote about Judas Maccabeus and his brothers (2 Macc 2.19-15.39) and it includes two letters at the beginning (1.1-10a; 1.10b-2.18). This book, a history of the Hasmonaean revolt from the beginning of the Hellenistic reform until the defeat of the Seleucid general, Nicanor, by Judas Maccabeus, provides us with a detailed record of the situation during the Hellenistic reform in Israel and supplements 1 Maccabees.

2. The Book of Jubilees.

The author of Jubilees writes Genesis 1 to Exodus 12 (15) from the point of view of the belief and practices of the author's own day. O. S. Wintermute, following Vanderkam's view, suggests that the date of Jubilees must be set between 161-140 BC ("Jubilees", in *OTP*, vol. 2, 44; Vanderkam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, Harvard Semitic Mono. 14 (Missoula, 1977), 283). Nickelsburg, however, suggests two problems with Vanderkam's dating and advocates the view that this book is written close to 168 BC, during the time of the Hellenistic reform (Nickelsburg, "Review on *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*", *JAOS* 100 (1980), 84; "Jubilees", in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. M. Stone (Phila., 1984), 97-104). He also states that "connections between the Book of Jubilees and the Qumran community were especially close" (*Jewish Literature*, 79; "Jubilees", 103).

3. The Psalms of Solomon.

These psalms were written in Jerusalem in the middle of the first century B.C., probably

are contemporary with the DSS, these particular writings are chosen because of the limitations of time and space and also as a sample of Jewish literature of the period in which the concept of the covenant is found.

The purpose of the discussion is to ascertain, first of all, whether the distinctions between the “pious Jews” and the “transgressors of the law” together with the “lawless” in 1 and 2 Macc., between the “searchers of the law” and “other Jews” in Jub 23.26, and between the “righteous” and the “sinners” in Pss Sol 13.11ff, indicate that the authors distinguish certain Jews from other Jews, e.g. Jews who are in the covenant and those outside it. Does the use of the phrase “searchers of the law” in Jub 23.26 indicate that the author of Jubilees thought that God had established a new covenant with the community of Jubilees? Are outsiders considered apostate so that the blessing of the covenant becomes limited to the group of faithful Israelites? The second aim is to ascertain whether the renewal of the covenant in Jub 1.15ff and the eschatological hope of the fulfilment of the covenant promise in the Psalms of Solomon (17.21, 32, 42; 18.5ff) indicate that the authors understand this hope as the fulfilment of the new covenant of Jer 31.

## **2.1 The First and Second Book of the Maccabees**

Many scholars maintain that while the main concern of the First Book of Maccabees is to advocate the legitimacy of the Hasmonaeen dynasty, the Second Book of the Maccabees is primarily temple propaganda.<sup>2</sup> However, it is not necessary to deal with these two books separately since, so far as the covenant

---

between 70 and 45 (R. B. Wright, “Psalms of Solomon”, in *OTP*, vol. 2, 641).

<sup>2</sup> J. A. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, AB 41 (Garden City, New York, 1976), 4-36; *2 Maccabees*, AB 41A (Garden City, New York, 1983), 3-37; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 114-121; R. Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*, CBQMS 12 (Washington D. C., 1981), 114; H. W. Attridge, “1 Maccabees” and “2 Maccabees” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, 171-183.

concept is concerned, there is no marked difference between them, apart from the silence of the author of the First Book on the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother. This martyrdom is in keeping with the brothers' and their mother's belief in resurrection based on the covenant. Hence, for convenience, the covenant concepts in the First and Second Book of Maccabees will be considered together.

### 2.1.1 The Transgressors of the Law and the Lawless

This section discusses the issue of whether the designations of the “transgressors of the law” and the “lawless”, which were renderings of the Greek *παράνομος* and *ἄνομος*,<sup>3</sup> refer to the Jews who did not keep the covenant.

The author of the First Book of the Maccabees points out that both the “transgressors of the law” (*υἱοὶ παράνομοι*), who persuaded some people to make a covenant with the Gentiles, and those who were pleased with the proposal, “built a gymnasium in Jerusalem according to the customs of the Gentiles”, with the permission of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 1.11-14; cf. 2 Macc 4.7-9).<sup>4</sup> Before examining this Hellenization and its result, it is necessary to clarify

---

<sup>3</sup> While in 1 Macc *παράνομος* occurs 4 times (1.11, 34; 10.61; 11.21) and *ἄνομος* 9 times (2.44; 3.5, 6; 7.5; 9.23, 58, 69; 11.25; 14.14), in 2 Macc only *παράνομος* occurs 4 times. In 2 Macc *παράνομος* is used with an impersonal connotation. Some commentators translate both the terms occurring in 1 Maccabees indiscriminately as “the lawless”, “lawless men” or “renegade Jews”. The writer of 2 Maccabees does not use *παράνομος* with any personal connotation, it is fair to say that he makes the distinction between those who transgressed the law and those who kept it.

In 2 Maccabees the epitomizer points out that Jason, the usurper of the high-priesthood was the one who “broke down the lawful manner of life and introduced new customs forbidden by the law” (*τὰς μὲν νομίμους καταλύων πολιτείας παρανόμους ἑθισμοὺς ἐκαίνιζεν*) (2 Macc 4.11). He also points out those who abandoned the covenant and the law. They are: - priests (2 Macc 4.13-15); Jerusalemites (2 Macc 5.17); Meneleus (2 Macc 5.15; 13.3f); soldiers (2 Macc 12.40); Alcimus (2 Macc 14.3f).

<sup>4</sup> According to 2 Macc 4.7-9, Jason the Oniad, brother of the Jewish high priest Onias III, received the power to establish a gymnasium and an ephebic institution in Jerusalem from Antiochus Epiphanes through bribery. Concerning the permission of Antiochus Epiphanes, J. A. Goldstein comments: “Mass violation by Jews of the law of separation was forbidden by royal as well as Jewish law. In the time of Ezra, King Artaxerxes had made the Torah, as interpreted by Ezra, binding on all Jews residing in the Trans-Euphrates province, which

whether *παράνομοι* and *ἄνομοι* refer to the Jews.

Generally, commentators render *παράνομοι* either as the “transgressors of the law” or the “lawless”.<sup>5</sup> Interestingly, S. Zeitlin translates *παράνομοι* either as the “transgressors against the law” or the “lawless”.<sup>6</sup> It is certain that *παράνομοι* refers to the Jews who transgressed the law. Several points can be added here. First, they arose from Israel (ἐξ Ἰσραήλ) (1 Macc 1.11). Secondly, they were the enemies of Jonathan (1 Macc 10.61; 11.21). Thirdly, they hated their own nation (τινες μισοῦντες τὸ ἔθνος αὐτῶν) (1 Macc 11.21). Whether or not *ἄνδρες παρανόμους* is parallel to *ἔθνος ἁμαρτωλόν*, *παράνομοι* generally refers to the Jews of apostasy, distinguished from the Gentiles (1 Macc 1.11, 34).<sup>7</sup> It is possible to infer that those who were designated as *παράνομοι* were the Jews who were against Jonathan and, from the writer’s perspective, those who hated the Jewish nation. Furthermore, from the writer’s view, “they abandoned the holy covenant” (JB) (ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ διαθήκης ἁγίας) (1 Macc 1.15).

The identification of *ἄνομοι* in 1 Macc is a matter of controversy. Does it refer to the apostate Jews, or the Gentiles, or to both? In 1 Macc 2.44 a group of Hasidim organized into an army “smote sinners in their anger and lawless men in their wrath”. W. Gutbrod suggests that *ἄνομος* in Jewish literature is a common

---

included Judea. Alexander probably confirmed the existing state of affairs; cf. AJ xi 8.5.338. Antiochus III again made the Torah the law of the land for the Jew (J. AJ xii 3.3.142; cf. II 4.11). Hence to carry out their program, the Hellenizers had first to get license from the king” (*I Maccabees*, 200).

<sup>5</sup> It is worth noting that the translation of *παράνομοι* as the “lawless” corresponds with the term *ἄνομοι*.

<sup>6</sup> While he renders it “the lawless” in 1 Macc 1.11, he renders it “the transgressors against the law” in 1 Macc 1.34, 10.61 and 11.26 (*The First Book of Maccabees* (New York, 1950). 71, 75, 180, 205).

<sup>7</sup> Many commentators hold that *ἔθνος ἁμαρτωλόν* designates the Gentiles just as *ἁμαρτωλός* is a Jewish term for the Gentiles (F. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris, 1949), 17; J. Dancy, *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees* (Oxford, 1954), 30; BGD, 44; K. Schunck, *1 Makkabäerbuch* (Gütersloh, 1980), 30). some commentators, however, claim that *ἔθνος ἁμαρτωλόν* refers to the apostate Jews just as in Isa 1.4 (LXX) “sinful nation” signifies Israel’s apostasy (S. Zeitlin, *1 Macc*, 74-75; Goldstein, *1 Macc*, 124). The fact that the troops were composed not only of Jews but also of Gentiles may indicate that the writer here distinguish *ἄνδρες παρανόμους*, the apostate Jews, from *ἔθνος ἁμαρτωλόν*, the Gentiles.

term for the Gentiles.<sup>8</sup> However, it is noteworthy that whereas ἄνομοι were ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους in 1 Macc 11.25, ἄνδρες ἄνομοι were from Israel (ἐξ Ἰσραήλ) in 1 Macc 7.5. In 1 Macc 3.5 the “lawless” were designated as “those who troubled his people”. According to 1 Macc 5.5, 44, the troublemakers were Gentiles. However, it is also possible to see the term “those who troubled his people” as reminiscent of the biblical phrase the “troubler of Israel” (e.g. 1 Kg 18.18; 1 Chron 2.7).<sup>9</sup> In 1 Macc 3.6 and 9.23 ἄνομοι corresponds with οἱ ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας (3.6) and οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀδικίαν (9.23). D. Garlington, observing the biblical use of ἀδικία in the covenant setting (Ezek 17.20; 39.36; cf. Bar 3.8), maintains that “ἀδικία is most readily explained by the underlying notion of a breach of Torah, and especially in its most radical form, apostasy”.<sup>10</sup> If his interpretation is accepted, ἄνομοι here refers to the apostate Jews. Fairweather and Black also regard the lawless in 1 Macc 9.23 as “the apostate Jews who had concealed themselves through terror of Judah”.<sup>11</sup>

With regard to the ambiguity of the identification of ἄνομοι, whether this term indicates Jews or Gentiles, it may be suggested that it is also possible that the writer uses the term ἄνομοι to refer to both the apostate Jews and the Gentiles. In 1 Macc 9.58, 69, the “lawless” were connected with the plot to arrest Jonathan and his company. It is therefore conceivable that the “lawless” in these passages may indicate both Jews and Gentiles as it is most likely that some Gentiles were involved in the plot. If this is the case, it seems that the writer regards the apostate Jews not only as the transgressors of the law but like the Gentiles, the lawless. If this understanding is acceptable, then it may be concluded that when the writer uses ἄνομοι with regard to Jews, ἄνομοι refers

<sup>8</sup> W. Gutbrod, “ἀνομος”, TDNT, 4, 1087.

<sup>9</sup> D. Garlington, “The Obedience of Faith”: A Pauline Phrase in Historical Context (Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of Durham, 1987), 133; cf. Goldstein, 1 Macc, 245.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. Nevertheless, he notes that “Renaud thinks the phrase in the latter part of 9.23 signifies the Gentiles over against renegade Jews” (cf. B. Renaud, “La Loi et Les Lois dans Les Livres des Maccabées”, RB 68 (1961). 48).

<sup>11</sup> Fairweather and Black, 1 Macc, 171.



to the apostate Jews, as *παράνομοι* is used to designate those who abandoned the holy covenant.

In short, whether or not *παράνομοι* and *ανομοι* designate the same people or different groups of people, it is fair to say that for the writer, both *παράνομοι* and *άνομοι* designate the apostate Jews, the Hellenizers who abandoned the holy covenant.

With regard to the way the Hellenizers abandoned the holy covenant in 1 Macc 1.11-15, two things are significant about the comment of the writer. First, the phrase “to make a covenant with the Gentiles around us” (*διαθώμεθα διαθήκην μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν κύκλῳ ἡμῶν*) indicates not only free intercourse with the surrounding Gentiles, but also observance of the practices of the Gentiles (1 Macc 1.13f). This phrase indicates that the Hellenizers forsook God’s commandment concerning Israel’s separation from the Gentiles.<sup>12</sup> It is worth noting that in Exod 23.32, God commands through Moses that Israel shall separate herself from the seven nations native to the promised land (cf. Exod 34.12-16; Deut. 7.1-14). Further, Ezra and Nehemiah apply the phrase the “inhabitants of the land” to the Gentile inhabitants of their own time (Ezra 9.1-2, 10-11; Neh. 9.2; 10.31; 13.1-3).<sup>13</sup> The “Gentiles around us” may refer here to the Greeks in particular.<sup>14</sup>

The phrase “ὅτι ἀφ’ ἧς ἐχωρίσθημεν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, εὗρεν ἡμᾶς κακὰ πολλά” indicates that Israel had suffered because of her separation from the surrounding nations. Even though the author does not specify the reason, it is conceivable that “those who did keep rigidly separate could hardly avoid incurring the hostility of Gentiles”.<sup>15</sup> It may also be true that the lawless men wanted Hellenization because the Jews had suffered economically as a result of

<sup>12</sup> W. Fairweather and J. Black, *The First Book of Maccabees* (Cambridge, 1936), 59.

<sup>13</sup> Goldstein, *1 Macc*, 199.

<sup>14</sup> Fairweather and Black, *1 Macc*, 59.

<sup>15</sup> Goldstein, *1 Macc*, 200.

separation, especially from the Greeks.<sup>16</sup> Goldstein maintains that most of the Hellenizing Jews did not become apostate.<sup>17</sup> However, the writer's comment on their Hellenization seems to indicate opposite: the apostate were not only "many" (πολλούς) but also zealous to be Hellenized (1 Macc 1.11-15, 43).

Secondly, the author points out that the Hellenizers not only built a gymnasium in Jerusalem "according to the customs of the Gentiles" (κατὰ τὰ νόμιμα τῶν ἔθνῶν) but they also "made themselves uncircumcised" (ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς ἀκροβυστίας), abandoned the holy covenant (ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ διαθήκης ἁγίας), "joined with the Gentiles and sold themselves to do evil" (ἐζευγίσθησαν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐπράθησαν τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρόν) (1 Macc 1.14f).

Attention is now drawn to the phrase ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς ἀκροβυστίας. This phrase may refer to "the operation to reverse their circumcision".<sup>18</sup> The reversal of the circumcision by operation may have been prompted by the pressure felt when the Jewish ephebes performed their exercises naked. Their circumcision "would have been the occasion for ridicule if not scorn" since "essential to the Greek idea of beauty is perfection".<sup>19</sup>

However, what is important to note is the writer's comment that "they abandoned the holy covenant". It is understood that for Jews circumcision is the perpetual sign for entering and maintaining the covenant relationship with God (Gen 17). The writer records that when Mattathias and his sons organized an army and fought against the lawless men and the Gentiles, they forcibly circumcised all the uncircumcised boys that they found within the borders of Israel

<sup>16</sup> S. Zeitlin, *1 Macc*, 71.

<sup>17</sup> Goldstein, *1 Macc*, 200.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* Zeitlin remarks that "in Hebrew those who underwent the process were called *meshukim*, in Latin *recutiti* (cf. 1 Cor 7.18)" (cf. C. Gutberlet, *Das Erste Buch der Machabäer* (Münster, 1920), 17; W. R. Farmer, *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period* (Westport, Connecticut, 1956), 57).

<sup>19</sup> Farmer, *Maccabees*, 57.

(1 Macc 2.46).<sup>20</sup> This circumcision by force indicates that the Hellenizers had abandoned the perpetual sign of the covenant relationship with God. It is worth noting that the writer of Jubilees points out that those who did not observe the commandment to circumcise had not only broken the covenant but also made themselves like the Gentiles (Jub 15.33f). For the writer of 1 Maccabees, the Hellenizers' operation to reverse circumcision signifies that "they joined with the Gentiles and sold themselves to do evil" (v. 15). Hence he concludes that they gave up the commandment of circumcision, the perpetual sign of the covenant relationship with God and forsook other commandments (1 Macc 1.41-49).

What does the author envisage as resulting from the Hellenization? Even though he points out that many Hellenizers abandoned the holy covenant, he does not argue for the necessity of a new covenant relationship between God and the Jews. Rather, he sees persecution by Gentiles to be a consequence of the sins of the Hellenizers. He records Antiochus' sacking of the temple in 169 BC as having met with no protest on the part of the Jews (1 Macc 1.20-24). He remarks, "the entire house of Jacob is clothed in shame" (1 Macc 1.28). In relation to the reaction of pious Jews to Antiochus' sack of Jerusalem, Goldstein comments, "they would indeed take adversity as punishment for sin and hence would feel more shame than indignation".<sup>21</sup> Moreover, the author of the First Book implies that even the pious Jews who "chose to die rather than to be defiled by food or to profane the holy covenant" regarded the severe persecution by the Gentiles to be the consequence of the sins of the apostates (1 Macc 1.29-64). He comments on the persecution as the time in which "very great wrath came upon

---

<sup>20</sup> Concerning the policy of enforcing circumcision on conquered people, Farmer remarks: "The logic that lay behind this policy of enforced circumcision is based on the belief that God would not fulfil the promises he had made to his people concerning the Holy Land so long as any male who was not circumcised in it was breaking his covenant, and, according to the Torah. Yahweh had proclaimed that the uncircumcised male who was not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul should be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant" (*Ibid.*, 71.).

<sup>21</sup> Goldstein, *1 Macc*, 211.

Israel" (1 Macc 1.64).

The epitomizer of the Second Book also regards Antiochus' attack on Jerusalem as punishment for the sins of the Hellenizers (2 Macc 4.16-17). He, however, points out, "these punishments were designed not to destroy but to discipline His people" (2 Macc 6.12). Moreover, even in the account of the martyrs' deaths in 2 Macc 6.18-7.42, he records that the martyrs confessed, "we are suffering these things on our own account, because of our own sins against our God" (2 Macc 7.18). Nonetheless, the epitomizer says that God will show mercy and bring wrath to an end (2 Macc 7.37-38; 8.2-4). He stresses that the death of the martyrs and their appeal for vengeance before and after death will contribute to the turning of God's wrath to mercy (2 Macc 7.47; 8.3, 5).<sup>22</sup>

In short, for the writers there was no necessity of a new covenant relationship with God, because while many Hellenizers abandoned the holy covenant, the pious Jews who kept the holy covenant still remained in Israel. Furthermore, they were convinced that God would bring the persecution to an end, since God was merciful to those who kept the covenant (1 Macc 2.20, 50; 2 Macc 7.47; 8.3, 5, 15).

### **2.1.2 The Pious Jews**

The authors say that many Jews chose to die rather than to profane the holy covenant by obeying the command of the king: "Many in Israel were firmly resolved in their hearts not to eat unclean food. They preferred to die rather than be defiled by food or break the holy covenant" (μὴ βεβηλώσωσιν διαθήκην ἁγίαν) (1 Macc 1.62-63; 2 Macc 6.10ff).<sup>23</sup> It is clear that these Jews were different from those who abandoned the holy covenant (1 Macc 1.11-15). However,

---

<sup>22</sup> Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 121

<sup>23</sup> The king's command is as follows: "he directed them (the Jews) to follow customs strange to the land, to forbid burnt offerings and sacrifices and drink offerings in the sanctuary. to

there was a further division among those who kept the holy covenant and were concerned about the Torah and the temple. They were divided into two: the non-militant pious Jews and the militant pious Jews.

i). The author of the First Book points out that among Jews who chose to die rather than to profane the holy covenant many went down to the wilderness to dwell there, "seeking justice and vindication" (ζητοῦντες δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίμα (1 Macc 2.29f). Concerning δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίμα, Gutberlet remarks, "δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίμα ist also ein verstärkter Ausdruck für Gerechtes, rechtliches Leben nach dem Gesetze; nicht von andern suchten sie Recht, sondern sie selbst wollten nach dem Gesetze leben".<sup>24</sup> They probably went to the wilderness because they believed that God forbade violent rebellion and God would protect those who observed the Sabbath day (cf. Isa.56.1-2).<sup>25</sup> They also probably believed the prediction, "Justice and vindication shall dwell in the desert" (Isa 32.16).<sup>26</sup> However, they were slaughtered on the Sabbath day by the wicked oppressors (1 Macc 2.38). Nevertheless, the epitomizer reminds the readers that they should not be depressed by such calamities (2 Macc 6.11ff).

Furthermore, the epitomizer introduces another event related to the non-militant pious Jews who were martyred because of their strict observance of the Torah. This was the case of the martyrs of the seven brothers and their mother (2 Macc 7). The seventh son declared their zeal for the observance of the law: "I will not obey the king's command, but I will obey the command of the law that is given to our fathers through Moses" (2 Macc 7.30). The epitomizer also points out that they were convinced that God would vindicate the martyrs by raising

---

profane sabbaths and feasts, to defile the sanctuary and the priests, to build altars and sacred precincts and shrines for idols, to sacrifice swine and unclean animals, and to leave their sons uncircumcised. They were to make themselves abominable by everything unclean and profane, so that they should forget the law and change all the ordinances" (1 Macc 1.44-49; cf. 2 Macc 6.1-2).

<sup>24</sup> Gutberlet, *1 Makkabäerbuch*, 38.

<sup>25</sup> D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings* (Cambridge, 1967), 94-95.

<sup>26</sup> Goldstein, *1 Macc*, 235.

the dead to life. He records the scene of the deaths of seven brothers and their mother as evidence of the belief in resurrection. The second brother confessed, "You accursed wretch, you dismiss us from this present life, but the King of the universe will raise us up to an everlasting renewal of life, because we have died for His laws" (2 Macc 7.9). What is significant is that even at the point of death, the youngest brother was convinced that they would inherit eternal life under God's covenant (2 Macc 7.36).<sup>27</sup> They seemed to believe that God's covenant assured them of eternal life after death.

ii). The authors point out that there was another group of Jews who were not only willing to live by the covenant of their fathers, but were also willing to fight and to kill because of their zeal for the Torah (1 Macc 2.20, 23-26; 2 Macc 8.21) The author of the First Book introduces Mattathias as the first leader of this group.<sup>28</sup> He remarks that Mattathias fled to the hills, in contrast to the martyrs who went down to the wilderness. Furthermore, he records the words of Mattathias when he heard about their martyrdom: "If we all do as our brethren have done and refuse to fight with the Gentiles for our lives and our ordinances, they will quickly destroy us from the earth" (1 Macc 2.40). So they made this decision that day: "Let us fight against every man who comes to attack us on the Sabbath day; let us not all die as our brethren died in their hiding places" (1 Macc 2.41). After the martyrdom of the non-militant Jews, a group of Hasideans changed their attitude and joined the militant Jews.<sup>29</sup> The

---

<sup>27</sup> Zeitlin remarks that "the Jews held that when God made His covenant with Abraham resurrection of His children was included" (*The Second Book of Maccabees* (New York, 1954), 168).

<sup>28</sup> The epitomizer, however, introduces Judas as the leader of this group.

<sup>29</sup> Even though some Hasidim were united with the militant Jews (1 Macc 2.42; 2 Macc 14.6), other Hasidim remained separate (1 Macc 7.12f). The writer points out that those who joined the militant Jews were "a company of the Hasideans" (συναγωγή Ἀσιδαίων) (1 Macc 7). Concerning the Hasidim in the Maccabean period, see P. Davies' "Hasidim in the Maccabean Period", *JJS* 28 (1977), 127-140; cf. O. Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology*, ET (Oxford, 1968), 17ff; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, vol. 1, ET (London, 1974), 175ff.

writer's description of them as "every one who offered himself willingly for the law" (πᾶς ὁ ἐκουσiazόμενος τῷ νόμῳ) in 1 Macc 2.42 contrasts with those who accepted the proposal of the transgressors of the law (παράνομοι) and went eagerly to the king (1 Macc 1.12).

What is interesting here is Mattathias' declaration against what the king commands: "Even if all the nations that live under the rule of the king obey him, and have chosen to do his commandments, departing each one from the religion of our fathers, yet I and my sons and my brothers will live by the covenant of our fathers. We will not obey the king's words by turning aside from our religion to the right hand or to the left" (1 Macc 2.19-22). The question raised here is what Mattathias and his followers had done in order to live by the covenant of their fathers, and what the phrase "to live by the covenant of our fathers" meant for them.

First of all, Mattathias, burning with zeal for the Torah, killed a Jew who tried to offer an sacrifice on an illicit altar in Modein and he also killed the king's officer who was forcing Jews to sacrifice (1 Macc 2.23-26). After killing them, Mattathias shouted "Let every one who is zealous for the law (ὁ ζηλῶν τῷ νόμῳ) and will maintain the covenant (ἵστῶν διαθήκην) follow me" (1 Macc 2.27). The author of the First Book justifies Mattathias' militant act against the king by his zeal for the Torah and the maintenance of the covenant by comparing it to that of Phinehas (1 Macc 2. 26; cf. Num. 25.6-15). According to Num 25.6-15, Phinehas, the priest, slays the Israelite man, Zimri the son of Salu and the Midianite woman, Cozbi, the daughter of Zur because of their unlawful intercourse. After this incident, God made a covenant of a perpetual priesthood with Phinehas and he made atonement for the sons of Israel (Num 24.12-13). The reference to Phinehas here clearly indicates that Mattathias is introduced as a covenant keeper.

Mattathias and his sons organized an army and fought against the Hellenizers and the Gentiles. The author says, "they struck down sinners in their anger and lawless men in their wrath" (1 Macc 2.44). As mentioned above, they forcibly circumcised all the uncircumcised boys that they found within the borders of Israel (1 Macc 2.46). In his farewell address, Mattathias exhorted his sons to show zeal for the law and to give their lives for the covenant of their fathers (1 Macc 2.50).

They were ready therefore to fight and kill to show zeal for the law and to give their lives in order to maintain the covenant of their fathers. At the same time, they were convinced that they could earn glory and eternal fame by their zeal for the Torah and the covenant (1 Macc 2.51).

Secondly, the issue of Sabbath observance is also a significant point to consider. It has already been seen that when some non-militant Jews were attacked on the Sabbath day and were killed for their strict observance of the Sabbath, Mattathias and his followers, after hearing the news, were at once provoked to anger. Then they decided that they would fight against any man who attacked them on the Sabbath day (1 Macc 2.41; 2 Macc 15.1-5). Nevertheless, the epitomizer says that Judas and his followers scrupulously kept the Sabbath (2 Macc 8.26-27; 12.38). He records "for it was the day before the Sabbath, and that is why they could not persist in their pursuit" (2 Macc 8.26). It is fairly clear that the epitomizer attempts to alleviate the contradiction which seemed to exist between the zeal for the observance of the Sabbath and the transgression of it. In relation to this, Zeitlin's remark is worth noting,

The reason that Judah did not pursue the Syrian army was, according to I Macc 4.16-18, that Gorgias had a strong army nearby in the mountains, and Judah had to be prepared for a sudden attack. In 1 Maccabees there is no mention of the approach of the Sabbath. It seemed that our author, who says Judah did not pursue his enemy because of the approach of the Sabbath, is giving a religious explanation. The reason given in 1 Maccabees is more



probable.<sup>30</sup>

The epitomizer implies that the willingness of the Jews to transgress the law of the Sabbath by defending themselves on that day was not necessarily an abandonment of their zeal for the Sabbath. Rather, "it was their zeal for the law which sustained them even in those battles when they were transgressing the law by fighting on the sabbath".<sup>31</sup>

Thirdly, this group stressed the crucial importance of the temple in Jerusalem. Judas encouraged his followers by urging them, "now let us cry to heaven, to see whether He will favor us and remember His covenant with our fathers and crush this army before us today" (1 Macc 4.10). When the enemy was crushed, Judas and his brothers again urged: "let us go up to cleanse the sanctuary and dedicate it" (1 Macc 4.36). They went up to Mount Zion and saw the sanctuary desolate (1 Macc 4.37-38). The author records their devotion to the temple: "Then they rent their clothes, and mourned with great lamentation, and sprinkled themselves with ashes. They fell face down on the ground, and sounded the signal on the trumpets and cried out to Heaven. Then Judas assigned men to fight against those in the citadel until he had cleansed the sanctuary" (1 Macc 4.39-41). They cleansed the sanctuary and dedicated it with songs and harps and lutes and cymbals (1 Macc 4.54).<sup>32</sup>

In 2 Macc 7, Nicanor went up to Mount Zion and said to the priests, "unless

---

<sup>30</sup> Zeitlin, *2 Maccabees*, 177.

<sup>31</sup> Farmer, *Maccabees*, 77.

<sup>32</sup> Concerning the dedication of the temple the author says, "The entire people prostrated themselves and bowed and gave thanks to Heaven Who had brought them victory. They celebrated the dedication of the altar for eight days, joyfully bringing burnt offerings. They decorated the front of the nave with golden cornices and bosses and restored the gates and the chambers and fitted them with doors. The people were overjoyed as the shame inflicted by the Gentiles was removed. Judas and his brothers and the entire assembly of Israel decreed that the days of the dedication of the altar should be observed at the time of year annually for eight days, beginning with the twenty-fifth of the month of Kislev, with joy and gladness" (1 Macc 4.55-59).

Judas and his army are delivered into my hands this time, then if I return safely I would burn up this house" (1 Macc 7.35). Then the priests went in and stood before the altar and temple and wept and besought God's vengeance (1 Macc 7.36-38). The epitomizer, in the parallel account, points out that Judas and his followers determined to attack bravely because "the city and the sanctuary and the temple were in danger" (2 Macc 15.17). Moreover, he stresses that their greatest and first fear was for the consecrated sanctuary rather than their concern for their wives, children, brethren or relatives (2 Macc 15.18). The second Book of Maccabees finishes with the record of the victory of Judas through the help of God and of the celebration of the day, saying, "Blessed is He who has kept his own place undefiled" (2 Macc 15.34). Furthermore, in 2 Macc 3, the epitomizer points out that the laws were very well observed because of the piety of the high priest Onias and his hatred of wickedness. Therefore, God defended His temple and Jerusalem by His miraculous intervention during Heliodorus' attempt to remove money from the temple.

In relation to the turning of God's wrath to mercy, the epitomizer points out that the people sought God's intervention in the case of the temple, which had been profaned by ungodly men (2 Macc 8.2). They did so because of the covenants which God made with their fathers (2 Macc 8.15). Furthermore, the authors stress that it was not military power but God's intervention on Israel's behalf which enabled them to win the battle (1 Macc 3.16ff; 4.6ff; 7.36-38, 41-44; 2 Macc 8.18).

In conclusion, these writings indicate a clear distinction between the apostate Jews, the Hellenizers, who abandoned the holy covenant, and the pious Jews who kept it. The Hellenizers forsook God's commandments concerning Israel's separation from the Gentiles. Hence they were designated as *παράνομοι*, or *ἄνομοι*, a Jewish term for the Gentiles. The pious Jews showed their zeal for the law and the temple out of their respect for the holy covenant. However, there is

hardly any evidence of a sectarian idea of separation between them.

The authors regard persecutions by the Gentiles as God's punishment for the sins of the Hellenizers. Nevertheless, they are convinced that these punishments are designed not to destroy but to discipline God's people. Moreover, they recognize that God's mercy has been shown to those who desire to live for the covenant. Even though the Hellenizers have abandoned the holy covenant and Israel has suffered much through the Gentiles, the writers do not see any necessity for a renewal of the old or for a new covenant relationship between God and the Jews. The pious Jews' zeal for the law and the temple for the sake of the holy covenant seems to have convinced the writers that the covenant relationship between God and Israel continues even in the midst of the apostasy and the suffering.

## **2.2 The Book of Jubilees**

The author of Jubilees indicates that Israel forsook the festivals of the covenant and had turned from the Torah to follow the ways of the Gentiles (Jub 1.7ff; 23.16). Nevertheless, he points out that even though Israel had transgressed the covenant which God had established with Moses on Mount Sinai, God did not forsake His people. Despite their unfaithfulness, "God has been more righteous than they in all their judgments and deeds" (Jub 1.6). The writer then points out that there is a group which "begins to search the law and the commandments and to return to the way of righteousness" (Jub 23.26). Furthermore, he indicates that Israel will return to God so that God shall dwell among them and He shall be their God and they shall be His people (Jub 1.17; 23.26ff).

This section discusses two issues: the distinction between the apostates and those who searched the law (§2.2.2) and the eschatological renewal of the covenant (§2.2.3). Before examining these two issues, I shall briefly survey the way in which the writer explains the covenant relationship between God and Israel.

### 2.2.1 The Covenant Relationship between God and Israel

The writer of Jubilees begins his book with the story of God's establishment of a covenant with Moses. God established a covenant with Moses by revealing "both what (was) in the beginning and what would occur (in the future), the account of the division of all the days of the Law and the testimony" (Jub 1.4). The purpose of God's command to write the revelation for "the division of all of the days of the law and the testimony" is to demonstrate that God has not abandoned the Israelites on account of their sins. On the other hand, He is said to have been more righteous than the Israelites in all their judgments and deeds (Jub 1.5-6). In this context, the writer introduces his contemporary situation. On the one hand, "many will be destroyed and seized and will fall into the hand of the enemy because they have forsaken my ordinances and my commandments and the feasts of my covenant and my sabbaths and my sacred place ..." (Jub 1.10) and "they will err concerning new moons, sabbaths, festivals, jubilees and ordinances" (Jub 1.14). On the other hand, "afterward they will turn to me from among the nations with all their heart and with all their soul and with all their might" (Jub 1.15).

The writer explains that God has not abandoned them and has been more righteous than they, by using the stories of Noah, Abraham, and Abraham's offspring. In Jubilees, these stories of events from Noah up until the first year of the Exodus from Egypt, are recorded to provide the background for the establishment of the Mosaic covenant. The covenant relationship between God and Israel had previously been established at the time of Noah (Jub 6.4). The establishment of the covenant with Noah included a promise to Noah and to all families on earth that there would not again be a flood to destroy the earth; that there would be no change in the order of the seasons<sup>33</sup> and that the descendants of

---

<sup>33</sup> M. Limbeck, *Die Ordnung des Heils: Untersuchung zum Gesetzesverständnis des Fröjudentums* (Düsseldorf, 1971), 75.

Noah would be multiplied (Jub 6.4-5). God set his bow in the clouds for a sign of his covenant with Noah and his children. God commanded Noah not to eat flesh with blood (Jub 6.7). Furthermore, it was ordained that Noah and his children should observe the feast of Shebuot every year in order to renew the covenant (Jub 6.17).

It is to be noted that the establishment of the covenant with Noah is different in Jubilees from the account found in Genesis (Gen 9). The Jubilees' account varies at two points. a) In the first place, Noah himself also made a covenant before God. God then set the rainbow for a sign of the covenant with Noah and confirmed that there would not be a flood upon the earth again (Jub 6.15; cf. 6.4). This difference in the establishment of the covenant is significant because the author seems to maintain that the covenant relationship between God and Noah was initiated not only by God but also by Noah. b) The second point is that Noah and his children observed the feast of the Shebuot in order to renew the covenant year by year until the day of Noah's death.<sup>34</sup>

Even though the first difference may indicate that the covenant relationship was initiated not only by God but also by Noah, Noah's obligation to celebrate the feast of Shebuot together with his obedience to the prohibition on eating blood was not to be understood in relation to the initiating of the covenant but with regard to the maintaining of the covenant relationship with God as his covenant people.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Concerning the meaning of the word *šb'wt*, S. Zeitlin asserts that "I venture to say that even the name shabuot in the Book of Jubilees has not the connotation of 'week', but means 'oath' " (S. Zeitlin, *The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and its Significance* (Phila., 1939), 6; "Jubilees and the Pentateuch", *JQR* 48 (1957-58), 218-220). O. S. Wintermute, however, maintains a degree of openness to the meaning of the word *šb'wt*. He chooses the spelling *shebuot* in order to maintain the double meaning of weeks and oaths. He comments that "the significance of this double meaning of weeks and oaths is probably not lost on the author of Jub ... The feast may have marked the passing of 'week' in the agricultural year and also celebrated the 'oath' made to Noah and Abraham" ("Jubilees", in *OTP*, vol. 2, 67).

<sup>35</sup> A. Jaubert, *La nation d'alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne* (Paris, 1963), 108.

God made a covenant with Abraham in the same month in which God had made a covenant with Noah (Jub 14.20). As a background to God's establishing a covenant with Abraham, the writer points out that whereas from the day of the death of Noah, his sons ate blood and corrupted the feast of Shebuot until the day of Abraham, "Abraham alone kept it" (Jub 6.19). Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that although the author makes no explicit mention of Abraham's observance of shebuot as a reason for God's establishing a covenant with him, the phrase "Abraham alone kept it" shows that the author intends to make a close connection between the establishment of the covenant with Abraham and his keeping of this feast.

The covenant with Abraham was a promise of the blessing of land and offspring (Jub 14.18-28; 15.1-4). The author says that God promised offspring to Abraham in order to establish his covenant with his descendants (Jub 15.4; 15.9-10).<sup>36</sup> Isaac was understood to be a sign of the fulfilment of the promise of the covenant (Jub 17.3). Isaac was born on the day of the feast of the covenant (Jub 16.13). Jaubert, pointing this out, calls Isaac the "son of promise".<sup>37</sup> When Abraham held a great feast at his son's weaning, "he rejoiced because the Lord had given him seed upon the earth so that they might inherit the land" (Jub 17.3; cf. Jub 15.19-21). The author describes Jacob once again as a prominent figure (Jub 27.22-24; 32.2-9, 18-19, 21-24).<sup>38</sup> It is interesting to see that Levi also became an important figure: Jacob put garments of priesthood upon him (Jub 32.3); he gave a tithe to Levi (Jub 32.2); all the books of the fathers were given

---

<sup>36</sup> "I will make my covenant between me and you and I will make you increase very much" (Jub 15.4); "I shall establish my covenant between me and you and your seed after you in their generations for an eternal ordinance so that I might be God for you and your seed after you. And I shall give to you and your seed after you the land where you sojourn, the land of Canaan, which you will possess forever. And I shall be God for them" (Jub 15.9-10).

<sup>37</sup> J. Jaubert, *Alliance*, 103.

<sup>38</sup> M. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* (Geneva and Paris, 1960), 72; E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Phila., 1977), 363; Wintermute, "Jubilees", *OTP* 2, 36. Jacob was known even to Abraham and to Rebecca (Jub 19.13-15; 22.11-24; 22.27-30).

to him (Jub 45.16).<sup>39</sup>

Thus, the author clearly indicates continuity in the covenants of Noah, Abraham and Moses.<sup>40</sup> There are three emphases which are common to all three covenants: the feast of Shebuot,<sup>41</sup> the law of circumcision<sup>42</sup> and the prohibition concerning the eating of blood.

### **2.2.2 The Distinction between the Apostates and the Searchers of the Law**

#### *i). The Apostates*

The author regards his own day as the day of an evil generation. He refers to it as a future generation from the perspective of the time of Moses. The author indicates that the oppression by the Gentiles is a sign of judgment for forsaking the covenant which God had established with Moses (Jub 1.12ff; 23.16ff). The violations of the feasts, the Sabbath and the laws of circumcision are suggested as the main reasons for the oppression.

Concerning the violations of the feasts and the Sabbath, the writer says,

There will be those who will examine the moon diligently because it will corrupt the (appointed) times and it will advance from year to year ten days.

---

<sup>39</sup> Jaubert, *Alliance*, 92, 99.

<sup>40</sup> Concerning the continuity between the Mosaic covenant and both the Noachic and the Abrahamic covenants, it is to be noted that the author adds halakhic lines to connect the covenants of Noah and Abraham with that of Moses (Jub 6.17-38; 15.25-34; cf. 23.14-32), when he rewrites his version of the covenants of Noah and Abraham.

<sup>41</sup> It is to be noted that God made his covenant not only with Noah but also with Abraham: "On that day we made a covenant with Abram just as we had made a covenant in that month with Noah" (Jub 14.20). In Jub 6.17-36, God commands Moses that the children of Israel should observe the feast of Shebuot which God has made with Noah to be observed in all their generations (Jub 7.20).

<sup>42</sup> In Jub 15.23-34, God says to Moses that Israel should keep the law of circumcision, "the sign of the covenant for their generations for an eternal ordinance" (Jub 15.28). God also predicts that "the sons of Israel will deny this ordinance and they will not circumcise their sons according to all of this law" (Jub 15.33).

Therefore, the years will come to them as they corrupt and make a day of testimony a reproach and a profane day, a festival, and they will mix up everything, a holy day (as) profane and a profane (one) for a holy day, because they will set awry the months and sabbaths and feasts and jubilees (Jub 6.36-37).

For the writer the feasts should be celebrated on the same day of the week year after year, because the days of the feasts were so appointed (by God).<sup>43</sup> Jaubert points out that the third month and the 15th day are frequently mentioned as the days of the feasts (cf. Jub 6.11; 14.1, 10, 18; 15.1; 16.13; 22.1-4; 44.1-8).<sup>44</sup> She also demonstrates that Sunday and Wednesday are frequently designated as the days of the feasts.<sup>45</sup> The exact recurrence of the feasts on the same days, year after year, was possible only if the special calendar of 364 days was adopted just as the writer indicates. According to this calendar each year begins on "Wednesday and lasted precisely fifty-two weeks so that the following year would also begin on Wednesday and all of the dates in that year would fall on the same day of the weeks as they had in any previous year".<sup>46</sup>

However, there is no doubt that the writer is aware that there are many who do not observe the feasts and the Sabbath at the appointed times. He points out that they use the lunar calendar (Jub 6.36-37). The use of the lunar calendar changes the length of months into between twenty-nine and thirty days. This results in a year of 354 days, ten days less than the recommended year of 364 days. Therefore, the writer criticizes the use of the lunar calendar as it corrupted the (appointed) times and advanced them from year to year by ten days (Jub 6.36). Furthermore, the writer regards the celebration of the feasts and Sabbath on the wrong day as a sign of forsaking the covenant. For the writer they make a profane day a holy day, and a holy day profane. In connection with the use

---

<sup>43</sup> Jaubert, *Alliance*, 104.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.

<sup>45</sup> Jaubert, "Le calendrier de Jubilés de la secte Qumrân", *VT* 3 (1953) 250-264; cf. Wintermute, "Jubilees", 39.

<sup>46</sup> Wintermute, "Jubilees", 39.



of the lunar calendar Sanders' remark is noteworthy: "the warning not to 'walk according to the feasts of the Gentiles' (6.35) might refer either to participating in actual Gentile feasts (which would involve idolatry) or observing their own feasts according to the Gentile calendar, which would be just as clear a case of forsaking the peculiar covenant between God and Israel".<sup>47</sup>

With regard to the violation of the Sabbath, it is to be noted that the Jews are to keep the Sabbath because God separated them for himself, a people set apart from all the nations (Jub 2.19, 31f). The Sabbath is spoken of as a great sign given to Israel alone.

The Creator of all blessed it (sabbath), but he did not sanctify any people or nation to keep the Sabbath thereon with the sole exception of Israel. He granted to them alone that they might eat and drink and keep the Sabbath thereon upon earth. And the Creator of all, who created this day for a blessing and sanctification and glory, blessed it more than all days (Jub 2.31-32).

The Sabbath must be kept as a holy day because "the Lord made the seventh day holy for all his works" (Jub 2.25) and He "creates this day for a blessing and sanctification and glory" (Jub 2.32). In consequence God has punished the transgressors of the Sabbath with great plague, captivity and turmoil in Israel through the merciless sinners of the Gentiles (Jub 23.22-23).

In relation to the violation of the laws of circumcision, it is worth noting that the author stresses circumcision as the focal point for maintaining the covenant relationship with God. He emphasizes three things.

First, circumcision was commanded to be kept by the Israelites for all the eternal generations (Jub 15.11ff; 15.25ff; 15.33f). God commanded Abraham to keep the covenant and to circumcise himself, his seed and all his household (Jub 15.7; cf. Gen 17). The author points out that circumcision was not merely the sign

---

<sup>47</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Phila., 1977), 366; cf. Leaney maintains that the Jews' use of the lunar calendar came from the Gentiles (A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (London, 1966), 87, 90).

of being an Israelite, but had already become the perpetual sign of the covenant relationship between God and Israel: "You shall circumcise your foreskins and it will be a sign of the eternal ordinance between me and you" (Jub 15.11); "Whatever male is not circumcised, the flesh of whose foreskin is not circumcised on the eighth day, that soul shall be uprooted from his family because he has broken my covenant" (Jub 15.14).

The author, however, does not regard circumcision as the sole condition of entry into the covenant. He says that while God chose Israel that they might be a people for himself, God did not elect Ishmael and Esau (Jub 15.30). It is clear that Ishmael and Esau were circumcised, but were not regarded as covenant people of God because God had not elected them. The author regards only "the physical descendants of Jacob" as the covenant people of God (Jub 1.27f; 16.17f; 19.18ff; 22.10ff; 22.25ff).<sup>48</sup>

Secondly, the author seems to regard circumcision as a sign of belonging to the covenant: "Any one who is born, whose own flesh is not circumcised on the eighth day, is not from the sons of the covenant which the Lord made for Abraham, since (he is) from the children of destruction" (Jub 15. 26a; cf. 16.25). Furthermore, he says that one who was not circumcised had "no sign upon him so that he might belong to the Lord because (he is destined) to be destroyed and annihilated from the earth and uprooted from the earth because he had broken the covenant of the Lord our God" (Jub 15.26b). In this sense, he regards circumcision as a sign of affirmation of the covenant people, rather than as being necessary for entry into the covenant. According to Jub 16.26, one who was born a son of Israel was already in the covenant before his circumcision.

Thirdly, those who did not observe the commandment to circumcise them-

---

<sup>48</sup> The question of the Gentiles' entry into the covenant may not have occurred to the author because for him the covenant relationship between God and Israel was limited to the descendants of Jacob.

selves had not only broken the covenant but had also made themselves like the Gentiles (Jub 15.33f). The author's emphasis on the observance of the laws of circumcision is related to his concern that the Israelites should remain distinguished from the Gentiles (Jub 15.31f). The author warns the members of the covenant people not to behave like the Gentiles (Jub 1.9; 6.35; 11.4, 16; 12.2; 20.3-5, 7; 22.22; 25.7; 36.5).

In short, the apostate Jews turned from the commandments and the covenant in order to walk after the Gentiles (Jub 1.9; 23.16ff). Moreover, they defiled "the holy of holies" (Jub 23.21).

*ii). The Searchers of the law*

The author shows that the covenant relationship between God and Israel continues even in his own day. The oppression by the Gentiles is not a sign that the covenant relationship between God and their fathers is broken, but it is a sign of judgment for forsaking the covenant, as God had predicted through the mouth of Moses (Jub 1.12ff; 23.22ff). Thus what the author stresses is the need for the people to repent of both their own and their fathers' sins and to return to God with all their heart and soul, that is, to keep all the commandments (Jub 1.22f). He suggests that if Israel returns to the Torah and searches the law and the commandments, God will be their God and they will be his people (Jub 1.15ff; 23.26ff).

The author points out that there is a group which "begins to search the law and the commandments and to return to the way of righteousness" (Jub 23.26, cf. 16).<sup>49</sup> The question raised here is whether the reference to these searchers of the law indicates that the writer thought that God had established a new covenant with this group, the community of Jubilees. Sanders says, "one of the main

---

<sup>49</sup> J. C. Vanderkam, *Jubilees*, 281.

concerns of the author of Jubilees is to establish the basic distinction between the faithful, covenant-keeping Israelites on the one hand and the apostates and Gentiles on the other".<sup>50</sup> He, however, does not agree with Testuz's opinion that "the author of Jubilees thought that God had established a new covenant with some among Israel and that those outside this new covenant are apostate" and that "the blessings of the covenant are actually to a small group of faithful Israelites, to those who compose the community of Jubilees".<sup>51</sup>

Testuz argues that the phrase the "elect of Israel" (Jub 1.29) means the "elect from among Israel".<sup>52</sup> On this basis he advocates the view that the community of Jubilees had withdrawn from the rest of Israel and regarded its members as the only true Israelites.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, Testuz claims that God had made a new covenant with these faithful Israelites.<sup>54</sup>

Sanders, however, suggests several points against Testuz's view. First, there is no evidence that the author restricted the concept of Israel to those who were members of a sect. He restricted it to those descendants of Jacob who did not commit one of the unforgivable transgressions; but these were limited in number, not sectarian in character (Sabbath, circumcision, love of the neighbour, etc.). Second, there is no mention in Jubilees of a new covenant. Third, there is repeated stress on physical descent from Jacob as the primary qualification for sharing in the covenant promises and the covenant distinction of Israel from the Gentiles (not from other Jews who are given an opprobrious title such as "seekers of smooth things").<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 362.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 372; cf. Testuz, *Religieuses*, 74, 174.

<sup>52</sup> Testuz, *Religieuses*, 33; cf. Sanders, *PPJ*, 362.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 33, 179; cf. Sanders, *PPJ*, 383.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 183; cf. Sanders, *PPJ*, 384.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, . 373. In connection with his argument against Testuz, he refers to Jaubert and Davenport who hold a similar view to himself (Jaubert, *Alliance*, 94; Davenport, *Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (Leiden, 1971), 79).

In relation to the group of faithful Israelites, it is necessary to note several further points. First, this group seems to be a group of people who repent of the sins of their fathers and of their own sins and return to God (Jub 23.26). The author probably regards this group not as a small number of people but as the Jews who returned from the exile and search the law and commandments.

However, it is not impossible to conceive that the division between children and their parents and elders was not a division between the previous generation and the writer's contemporary generation, but rather a division within the same generation. If the term "children" in Jub 23.16 refers to Israel as a whole in contrast with the previous generation of the apostasy, it is difficult to explain the co-existence of the old men with the youths (Jub 23.16, 18-21).

Behold, the land will be corrupted on account of all their deeds, and there will be no seed of the vine, and there will be no oil because their works are entirely faithless. And all of them will be destroyed together: beasts, cattle, birds, and all of the fish of the sea on account of the sons of man. Some of these will strive with others, youths with old men and old men with youths, the poor with the rich ... because they have forgotten the commandments and covenant and festivals and months and sabbaths and jubilees and all of judgment (Jub 23.18-19).

The co-existence of the old men with the youths may indicate that the apostates are people of the writer's own day. If this is so, then it is likely that the distinction between the apostates and the searchers of the law is not only between the previous generation and the writer's own generation but also within the writer's own generation, whether or not the searchers of the law are a small group (Jub 23.18-21).

It would be hard to deny that in the book of Jubilees there is little evidence of a withdrawal from the Jewish community and from the temple cult in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, it is clear that this group's interpretation of the law is different from that of other Jews, at least with regards to their view of the calendar. As

previously discussed, in Jub 6.34ff the author indicates that there are many who do not observe the holy days according to the law. He implies that others count the dates of the holy days according to the lunar calendar, which corrupts the appointed times of the holy days (Jub 6.36). It may be concluded that the faithful Israelites in Jubilees are a group of people who keep the holy days according to the solar calendar, not like other Jews who keep them according to the lunar calendar.

It is to be noted that although there is a division among the Israelites, the enemies of this group are not the apostates from Israel but the Gentiles. They pray "to be saved from the hand of the sinners, the Gentiles" (Jub 23.24; cf. Jub 1.19). The Israelites will eventually drive out the enemies and will be called "sons of the living God" and will enjoy God's blessings. The author's main concern is not a division within Israel but the separation between Israel and the Gentiles. The author's interest is still for the entire nation of Israel to observe the law and to keep the temple cult in Jerusalem free from contamination through contact with the Gentiles.<sup>56</sup>

To sum up, the author stresses that whatever the present situation might be, God has remained faithful to his covenant so that He will draw the Israelites from among the nations to the promised land. He will be their God and they will be his people. He will dwell in the midst of his people and His people will enjoy the blessings of God. Furthermore, they will drive out their enemies and will see judgments and curses upon their enemies. It may also be concluded that even though the concept of a new covenant applying to a small number of faithful Israelites has not yet appeared in the Book of Jubilees, a division between the covenant-keeping Israelites and other Israelites has already emerged with regard to the dates of the holy days.

---

<sup>56</sup> Vanderkam, *Jubilees*, 281.

### 2.2.3 The Eschatological Renewal of the Covenant

The author expects an eschatological renewal of the covenant relationship between God and Israel. When Israel confesses her sins and returns to God, she will return to the promised land from among the nations and restore the covenantal relationship with God forever (Jub 1.15ff).

In connection with the renewal of the covenant, the author points out that God himself will create for them a holy spirit and purify them so that they will keep all of his commandments (Jub 1.23f). God will draw his people from among the nations back to the land. He will build the temple and will never forsake them (Jub 1.15-18). The author, however, probably recognizes that these conditions do not guarantee that the Israelites will keep the covenant relationship with God, for Israel herself is not able to keep all the commandments. He says in fact that they have become corrupted and have defiled the Holy of Holies (Jub 23.21). He seems to recognize that it is impossible for the Israelites to keep the covenant relationship unless their hearts have been transformed by God. Hence he prays that God "will create for them an upright spirit", lest the spirit of Belial "ensnare them from every path of righteousness" (Jub 1.20). He then predicts,

I [God] shall cut off the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their descendants. And I shall create for them a holy spirit, and I shall purify them so that they will not turn away from following me from that day and forever. And their souls will cleave to me and to all my commandments. And they will do my commandments (Jub 1.23f).

Even though there is no mention of the law being written on the heart as in Jer 31.31-34, it is quite conceivable that the author understands this promise in relation to the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff.<sup>57</sup> Three points can be suggested to support this.

---

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Behm, "δὲ αὐθιγῆ", TDNT I, 128.

First, the author expects a new era in which Israel will cleave to God and will keep all his commandments, because God himself will create a holy spirit for them, which will give them both the desire and the ability to keep the law.<sup>58</sup> A similar idea of the observance of the law can be found in Jer 32.39-40 and Ezek 36.25-28. Jer 32.39-40 shows that God will give the Israelites' hearts the fear of God so that they will never turn away (cf. Jub 24.7). Furthermore, the prophet Ezekiel proclaims that God will purify the Israelites and will give them a new spirit so that they will walk in his statutes (Ezek 36.25-28). It is worth noting that these two passages can be understood in connection with the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff.<sup>59</sup>

Secondly, the author points out that the Lord says to the Angel of the Presence ... "everyone will know that I am the God of Israel and the father of all children of Jacob" (Jub 1.28). This theme is also one of the distinctive characteristics of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff. Jer 31.34 says, "they shall not teach again, ... for they should all know me". In context this must be the result of the internalization of the law within the heart. The author of Jubilees, however, relates the knowledge of God to his personal appearance in the sight of all (Jub 1.28).

Thirdly, he announces that God will establish the sanctuary on Mt Zion, and from there God himself will rule as King forever. With regard to this it is important to note that at the time of the author there was already a sanctuary in Jerusalem. The author criticizes those who defile the Holy of Holies (Jub 23.21). However, what he emphasizes is not the purification of the sanctuary but its establishment.<sup>60</sup> He points out that the sanctuary on Mt Zion will be established following a great battle with the Gentiles which will end with victory

---

<sup>58</sup> Davenport, *Eschatology*, 27.

<sup>59</sup> See pp. 20ff.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.



for faithful Israel. This indicates that the author expects the establishment of a new sanctuary in the midst of all the elect of Israel in the new era (Jub 1.29). This understanding is significant because even though there is no mention of a sanctuary in Jer 31.31ff, in relation to a new covenant Ezekiel proclaims that God will establish his sanctuary in the midst of his people forever (Ezek 37.26ff).

In conclusion, the author understands the new age in terms of the transformation of the Israelites' hearts, the establishment of the new sanctuary and of kingly rule forever. It is likely that he understands the eschatological renewal of the covenant as the fulfilment of the prophecy of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff and of Ezek 36.26ff and 37.26ff.

### **2.3 The Psalms of Solomon**

The term "covenant" occurs three times in the Psalms of Solomon (Pss Sol 9.10; 10.4; 17.15). The author says that God made a covenant with their ancestors concerning them (Pss Sol 9.10), which here refers to the Abrahamic covenant (Pss Sol 9.9; cf. 18.3). He speaks of the Mosaic covenant as "the Law of the eternal covenant" (Pss Sol 10.4). Further, he describes the Israelites who lived among the Gentiles as "the children of the covenant" (Pss Sol 17.15). However, it is not difficult to see that, besides these, there are some other passages in which the author alludes to the covenant relationship between God and Israel (Pss Sol 7.8f; 11.7; 14.5; 17.4; 18.3f). In Pss Sol 14.5, the author points out that "Israel is the portion and inheritance of God". He makes reference to the Davidic covenant in 17.4: "Lord, you chose David to be king over Israel and swore to him about his descendants forever, that his kingdom should not fail before you". It is clear that for the author the covenant relationship between God and Israel continues in his own day.

In 2.3 I shall discuss two areas: the author's distinction between the righ-

teous and sinners (§2.3.1) and his description of the eschatological hope of the fulfilment of the covenant promises (§2.3.2). The purpose is to examine whether the distinction indicates a division among the Jews, and whether the author understands the eschatological hope in terms of the fulfilment of the promise of Jer 31.

### 2.3.1 The Distinction between the Righteous and Sinners

The author makes a distinction between those who belong to the house of Israel and those who are sinners. The author appeals to God when he reviews the covenant relationship with God: "May the mercy of the Lord be upon the house of Israel forever" (Pss Sol 9.10; 10.3; 11.9). In other places, he points out, "the Lord's mercy is upon the devout and his mercy is upon those who fear him" (Pss Sol 13.12 cf. 13). This notion sharply contrasts with his saying, "sinners shall be taken away to destruction" (Pss Sol 13.11).

It is clear in context that those who belong to the house of Israel are the "devout" and "those who fear the Lord" (Pss Sol 13.12). The "devout" are paralleled with the "righteous" in Pss Sol 13.11.<sup>61</sup> The author also calls this group

---

<sup>61</sup> The devout or the righteous are also called the "poor" (Pss Sol 5.2; 15.1), "those who love God" (Pss Sol 6.6; 10.3; 14.1). What is interesting to us is that all these terms refer to the same group: the people who are "the righteous according to the law" (Pss Sol 14.2), who are "scrupulous to avoid unintentional sins" (Pss Sol 3.7) and who "atone for sins of ignorance by repentance" (3.8; cf. 9.7). Concerning the identification of this group, many scholars maintain that they must be the Pharisees (See R. Wright's "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes" in *1972 Proceedings*, SCS 2, 150, N. 10). G. B. Gray says that "we need not hesitate to see in the 'righteous' of the Psalms the Pharisees, and in the 'sinners' the Sadducees (cf. 4.2ff); and in the Psalms themselves the work of one or more of the Pharisees" ("The Psalms of Solomon", in *APOT* 2, 630).

Dupont-Sommer, however, maintains that this group must be the Essenes by attributing the authorship to the Essenes (*The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Oxford, 1961), 296, 337). Wright points out some elements in the Psalms of Solomon which are uncharacteristic of the Pharisees (*1972 Proceedings*, 139-141; cf. Charlesworth's review on J. Schüpphaus' book *Die Psalmen Salomos* in *JAAR* 50 (1982), 292f). Moreover, he proposes another possibility that "the Psalms of Solomon originated in an Essene-like community in Jerusalem that stood in opposition to the Sadducees and in contrast to the Pharisees" ("Psalms of Solomon", in *OPT* 2, 642; cf. *1972 Proceedings*, 141-147).

"Israel" (Pss Sol 5.18; 8.26, 34; 9.11; 12.6; 14.5; 17.42; 18.1ff). The prevailing situation of the group is that they are under persecution both by Gentiles and by fellow Jews. The temple has been defiled by Gentile conquerors (Pss Sol 2.20) and fellow Jews (Pss Sol 8.9-13). The righteous have fled from Jerusalem into the wilderness to save their lives from the sinners (Pss Sol 17.15-18).

On the other hand, the present situation is a period of God's discipline upon his covenant people because of their sins (Pss Sol 14.1; 16.11; 17.5). The author, however, is convinced that God disciplines them just as a father does his beloved son (Pss Sol 13.7ff; 18.4). He believes that God is faithful to those who endure his discipline (Pss Sol 14.1). Moreover, he declares repeatedly that God is righteous in his judgment (Pss Sol 2.15-18; 8.7, 32; 9.2, 5; 10.5; 17.10). Thus he looks forward to the fulfilment of the Lord's promises, particularly the coming of the promised Messianic king, who is the son of David, coming to purge Jerusalem from the Gentiles and to destroy the unlawful nations, the Messiah, who will bring the children of Israel to their homeland and will rule over them (Pss Sol 17.21ff; 18.5ff).

Frequently the author indicates that the sinners are Gentiles (Pss Sol 1.8; 2.1f; 17.23) and condemns them to destruction (Pss Sol 2.25ff, 34; 8.23; 17.3, 24). Nevertheless, in some places fellow Jews are also designated as sinners (Pss

---

Charlesworth makes an editorial remark that "it is unwise to label these Psalms as either Pharisaic or Essene". He continues: "We know far too little about Pharisaic thought prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, in 70; our only sources on them are later than this paradigmatic date and are considerably subjective (the NT, Josephus, and the rabbinic writings). Similarly, although we are now convinced that some Essenes lived in Jerusalem, we are unsure of the ideas and customs that distinguish them from other contemporaneous Jews. The recognition that some ideas in these psalms are similar to those among Pharisees or among the Essenes ignores the fact that these two sects are very similar; moreover, scholars are now recognizing that the Essene community at Qumran may have received an influx of Pharisees fleeing Jerusalem in the early decades of the first century BC. Finally, according to both Philo and Josephus, most Jews were not members of a sect; there are far more Jewish groups than the classic four (Sadducee, Pharisee, Essenes, Zealot-and the latter sect postdates the composition of these psalms); hence it is unwise to force these psalms into any model of the Pharisees or Essenes" ("Psalms of Solomon" in OTP 2, 642).

Sol 4.2, 8; 15.5, 10, 11).<sup>62</sup> The author's criticism of Jewish sinners is that they arrogantly commit all kind of sins and do not remember God (Pss Sol 4.2ff). They commit sexual transgressions and defile the sanctity of the temple: "They (the foreigners) set up the sons of Jerusalem for derision because of her prostitutes" (Pss Sol 2.11) and "the daughters of Jerusalem defile themselves with improper intercourse" (Pss Sol 2.13). He confesses, "my heart and my belly are troubled over these things" (Pss Sol 2.14). In Pss Sol 8.5ff, he again laments the sexual transgressions and the defilement of the temple by sinners.<sup>63</sup> Moreover, he points out that their transgressions are worse than those of the Gentiles (Pss Sol 2.9; 8.13; cf. 1.8).

The distinction between the righteous and Jewish sinners raises the question of what conditions there are for possible exclusion from the covenant people of God.

The author indicates that the sinners are in fact excluded from Israel, the covenant people of God. As mentioned above, he accuses sinners of being arrogant before God, of not remembering God and of insolently defiling the temple.<sup>64</sup> Further, he says that they opened the gates of Jerusalem and welcomed the enemy into Jerusalem so that the Gentiles arrogantly trampled the temple with their sandals (Pss Sol 2.2; 8.15ff). Moreover, they commit sins worse than the

---

<sup>62</sup> Most scholars maintain that the sinners refer to the Hasmonaean Sadducees (G. B. Gray, 630; R. Wright, 1972 *Proceedings*, 136; OTP 2. 642; P. Winter, "Psalms of Solomon", *IDB* III. 959). However, Sanders, although admitting that many of the supporters of the Hasmonaean High priests are Sadducees, limits the identification of them to the Hasmonaean High priests and their supporters (*PPJ*, 403-404).

<sup>63</sup> He laments, "My stomach is crushed at what I heard; my knees are weak, my heart is afraid, my bones shook like reeds" (v. 5); "In secret places underground is their lawbreaking, provoking (him), son involved with mother and father with daughter; everyone committed adultery with his neighbor's wife" (vv. 9-10); "They stole from the sanctuary of God as if there were no redeeming heir. They walked on the place of sacrifice of the Lord, (coming) from all kind of uncleanness; and (coming) with menstrual blood (on them), they defiled the sacrifices as if they were common meat. There is no sin they left undone in which they did not surpass the Gentiles" (vs 11-13).

<sup>64</sup> He specifies that "they stole from the sanctuary of God" (Pss Sol 8.11) and "with menstrual blood (on them) they defiled the sacrifices as if they were common meat" (Pss Sol 8.12).

Gentiles (Pss Sol 2.9; 8.13). Hence the author says that God has punished these sinners (Pss Sol 8.14ff). Furthermore, he condemns these sinners severely (Pss Sol 4.6, 8.14ff, 24) and predicts their eternal destruction (Pss Sol 3.11; 13.11; 14.9; 15.8ff; Cf. 2.31, 34). Sanders remarks, "the sins of the sinners were considered so heinous as to cause those who committed them to forfeit their place in the covenant".<sup>65</sup>

What is important to note here is that the author is convinced that the covenant promises extend to all Israel except for those whose sins are so wilful that they consequently exclude themselves from the covenant people. The author says that the righteous commit unintentional sins (Pss Sol 3.7; 9.7; 13.7, 9; 16.11ff). Moreover, he confesses, "I (was) near the gates of Hades with the sinner" (Pss Sol 16.2). This may indicate that the author himself had departed far from God at one time so that he apparently was not able to claim that he belonged to the righteous. He, however, points out that the righteous man "atones for sins of ignorance" by repentance, fasting and humbling his soul (Pss Sol 3.8; 9.7). He says that when the righteous repent, God does not accuse them concerning their sin (Pss Sol 9.7). On the other hand, the author frequently says that God disciplines them, but he does not destroy them (Pss Sol 13.1-8; 14.1; 16.11; 17.5). God's chastisements lead the righteous to repent and to return to God (Pss Sol 16.11; cf. 10.3). Moreover, the author remarks that God's chastisements cleanse the righteous from sin (Pss Sol 10.1; 13.10).

What is of particular interest is the fact that the righteous can be atoned for through repentance and God's chastisement. In connection with this idea, Sanders comments, "the failure to mention the sacrificial system as atoning is probably due to the nature of the Psalms and their immediate concerns".<sup>66</sup> Nevertheless, it is undeniable that God's chastisement and man's repentance are

---

<sup>65</sup> *PPJ*, 404.

<sup>66</sup> *PPJ*, 398.

essential elements of atonement in the Psalms of Solomon. The author is convinced that unintentional transgressions do not automatically exclude a Jew from the covenant people.

### **2.3.2 Eschatological Hope of the Fulfilment of the Covenant Promises**

The author lives in the time of the Gentiles' invasion and their lawless acts in the temple. He also lives in the time of internal conflict caused by corruption in the political and religious leadership, particularly their defilement of the temple. Despite this distressing circumstance, the author is convinced that God had made a covenant with their ancestors concerning them (Pss Sol 9.10) and had sworn to David that his kingdom should not fail before him (Pss Sol 17.4). So he announces, "God will raise up for them their king, the son of David to rule over his servant Israel" (Pss Sol 17.21). Elsewhere, he says "the Lord will remember his servants in mercy, for the testimony of it (is) in the Law of the eternal covenant" (Pss Sol 10.4).

First of all, the eschatological hope of the fulfilment of the covenant promises is based on the coming messianic king, the son of David (Pss Sol 17.21, 32, 42; 18.5ff; cf. 7.10; 11; 15.12). The author confesses that God is their king forever (Pss Sol 2.30, 32; 5.19; 17.1, 46). He, however, declares that God will raise up a king to rule his servant Israel (Pss Sol 17.21). The coming Messiah will be a kingly figure, the son of David (Pss Sol 17.21). The Messiah himself will be "a righteous king" (Pss Sol 17.32), "free from sin" (Pss Sol 17.36), "powerful in the holy spirit" (Pss Sol 17.37), "wise in the counsel of understanding with strength and righteousness" (Pss Sol 17.37).

When the Messiah will come, he will destroy the unrighteous rulers, he will purge Jerusalem from Gentiles and drive them out from Judea (Pss Sol 17.22-23). He will accomplish these things, not with military power, but "with the word of

his mouth forever" (Pss Sol 17.35; cf. 17.24f). On the other hand, he will gather a holy people from the nations as the Lord their God has made them holy and will not tolerate unrighteousness to remain among them (Pss Sol 17.26-27, 31; cf. 8.28; 11). "He will distribute them upon the land according to their tribes; the alien and the foreigner will no longer live near them", and "he will judge peoples and nations in the wisdom of his righteousness" (Pss Sol 17.28-29). Further, "he will purge Jerusalem (and make it) holy as it is even from the beginning" (Pss Sol 17.30) and "he will lead them (the Lord's flock) all in holiness" (Pss Sol 17.41). "He will direct people in righteous acts, in the fear of God, and set them all in the fear of the Lord" (Pss Sol 18.8). In consequence, "he (the Messiah) will glorify the Lord in (a place) prominent (above) the whole earth" (Pss Sol 17.30).

Secondly, those who would participate in the blessings of the messianic kingdom will be called "a holy people" (Pss Sol 17.26).<sup>67</sup> They have been made holy by the Lord their God (Pss Sol 17.26). God has cleansed Israel for the day of mercy in blessing, for the appointed day when his Messiah will reign (Pss Sol 18.5). Moreover, as mentioned above, the Messiah will not tolerate unrighteousness to remain among them (Pss Sol 17.27) and will direct people in righteous acts and in the fear of God and will set them all in the fear of the Lord (Pss Sol 17.41, 43; 18.8). Furthermore, "any one person who knows wickedness shall not live with them" (Pss Sol 17.27) and "the alien and the foreigner will no longer live near them" (Pss Sol 17.28). Thus there will be no unrighteousness and no arrogance among them in his day (Pss Sol 17.32, 43).

What is noteworthy for the present study is that the sinlessness of the people in the messianic kingdom will be due to the fear of God put in their hearts by the Messiah himself (Pss Sol 18.8-9; cf. 17.35, 40-41). Further, there will no longer

---

<sup>67</sup> They will be also called "the tribes of the people" (v. 26), "the children of their God" (v. 26), "the Lord's people" (v. 35), "the Lord's flock" (v. 40), "the house of Israel" (v. 42), "the tribes of the sanctified" (v. 43) and "sanctified people" (v. 43).

be any apostasy in the messianic age; their fear of God will be as unchangeable as the movement of stars. I have already argued that “putting the fear of God in the heart” can be understood in relation to the fulfilment of the prophecy of the new covenant of Jer. 31.31ff, for the fear of God will prevent the covenant people from committing apostasy (Jer 32.39-40). In addition, it is also to be noted that the author’s use of the term “the house of Israel” in relation to the mercy of God, based on the covenant relationship, may indicate a close connection between the messianic kingdom and the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant of Jer. 31.31ff. The same term “the house of Israel” is used of those with whom God will make a new covenant in Jer 31.31ff.

Finally, the relationship between the messianic kingdom and the nations is of interest. The Messiah will drive out the alien and the sinner from Israel and destroy the unlawful nations (Pss Sol 17.22-25).<sup>68</sup>

Nonetheless, the Messiah will judge “peoples and nations in the wisdom of his righteousness” (Pss Sol 17.29). In context, the Messiah’s judgment upon the nations may not be understood as punishment upon them. Rather it indicates his compassionate rule over them in the wisdom of his righteousness. The author also uses the verb “judge” here in relationship to the Messiah’s ruling of his own people (Pss Sol 17.26-29) and he points out that the Messiah shall be “compassionate to all the nations” (Pss Sol 17.34). Furthermore, the nations will serve him under his yoke (Pss Sol 17.30). In Pss Sol 7.9, the term “yoke” indicates the obligation of the devout to God.<sup>69</sup> Accordingly, it is fair to say that the author is convinced that even though the Messiah will destroy the unlawful nations, the nations will

---

<sup>68</sup> R. Wright remarks, “The writer is no universalist. Gentiles are lawless by nature and are rejected by God (Pss Sol 2.2, 19-25; 7.1-3; 8.23; 17.13-15), even if occasionally He chooses them as instruments of his wrath against sinful Israel (Pss Sol 8). No hope is offered for their conversion. Indeed, one of the blessings of the messianic age will be the expulsion of the Gentiles from Israel (Pss Sol 17) (OTP 2, 645).

<sup>69</sup> R. Wright comments on the meaning of the term that “the implication is twofold: (1) there is an obligation, sometimes severe which the devout have toward God, and (2) they take it upon themselves voluntarily” (OTP 2, 658).



not be totally excluded from the blessing of the messianic kingdom.

## **2.4 Summary and Conclusion**

1. The authors of these writings emphasize that the apostate Jews have abandoned the covenant and, as a consequence, their own days are the time of oppression by the Gentiles. Nevertheless, they are convinced that the covenant relationship between God and their fathers continues even in their own days. In order to maintain this covenant relationship with God, the authors stress that the covenant people must keep all the commandments. They commonly emphasize circumcision, the Sabbath, and the sanctity of the temple. In addition to these, in 1 and 2 Maccabees and in Jubilees the authors urge separation from the Gentiles and their practices which are contrary to the commandments of the Torah. The author of the Psalms of Solomon warns that the covenant people must not commit sins such as sexual transgressions or the things that defile the temple.

On the other hand, in relation to the transgressions of the covenant people, the author of Jubilees emphasizes God's mercy towards his people. He points out that God will cleanse his people when they confess their own sin and the sins of their fathers. In the Psalms of Solomon the author indicates that even though sinners, who are arrogant before God, are not remembering God and are defiling the temple are excluded from Israel, unintentional transgressions themselves do not automatically exclude a Jew from Israel. The author stresses that the righteous can atone for his unintentional sins through repentance and through God's chastisement.

2. The authors make a distinction between apostate Israelites and covenant-keeping Israelites.

a). In 1 and 2 Maccabees and in Jubilees, the apostates are those who join the Gentiles, make themselves like the Gentiles and abandon the covenant. The

author of the Psalms of Solomon accuses Jewish sinners of not remembering God and of committing all kind of sins with arrogance as if there were no redeeming heir. Particularly, he points out that they commit sexual transgressions and defile the sanctity of the temple. He also claims that they commit sins that are worse than the sins of the Gentiles.

It is clear that both Jubilees and the Psalms of Solomon maintain that apostates are excluded from Israel. Nevertheless, the writer of the Psalms of Solomon is convinced that unintentional transgressions themselves do not automatically exclude a Jew from the covenant people because the righteous can be atoned for through repentance and God's chastisement. The authors of Maccabees are silent on this matter except that they speak of God's punishment of sinners on behalf of the pious Israelites. What is common to all these writings is the fact that the sins of the apostates result in God's punishment of Israel at the hand of the Gentiles.

b). The covenant-keeping Israelites are those who keep all the commandments. In 1 and 2 Maccabees, a distinction is made within those who keep the covenant between the non-militant pious Jews and the militant pious Jews. Whereas the non-militant Jews, believing in the resurrection on the basis of the covenant, choose to die rather than to profane the holy covenant, the militant Jews are not only willing to live by the covenant of their fathers but also willing to fight and kill because of zeal for the Torah.

In Jubilees, the covenant-keeping Jews are the people who return to God from the nations, search the law and commandments and return to the path of righteousness. What is of note here is that the covenant-keeping Israelites' interpretation of the law is different from that of other Jews, at least concerning the dates of the holy days. This seems to suggest an emergent sectarian element in Jubilees. However, the author's interest is still that the entire nation of Israel

should keep the law and the temple cult in Jerusalem free from contamination. It is likely that the concept of a new covenant applying to a small number of pious Jews has not yet appeared in the book of Jubilees. The author of the Psalms of Solomon says that the covenant-keeping Jews are the holy people who fear the Lord and are under persecution by Gentiles and fellow Jews.

4. It may be concluded that both the author of Jubilees and of the Psalms of Solomon predict the renewal of the covenant in terms of the fulfilment of the new covenant of Jer. 31.31ff and of Ezek 36.26ff where Ezekiel proclaims that God will give them new hearts in order to keep the law.

The author of Jubilees points out that God will create for the Israelites a holy spirit so that they will keep all of his commandments. In the Psalms of Solomon, the fulfilment of the covenant is based on the coming messianic king, the son of David. The author points out that those who will participate in the messianic kingdom will fear the Lord. The fear of God here is emphasized in relation to the fact that there will no longer be apostasy in the messianic age. This idea can be understood in relation to the fulfilment of the prophecy of the new covenant of Jer. 31.31ff. Hence the fear of God may indicate a connection between the messianic kingdom and the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant of Jer. 31.31ff. Furthermore, the author of Jubilees relates the knowledge of God to the new age. Even though he relates it to his personal appearance in the sight of all, this theme is also one of the distinctive characteristics of the new covenant of Jer 31.

5. The authors regard the Gentiles as sinners who are destined to destruction. However, the authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees point out that Judas makes a treaty of friendship and alliance with the Romans (1 Macc 8; 2 Macc 4.11). The author of the Psalms of Solomon is convinced that even though the Messiah will destroy the unlawful nations, the nations will not be totally excluded from the blessings of the rule of the messianic king.

## Chapter 3

### The New Covenant in the Dead Sea Scrolls

---

The consensus of opinion is that most of the Dead Sea Scrolls were the writings of the Essenes who lived at Qumran from the middle of the second century BC until AD 68.<sup>1</sup> Among these scrolls there are rules of the community, poetry, liturgies, wisdom texts, biblical interpretations and other miscellaneous compositions. They reveal not only the origin, purpose and way of life of the community but also its religious ideas and feelings. There is no doubt that the concept of the covenant is one of the most important religious ideas in these scrolls. Furthermore, what is noteworthy for the present study is the fact that the scrolls describe the covenant between the community and God as a new covenant (CD 6.19; 8.21; 19.33; 20.12; cf. 1QpHab 2.3ff).

The aim of this chapter is to examine whether the appearance of the term the “new covenant” in the DSS for the first time in extant Jewish literature after its appearance in Jer 31.31ff indicates that the Qumran community believed that the prophecy of that new covenant in Jer 31 was being fulfilled in its own history. In order to answer this question I shall examine whether the contexts in which the

---

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Charlesworth, “The origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the DSS: Four Transitional Phases among the Qumran Essenes”, *RQ* 10 (1980), 213-233. He also suggests the possibility of the existence of the Essenes in Palestine or in the Diaspora after AD 68 (p. 233). The origin of the Essenes is still a matter of controversy. Some scholars, particularly Jerome Murphy-O'Connor and Philip R. Davies, have challenged the widely accepted view of the origin of the Essenes in Palestine during the reform movement in the early second century B.C. They insist on the Babylonian origin of the Essenes: Murphy-O'Connor, “The Essenes and Their History”, *RB* 81 (1974), 215-244; “The Damascus Document Revisited”, *RB* 92 (1985), 223-246; P. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant* JSOTS 25 (Sheffield, 1983). The identification of the community is beyond the scope of this study.

term “new covenant” occurs support this idea and, furthermore, whether other religious ideas in the DSS also support it.

As an attempt to examine the four contexts in which the term “new covenant” occurs, the investigation begins with the phrase the “new covenant in the land of Damascus” (§3.1). This will lead on to the relationship between the new covenant community and the Teacher of Righteousness, because the contexts relate the new covenant closely to the Teacher (§3.1.3). In relation to this P. Davies claims that the contexts in which the term the “new covenant” appears in the texts do not support the idea that the community was convinced that the prophecy of the new covenant of Jer 31 was being fulfilled within itself.<sup>2</sup> I shall argue against Davies’ claim.

With regard to the investigation into whether the religious ideas in the DSS indicate that the community believed that they themselves were the fulfilment of the new covenant of Jer 31, the discussion is limited to the sect’s biblical interpretation of OT prophecy (§3.2) and to CD 3.13f which speaks of God’s establishment of the everlasting covenant with the founders of the community (§3.3). This investigation is followed by a comparison of the everlasting covenant in the DSS with the new covenant in Jer 31, paying particular attention to the emphasis on a new covenant relationship between God and the community, on the importance of the law, and on the forgiveness of sins (§3.4).

---

<sup>2</sup> Davies insists that in the contexts the term “new covenant” indicates that all those members of the community who accepted the Teacher had acknowledged themselves as members of a new covenant, “distinguishing themselves from the community which adhered to the original ‘Damascus Covenant’ and did not accept the teacher” (*Damascus Covenant*, 177).

### **3.1 The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus**

According to the Damascus Document, the community originated with a group of people in Israel who knew their trespass and guilt (CD 1.8-9). After twenty years' wandering without adequate guidance, God "raised up for them one (the Teacher of Righteousness) who would teach the law correctly, to guide them in the way of his heart and to demonstrate to future ages what he does to a generation that incurs His anger, that is, to the congregation of those who betray Him and turn aside from his way" (CD 1.11-12). The Document points out that Israel had broken the covenant and transgressed against the law, and thus "God grew angry with their horde and utterly destroyed all their throng and treated all their works as an abominable thing unclean" (CD 1.14-2.1).

However, the Scroll emphasizes that God had made his everlasting covenant with those who had held fast to his commandments (CD 3. 13). In other places, the Document says that God had made a new covenant with the community (CD 6.19; 8.21; 19.33; 20.12). The community was exiled to Damascus and entered into the new covenant relationship with God there. The community designated the new covenant as the "new covenant in the land of Damascus". It is necessary to investigate the significance of the "land of Damascus" in reference to the new covenant.

#### **3.1.1 The Land of Damascus**

The identification of "Damascus" has been a matter of dispute. Before the discovery of the DSS, scholars accepted the literal interpretation of Damascus. Most scholars, since the discovery, do not agree with the view that the community

had been exiled to the city of Damascus. Instead, they treat it symbolically. Two main alternative interpretations have been put forward: "Damascus" is either Babylon, the place of exile after the destruction of the first temple, or the Qumran area.<sup>3</sup> However, observing the symbolic significance of the name "Damascus", G. Vermes advocates that it is not important to identify whether the community settled in Syria or in the Qumran area.

Wherever it (the land of Damascus) was, their exile was interpreted as the fulfilment of prophecy because they firmly believed that their whole experience was predestined by God and revealed by the Prophets. If they did travel to Damascus, it was because God had decreed and foretold that they would live in that area. If, in fact, they went somewhere else, they still called this place the "land of Damascus" because their exegesis of Holy Scripture obliged them to do so.<sup>4</sup>

Accordingly, what is of even greater concern here is the significance of the term, the "land of Damascus", in its context. The term, the "land of Damascus", here may provide a clue to understanding the significance of the new covenant in the DSS, for there is no other explicit explanation of the new covenant except the reference to "Damascus" where the new covenant was established.

According to CD 6.2ff, "God raised men of understanding and wisdom from Aaron and Israel and let them hear (his voice)". As a consequence they went out from the land of Judah, settled in the land of Damascus, "dug the well", viz. the

---

<sup>3</sup> P. Davies presents three views on the identification of Damascus in CD: a) the Qumran community had sister communities in the region of Damascus, and it is to these related communities rather than the Qumran community itself that CD applies (Milik and Fitzmyer); b) the Qumran community may have come to the Dead Sea from Damascus, or sought refuge in Damascus between sojourns at Qumran; c) Damascus is a symbol for a place of refuge or of exile. With regard to the view of Damascus as a symbol, Davies comments: "Stegemann's version of this answer is that 'Damascus' need not indicate any particular geographical region, but may simply refer to the Judean wilderness; but the earlier and more widely embraced version is that of Cross, for whom 'Damascus' is a symbol for Qumran" (*Damascus Covenant*, 17). See note concerning the origin of the community in the Babylonian exile.

<sup>4</sup> G. Vermes, "Lion-Damascus-Mehokek-Man-Symbolical Traditions in Dead Sea Scrolls", in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden, 1973), 44.

law, and observed the law according to their interpretation of it. CD 7.13ff shows that the sojourn in "Damascus" is based on an interpretation of Amos 5.26-27, where there is an explicit connection between exile and Damascus. Here the author of the CD allegorizes the judgment passage against Israel as a prophecy of salvation which has been fulfilled in the exile of the community.<sup>5</sup> He indicates that the exile in the land of Damascus was the fulfilment of the prophecy not only of the new interpretation of the law, but also of the transfer of the books of the law (the tabernacle of the king) and the books of the prophets (the Kiyyun of statutes) from Jerusalem to Damascus (Amos 5.26-27; Num 24.17).<sup>6</sup>

G. Vermes comments, "the house of the law', i.e. the community, would be transferred from Jerusalem to 'the land of the north', to Damascus".<sup>7</sup> Further, he has shown that the Amos-Numbers Midrash (7.14b-15a, 18b-19a) provides a symbolic use of Damascus in relation to the eschatological sanctuary.<sup>8</sup> He supposes, "in the mind of the author of the Damascus Document, Damascus was associated with more than one biblical proof-text and that he was influenced by some previous exegetical tradition connected with the word" [Damascus].<sup>9</sup>

He has drawn attention to Zech 9.1 in this respect.<sup>10</sup> He investigates the

<sup>5</sup> O. Betz, *Offenbarung*, 13.

<sup>6</sup> In Amos, the meaning of the word *kiyyūn* is disputed. Most commentators have left the word untranslated. Concerning the quotation of Amos 5.26 in CD 7.13f Fitzmyer comments that "the author of CD did not understand what sakkuth and kewan were, i.e. astral deities worshipped by idolatrous Israelites" (*Essays on the Semitic Background of the NT* (London, 1971), 40). Peter von der Osten-Sacken, however, says, "CD (VII.14f) hat bereits im Zitat von 5.26 weder *sākūn* und *kēwān* noch *sikūt* und *kiyyūn*, vielmehr den ersten Begriff von vornherein (wie LXX und Symmachus: *σκηνη*, ähnlich Aquilas) *sukt* gelesen (Qere), den zweiten hingegen wahrscheinlich (wie Aquila und Symmachus: *χιών*) *kēyyōn*" ("Die Bücher der Tora als Hütte der Gemeinde", *ZAW* 91 (1979), 435).

<sup>7</sup> G. Vermes, "Lion-Damascus", 46.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* 48.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 46.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 47f; see also R. North, "The Damascus of Qumran Geography", *PEQ* 87 (1955), 34; T. H. Gaster, *The Scripture of the Dead Sea Sect* (London, 1957), 14.



meaning of the phrase “Damascus is his resting place” (*dámmeseq m<sup>e</sup>nuḥātô*) in Zech 9.1 with the help of the Septuagint and the Targum. He points to the understanding of *m<sup>e</sup>nuḥātô* as a cultic connotation, i.e. the sanctuary in both the Septuagint and the Targum.<sup>11</sup> In the LXX, the phrase was translated “his sacrifice shall be in Damascus” (*Δαμασκοῦ θυσία αὐτοῦ*). In the Targum, the phrase was paraphrased “Damascus shall rejoin the land of the house of his presence”.<sup>12</sup> After presenting several biblical passages where *hámme<sup>e</sup>nūḥāh* signifies the place of the Temple of the Lord (Deut 12.9; Isa 66.1; 1 Chron 28.2), G. Vermes concludes that “Damascus was expected to be the seat of the eschatological Sanctuary, the gathering place of the exiles, and the place of the Messiah’s coming; and these traditions were brought into line - though not explicitly in the Septuagint - with the fundamental Jewish belief which referred everything to Jerusalem”.<sup>13</sup> As Vermes argues, the community seemed to understand the land of Damascus to be the symbolic place where the law (i.e. a new interpretation of the law) and the messianic temple would be found. The phrase the “new covenant in the land of Damascus” is therefore to be examined within the contexts in which it occurs.

### 3.1.2 The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus

It is in the Damascus document that the phrase the “new covenant in the land of Damascus” uniquely occurs (CD 6.19; 8.21; 19.33; 20.12; cf. 1QpHab 2.3). In my discussion I shall not examine CD 8.21 simply because it does not seem to contribute significantly to an investigation of the new covenant in the land of

<sup>11</sup> G. Vermes, “Lion-Damascus”, 47.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

Damascus. I include the text of 1QpHab 2.3f because the close association of the Teacher with the new covenant seems to be relevant here.

i). *CD 6.11b-7.4*<sup>14</sup>

In this pericope, the phrase the “new covenant in the land of Damascus” is introduced in relation to the community’s new interpretation of the law concerning the Temple, the Sabbath day, the Festival days and the Fast days. Furthermore, this phrase also relates to their observance of the law according to the new interpretation and to their separation from outsiders. The community’s halachah concerning the Temple, the Sabbath, the Festival days and the neighbours (CD 6.11b-7.4a) is followed by promises and warnings (CD 7.4b-7.9). With regard to the halachah, the word *pērūš* is important. It occurs three times (CD 6.14, 18, 20). Concerning the meaning of *pērūš*, Schiffmann comments that *pērūš* at Qumran “is another term for the law derived from Scripture by interpretation”.<sup>15</sup> Neh 8.8 provides evidence that implies the meaning of an exposition of the law. In Neh 8.8, Nehemiah says that they (some Levites) read from the book, from the law of God, translating (explaining) to make sense of it so that they (the

<sup>14</sup> Text: And all who have been admitted into the covenant (are not) to enter the sanctuary to light His altar in vain, and become closers of the door as God said: Who among you will close its door and you shall not light my altar in vain unless they are observant in doing “according to the law as detailed” (*k<sup>e</sup>pērūšāh háttôrāh*) for the period of wickedness: to separate from the children of the Pit; to refrain from unjust wealth which defiles, (whether) in vowing, or devoting, or in respect of Temple property; this is to rob the poor of His people that widows become their spoil and that they might murder the orphans to separate the unclean from the clean and to make clear the difference between the holy and the profane; to keep the “Sabbath day according to the details” (*yôm háššúbāt k<sup>e</sup>pērūšāh*) and the festival days and the Fast Day according to the finding of the members of “the new covenant in the land of Damascus” (*háb<sup>e</sup>rīt háḥādāsāh b<sup>e</sup>’ereš dámmāseq*) to offer the “holy things according to their details” (*hāqōdāšīm k<sup>e</sup>pērūšēhem*) to love each other one his brother as himself; to support the poor, the needy and the stranger; to seek each one the well-being of his brother; and not to sin each one against his kinsman; to keep away from lust according to the regulation; to reprove each man his brother according to the commandment and not bear a grudge from one day to the next; to keep away from all uncleanness according to their rules, and for each man not to defile his holy spirit as God has taught them to distinguish (them) (Davies’ translation).

<sup>15</sup> L. Schiffmann, *The Halachah at Qumran* (Leiden, 1975), 36.

people) understood the reading.

It is clear that *pērūš* in the present context indicates that the word is used in the interpretation of the law concerning the Temple, the Sabbath and other laws. This word also indicates that the community observed the law according to the new interpretation. Moreover, the fact that *pērūš* is closely related to the time of wickedness indicates that the exact observance of these new interpretations of the law separated the members of the community from outsiders who walked in wickedness. Those outside the community were called the “children of the Pit” (CD 6.14). The term “children of the Pit” shows that the members of the community regarded outsiders as those who did not belong to God.

What is important in understanding the new covenant in this pericope is that the new covenant is closely linked with the new interpretation of the law concerning the Temple, the Sabbath and Festival days and , in consequence, the separation between those who observed the law according to the new interpretation and those who did not. It is also important to note that the separation between them implied not a separation between groups, but separation between the children of the covenant of God and the children of the Pit who are outside God's salvation.

ii). *CD 19.33b-20.1a*<sup>16</sup>

This section condemns the apostates who had once entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus. They had turned back and departed from “the well

---

<sup>16</sup> Text: (and) thus all the men who entered “*the new covenant in the land of Damascus*” and have turned back and acted treacherously and departed from the well of living water shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and shall not be written in their rec(ords) from the time the Teacher of the community is gathered in until the arrival of the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel (Davies' translation).

of living waters". What is significant here is the close relation between the new covenant and the well of living waters; the departure from the well of living waters was equated with turning back from the new covenant in the land of Damascus. According to CD 6.2ff, the well is the law which those who entered into the land of Damascus dug and in which they consequently walked. Furthermore, in CD 3.12ff, the well of living water is related to a new interpretation of the Sabbath and Festivals which were the hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray until God had revealed them to the members of the community. Accordingly, in this section, as in CD 6.11b-7.9, the new covenant is closely associated with the new interpretation of the law about the Sabbath and Festivals which were revealed by God on the one hand and were "dug" by the members of the community on the other.

In comparison with CD 6.11ff, what is distinctive in this passage is that those who were condemned were former members of the new covenant community who had been related to the Teacher of the Community. The relationship between the new covenant community and the Teacher of the community will be discussed later in this section.

iii). *CD 20.8b-12*<sup>17</sup>

This section shows that those who had placed idols in their heart, walked in the stubbornness of their heart and rejected (the precepts), had no share in the House of the Law and would receive the same judgment as their companions who

---

<sup>17</sup> Text: And the same judgment applies to everyone who rejects the former and the latter (ordinances), who have placed idols on their heart and walked in the stubbornness of their heart. They have no share in the House of the Law. They shall receive the same judgment as their companions who turned back with the men of scoffing, for they spoke heresy against the ordinances of righteousness and rejected the covenant which they affirmed in "*the land of Damascus that is, the new covenant*".

had turned back with the “men of scoffing”, for they spoke heresy against the precepts of righteousness and rejected the covenant and bond which they had made in the land of Damascus, that is the new covenant. The author identifies those who rejected the new covenant. The immediate context indicates that those who rejected the new covenant were associated with those who had turned back with the men of scoffing. According to CD 1.14ff, the men of scoffing are described as those who “shed over Israel the water of lies, sought smooth things, transgressed the covenant and violated the precept”. J. A. Huntjens comments that the “seekers for the smooth things” (*ḥlqwt*) are identified in 1QH 4.10-11 as those who are guilty of “exchanging the law” ... that they may gaze on their folly concerning their festivals”.<sup>18</sup>

It is an inescapable conclusion that here again the new covenant is connected with the interpretation of the law and the festival days. It is also important to note that the apostates themselves made the covenant in the land of Damascus and the text emphasizes that what they made in the land of Damascus was the new covenant. Concerning the new covenant in CD 20.12, particularly the phrase “and this is the new covenant”, Davies assumes that “new covenant” is a gloss on “covenant in the land of Damascus”. On the basis of this assumption he claims that while “at an early stage the new community continued to regard itself as the true community of the (original) Damascus covenant, only at a secondary stage, and probably as a result of conflict within the parent community, did the new community define itself as the community of the new covenant, in order to distinguish itself from the continuing community which clung to the original ‘Damascus covenant’ and did not accept the Teacher”.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> J. A. Huntjens, “Covenant and Law in the Texts from Qumran”, *RQ* 31 (1974), 363.

<sup>19</sup> Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 176-177. His idea will be discussed later in 3.1.3, The New Covenant Community and the Teacher of Righteousness.

iv). *1QpHab 2.1ff*<sup>20</sup>

This text is divided into two by pesher interpretation: (1) the enemies in the time of the Teacher of Righteousness; (2) the enemies of the Qumran community after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>21</sup> Even though there is a lacuna after the word “new”, there is no dispute among scholars that it contains the word “covenant”. It is also indisputable that the new covenant here is the same covenant, the “new covenant in the land of Damascus”. The new covenant here is linked with the contemporary enemies of the Teacher of Righteousness. The text identifies those who were unfaithful to the new covenant as those who did not listen to the word received from the mouth of God through the Teacher of Righteousness. Here is also to be noted the close relationship between the new covenant and the Teacher of Righteousness.

### 3.1.3 The New Covenant Community and the Teacher of Righteousness

Concerning the relationship between the Teacher of Righteousness and the community of the new covenant in the land of Damascus, Davies insists that the new covenant community which accepted the Teacher of Righteousness and his teaching called itself the community of the new covenant, “... distinguished itself from the ‘parent community’ which was based on God’s covenant in CD 3.13ff”.<sup>22</sup> He claims two things for this. The first is that the CD community

<sup>20</sup> Text: (Interpreted, this concerns) those who were unfaithful together with the Liar, in that they (did) not (listen to the word received by) the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God. And it concerns the unfaithful of the New (Covenant) in that they have not believed in the Covenant of God (and have profaned) His holy name (G. Vermes, *DSSE*, 236).

<sup>21</sup> M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, CBQMS 8 (Washington D. C., 1979), 24.

<sup>22</sup> Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 177.

originated in the Babylonian exile.<sup>23</sup> The second is that the original lawgiver of the community, who is called the "Interpreter of the Law", is not to be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness. He suggests two reasons.

a) The arrival of the "Teacher" is placed well after the formation of the root and even further from the survival of the "remnant", while the Interpreter is placed at the very origins of the remnant community.

b) The "Interpreter of the Law" in CD is a past figure, but the one who teaches righteousness in 6.11 is a future figure.<sup>24</sup>

In order to justify his view of the relationship between the new covenant community and the Teacher of Righteousness, he advocates several further points.<sup>25</sup>

1. The new covenant community is a splinter group from the parent community which has observed for generations the halachah given by the original lawgiver of the community, the Interpreter of the Law.

2. The new covenant community has the figure and authority of a Teacher as the basis of its identity and at the centre of its legal structure.

3. However, the members of the so-called "parent community" who had re-

---

<sup>23</sup> Davies' view on the origin of the CD community in Babylon has raised different responses. Murphy-O'Connor, admitting that the argument for the Babylonian origin of the Essene movement is not conclusive in itself, applauds Davies' contribution to confirm his hypothesis of the Babylonian origin of the Essene movement by a literary analysis of CD ("Revisited", *RB* 92 (1985), 223-46).

M. A. Knibb, however, raises a difficulty with any theory of a Babylonian origin for the Essenes. Even though Knibb argues mainly with Murphy-O'Connor's hypothesis, he is aware of Davies' view on this issue in Davies' book, *The Damascus Covenant*. His main objections are that he understands the meaning of some words differently from Davies and Murphy-O'Connor and that virtually nothing is known about the circumstances of the Jews in Babylonia after the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Although he admits that there is nothing impossible in the idea that the Essene movement originated in Babylon, he concludes that the origins of the Essenes belong to Palestine, emerging from the Hasidim, a reform movement in Palestinian Judaism at the end of the third and the beginning of the second century B.C. ("Exile in the Damascus Document", *JSS* 25 (1983), 99-117). Discussions on this issue have been examined in G. Vermes, "The Essenes and History," *JJS* 32 (1981), 18-31 and G. Milikowsky, "Again: DAMASCUS in Damascus Document and in Rabbinic Literature", *RQ* 11 (1982), 97-108.

<sup>24</sup> Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 123.

<sup>25</sup> The following points are my summary of Davies' main arguments which come from chapter 5 and 6 in Davies' *Damascus Covenant* (pp. 173-201).

fused to accept the claims of the Teacher to be the expected eschatological figure, remained within the original "Damascus" covenant.

4. A Teacher of Righteousness who is mentioned in the opening discourse (CD 1.11) has to be seen as secondary. Nevertheless, if this reference is original, it certainly cannot indicate the same figure, the "Interpreter of the Law", because there the "Interpreter of the Law" "... belongs to the origins of the community which are placed in the Exile".

5. The word "new" in the phrase the "new covenant in the land of Damascus" was inserted into the text only after the Teacher's adherents had acknowledged themselves as members of a "new covenant" in order to distinguish themselves from those who remained within the original "Damascus" covenant.

Even though Davies' extensive exegetical study of the Damascus Document may contribute to a new understanding of the nature of the scroll, two important questions are raised with regard to his view of the relationship between the "Teacher of Righteousness" and the "new covenant in the land of Damascus".

The first question is about his distinction between the new covenant community which accepted the Teacher and his teaching, and the so-called "parent community" which clung to the original "Damascus" covenant. It may be admitted that a large-scale defection from the new covenant community could be envisaged in the context of CD 19.33ff and 20.8ff so that the number of the defectors outnumbers that of the new covenant community. However, it is clear that if Davies' term "parent community" is acceptable here, then those who were condemned were "the members of the parent community", who had once entered into the new covenant in the land of Damascus. Davies perceives the difficulty of defending his view because those who were condemned had once entered into



the new covenant. Hence, he insists that the condemned had not entered into a new covenant at all.

If the qualification “new” was introduced here after the condemnation was formulated, then it originally condemned those who had entered the “Damascus covenant”; in other words, it was directed against all those members of the community who refused to accept the teacher, and only after the Teacher’s adherents had acknowledged themselves as members of a “new covenant” was the word “new” inserted into the text. If this is the case, those condemned had not “entered a new covenant” at all.<sup>26</sup>

Nevertheless, Davies’ thesis does not prove the fact that there was discontinuity between the new covenant community and the so-called parent community. In CD 6.19ff, the term “new covenant” occurs in relation to people outside the community. The context shows that the separation, as Davies asserts, was not within the community, but was a separation between the members of the community, the children of the covenant of God, and those who were outside it, the children of the Pit, who were outside God’s salvation.<sup>27</sup> If Davies’ comment that the term “new” was introduced here after the condemnation had been formulated is acceptable, then those condemned were condemned in terms of both the “Damascus” covenant and the “new” covenant. If this is so, Davies’ supposition that the members of the parent community who refused to accept the Teacher clung to the original “Damascus” covenant is less than convincing.<sup>28</sup>

The second question is about Davies’ distinction between the “new” covenant and the original “Damascus” covenant, which God made with those who had held fast to his commandments (CD 3.13f). As already seen above, one of Davies’ main arguments comes from his view that the original lawgiver of the community is not

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 177.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 128.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

to be equated with the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>29</sup> As Davies points out, as far as the text in CD 6.1ff is concerned, the Interpreter of the Law is a figure of the past, but the one who teaches righteousness is a figure of the future. However, this cannot be decisive. If it is supposed that there was some evolution in religious ideas in the community during the period of the Teacher of Righteousness and after his death, this difference can perhaps be resolved. Is it not possible that at an earlier stage of the community, the Teacher of Righteousness was called the Interpreter of the Law and the community was still expecting the one who would teach righteousness, while at a later stage of his life or after his death, the members of the community came to believe that they were living at the end of days and began to call the "Interpreter of the Law" the "Teacher of Righteousness"?<sup>30</sup>

Davies himself provides a clue to the solution of this problem. After a thorough analysis of the Damascus Document, he concludes that the document is not uniform but consists of three successive layers of material. According to him, the text in CD 6.11 is regarded as the original work and the text mentioning the Teacher of Righteousness is the third layer, a substantial supplement reflecting the ideology of the new covenant community.<sup>31</sup> Thus, Davies provides the necessary span of time for the probable development of religious thought within

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 123.

<sup>30</sup> J. H. Charlesworth comments: The best recent research is demonstrating that the proper approach to the Dead Sea Scrolls is in terms of recognizing that the major documents, especially 1QS and Dam. Doc, have obtained their present form through an evolutionary process that mirrors somewhat the historical stages of the Qumran Essenes. Essene theology was not a closed system but developed during the 200 years of the existence of the Qumran Essenes ("Origin" *RQ* 10 (1980), 233).

It is worth noting that F. F. Bruce has already suggested the possibility that the Teacher was called the Interpreter of the Law: although he admits the possibility that the designation of the Teacher of Righteousness may have been given to more than one man, he points out that an outstanding leader, the first organizer of the community, was revered not only in his lifetime but after his death as the Teacher of Righteousness par excellence (*Second thought*, 94).

<sup>31</sup> Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 198.

the community and the subsequent change of the name of the "Interpreter of the Law" into the "Teacher of Righteousness".

Finding differences in ideology and vocabulary not only between the original part of the work and that of the Qumranic recension, but also between the community and its defectors, Davies claims that there was a conflict within the parent community, mainly because of the claims of the Teacher to be the eschatological figure. As a result of this conflict, the Teacher and his followers separated from the parent community and called themselves the community of the new covenant.

Differences in ideology and vocabulary are not necessarily the result of different covenants. Rather it is more probable that such differences are due to some evolution in religious thinking, and to changes in the situation from earlier to later stages of the community, even under the same covenant. It is fairly clear that there was a conflict within the community. However, as far as CD is concerned, those condemned had once been the members of the new covenant community. Thus, this separation was not the new covenant community's separation from the parent community but defection from the new covenant community.

Positively, it is fair to say that the "new covenant in the land of Damascus" is the same covenant as that which God made with those who had held fast to his commandments (CD 3.13ff). The question raised here is that of when and why the covenant in CD 3.13ff was called the "new covenant in the land of Damascus". The term "new" might have been added to the Damascus covenant at a later stage of the community, if Davies' analysis is acceptable.

Nevertheless, if the word "new" was added later, it was probably added not because the phrase the "covenant in the land of Damascus" was by itself inap-

appropriate or misleading, as Davies insists, but because, as time had passed, the members of the community had become convinced that the covenant which God had made with them was nothing but the new covenant. This understanding seems to be appropriate because they thought that they were living at the end of days, and they believed that God had made known to the Teacher of Righteousness all the mysteries of the words of his servants and prophets. Furthermore, their claim that much of biblical prophecy had already been fulfilled in the history of their community also indicates the probability that the community called itself the community of the new covenant in the land of Damascus.

In conclusion, the community was convinced that God had established an everlasting covenant with those who had held fast to his commandments (CD 3.13ff). This covenant was probably the same covenant as the new covenant of the land of Damascus. The new covenant was closely related to the new interpretation of the laws, particularly of Sabbaths and Festivals. The opponents of the community were not only the outsiders but also those who had once entered into the new covenant but had subsequently joined the outsiders. Thus Davies' view of the distinction between the so-called "parent community" and the "new covenant community" with regard to the close relationship between the new covenant and the Teacher of Righteousness is less than convincing.

### **3.2 Biblical Interpretation of the OT Prophecy**

This section examines the Qumran community's view of OT prophecy in order to answer the important question as to whether this view supports the idea that the community believed that the prophecy of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled in its own history. In fact, there is no interpretation of Jer 31.31ff

in the DSS in terms of the fulfilment not even in the pesher interpretation of Habakkuk (cf. 1QpHab 2.3). So the question cannot be answered directly. What is possible is an examination of the community's understanding of OT prophecy, which may give some indication that the Qumran community did indeed believe that the prophecy of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled in itself.

Concerning the community's beliefs about OT prophecy, G. Vermes points out several basic tenets: first, the words of the prophets are full of mystery and have a hidden significance which must be discovered by means of further revelation; secondly, this hidden meaning alludes to what is to take place at the end of the world; thirdly, the end of the world is near and the prophecy consequently applies to the writer's own generation; fourthly, and most important of all, the person to whom all these mysteries were revealed was the Teacher of Righteousness himself.<sup>32</sup>

### **3.2.1 Fulfilment of OT Prophecy**

What is significant for the present study is the community's claim that OT prophecy had already been fulfilled in the history of their movement. According to 1QpHab 2.3ff, the Teacher of Righteousness was endowed with wisdom to interpret all the words (mysteries) of the prophets and he foretold all that would happen to his people and his land to the last generation (1QpHab 7.1ff; cf. CD 1.12-13). In other places, it had been shown that they were living in the last days

---

<sup>32</sup> Vermes, "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting", in *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 6 (1969), 91; cf. W. H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls", *BA* 14 (1951), 54-76; F. F. Bruce, *Biblical*, 7-19; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit OT Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the NT", in *Essays*, 3-59; R. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic period* (Grand Rapids, 1975), 19-50; D. Dimont, "Qumran Sectarian Literature", in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. M. Stone (Phila., 1984), 483-550.

foretold long before by the prophets (1QS 8.12-14; CD 6.10, 14; 12.23; 14.19). In addition to the Teacher's inspired interpretation and their conviction that they were living at the end of days, they believed that their study of the Scripture was "to do according to all that had been revealed from time to time and according as the prophets revealed by the Spirit of His holiness" (1QS 8.15f). Accordingly, it may be assumed that devoting themselves to the study of Scriptures with the Teacher's interpretation during their exile in the wilderness, the members of the community were convinced that the things and signs of the last days spoken by the prophets were being fulfilled in the history of their own times and in the inner life of their own community.<sup>33</sup>

The question raised here is to what extent the community believed that OT prophecy was fulfilled in the history of their movement. According to 1QS, they lived in the desert of Judah, not merely because they had fled from Jerusalem and its temple on account of what they considered to be the illegitimacy of its high priest, but more particularly because they sought to carry out literally the command of Isaiah 40.3: "they shall separate from the habitation of ungodly men and shall go into the wilderness to prepare the way of him, as it is written, prepare in the wilderness the way of... make straight in the desert a path for our God" (1QS 8.12-14). In the commentaries of the Qumran community, particularly on Habakkuk, the community claimed that OT prophecy was fulfilled in detail not only in the works and sufferings of the Teacher and his followers but also in the evil and blasphemous works of the "wicked priest" and the "man of lies". Furthermore, they were convinced that apostates from the community, exposed by the Teacher, were foretold in the Scripture: "their doom was also predicted, what would befall them in this life and what will befall them in the

---

<sup>33</sup> F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library*, 217.



future judgment”.<sup>34</sup>

### 3.2.2 Pesher Method of Interpretation

A further question to be considered is how the members of the community applied their convictions to biblical interpretation. By applying their pesher method they insisted that the OT prophecy was fulfilled in their community. The use of the pesher method is the most distinctive feature of their interpretation of OT prophecy. This is not to deny the fact that their interpretation of Scripture is similar to other contemporary interpretations of Scripture. Indeed, it is to be noted that the Teacher was not the first to employ such a method of interpretation.<sup>35</sup>

However, the peculiarity of the community's interpretation is characterized by their typical use of the pesher method.<sup>36</sup> In Scripture, the word “pesher” (*pēšer*) is used in the stories about Joseph and Daniel as an inspired interpretation of a mysterious dream or message (Gen 40-41; Dan 2.18ff; 4.9). The same word is used in the Scrolls is used for the revealing of the mysteries hidden in Scripture so as to apply them to their contemporary situation. As the application of the pesher method is limited to passages of Scripture, and the sacred text is then applied to contemporary events, some scholars maintain that the pesher method must be connected with rabbinic midrash.<sup>37</sup> It is also noticeable that in the Dead Sea Scrolls the pesher method was applied to a text with the conviction that the OT prophecy was interpreted first of all through divine inspiration revealing the

<sup>34</sup> W. H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula, 1979), 36.

<sup>35</sup> R. Bloch, “Midrash”, 29-50; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 127.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> Brownlee, “Biblical Interpretation”, 54; M. Burrow, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (London, 1956), 211; K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (Lund, , 1954).

hidden mystery to the community.<sup>38</sup>

It is obvious that on the one hand, the community's interpretation is not different from contemporary methods of interpretation but, on the other hand, their use of *peshar* is distinctive. After quoting a sentence or part of a sentence in Scripture, the interpreter applies it to contemporary events with complete assurance. What is new in the *peshar* method in the DSS is the way it shows how each prophetic word had already been fulfilled, or soon would be fulfilled in the history of Israel in general or of the Qumran community in particular.<sup>39</sup>

### 3.2.3 Absence of Interpretation of Jer 31.31ff

The community's conviction that OT prophecy had already been fulfilled in the history of its movement raises the question that, if this is so, then why did they not interpret the prophecy of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff in terms of its fulfilment in their community (cf. 1QpHab 7.4-5)? It is to be admitted that as far as we know from the texts so far published, there is no explicit evidence in the DSS that the community interpreted this passage in relation to their community except for the term the "new covenant of the land of Damascus".<sup>40</sup> Nevertheless, the absence of the interpretation of the new covenant of Jer 31 cannot be decisive evidence to discredit the idea of the community's understanding of a close connection between them.

---

<sup>38</sup> Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 43.

<sup>39</sup> O. Betz suggests the following points as the distinctive characteristics of the *peshar* interpretation in the DSS: a) the inspiration by the Holy Spirit (1QH 7); b) the historical, not haggadic or halachic interpretation; c) the limitation to the circle of the sectarians and to their age (oral communication).

<sup>40</sup> C. Rabin suggests that there are five other allusions to Jeremiah in CD: Jer 17.22 in CD 6.7; Jer 23.13 in CD 5.20; Jer 25.31 in CD 1.2; Jer 14.4-5 in CD 8.20; Jer 27.6 in CD 1.6 (*The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford, 1954), 82; cf. R. F. Collins, "Berith-Notion", 572).



First of all, there is no need to suppose that all their interpretations had to be written and published.<sup>41</sup>

Secondly, it is more probable that the members of the community found it difficult to interpret this passage by the pesher method, for one of the distinctive characteristics of the community was its emphasis on the need for teaching (seeking) the law. This seems to contradict the characteristic element of Jer 31.34 where there is no need for teaching the law.<sup>42</sup>

Thirdly, one more reason may be suggested as to why the Qumran community did not interpret Jer 31.31ff, by means of the pesher method, as being fulfilled in their community. Even though the members of the community were convinced that they were living in the last days (1QpHab 2.5-6) under the jurisdiction of the new covenant, they were still living in the "epoch of the wicked" (CD 6.10; 12.23; 14.29) and "days of dominion of Belial" (1QS 2.19). Accordingly, they were awaiting the messianic era, the day of accomplishment of the new covenant in its fullest sense, in which there would be no apostasy. The messianic era would be a "time of visitation" for the judgment of the wicked and the reward of the

---

<sup>41</sup> C. Roth, "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis", VT 10 (1960), 52. Roth remarks: "There is no need to assume that such interpretations were all necessarily committed to writing. It is more logical to imagine that the Teacher constantly pondered over the words of Holy Writ, and realized from time to time some new application to current circumstances, of which he informed the other members of the group. Later, he himself, or one of his disciples, might or might not write it down".

<sup>42</sup> Betz, *Offenbarung*, 44f: "Die Sekte, die sich durch die eifrig betriebene Forschung von ihrer Umwelt unterscheidet (1QS 5.11), steht jedoch gerade damit im Gegensatz zum Ideal des Neuen Bundes, wie Jeremia es entworfen hat. Denn nach Jer 31.33f wird Gott den Angehörigen des Neuen Bundes die Tora ins Herz schreiben, so dass keiner mehr den anderen zu lehren braucht; die Sekte dagegen schreibt die Tora auf Rollen und forscht und lehrt. Selbst in Neuen Bund der Endzeit hört nach ihrer Ansicht das Studium nicht auf, denn neben dem weltlichen Messias steht dort der Toraforscher, der das Werk des Lehrers der Gerechtigkeit fortsetzt....Die eifrig betriebene Forschung mag einer der Gründe dafür sein, dass man die Sekte nur selten vom 'neuen Bund' spricht, wenn sie die eigene Gemeinde bezeichnet".

Nevertheless, Betz maintains that the community believed that the condition of forgiveness of sins of Jer 31.34 was fulfilled (CD 3.18, 45ff).

faithful (1QS 3.18-19; 4.18-20, 26) and the bliss of the people of God (1QS 4.6-8). Thus, it may be assumed that the community were convinced that the prophecy of the new covenant of Jer 31, fulfilled in their community, was moving towards its complete fulfilment in the messianic era.<sup>43</sup>

In short, even though there is no interpretation in the DSS of Jer 31.31ff as being fulfilled in the community, this absence cannot be decisive in justifying any claim that there is no relation between the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff and that in the DSS.

R. F. Collins challenges the view that the members of the Qumran community was convinced that the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled in their community.<sup>44</sup> He says that the fact that the Torah must be studied indicates a clear opposition between the new covenant of CD and that of Jeremiah.<sup>45</sup> Following R. Schreiber,<sup>46</sup> he points out that while the Jeremiah new covenant has a positive orientation towards salvation, the new covenant in CD can lead either to eternal life (CD 3.20; 7.6; 19.1-2) or to the punishment of the sword (CD 1.17; 3.11; 7.6; 19.10, 13) and death (CD 15.5).<sup>47</sup> It is to be admitted that there are differences between the new covenant of CD and that of Jeremiah. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the question as to whether the members of the community believed that the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled within themselves must not be determined by whether the concept of their new covenant was actually in accordance with the promise in Jer 31.31ff but rather

---

<sup>43</sup> It is necessary to note that as far as the eschatology is concerned, there was a realized eschatological period and an unrealized eschatological period in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The eschatology of the new covenant in the DSS will be dealt with in the next chapter.

<sup>44</sup> Collins, "Berith-Notion", 572-575.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> R. Schreiber, *Neue Bund*, 18.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

by whether and how they themselves understood the fulfilment of the promise.

Accordingly, further evidence is necessary before we can conclude that the community believed that the prophecy of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff had been fulfilled in its own history. I shall therefore examine CD 3.11ff which speaks of God's establishment of an everlasting covenant with the founders of the community (CD 3.11ff).

### **3.3 Establishment of the Everlasting Covenant**

According to CD 3.13f, "with those who hold fast the commandments of God, God established his covenant with Israel by revealing to them the hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray". The same covenant seems to be called the "covenant of grace" (1QS 1.8), a "covenant of everlasting community" (1QS 3.11f) and the "new covenant in the land of Damascus" (CD 6.19; 8.21; 19.33; 20.12; cf. 1QpHab 2.3).

The purpose of the investigation of the everlasting covenant in CD 3.13ff is to compare this everlasting covenant with the new covenant of Jer 31.31-34 and, then, to ascertain whether the Qumran community believed that the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31 was being fulfilled in its community. In relation to the establishment of the everlasting covenant three things are important for the present study.

1. While the community pointed out that Israel had broken the covenant which God had made with her, they insisted that God had established a new covenant relationship with their own members.

2. The community emphasized the close relationship between the law and the everlasting covenant. They suggested that God established his everlasting

covenant with those who had held fast to His commandments by revealing to them the hidden things (CD 13.13f). The hidden things here refer to the commandments of God (CD 4.16ff; 1QS 5.11f; 8.11f).

3. The community insisted that forgiveness of sins was closely connected with the everlasting covenant in CD 3.13f.

In order to maintain this third point, I shall consider the broad contexts of the everlasting covenant.

### **3.3.1 The Root for Planting**

The background to God's establishment of the everlasting covenant with them was that the community insisted that Israel had sinned in forsaking God so that God had hidden his face from Israel and delivered them to the sword. He, however, had preserved a remnant for Israel, for he remembered the covenant of the fathers (CD 1.3-4). Furthermore, they claimed that in the period of wrath, he made them a "root for planting" with whom he established his (everlasting) Covenant (CD 1.6-7; 3.13; cf. Isa 60.12f; 61.3, 8; Jub 1.16; 21.24f). It is necessary to differentiate between the "remnant" and the "root for planting". Some scholars use the term "remnant" without attention to the difference between the "remnant" and the "root for planting" (CD 1.4, 7). Vermes comments, "the Essenes not only considered themselves to be the 'remnant' of their time, but the 'remnant' of all time, the final 'remnant'."<sup>48</sup> Here he probably uses the term "remnant" with the same meaning as the "root for planting" from the remnant. Davies insists, "the remnant and the root for planting are hardly distinguishable in the original form of the discourse".<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Vermes, *DSSE*, 35.

<sup>49</sup> Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 65.

Even though Davies admits that many scholars translate the word *pāqād* as “visit” which seems more suitable to the interpolated text, he follows Rabinowitz’s translation of the word *pāqād* as “punish”. He does so mainly because he maintains that there has been an interpolated text between the phrase “in the period of wrath” (*b<sup>e</sup> qēṣ ḥārôn*) and the phrase “he visited them” (*p<sup>e</sup> qādām*). Furthermore, he claims that the “period of wrath” can only be the duration of the divine anger, and there is no distinction between the remnant and the CD community in the DSS.<sup>50</sup> Even if the references to the 390 years after Nebuchadnezzar and the 20 years in which the original members were like the blind and grope (their) way may be a later interpolation (CD 1.5, 10), they are still valuable for understanding the origins of the community, because the interpolator intended to provide a detailed picture of the origins of the community.<sup>51</sup>

Moreover, as Davies admits, in the expansion of this discourse, the passage makes it clear that there is a distinction in the community between the remnant and the root from the remnant. Whether at an earlier or a later stage of the community, it is undeniable that there is a distinction between them. Concerning a distinction between the remnant and the community, E. P. Sanders remarks,

The clear meaning of the passage in CD, however, is that the remnant of Israel consisted of all the Jews who remained after the destruction of Nebuchadnezzar. This remnant is not coextensive with the sect, for some of the remnant refused to accept the Teacher of righteousness whom God sent them (CD 1.11-21); on the contrary, some of the descendants of the survivors of Nebuchadnezzar’s destruction were seen by the sect as constituting the “congregation of the faithless” (CD 1.12).<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> Knibb, “Exile,” 99-117.

<sup>52</sup> Sanders, *PPJ*, 250, note 35. Further, he says: “CD 1.4, in other words, uses the term ‘remnant’ to refer to those saved from destruction in the past. 1QH 6.8; 1QM 13.8; 14.8f. use the term to refer to the eschatological people of God. Nowhere is *sh’ar* or *she’erit* used of the sect in its historical existence. It may be that in CD 2.11<sup>sh’ar</sup> should be taken as referring to the sect. Here it is said that God always left a remnant (*peletah*), and those who constitute the

In §1.1.1 I have already shown that in Jeremiah the term “remnant” is used not only of those who were driven out of Judah (Jer 23.3; 31.7; 44.12, 14; 44.28) but also of those who remained in Judah under Gedaliah (Jer 40.11, 15; 42.2, 9).<sup>53</sup> However, the concept of the people of God is applied only to those who were driven out of Judah and, later, would be brought back to Judah: “my flock” (Jer 23.3); “thy people” (Jer 31.7). In the post-exilic period, the term “remnant” is applied as a technical term to those who return from exile (Hag 1.12, 14; 2.2; Zech 8.6, 11, 12; Ezra 9.8, 13, 14, 15; Neh 1.2, 3). Ezra points out that the very fact of the return was the fulfilment of a promise (Ezra 1.1ff; cf. Jer 25.11; 29.10) and the confirmation of God’s steadfast love for Israel (Ezra 9.8f).

In comparison with this, what is significant in the community’s description of themselves as the “root for planting” lies in the fact that they distinguished themselves from the remnant who had returned from the exile. As already seen in chapters 1 and 2, both the post-exilic biblical writings and the early Jewish literature indicate the belief that the covenant relationship between God and Israel still existed. As evidence of this relationship the writers emphasize that their people returned from the exile as the remnant. The community’s differentiation of themselves from other Jews becomes clearer when one considers their claim that God had revealed the hidden things and the mysteries to them in order to establish an everlasting covenant with them. Accordingly, they could insist that God had made a new covenant with them.

---

remnant are contrasted with those who stray (not with the destroyed). This, however, is scant evidence on which to insist that the sect thought of itself as the remnant”.

<sup>53</sup> See above pp. 16f.

### 3.3.2 The Revelation of the Hidden Things and Mysteries

The community claimed that God revealed the hidden things to the original members of the community (CD 3.14) and made known to the Teacher of Righteousness the mysteries of all the words of the prophets (1Qp Hab 2.7ff; 7.4ff). The members of the community were convinced that this revelation was necessary because there had been hidden things in the books of the law (1QS 5.11) and mysteries in the books of the prophets (1QpHab 7.5). The fact that God revealed the hidden things and made known to the Teacher of Righteousness the mysteries of all the words of the prophets must be the crucial point in our understanding of God's everlasting covenant with the Qumran community.

#### i). *Revelation of the hidden things*

According to CD 3.13f, with those who had held fast to the commandments of God, God established his covenant by revealing the hidden things (*hānnis tārôt*) in which all Israel had gone astray.<sup>54</sup> The immediate context shows that the hidden things related to the holy Sabbath and glorious Festivals (CD 3.13ff). In connection with God's holy sabbath and festivals, the hidden things denote calendrical matters. It has been widely accepted that the Essenes regulated their liturgy following the solar calendar of 1 Enoch 72-82 and Jubilees.<sup>55</sup> Convinc-

<sup>54</sup> 1QS 5.11f shows that the community claimed that there had been "hidden things" (*hānnis tārôt*) and "revealed things" (*hānniglôt*) in the books of the law. It is clear that while the "revealed things" of the law must refer to those parts of the law about which there was no dissension between the sect and other Jews, the "hidden things", which were revealed to the sect, were still kept secret from other Jews (1QS 8.11f; 9.17). The community Rule says, "they (other Jews) have not enquired nor sought his ordinances to discover the hidden things in which they have gone astray, while in the things revealed they have acted with a high hand" (1QS 5.11f; 8.11f).

<sup>55</sup> S. Talmon, "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert", in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Jerusalem, 1958), 162-199; R. T. Beckwith, "The Modern Attempt to Reconcile the Qumran Calendar with the True Solar Year", *RQ* 7 (1969-71), 379-396; Vermes, *Qumran in Perspective*, 175-177. This issue will be discussed further in chapter 4.

ing evidence for this has been suggested by Talmon.<sup>56</sup> Leaney summarizes his argument,

DSW 2.1f. makes quite clear that the sect divided the cycle of priestly duty into twenty-six courses. Thus each course served one week in each half-year of a year containing fifty-two weeks, entering upon a week of duty twice in a year.<sup>57</sup>

Further, the hidden things may relate to halachah dealing with lust, wealth and the defiling of the sanctuary, for they were suggested as the means by which Israel went astray (CD 4.16ff.). This view may be countered by suggesting that, in the DSS, Israel's sins in connection with lust, wealth and the defiling of the sanctuary were related to the outcome of the activity of Belial - seeking their own desires, their stubbornness of heart and their forsaking the covenant, rather than to the hidden things in the law. Here we must not lose sight of the fact that there had been a close relationship between the hidden things and disobedience to the commandments of God. According to the CD 5.2ff, the books of the law had been sealed and hidden since the deaths of Eleazar, Joshua and the elders until Zadok arose, because the Israelites were worshipping Ashtoreth.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> S. Talmon, "Calendar", 162-199.

<sup>57</sup> Leaney, *Rule*, 93.

<sup>58</sup> Recently B. Wacholder argues, "Moses had composed two Torah: an ephemeral one of his own day or the Pentateuch; and another *sefer hattorah* designated for the messianic aeon" ("The 'sealed' Torah versus the 'revealed' Torah: An Exegesis of Damascus Covenant V.1-6 and Jeremiah 32.10-14", *RQ* 12 (1986), 352; cf. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran* (Cincinnati, 1983), 124ff). He says, "*Dam. Doc.* V.1-6 refers to the Second Torah of Moses which was discovered by Zadok the True Lawgiver" (*Ibid*). As to how the sect believed that there was a need for a Second Torah of the end of days, he claims, "the need for the Second Torah was indicated by God in Deut 31.19ff: Israel's future idolatrous and blasphemous behaviour will render the First Torah null and void" (p. 355).

Moreover, he insists, "the author of the *Damascus Document* claims on the basis of Deut. 31.26 that Moses inscribed two copies of the eschatological Torah: one was to be sealed and stored, and the other was for public display" (p. 360). Interestingly, he proposes, "the term *sefer hattorah hehathum* (*Dam. Doc.* 5.2) and *niglah* (v.5) correspond to the designations *sefer ... hehathum* and *sefer haggaluy* in Jer 32.10-14" (p. 352). Accordingly, he insists, "Eleazar performed for Moses what Baruch would later for Jeremiah: he hid both the 'sealed document' (*sefer ... hehathum*) and the 'buyer's copy' (*niglah=sefer haggaluy*)" (p. 360).

What attracts attention for the present study is his statement, "the members of the 'new



Concerning the revelation of the hidden things in the law, three points can be observed.

First, the revelation is closely linked with the covenant between God and Israel. God established a new covenant with Israel by revealing to them hidden things in which all Israel went astray (CD 3.13f.). The hidden things were related to Israel's breach of the covenant of God which he had made with the fathers (Moses). God revealed the hidden things in the books of the law in order to establish a new covenant with Israel.

Secondly, the revelation came to those who held fast the commandments of God. The Damascus Document explains the history of Israel. On the one hand, Israel did not keep the commandments of God so they perished. On the other hand, a small group of individuals kept the commandments of God and "were

---

covenant' now possess the *niglah*, the duplicate copy of this eschatological Torah, but the *hathum* remains hidden within the container where it was placed during the last days of Moses" (p.361). Again he emphasizes the same point in the concluding statement.

"Let us not forget that according to *Dam. Doc.* V.4-5 Zadok revealed only the *niglah*, the copy destined for public consultation. The *Hathum* or stored copy remains hidden in another place of storage. The original document of Moses was still sealed within a mystery even after Zadok's discovery of the *niglah*" (p. 367).

The concern here is not whether or not Wacholder's theory is convincing, but whether his theory disproves the idea that there had been "hidden things" and "revealed things" in the Books of the Law. As he argues, the revelation of the hidden things in CD 3.10ff might indicate exactly the community's possession of the *niglah* which was concealed until the rise of Zadok (cf. CD V.2ff). Nevertheless, his argument remains unanswered concerning the sect's claim, "they (the outsider) have not enquired nor sought among His ordinances to discover the hidden things in which they have gone astray, while in the things revealed they have acted with a high hand" (1QS 5.11; cf. 8.11f). According to this claim it is clear that the hidden things are not the ordinances (not the Torah itself), but existed in the ordinances (the Torah). There might be a possibility that the sect claimed the revelation of the hidden things in the law on the basis of Deut 29.29: "the secret things belong to the Lord our God, but the things revealed belong to us and to our sons forever, that we may observe all the words of the law" (Dr. R. Hayward (oral communication).

What is clear for the present study is that the members of the Qumran community were convinced that even the Jews outside the sect possessed the revealed things. The problem to the outsiders here did not come from concealment of the revealed things to them, but from their insolence towards the revealed things and, furthermore, from the fact that the hidden things still remained secret to them (1QS 8.11f; 9.17).

written down as friends of God and covenant partners forever" (CD 3.1ff). The members of the community were convinced that, while all the rest of Israel went astray, they themselves held fast to the commandments of God. In other words, they sought God with a perfect heart (CD 1.10), so that God established his covenant with them by revealing the hidden things.

Thirdly, the term "Israel" here clearly contrasts with "all Israel who went astray". The community had distinguished themselves from other Jews by the fact that they held fast to the commandments of God. The possession of the new revelation and a new covenantal relationship intensified their conviction that they alone were the covenant people, the true Israel.<sup>59</sup>

Their conviction that God had revealed the hidden things to them led them to insist that God had established a new covenant with them. Consequently, they were convinced that they alone were the new covenant people.

*ii). Revelation of the mysteries*

According to 1QpHab 7.5, "God told Habakkuk to write down that which would happen to the final generation, but he did not make known to him when time would come to an end. However, God made known to the Teacher of Righteousness all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets". The word "mystery", *rāz*, is an Aramaic word of Persian origin that is found in biblical Aramaic in Dan 2.18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47; 4.6.<sup>60</sup> In Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar's dream constituted a *rāz* which demanded an interpretation of its hidden meaning. God, the revealer of mysteries (Dan 2.28ff), disclosed them to Daniel so that he could make them known. The "mysteries" in the DSS are related to God's

---

<sup>59</sup> Cross, *Ancient Library*, 128f; G. Vermes, *DSSE*, p.35; Leaney, p.74.

<sup>60</sup> Horgan, *Pesharim*, 237.

works concerning creation, history (beginning and end of the days) and events (salvation and judgment).<sup>61</sup> Further, the community was convinced that there were mysteries in the books of the prophets.<sup>62</sup>

What is significant for the present study is the fact that they were convinced that all the mysteries of the words were closely connected with the last days (the fullness of that time - *g<sup>e</sup>már háqēš*), the time of which God had not made known to Habakkuk. There are various translation of the phrase *g<sup>e</sup>már háqēš*: the fullness of that time (Brownlee, *Habakkuk*, 110), the fulfilment of the end time (Horgan, *Pesharim*, 36), the end of time (Vermes, *DSSE*, 239), die Vollendung der Zeit (Lohse, *Texte Aus Qumran*, 235). Concerning the meaning of *g<sup>e</sup>már háqēš lô' hôdi'ô* (1QpHab 7.2), Brownlee says, "that which was not made known was the entire content to which the enigmatic words really relate, for they contain mysteries not disclosed".<sup>63</sup>

Brownlee's remark is supported by the statement of 1Qp Hab 2.7ff. God set understanding in the heart of the priest (the Teacher) so that he might interpret all the words of his servants, the prophets, through whom he had foretold all that would happen to his people. All these things would happen to the final generation. Accordingly, all the mysteries of the words are closely connected with the last days (the fullness of that time).

Furthermore, it is important to note that the word "to reveal" (*gālāh*) is used not only concerning the hidden things in the law, but also of the mystery of history in the past and present: I will open your ears to the ways of the wicked (*'egleh*

<sup>61</sup> J. Coppens, " 'Mystery' in the Theology of Saint Paul and its Parallels at Qumran", in *Paul and Qumran* (London, 1968), 135-141; Betz, *Offenbarung* 83-87.

<sup>62</sup> J. Coppens calls it a "scriptural mystery" ("Mystery", 136).

<sup>63</sup> W. H. Brownlee, *Habakkuk*, 110.

'ozn<sup>e</sup> kem b<sup>e</sup> dárkê r<sup>e</sup> šā'im) (CD 2.2); I will open your eyes to see and understand the dealings of God (wá'ágálleh 'ênékēm lir<sup>e</sup> 'ôt ūl<sup>e</sup> hābîn b<sup>e</sup> má'āsê 'ēl) (CD 2.14). In context the word *gālāh* is used concerning the history of Israel, particularly events relevant to the community. The word *yādā'* is also used concerning the revelation of those mysteries in the words of the prophets which would occur at the end of days. Concerning the different use of the words *gālāh* and *yādā'* in the DSS, O. Betz points out,

Mit dem bisher beobachteten Gebrauch des Begriffes *gālāh*, der stetz die Enthüllung einer schon vorhandenen, jedoch verdeckten, Sache meint, stimmt es überein, wenn in CD 1.11 das Bekanntmachen der Zukunft als der noch Ungeschehenen Geschichte nicht durch *gālāh*, sondern durch das Verbum *yādā'* (Hi) bezeichnet wird.<sup>64</sup>

With regard to the revelation of the mysteries, the authoritative role of the Teacher of Righteousness in the community is prominent. According to 1QpHab 7.2, the Teacher of Righteousness received the word from the mouth of God. The phrase "the mouth of God" probably indicates his understanding of a prophet-like role, as Jeremiah was declared to be the "prophet from the mouth of God" (Jer 23.16). According to 1QS 8.15, the law was revealed to the prophets by his Holy Spirit (cf. CD 5.21). Interestingly, the hymnist confesses many times that the Spirit of God was in him: "for thou hast upheld me by thy strength and hast poured out thy Holy Spirit within me" (1QH 7.6-7); "thou hast favoured Thy servant with the Spirit of knowledge" (1QH 12.11f; 13.18-19; 17.26).<sup>65</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Betz, *Offenbarung*, 14.

<sup>65</sup> Concerning the identification of the hymnist F. F. Bruce comments, "Whether the speaker in the hymns is the Teacher of Righteousness or not is a moot question. As members of the community believed, it was to him in the first instance that these revelations had been granted". (*Biblical*, 19).

Concerning the Teacher's prophetic role in relation to the gift of the Holy Spirit, W. Grundmann says, "The Teacher is a prophet in virtue of the gift of God's holy spirit. Of the highest significance is the difference between this claim and the Jewish doctrine that no prophet had risen up since Malachai, and that the holy spirit had disappeared from Israel (1 Sotah. 13.2), a doctrine which is foreshadowed in Ps 74.9 and 1 Macc 9.27 and in the prayer of Azariah 13f;

A. Dupont-Sommer claims that the Teacher of Righteousness applied the Songs of the Servant of the Lord to himself (1QH 7.10; 8.36; 18.14-15).<sup>66</sup> He also insists that in connection with the phrase "my covenant" in 1QH 5.23, the Teacher of Righteousness considered himself to be truly the leader of the divine covenant.<sup>67</sup> Furthermore, he says that the "Teacher of Righteousness was conscious of being himself, a new Moses, the prophet similar to Moses whose coming is announced in Deut 18.18-19".<sup>68</sup> Whether the Teacher of Righteousness thought of himself as such a person or not, it is important to note that there were differences between the prophets and the Teacher of Righteousness. G. Jeremias points out a difference between them, even though he says that the Teacher of Righteousness was a prophet: "Aber ein entscheidender Unterschied besteht zwischen dem Lehrer und den atl. Propheten. Die Aufgabe des Lehrers ist es dabei, dass sich alle Worte der Propheten auf die Endzeit beziehen, eine Meinung, die auch im rabbinischen Judentum Vertreter gefunden hat".<sup>69</sup>

Finally, with regard to the revelation of mysteries, what is worth noting is that the community was convinced that those who did not listen to the word of the Teacher of Righteousness were the unfaithful of the new covenant (1QpHab 2.3f; cf. CD 20.28, 32). In context, what is emphasized is that the Teacher's interpretation belongs to the end of days and to what would happen to his people and

---

it is found in *Syr. Bar.* 85.3, and attested for Judaism by Origen (*contra. cels.* 7.8)" (W. Grundmann, "The Teacher of Righteousness of Qumran and the Question of Justification by Faith in the Theology of the Apostle Paul", in *Paul and Qumran*, 88).

<sup>66</sup> A. Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 301.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 362.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 363.

<sup>69</sup> G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen, 1963), 141. Further he says: "Der Lehrer ist von Gott autorisiert, die Geheimnisse der Prophetenworte zu enträtseln, denn die Worte der Propheten sind Geheimnisse (*rāzīm* 1Qp Hab - 7.5), die man ohne Auslegung des Lehrers nicht verstehen kann. Der Lehrer tritt also mit seiner Verkündigung nicht neben die Schrift, sondern er basiert auf der Schrift. Er allein hat von Gott das rechte Verständnis offenbart bekommen. Darum kann er und mit ihm seine Gemeinde nach dem Willen Gottes leben".

his land. The phrase “His people and His land” strongly indicates the covenantal relationship between God and his people. Accordingly, the new covenant is not merely a new covenant but a new covenant related to the end of days.

### 3.3.3 The Forgiveness of Sins

According to CD 3.18, “God, in his wonderful mysteries, forgave their sin and removed their wickedness” (‘ēl b<sup>e</sup>rāzē p<sup>e</sup>lā’āw kipper b<sup>e</sup>’ād ‘āwônām wáyysiśā’ l<sup>e</sup>piš’ām). It is clear that God is the subject of the forgiving action. P. Garnet points out that the verb *kipper* is used with the preposition b<sup>e</sup>’ād with the person to be forgiven. He says, “this usage is probably modelled on 2 Chron 30.18, the only instance in the Old Testament where, with God as the subject and man the beneficiary of the atoning action, the verb is used with the proposition b<sup>e</sup>’ād.<sup>70</sup> It is also true that the forgiveness of sins is closely linked with the phrase “in His wonderful mysteries”. However, it is not easy to determine what the phrase means in the context of the forgiveness of sin. P. Garnet paraphrases it “in his mysterious goodness”.<sup>71</sup>

The author of Hodayoth says “in thy wrath are all chastisements, but in Thy goodness is much forgiveness” (1QH 11.9). The hymnist gives praise that “God opened his ears to wonderful mysteries” (1QH 1.21), “made him a discerning interpreter of wonderful mysteries” (1QH 2.13) and “gave knowledge through wonderful mysteries” (1QH 4.23; 7.27). The Community Rule says that the instructor instructs the members of the community in the wonderful mysteries (1QS 9.18). Even though there is no clear idea in the DSS as to what the “wonderful

<sup>70</sup> P. Garnet, *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls*, WUNT 2.3 (Tübingen, 1977). 98).

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 90; cf. J. Coppens, “Mystery”, in *Paul and Qumran*, 136.

mysteries” mean, probably the wonderful mysteries were reflected in the community’s teachings, particularly its teachings concerning God’s dealing with his people, which constituted the distinctiveness of the community. However, in this section consideration is limited to the Damascus Documents simply because the concern here is to assess how this phrase relates to forgiveness of sins in CD.

First of all, God is the subject of the forgiving action throughout CD except for CD 14.18f, where it is the Messiah: “And this is the exact statement of the ruling in which (they shall walk during the epoch of wickedness, until there shall arise the Messi)ah of Aaron and Israel, and he will make conciliation for their trespass” (CD 14.18f).<sup>72</sup> Concerning the Messianic atonement in connection with CD 14.18f, Garnet admits that the “coming of the Messiah and the eschatological forgiveness are so closely linked that the latter can be spoken of as the purpose of the former”.<sup>73</sup> He, however, advocates that “this passage does not imply that the Messiah will make atonement, but only that his coming is God’s final act in forgiving Israel”.<sup>74</sup> Garnet understands this passage in relation to Dan 9.24. Thus he maintains that the “coming of the Messiah is a sign that God has forgiven Israel in accordance with the programme in Dan 9.24”.<sup>75</sup>

What is significant is the fact that the covenant is suggested as a basis for forgiveness of sin (CD 4.6ff): “[... These are] the holy [founders] whom God forgave; they acquitted the righteous and condemned the guilty. And (as for) all who have entered (the covenant) after them, to behave in accordance with the details (*k<sup>c</sup> pērūs*) of the law in which the founders (*hāri(’)šōnīm*) were instructed,

<sup>72</sup> Rabin’s translation (*Zadokite*, 70).

<sup>73</sup> Garnet, *Salvation*, 97.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 99. Dan 9.24 says that “seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to make atonement for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy place”.

until the completion of the period of these years, God will, according to the covenant which he established with the founders, to forgive their iniquities, forgive them also".<sup>76</sup>

The question raised here is the identification of *hāri(')šōnîm*, with whom God established his covenant. G. Vermes maintains that they were the forefathers.<sup>77</sup> P. Davies, however, argues that they were the founders of the community. Davies suggests five points.

a) The text does not indicate that there is continuity between the first (i.e. pre-exilic) covenant and the covenant of 3.13; it is rather that there is continuity between the covenant relationship of the first members and those who follow.

b) The use of the same phrase *hēqîm b<sup>e</sup>rît* in both 4.9 and 3.13 indicates that the covenant in these passages probably refers to the same covenant.

c) The *hāri(')šōnîm* in line 6 are the members of the same covenant in 3.18, whom God forgave (*kipper b<sup>e</sup>'ád*).

d) The phrase "who came after them" (*hābbā'îm 'āḥārêhem*) refers more naturally to successive members of the same covenant.

e) *k<sup>e</sup>perūs* and *hitwáss<sup>e</sup>rū* are both used in CD of community law, which is not represented as being either known or accepted by the pre-exilic generations.<sup>78</sup> His understanding of *hāri(')šōnîm* as the founders of the community seems to be more convincing.

The following points may be added to the argument given by Davies.

(1) The founders of the community recognized their iniquity and knew that they were guilty (CD 1.8f).

<sup>76</sup> Davies' translation (*Damascus Covenant*, 241).

<sup>77</sup> Vermes, *DSSE*, 100.

<sup>78</sup> Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 99; cf. G. Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 79-80.



(2) God forgave them because of their repentance of their sin (CD 2.5f).

(3) With them God established his covenant (CD 3.13ff).

Accordingly, the covenant here must be the same covenant which God established with the founders of the community. Here forgiveness of sin is closely connected with the covenant.

Secondly, observance of the new interpretation of the law is also closely connected with the forgiveness of sin. In the context those who would be forgiven by God were the ones who had entered into the covenant after the founders, and behaved in accordance with the interpretation of the law in which the founders were instructed.

Thirdly, the forgiveness of sin is also related to the "sure house" (CD 3.19). It is clear that the phrase "sure house" designates the community itself (cf. 1QS 5.6; 8.5,9; 9.6), even though the meaning of "sure house" is a matter of dispute.<sup>79</sup>

### **3.4 Comparison of the New Covenant in the Dead Sea Scrolls with the New Covenant in Jer 31.31-34**

In this section I shall compare the new covenant concept in the DSS with that in Jer 31.31ff under two headings: 1) dissimilarity and 2) similarity.

#### **3.4.1 Dissimilarity**

There are two key points of dissimilarity. First, Jer 31.31ff makes no mention of what the DSS describe as the "hidden things" in the books of the law or of

---

<sup>79</sup> The meaning of "sure house" will be dealt with in relation to the community as a spiritual temple in chapter 4 (p. 157).

the necessity for revelation of the hidden things. Whereas in the old covenant the law was inscribed upon tablets of stone (Exod 31.8; 34.1, 28) and written in a book (Exod 24.4, 7) to be deposited in a sacred place, in the new covenant the same law will be deposited in the human heart. Secondly, the new covenant in the DSS emphasizes the need for teaching of the law (1QS 5.10ff; 6.6; 8.15; CD 6.7; 7.16). However, in the new covenant of Jer 31 everyone has unmediated knowledge of God. It says that "they shall not teach again, ... for they shall all know me" (v. 34). The newly created heart in this new covenant does not need a teacher, since the law no longer stays outside as the externally codified law, but is internalized within the heart by God.

### **3.4.2 Similarity**

It is not difficult to find several points of similarity even in the face of dissimilarity. Four things are suggested here.

First of all, both covenants emphasize a new covenant relationship. Just as Jer 31.31ff announces that Israel had broken the covenant which God had made with their fathers when He brought them out of Egypt (Jer 31.32), the Damascus Document says, "they had forsaken the covenant of God" (CD 3.11). Jer 31.31ff announces that God will make a new covenant with Israel. The Qumran community claimed that God had established his covenant, i.e. the new covenant, with the original members of the community (CD 3.12-13). In connection with this, it is of interest to note that whereas the post-exilic biblical writers were convinced that the covenantal relationship between them and God still existed even in the midst of Israel's disobedience,<sup>80</sup> the members of the

---

<sup>80</sup> See above pp. 30ff.

Qumran community were convinced that the covenantal relationship had been broken because of Israel's sins. Therefore, God had established a new covenantal relationship with them who were the root for planting from the remnant.

Secondly, both new covenants can be distinguished from the old covenant with regard to continuity and discontinuity in relation to the law. The Qumran community declared that God established his covenant with those who had adhered to the commandments of God by revealing to them the hidden things in which all Israel went astray (CD 3.10-14; cf. 1QS 5.11). After the establishment of the new relationship with God they also emphasized that those who were to join the community must return to the law of Moses with all their heart and with all their soul. Nevertheless, in 1QS 5.8f "returning to the law of Moses" is defined as keeping the law of Moses in accordance with all that has been revealed to the sons of Zadok. In the DSS the keeping of the law of Moses indicates continuity, but keeping the law according to the new revelation shows discontinuity. Here continuity and discontinuity between the old covenant and the new covenant of DSS can be discerned in connection with the law.

Continuity and discontinuity with regard to the law can also be found in Jer 31.31ff. The fact of the same law (my law) indicates continuity, while the writing of the law on the heart shows discontinuity with the old covenant, where the law was inscribed upon tablets of stone (Exod 31.8; 34.28) and written in a book (Exod 24.27) to be deposited in a sacred place. The new covenant in Jer 31.31ff will be an inward relationship with God through His writing the law on the hearts of the people: "I will put my law within them, and on their heart I will write it" (v. 33).<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> See above p. 20.

Thirdly, both covenants emphasize the keeping of the law. The announcement of the internalization of the law within the heart may indicate that the new covenant people, unlike the old covenant people, will keep the law. Jer 32.39f says that God will give the Israelites' hearts the fear of God so that they will never turn away (cf. 24.7; Ezek 36. 26f). As I have argued above,<sup>82</sup> the giving of the fear of God in the heart in relation to the establishment of the everlasting covenant can also be understood in terms of keeping the law. With regard to the new covenant, the Qumran community's claim to the revelation of the hidden things in the law of Moses, their observance of the law as against the Israelites' trespass of the law, and their emphasis on the voluntary commitment to observance of the law, indicate that the community claimed to keep the law.

Fourthly, both covenants emphasize forgiveness of sin. Jer 31.31ff announces that God will forgive the iniquity of the people and, furthermore, no longer remember their sins (v 34). Even though the announcement itself makes no mention of any provision for the forgiveness of sin, it is clear that God is the one who forgives the sins of his people on the basis of his new covenantal relationship with them. The Qumran community was convinced that forgiveness of sin was based on the new covenantal relationship between God and his people. CD 3.18 says, "God, in His wonderful mysteries, forgave their sins and their wickedness". It is clear that those who were forgiven by God were the ones with whom God had established the everlasting covenant. According to CD 4.6-9, God forgave and would forgive those who had entered into the covenant which God had established with the founders of the community. Furthermore, forgiveness of sin in CD is closely linked with a sure house which God had built for those who were forgiven and would be forgiven. The sure house in CD 3.19 must be understood in terms

---

<sup>82</sup> See above pp. 20ff.

of God's establishment of an everlasting covenant, the new covenant, with the community.<sup>83</sup>

### **3.5 Summary and Conclusion**

In relation to the Teacher of Righteousness, Davies' distinction between the so-called "parent community" and the "new covenant community" does not discredit the validity of the view that the community's use of the term "new covenant" indicates that the community believed that the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled among them. His distinction is not justified, because the Interpreter of the Law, who was related to the so-called original "Damascus covenant", is arguably the Teacher of Righteousness himself, who was closely connected with the "new covenant in the land of Damascus". Furthermore, a large-scale defection envisaged in CD 19.33 and 20.8ff was not the new covenant community's separation from the so-called parent community, but rather a defection from the new covenant community, whatever the scale of the defection might have been. It is clear that those who were condemned and who joined the outsiders had at one time entered into the new covenant.

The absence of any interpretation of Jer 31.31ff by the pesher method cannot be decisive in advocating that the community did not understand their new covenant in relation to the new covenant of Jer 31. This absence may well be connected with the difficulty of applying the pesher method to Jer 31.31ff, mainly because of their emphasis on the teaching of the law.

There is dissimilarity between the new covenant in Jer 31 and that in the DSS. In the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff there is no mention of what the DSS call

---

<sup>83</sup> This point will be considered in chapter 4.

“the hidden things in relation to the law”. What Jer 31.33 says is that in the new covenant God will put his law in the human heart. Furthermore, Jer 31.34 says that everyone has unmediated knowledge of God, an idea which is absent from the new covenant in the DSS.

Nevertheless, the Qumran community’s understanding of a strong link between the new covenant in the DSS and that of Jer 31.31ff can be seen by their declaration that God had made an everlasting covenant with them (CD 3.11ff). The community’s explanation of the background to God’s establishment of the everlasting covenant, and their understanding of the significance of that covenant, indicate that they understood their new covenant in terms of the fulfilment of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff. The following three points can be suggested as evidence of it.

First, the community’s description of themselves as the “root for planting”, and their claim that Israel had broken the covenant which God had made with their fathers, seem to relate to their claim that God had made a new covenant with them. The community’s self-understanding is distinctive, compared with the post-exilic biblical writings and early Jewish literature, where the Israelites were convinced that the covenant relationship which had been established between God and their fathers existed even in their own days. Hence, the Qumran community’s understanding of the necessity of a new covenant relationship with God seemed to be derived from the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff.

Secondly, the community believed that God had established his everlasting covenant by revealing the hidden things in the law of Moses to those who had adhered to God’s commandments. The community’s emphasis on the strict observance of the law according to God’s new revelation of the hidden things indicates

both continuity and discontinuity between the new covenant in the DSS and the old covenant, just as continuity and discontinuity can be discerned between the new covenant of Jer 31 and the old covenant in relation to the law. Accordingly, continuity and discontinuity between the old covenant and the new covenant in relation to the law may further suggest a link between the concept of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff and that in the DSS.

Thirdly, CD 3.18 says, "God, in his wonderful mysteries, forgave their sin and removed their wickedness". It is clear that God is the subject of the forgiving action. Furthermore, the community closely related God's establishment of the everlasting covenant to his forgiveness of sin of His people. According to CD 4.6-9, it is clear that God forgave and would forgive those who entered into the covenant which God had established with the founders of the community. Jer 31.31ff says that God is the one who forgives the sins of His people on the basis of His new covenant relationship with the people. Thus, it is probable that the concept of the forgiveness of sins in the new covenant of the DSS must have found its origin in the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff.

Here we can say that even in the face of dissimilarities, it is an almost inescapable conclusion that the new covenant of the Dead Sea Scrolls is closely linked with the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff and seems to find its origin there.

## Chapter 4

### The Distinct<sup>ive</sup> Nature of the New Covenant in the Dead Sea Scrolls

---

In chapter 3 I discussed whether the members of the Qumran community believed that the prophecy of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled within themselves. I concluded that even though there are dissimilarities between the new covenant of Jer 31 and that of the Qumran community, the members of the community were convinced that the prophecy of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled in their own history. The following chapter will discuss the distinct<sup>ive</sup> nature of the new covenant concept in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First of all, I shall provide further evidence that the Qumran community believed that the prophecy of Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled among them. In the second place I shall examine the idea of the new covenant for a comparison later with the new covenant concept in the NT. In order to accomplish these goals I shall examine four characteristics of the new covenant in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

4.1 addresses entry into the new covenant. There have been various debates about how and when new members were recognized as full members of the community. This question may be answered by examining the community's emphases on i) voluntary return to the law of Moses in accordance with the new revelation, ii) the different stages for admission to the community, iii) separation from other Jews, iv) purity.

4.2 looks at the community's concept of the law. As has been seen in chapter 2, the law is an important feature in the new covenant of Jer 31. Thus the concern here is to investigate the community's concept of the law with regard to



the new covenant. Chapter 3 has shown that the community maintained that God established his covenant with those who had adhered to his commandments by revealing to them the hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray (CD 3.10-14; 1QS 5.11). Chapter 3 has also shown that the hidden things were related to the holy Sabbaths and his glorious Festivals (CD 3.14). So the focus of discussion will be the community's new interpretation of the Sabbath law.

4.3 discusses the community's concept of the temple. The community was convinced that the Jerusalem temple was defiled. They eventually rejected the Jerusalem temple cult. This section examines (a) the relationship between the temple and the new covenant, and (b) the issue of how the community made up for the loss of the function of the Jerusalem temple, once they had rejected the Jerusalem cult.

4.4 examines the eschatological tension between the contemporary situation of the community and the future messianic era in connection with the renewal of the covenant of perpetual priesthood and the eschatological temple. The concern here is how, under its new covenant, the community attempted to solve the problem of the apostasy of unfaithful members. The answer can be found in the community's conviction that the contemporary eschatological era, in which a tendency to apostasy prevailed, would be terminated with the coming of the Messiah when the covenant of perpetual priesthood would be renewed.

#### **4.1 Entry into the (New) Covenant**

The Qumran community emphasized that other Jews, who were already part of the covenant people, should enter into the Qumran new covenant voluntarily by "binding an oath to return to the Torah of Moses". They also stressed that the new members must separate from the "men of falsehood". Moreover, the new members could become fully qualified members only after passing through

four distinct stages of admission, which took more than two years to accomplish. It is clear that these four stages were related to the community's emphasis on purity. For the present study the aim here is, first of all, to examine whether the community's emphases on the new members' voluntary entry into the new covenant and on their separation from the "men of falsehood" indicate that they believed themselves to be the only new covenant people, the true Israel. The second is to discuss why purity in new members was so important to the Qumran community. Therefore, the emphasis on "entry into the new covenant" will be examined under four sub-headings: §4.1.1 The voluntary nature of entry, §4.1.2 Separation from the men of falsehood, §4.1.3 The four distinct stages of entry into the new covenant and §4.1.4 The emphasis on purity.

There are three explicit texts in 1QS dealing with the process necessary for new members entering into the Qumran new covenant community (1QS 1.16-2.18; 5.7b-13a; 6.13b-23a). 1QS 1.16ff is a large unit, describing a ritual ceremony, mainly for initiation into the new covenant and the community.<sup>1</sup> This pericope consists of four parts - a command to enter the covenant (1.16b-18a), a liturgical ritual (1.18b-20), an historical review (1.21-2.1a) and lastly, blessing and curses (2.1b-18). The question to be raised concerning this pericope is whether or not

---

<sup>1</sup> There has been a certain amount of debate concerning the ritual in this pericope: is it simply an initiation ceremony for new members of the community or is it both an initiation ceremony for new members and a renewal ceremony for all the members of the community? Many scholars maintain that it is both. They claim that the expression, "thus, they shall do year after year" in 1QS 2.19 indicates an annual covenant renewal ceremony (see Cross, *Ancient Library*, 96; Leaney, *Rule*, 95ff; J. Muilenburg, "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations", *VT* 9 (1959), 347-365; J. Milik, *Ten years of Discovery* (London, 1959), 116-117).

On the other hand, Baltzer doubts that the covenant renewal festival was an annual celebration. He suggests that the covenantal ceremony was held whenever the situation demanded it (K. Baltzer, *The Covenant Formulary* (Phila., 1971), 59-70; cf. D. J. McCarthy, "Covenant in the OT", *CBQ* 27 (1965), 226). E. W. Kim maintains that 1QS 1.16-2.18 indicates an annual ceremony of initiation, but not that of a covenantal renewal ceremony. He claims that at the annual assembly only the new members had to enter the covenant in the presence of God (1QS 1.16) as well as in the presence of the volunteers (1QS 5.8). Further, he insists that 2.19b-25a begins procedural instruction for those who participate in the initiation liturgy (E. W. Kim, *Eschatological Examination*, 320ff). Whatever may be the case, it is clear that this pericope certainly deals with an initiation ceremony for new members.

the command "to enter into the order of the community" (*bô' b<sup>e</sup>serek háyyáhád*) is the same as the idea "to come into the covenant before God" (*'ābôr bā<sup>b</sup>e rīt lipnē 'ēl*) (1QS 1.16)? The same idea can be seen in 1QS 5.7b-8a: "Any one who enters into the council of the community shall enter into the covenant of God in the sight of all those who volunteer themselves" (*kôl hábbā' l'āšát háyyáhád yābô' bib<sup>e</sup> rīt 'ēl l'ēnēkôl hāmmittā<sup>d</sup> bīm*).<sup>2</sup>

The second pericope (1QS 5.7b-13a) is the regulation concerning new members' entry into the new covenant. The regulation defines three elements: first, anyone who wants to enter into the council of the community "shall enter into the covenant of God in the presence of all those who volunteer themselves" (7c-8a); second, he "shall take an oath to return to the Torah of Moses" (8b); and third, he "shall take upon himself separation from the men of error" (10b). Here "entering into the covenant" is further defined as "entrance into the council of the community" (*hábā' lá'āšát háyyáhád*).<sup>3</sup> The third text describes four distinct stages of admission to the community. In relation to these three texts I shall now discuss the following four areas, which are relevant to the present study.

<sup>2</sup> O. Betz maintains that while the word *bô'* was used in relation to the new member's entry into the order of the community, the word *'ābôr* was used in relation to the member's annual entry into the covenant (oral communication); cf. J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea*. 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB (translated title, written in Hebrew, Jerusalem, 1965).

<sup>3</sup> Concerning the "council of the community", 1QS 8.1 says that "(there shall be) within the 'council of the community' twelve men and three priests". The question raised here is whether the "council of the community" indicates an "inner circle" within the community or the community as a whole. Sutcliffe and Leaney claim that the "council of the community" refers not to the community as a whole but to the fifteen men who were the original members of the community. (E. F. Sutcliffe, "The First Fifteen Members of the Qumran Community", *JSS* 4 (1959), 137-138; Leaney, *Rule*, 211).

However, P. Wernberg-Møller, Matthias Delcor and Vermes maintain that the fifteen members in 1QS 8.1ff were an "inner circle" within the "council of the community". (P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline. Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (Leiden, 1957), 122; Matthias Delcor, "The Courts of the Church of Corinth and the Courts of Qumran", in *Paul and Qumran*, 79; Vermes, *DSSE*, 38). Wernberg-Møller says: "So, 'št hyhd should probably also in our line be taken as alluding to the community as a whole, and the meaning is: therefore, what is said in the following applies to the community, and not the twelve or fifteen men exclusively" (*Ibid.*).

#### 4.1.1 The Voluntary Nature of Entry

The Qumran community insisted that Israelites must enter into their new covenant voluntarily. Any Gentile could become a Jew, a member of the covenant people by circumcision in accordance with the law of Moses, and, at the same time, any Israelite could be cut off from the covenant people by violating the covenant. It is fair to say that normally from an OT perspective, entry into the (old) covenant was essentially through birth in the first instance, and circumcision in the second.<sup>4</sup> In fact, circumcision was not only a sign of membership in "Israel" but also a covenantal sign between Israel and God (Gen 17.9-14).

The Qumran community constantly applied the term "circumcision" to a process of heart-cleansing: "he shall in community circumcise the foreskin of his inclination and his stiffneck" (1QS 5.5); "he did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart" (1QpHab 11.13; cf. Deut 10.16; 30.6; Jer 4.4).<sup>5</sup> The community claimed that the covenantal relationship had been broken between the Israelites and God, since the Israelites "had forsaken the covenant of God and chosen what they wanted and been drawn after the stubbornness of their hearts to do each one as he wanted" (CD 3.11).

Nevertheless, the community pointed out that God, remembering the covenant of the forefathers, had made his new covenant with the original members of the community who had held fast to his covenants (CD 3.13). At the same time, the community pointed out that the original members had perceived their iniquity and recognized that they were guilty men and like blind men groping their way. They claimed that God had observed their deeds and raised for them a Teacher

---

<sup>4</sup> Vermes, *Qumran in Perspective*, 171.

<sup>5</sup> The community's understanding of circumcision shows a contrast with contemporary literature such as 1 Macc 1.60f where "circumcision, as an essential expression of the national religion, came to be regarded as worth dying for" (cf. 1 Macc 2, 46; 2 Macc 4.25) (R. Meyer, "περιτομή", TDNT VI, 77-78).

of Righteousness to guide them in the way of his heart (CD 1.5ff). Furthermore, the community claimed that God had raised up the Teacher of Righteousness in order to make known to him all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets (1QpHab 7.4-5).

Therefore, as far as the community was concerned, the covenantal relationship between God and themselves had been reestablished through the repentance of the original members of the community and through God's initiative in the new revelation. Hence the community insisted that although those entering the community were all Jews (1QS 6.13b), they had to join the new covenant voluntarily by taking an oath before the witnesses to return to the Torah of Moses (1QS 5.7-13).<sup>6</sup> According to CD 15.5ff, even the children of the members of the community had to wait until adulthood to make their solemn vows of entry into the new covenant. In short, the voluntary nature of entry into the new covenant indicates that the basis of initiation as covenant people had changed from birth to choice.<sup>7</sup>

Furthermore, the community stipulated that a novitiate should take a binding oath "to return to the Torah of Moses" (*lāšūb 'el tōrāt mōšeh*) (1QS 5.7-13).<sup>8</sup> In 1QS 5.8f "to return to the Torah of Moses" is defined as "keeping the law of Moses in accordance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok". The community claimed that those who were not in the covenant went astray with regard to the "hidden things" and transgressed the "revealed things" insolently.

---

<sup>6</sup> Sanders posits this idea as following: "Unlike the Rabbis, who dealt primarily with how Israelites should behave within the covenant and thus, remain in it (and only occasionally with how Gentiles might enter), the community insisted that individuals, even though already Israelites, must consciously join their covenant" (*PPJ*, 270).

<sup>7</sup> N. Dahl, "Review of Paul and Palestinian Judaism", *RSR* 4 (1978), 153-58.

<sup>8</sup> On the basis of unpublished fragments from cave 4, scholars maintain that this ceremony took place at the annual feast of Weeks (Milik, *Ten Years*, 103; Vermes, *Qumran Perspective*, 103). It is worth noting that Milik advocates that this ceremony recalled the feast of Weeks in Jubilees by suggesting that according to the unpublished fragment this ceremony took place in the third month of the year as Jubilees did (*Ibid.*, 117).

According to CD 3.10-14, the “hidden things” were revealed only to the new covenant community. The “hidden things” had been recently revealed to the community, but still remained a secret to the outsiders (cf. 1QS 8.11 f; 9.17). The “revealed things” must be the part of the law about which there was no dissension between the community and the other Jews. It is evident that the community’s study of the law which led to knowledge of the hidden things developed into the community’s own precepts. Consequently, their emphasis on returning to the law of Moses according to the new revelation separated them from other Jews outside the community. This leads us to another characteristic of entry into the new covenant in the DSS, separation from the “men of falsehood”.

#### **4.1.2 Separation from the Men of Falsehood**

The community stipulated that new members of the community should separate (*lāhibādēl*) themselves from all the “men of falsehood” (*’ánšê hā’āwel*) who walked in the way of wickedness (1QS 5.10).<sup>9</sup> According to 1QS 5.1-3, the whole community should separate from the congregation of the men of falsehood and submit to the authority of the sons of Zadok, priests who kept the covenant, and to the authority of the “multitude of the men of the community” who held fast to the covenant (the community’s).<sup>10</sup> The “men of falsehood” are defined as those who walk in wickedness (1QS 5.11) and in context the phrase refers to other Jews who were not obedient to the Zadokite priest to whom the “hidden things were revealed, and who preserved the covenant”.<sup>11</sup> In other places, “men of falsehood” refers to apostates who departed from the new covenant community (1QH 4.19). According to CD 19.34, all the men who had entered the “new covenant in the land of Damascus” and later turned back, acted treacherously, departed from the well of living water and should not be reckoned in the “council of the people”.

---

<sup>9</sup> Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 61.

<sup>10</sup> Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 109.

<sup>11</sup> Sanders, *PPJ*, 224.

The community's emphasis on separation from other Jews leads to the community's concept of "Israel". Sanders raises the question of whether or not "the community, when defining itself over against the non-sectarian Israelites, appropriated to itself the title 'Israel'."<sup>12</sup> Many scholars maintain that the community considered themselves to constitute the "true Israel".<sup>13</sup> While admitting that the community's view of themselves as the true Israel, "is accurate in one way", Sanders claims that "they did not simply appropriate the 'title'."<sup>14</sup> His view is that "the members seem to have been conscious of their status as the community, chosen from out of Israel, and as being a *forerunner of the true Israel*, which God would establish to fight the decisive war".<sup>15</sup>

He suggests a reason why the community did not consider itself exclusively Israel: "When dealing with the events of the last days, the enemies, in the view of the authors of 1QM, 1QSa and 1QpHab, are the Gentiles, while the elect are the Israelites - apparently all of Israel which survives, not just the present community. The community believed that eschatological Israel would be formed by the conversion of the rest of Israel to the way of the community".<sup>16</sup>

As Sanders points out, as far as the eschatological period is concerned, the title "Israel" signifies a distinction between Israel and the nations rather than between the community and other Jews. He rightly says that the "community believed that eschatological Israel would be formed by the conversion of the rest of Israel to the way of the community". However, it is important to note that in that eschatological age other Jews would not exist as an entity distinct from the community, because they would have already joined the community (1QSa 1.1-6). What seems to be a weak point in his argument is that Sanders discounts

---

<sup>12</sup> Sanders, *PPJ*, 244

<sup>13</sup> Cross, *Ancient Library*, 128f; Leane, *Rule*, 74; H. Ringgren, *Faith of Qumran* (Phila., 1963), 137, 163; Vermes, *DSSE*, 35.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 245

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 247.

some passages where the term “Israel” refers not to Israel as a whole but clearly to the community itself. He says,

When the community covenant is called the “covenant for all Israel” (CD 15.5), the meaning is probably that the community covenant is the one in which all Israel should be, rather than that the community is exclusively Israel; a similar claim is probably being made in CD 3.13.<sup>17</sup>

His general application of the term “Israel” to the Jews as a whole discounts the community’s special use of the term “Israel” applied exclusively to the community itself. It is clear that the term “Israel” in CD 3.13 contrasts with all Israel who went astray. The community distinguished themselves from other Jews by the fact that they held fast to the commandments of God. The possession of the new revelation and a new covenantal relationship intensified their conviction that they alone were the covenant people, the true Israel.

#### **4.1.3 Four Distinct Stages of Entry into the New Covenant**

1QS 6.13-23 shows four distinct stages for admission to the community: 6.13b-15b; 15c-17; 18-21a; 21b-23. In the first stages (1QS 6.13b-15b), any one who wanted to enter into the covenant community was examined by the “overseer” (*háppāqîd*) on his understanding and deeds. If he passed the test, the overseer would bring him into the covenant to return to the truth and to turn away from all iniquity. The overseer instructed him in all the decrees of the community.

In the second stage (1QS 6.15c-17), the “many” (*hárábbîm*) asked themselves about his affairs. The term the “many” usually refers to the fully qualified members of the community.<sup>18</sup> If the (casting) lot<sup>19</sup> was favourable to him, he could approach the “council of the community”, but he was still prohibited from touch-

---

<sup>17</sup> Sanders, *PPJ.*, 247.

<sup>18</sup> S. Liebermann, “The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline”, *JBL* 71 (1952), 203; C. Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 8; P. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 101.

<sup>19</sup> Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 108; Leancy, 166-167.



ing the “purity of the many” (*ṭohōrāt hārābbîm*) and transferring his wealth to the “property of the many” (*hôn hārābbîm*). The “purity of many” may refer to the common meals, from which the applicant and the first-year novitiate were excluded.<sup>20</sup> The “property of many” must be a common fund to which members contributed from “their own income, tithes and for misdemeanours”.<sup>21</sup> J. Milik suggests that the members had a considerable amount of money, since there was a considerable number of bronze coins found in the remains of the settlement.<sup>22</sup>

In the third stage (1QS 6.18-21a), when the novitiate had completed a year among the community, again the “many” enquired about his affairs according to “his understanding and his deeds in the law” (*śiklô ūmá‘āšâw báttôrāh*). The term *śiklô* here means the applicant’s religious knowledge (e.g. Aboth 1.7).<sup>23</sup> If the (casting) lot was favourable to him, he would approach the “company of the community” (*sôd háyyáhád*) but he was still prohibited from touching the “drink of the many” (*másqēh hārābbîm*). The term “drink of many” here refers to the liquids which accompanied the common meals of the community.<sup>24</sup>

In the fourth stage (1QS 6.21b-23), when he had completed a second year among the community, if the “many” decided in his favour, he entered into the order of his rank among his brothers for law, justice and purity. He then had certain rights such as voting and participating in the “drink of the many”. From that time his wealth was transferred to the community.<sup>25</sup>

In relation to these four distinct stages, there have been various debates about how and when new members were regarded as part of the new covenant people.

---

<sup>20</sup> Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 8.

<sup>21</sup> Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 31; M. Black, *The Essene Problem* (London, 1961), 24ff; M. Newton, *Purity*, 23.

<sup>22</sup> J. Milik, *Ten Years*, 102.

<sup>23</sup> Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 5. Rabin remarks that the status of a member within a group was determined by the different degrees of religious knowledge.

<sup>24</sup> Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 9; Milik, *Ten Years*, 102; Newton, *Purity*, 21.

<sup>25</sup> Black, *Essene Problem*, 19ff.

The dominant debate has been over the issue of whether a baptismal initiation was necessary for entry into the new covenant community. Some scholars advocate that the accepted initiate became part of the new covenant people through an initiatory baptism. Their main argument is that the phrase “to enter into the covenant” and “to enter into the water” are one and the same act (1QS 5.7-8, 13; cf. 1QS 3.4-12). Further, it has been maintained that “entering into the water” (*bô’ bámmáyim*) and the “purity of the Men of Holiness” (*tāhārát ’ánšê háqqôdeš*) are one and the same thing.<sup>26</sup> Accordingly, the term the “Purity of the Many” to which admission is permitted to the novice (1QS 6.16) and the “purification of Men of Holiness” (1QS 5.13) are claimed to be one and the same, since *’ánšê háqqôdeš* and *hárabbîm* stand for the members of the Qumran community.<sup>27</sup> Consequently, it has been claimed that the novitiates became the new covenant people through an initiatory baptism, that is, the “Purity of the Many” at the end of the first year of the novitiate.

Other scholars reject the existence of an initiatory baptism into the Qumran community. First of all, although they admit that the new member’s admission to the ablutions of the community would have a special character, they maintain that there was no evidence that it differed in form from the ablutions that would take place after the initiation.<sup>28</sup>

Secondly, if some initiatory ceremony were to be accepted, it should be when the new member entered into the new covenant. The first two texts (1QS 1.16-2.18; 5.7-13) showed that the new member took a solemn oath before witnesses to turn to the Law of Moses when he entered into the new covenant. However, there is no mention of a bath here. These texts also indicate that one who

---

<sup>26</sup> Cross, *Ancient Library*, 70.

<sup>27</sup> A. T. Abraham, *The Baptismal Initiation of the Qumran Community* (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton Theo. Seminary, 1973), 163.

<sup>28</sup> H. H. Rowley, “The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect”, in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester, 1959), 222.

entered into the community was the same as one who entered into the council of the community (1QS 1.16; 5.7b-8a). The third text (1QS 6.13b-23), shows, "one who was brought into the covenant" was not yet the one who belonged to the "Council of the Community".

It is to be noted that there is a difference between the first two texts and the third text. In the first two texts "one who entered into the new covenant" did so by means of the new member's solemn oath before the witnesses. On the other hand, in the third text in 1QS6.13b-15a, one who came into the new covenant did not come by means of a public ceremony but through instruction by the overseer in all the laws of the community. The public ceremony of entry into the covenant described in the first two texts must be identified with the process undergone at the end of the first stages in the third text. After this ceremony the new member was ready to pass through the different levels of the purity of the community.<sup>29</sup>

Thirdly, the "purity of the many" refers not to the initial bath but to the common meals of the community. It is important to note that there is no mention of ritual bath in 1QS 6.13ff. This pericope may imply that "prior ablution was required before one could in fact touch 'the purity'."<sup>31</sup>

These four distinct stages of new members' entry into the new covenant are closely tied to the community's emphasis on purity, to which I shall now turn.

#### **4.1.4 The Emphasis on the Purity**

Four points will be discussed here with regard to the community's emphasis on the purity.

---

<sup>29</sup> Newton, *Purity*, 30.

<sup>31</sup> Newton, *Ibid.*, 26. He says: "The purity" refers to those things which belong to the community, both individually and communally. This includes a knowledge and understanding of the community's interpretation of the purity rules; but, more specifically, it can refer to food and is frequently used in this way when a distinction is made between food and property".

i). The community regarded other Jews as impure (CD 2.1; 5.7).<sup>32</sup> According to CD 5.7, the community accused those who were involved with the temple in Jerusalem of being unclean, since they lay with menstruating women. CD 6.17 commanded those who had been admitted into the covenant that they should “separate” (*ʔhābdīl*) the “unclean” (*hāṭṭāmēʔ*) and the “clean” (*hāṭṭāhôr*) and make known the difference between the “holy” (*hāqqôdes̄*) and the “profane” (*hāḥôl*)<sup>33</sup> While Newton comments, “the task of distinguishing between the pure and impure is expressed by the use of the verb *badal*”, he suggests that in the OT the verb *bādāl* is used to describe several different situations: the “setting apart of the priesthood from the rest of Israel (Lev 10.10; 11.47; 20.25); the separation of the clean from the unclean (Ezek 22.26; 44.23); the separation of Israel from the people [of the nations] (Lev 20.24, 26; Ezra 6.21)”.<sup>34</sup> Further, he rightly comments that while the “separation from the nations in Lev 20.24, 26 (‘I am the Lord your God, who have [sic] separated you from the people’) forms the model, ... the distinction at Qumran is between themselves and the rest of Israel rather than between themselves and the Gentiles”.<sup>35</sup>

ii). The community’s notion of the impurity of outsiders provided the basis of their strict rules of purity for new members’ entry into the community (1QS 6.13-23; cf. 1QS 9.15). The process of purification for applicants took more than two years. They needed to be clean before they entered into the community, partly because the community had to protect itself from the impurity of the

<sup>32</sup> Newton, *Purity*, 24.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. 1QS 5.18.

<sup>34</sup> Newton, *Purity*, 15-16

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 16: “an expression of this sentiment is given in 1QS 5.1: ‘They [the men of community] shall separate *badal* from the congregation of the men of falsehood’. It seems that the ‘men of falsehood’ are other Jews who had not submitted to the authority of the Zadokite priesthood. The members of the community are exhorted to separate themselves from ‘all the men of falsehood’ (1QS 5.10), ‘those not reckoned in his Covenant’ (i.e. the covenant of Qumran) (1QS 5.18), the “habitation of ungodly men” (1QS 8.13), ‘the Sons of the Pit’ (CD 6.15) and ‘all those who have not turned aside from all ungodliness’ (1QS 9.20). While these groups are clearly defined, there is no reason to suppose that they are anything other than non-sectarian Jews. The Qumran community had no occasion to enter into a polemic with Gentiles” (p. 16-17).

outside.<sup>36</sup> Hence new members had only limited contact with the community and its property in accordance with the four distinct stages of admission discussed above.<sup>37</sup>

iii). The community emphasized the Spirit as the way of purification.<sup>38</sup> With regard to the new members' purification the community's emphasis was not only on the water of washing but also repentance. 1QS 3.6-9 describes the way of purification: "In the Spirit of Holiness (which is given) to the community in its truth he will be purified from all his iniquity" (3.7); "He will be sprinkled with the waters of purification and sanctified with the water of washing" (3.9). In this context two things are clear. The community maintained a close connection between the cleansing power of the Spirit of Holiness and that of water and, at the same time, stressed the necessity of repentance and submission to God's precepts prior to any kind of washing. Newton says, "while column six, which describes the process of the new member through the levels of purity, makes no specific mention of immersion at this time, 1QS 5.13 would suggest that a cleansing is necessary before one may touch the "purity" and in fact one would expect that each stage through which a novice passed on his way to full membership required similar bathing".<sup>39</sup>

It is important however not to lose sight of the fact that repentance was required prior to washing. The community emphasized that applicants turn from wickedness (1QS 5.1, 14) and join the community voluntarily (1QS 5.7). One who joined the community practised truth in the community with humility and did not walk in the stubbornness of his heart to stray after his own heart and the wickedness of his own inclination (1QS 5.3-5). The community strongly insisted

---

<sup>36</sup> The community regarded themselves as members of a temple-like community. Thus, they applied the strict rules of purity to their members in order to fit them for temple service.

<sup>37</sup> See above pp. 135ff.

<sup>38</sup> Purification by the Spirit will be considered later.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

that no man should enter the waters in order to approach the purity of the men of holiness because men would not be purified unless they turned from their wickedness (1QS 5.14).

Regarding the two descriptions of the way of purification, Newton comments, "its intention is to point to the necessity of repentance for those who wished to join the community and to teach the uselessness of any kind of washing unless it is preceded by a submission to God's precepts".<sup>40</sup>

iv). The community placed an emphasis on purity because they regarded it as a vital element for maintaining their status and for functioning as a new covenant people. Newton points out the importance of the concept of purity in the community: "in the Scrolls purity terminology occurs in two principal contexts: the requirements for and the consequences of admission to the community and the maintenance of status once a member was in the community".<sup>41</sup>

First. purity by "washing with water" is required for all the community . CD 11.21 says, "no man entering the house of worship shall come unclean and in need of washing". The community emphasized the need for purity in worshippers. This regulation was similar to that for priests who participated in the sacrifices (Exod 30.17; 40.32-32; Lev 22.6). The priests in the Jerusalem temple practised washing before offering the sacrifice (Jub 21.16; M. Tamid 1.2; M. Yoma 3.2). The requirement of washing for worshippers in the community was in accordance with the notion that the community in the contemporary situation substituted "prayer" and "perfection of way" for sacrifice in the temple (1QS 9.4, 5).<sup>42</sup> Hence the purity of the worshippers must be connected with maintaining the purity of the community at the level required for temple service in Jerusalem.

---

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 28.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>42</sup> G. Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 93-106.

Secondly, the community meal was eaten in a state of purity.<sup>43</sup> It is commonly considered that washing with water was practised before attendance at the community meal. Even though there is no explicit statement of washing in relation to the community meal, the fact that the meal was eaten in a state of purity presupposes some form of washing before participating in the meal (1QS 5.13; cf. 1QS 6.16f, 20ff; 7.16, 19, 23).<sup>44</sup> 1QS 6.2f indicates that the community meals were to be a part of the activities of the community: "together they shall eat and together they shall bless God and together they shall counsel".<sup>45</sup>

1QS 6.4f shows that the priest had a leading role in the community meals: the "priest shall be first to stretch forth his hand to bless at the beginning of the bread or the wine". Regarding the role of the priest and the bread and wine, B. Gärtner advocates that the community meal was sacral in character.<sup>46</sup> He also suggests that this view is supported by the meals of the Therapeutae.<sup>47</sup> However, the idea has been opposed by many scholars.<sup>48</sup> Regarding the purity of the meal, J. Neusner points to the fact that the Fellowship (*ḥaburah*), a religious group before the destruction of the temple, had eaten "secular food" (*ḥwlyn*) in a state of ritual purity and the Pharisaic traditions ascribed to the ancients the practice of eating even common food in a state of priestly purity.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>43</sup> J. van der Ploeg, "The Meals of the Essenes", *JJS*, 2 (1957), 163-75; J. Priest, "Messiah", 95-100.

<sup>44</sup> H. Ringgren, *Faith*, 221.

<sup>45</sup> L. H. Schiffmann, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Missoula, 1983), 191: "Blessing was apparently part of a fixed regimen of daily prayers as has been demonstrated by S. Talmon" ("The 'Manual of Benedictions' of the Community of Judaeon Desert", *RQ* 2 (1959-60), 475-500). The blessing in the passage under consideration does not refer to the blessings recited for eating food, but rather to the liturgical worship of the group. Taking counsel occurred in the *Moshav Ha-rabbim*, the Qumran legislative and judicial assembly.

<sup>46</sup> B. Gärtner, *Temple*, 10-13.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> van der Ploeg, "Meal", 163-175; Schiffmann, *Sectarian Law*, 191-197; Newton, *Purity*, 34-36. Schiffmann stresses: "The recitation of benedictions before the meal and at its conclusion by a priest and the required ritual purity at the meal in no way make the meal sacral. Rather, these traditions were part of every day life for the Jews of Palestine by this time and were observed by all the 'community' at every formal dinner or banquet regardless of its context (*Ibid.*, 197).

<sup>49</sup> J. Neusner, "The Fellowship in the Second Jewish Commonwealth", *HTR* 53 (1960), 127.

Thirdly, according to 1QS 5.16, the members of the community were not to share anything with outsiders. The context shows the reason why the community regarded all the deeds and the property of outsiders as impure (1QS 5. 19-20). In 1QS 6.13-23 it is to be noted that novices were not allowed to touch "solid foods" until after their second public examination, and only the full members of the community who had passed through all the levels of purity could touch the "drink of the many". The stricter regulation regarding liquids compared with those for food might derive from Lev 11.38 where liquids were considered as conveyors of uncleanness. This distinction between liquids and solid foods is similar to that made in Rabbinic sources.<sup>50</sup>

On the other hand, full members of the community who sinned were regarded as unclean (1QS 5.14). Therefore, they were often excluded from the "purity" and thus, the meals, for a time (1QS 6.25; 7.16, 19, 23). Concerning the punishment of exclusion from the "purity", L. H. Schiffmann comments,

What this penalty meant for the community was a return to the status of one who had passed the examination by the *moshav ha-rabbim*. In order to regain his status in the community, he had to complete again the full progression of initiatory stages. Only then would he again become a full member of the community. In other words, removal from the purity constitutes demotion to the status of a first year novice.<sup>51</sup>

To sum up, first, the community claimed that new members must voluntarily enter into the new covenant by taking an oath to return to the law of Moses, because the covenant relationship between God and the Israelites had been reestab-

---

<sup>50</sup> C. Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 9.

<sup>51</sup> Schiffmann, *Sectarian Law*, 165. Further, he comments: "In the light of the connection of the Penal Code with the process of the community's initiation, and the conclusion that separation from the pure food constitutes a form of demotion to lower status, consideration must be given to the exact nature of separation from the purity for one year. Above, it was seen that a two year separation from the purity meant that the offender retraced his stages through the community initiation process. It seems apparent, then, that in the second year of his separation it was only the *mashgeh*, the liquid food, with which he could not come into contact, whereas for the first year he was also prohibited from coming into contact with solid food" (*Ibid.*, 167).



lished by the repentance of the original community and by God's initiative in the new revelation in response to their observance of the commandments of God. As conditions for entry into the new covenant, the community emphasized a return to the law of Moses in accordance with the new revelation and separation from other Jews, the "men of falsehood".

Secondly, with regard to the entry of new members and the emphasis on purity, it is to be noted that the community regarded other Jews as impure. Therefore, it was necessary for the community to purify the impurity of new members before their admission to the community. The applicant passed through four distinct stages for admission in a process of purification which lasted over two years. As the way of purification, the community maintained a close connection between the cleansing power of the Spirit of Holiness and that of water, and the necessity of repentance and submission to God's precepts prior to any kind of washing. These characteristics of entry indicate that the community distinguished themselves from other Jews and, furthermore, regarded themselves as the only new covenant people.

Thirdly, the community emphasized purity in order to maintain their status and to function as the new covenant people. It is to be noted that purity for all the community by "washing with water" was required before worship and before the community meal. The members of the community did not share anything with outsiders, because they regarded all the deeds and the property of outsiders as impure. It is also to be noted that even full members of the community when they had sinned, were regarded as unclean and were excluded from the "purity" of the community and the community meal for a certain period of time according to the purity regulations.

## 4.2 The New Covenant and the Concept of the Law

My aim here is not to examine the concept of the law in general but to discuss how the Qumran community related the law to their new covenant. In 4.1 I have discussed how the Qumran community applied strict purity laws to new members' entry into the new covenant community. In 4.3 I shall discuss how the community applied strict purity laws to the full members on the basis of the conviction that they constituted a new spiritual temple. I have already shown in chapter 3 that the community was convinced that God had established the new covenant with them by revealing the hidden things, and that the hidden things were related to the holy Sabbaths and his glorious Festivals (CD 3.13-15). Hence my investigation here is limited to the following two areas: i) why did the community make such a close connection between the new covenant and the sabbath? ii) what was the new interpretation concerning the sabbath?

### *i). The Sabbaths as signs of a perpetual covenant*

With regard to the community's close association of the new covenant with the Sabbath, it is worth noting that the Sabbath had been understood as a "sign of a perpetual covenant" between God and Israel: "So the sons of Israel shall observe the Sabbath, to celebrate the Sabbath throughout their generation as a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between Me and the sons of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, but on the seventh day He ceased and was refreshed" (Exod 31.16-17).<sup>52</sup> Concerning the Sabbath as a sign of the covenant, what is significant is the fact that the observance of the Sabbath was

---

<sup>52</sup> In context the Sabbath is called a sign of God's sanctifying Israel (v.13) and of God's cessation of the work of creation after six days (v.17). In broad context, the Sabbath is closely related to the memorial not only of creation but also of God's deliverance of his people from Egypt (Exod 20.2; Deut 5.15). According to Deut 5.15, the Israelites were commanded to keep the Sabbath day as a remembrance of God's deliverance of them from Egypt: "And you shall remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and the Lord your God brought you out of there by a mighty hand and by an outstretched arm; therefore the Lord your God commanded you to observe the Sabbath day".

an obligation upon Israel as a covenant people (Deut 5.2-3).<sup>53</sup> Principally the observance of the Sabbath was characterized by the phrase “to keep the Sabbath holy” (*zākôr 'et yôm háššábāt l'qáqá<sup>d</sup>šô*) (Exod 20.8). The phrase indicates not only the cessation from daily work on this day but also the worship of God (Lev 23.2-3; Num 28.9-10). In Lev 23.2-3 the Sabbath is called a “holy convocation”. The context shows that on the days of holy convocations Israel should present an offering by fire to the Lord. Num 28.10 says that the “burnt offering of every Sabbath is in addition to the continual burnt offering and its libation”.

Furthermore, the observance of the Sabbath included the land, the Sabbath year, and the year of jubilee (Lev 25). According to Lev 25.4-5, every seven years the land should have a sabbatical rest to the Lord; this is a sabbatical year of the land. In Lev 26 the land is related to the covenant which God made with Israel. If the Israelites were to keep God's commandments, the land would yield its produce abundantly (vv. 4-5). However, if the Israelites did not keep God's commandments, the land “shall not yield its produce and the trees of the land shall not yield their fruits” (v. 20) and, furthermore, the Lord “will make the land desolate” (v 32).

The year of jubilee is a special sabbatical year. The year of jubilee was to be celebrated every fiftieth year and was to be inaugurated by the blowing of the trumpet on the Day of Atonement (Lev 25.9-10). In this year God restored his people and the land. This year was characterized as *release* not only of personal debts and property but also of these people who had become slaves. The fact that the sabbatical release of the year of jubilee was inaugurated on the Day of Atonement is significant for the Qumran community's emphasis on the strict observance of the Day of Atonement (CD 6.18f), because the Day of Atonement

---

<sup>53</sup> H. P. Dressler, “The Sabbath in the Old Testament”, in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical Historical and Theological Investigation*, ed. D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids, 1982), 30.

is designated as *shabbat* (Lev 23.32).<sup>54</sup>

The perpetual observation of the Sabbath was strongly emphasized by the repetition of the command to keep the Sabbath (Exod 16.28; 20.8; 31.13, 16; Lev 19.3, 30; 26.2; Deut 5.12-15) and the sanction of the death penalty to the one who profaned the Sabbath (Exod 31.14). The Sabbath would be profaned if work was performed so that the Sabbath was regarded like any ordinary day.<sup>55</sup> Nevertheless, the prophets' admonitions to the Israelites for their failure to keep the Sabbath indicated that the pre-exilic Israel had either disobeyed the commandments of the Sabbath or lost the spirit of the observance of the Sabbath (Jer 17.21-24, 27; Ezek 20.12-13, 20-24; 22.8, 26, 31). Moreover, the prophets' admonitions point out that profaning the Sabbath became a cause of the exile.

Ezekiel however emphasized the Sabbath as a sign of the covenantal relationship between God and Israel (Ezek 20.20-24). In Neh. 10.31 the keeping of the Sabbath was described as a sign of the observance of the law of Moses (v.29). The fact that the keeping of the law of Moses was connected primarily with the covenantal relationship between God and Israel (Neh. 9-10), reinforces the importance of the connection between the covenant and the Sabbath.

The keeping of the Sabbath was also one of the essential features of Judaism.<sup>56</sup> The strong link between the new covenant and the Sabbath seems to be derived from their understanding of the Mosaic Sabbath as a sign of the perpetual covenant between God and his people. In chapter 2 I have already shown that the observance of the Sabbath was one of the essential marks for maintaining the status of the covenant people in early Judaism. In Maccabees some pious Jews

---

<sup>54</sup> Bacchiocchi draws attention to the importance of the Day of Atonement by the fact that the Passover and the Day of Atonement were the only feasts which were designated as "*shabbat*" ("*Sabbatical Typologies of Messianic Redemption*", *JSJ* 17 (1987), 167).

<sup>55</sup> Dressler, "Sabbath", 27

<sup>56</sup> G. Moore, *Judaism in the First centuries of the Christian Era* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), 2:16; S. Kimbrough, "The Concept of Sabbath at Qumran", *RQ* 5 (1966), 483; E. . Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Jerusalem, 1976), 348.

determined to die rather than to profane the Sabbath: when they were attacked on the Sabbath, they did not defend themselves and were killed (1 Macc 2.34-38). Even though the militant pious Jews were willing to fight on the Sabbath and, in fact, did fight on the Sabbath, the epitomizer says that they scrupulously kept the Sabbath (2 Macc 8.26-27; 12.38).

In Jubilees, the Sabbath was called a great sign given only to Israel (Jub 2.19, 31f). The observance of the Sabbath was a means of maintaining the status of the covenant people, separating themselves from the Gentiles (Jub 23.22-23). What is significant for the present study is that the author of Jubilees recalls his reader to the importance of keeping the holy days at their proper times according to the revelation to Moses. It indicates that some Israelites were not observing the holy days according to the Jubilees' calendar but according to the lunar calendar (Jub 6.36-37). Some scholars maintain that the emphasis on the observance of the Sabbath and the Festivals according to the solar calendar, especially in the Qumran community, derived from the idea that in this way they joined with the angels who worshipped God in his presence according to the solar calendar (2 Enoch 14-17; 1QH 3.22; 11.11).<sup>57</sup>

Therefore, although after the exile Israel tried to observe the Sabbath strictly, there was a variety of attitudes towards the Sabbath among different Jewish groups. The OT itself prescribes very little in detail concerning the actual observance of the Sabbath. It was perhaps inevitable that "a substantial body of tradition developed that enabled the Jew to ascertain exactly what would be expected of him in a variety of situations even if the Torah was not explicit".<sup>58</sup> On the other hand, the Jews were also confronted with the predicament of observing the Sabbath in the face of a foreign power or of economic necessities (Jer 17.22;

---

<sup>57</sup> J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, vol. 1 *Übersetzung*, vol. 2 *Anmerkungen* (Munich and Basel, 1961), 1, 16; 2, 10f; Leane, *Rule*, 95; Dr. R. Hayward (oral communication).

<sup>58</sup> C. Rowland, "A Summary of Sabbath Observance in Judaism at the Beginning of the Christian Era", *From sabbath*, 44.

I Macc 2.31-38, 41). Given this background I shall now discuss the Qumran community's new interpretation of the Sabbaths.

*ii). New interpretations of the Sabbaths*

The Qumran community emphasized that Israel went astray in its Sabbath observance (CD. 3.12-16). This may relate to their attitude towards the observance of the Sabbath, which was different from that of the community. CD 6.18 says that the community "should keep the Sabbath day according to its exact interpretation" (*lišmôr 'et yôm háššábāt k<sup>e</sup>pērūšāh*). The expression "according to its exact interpretation" (*k<sup>e</sup>pērūšāh*) indicated that this was a special Sabbath law of the community, different from that of the "Sons of the Pit" (CD 6.15). So in what sense did the community claim that Israel went astray concerning the Sabbath? After comparing the study of the Sabbath law in CD 10.14-11.18 with other literature, S. Kimbrough concludes that the "concept of Sabbath at Qumran does not seem out of step with Judaism, nor so apparently more strict than the Pharisees and the resulting Rabbinical tradition".<sup>59</sup> Even though Schiffmann, after a thorough study of the Sabbath law in CD 10.14-11.18, maintains that the Qumran community's separate identity must be recognized, he admits that the community's Sabbath law had an affinity with the Pharisaic tradition.<sup>60</sup>

Even if it is admitted that the Pharisaic and the Rabbinical laws of the Sabbath were later than those of the Qumran community, it is difficult to draw any conclusions as to whether the community's Sabbath law in CD 10.14-11.18 indicates unique differences from others, since there are no sources with which to compare them. Thus, some scholars tend to answer the question raised here, not from the Sabbath law in CD 10.14-11.18, but from the community's observance of the Sabbath in accordance with the solar calendar. 1QS 1.13f shows that "they

---

<sup>59</sup> Kimbrough, "Sabbath" 502.

<sup>60</sup> Schiffmann, *Halakhah*, 136.

should not depart from any one of all the commandments of God about their seasons nor advance their times nor retard any one of their Festivals". It has been widely accepted that the community regulated their liturgy following the solar calendar of 1 Enoch 72-82 and Jubilees.<sup>61</sup>

Scholars also suggest that the solar calendar was connected with the priestly tradition in Judaism.<sup>62</sup> In the practice of the community's liturgy the distinctiveness of this calendar was its absolute regularity. Vermes says,

The outstanding feature of this solar calendar was its absolute regularity in that instead of 354 days, not divisible by seven, it consisted of 364, i.e. fifty-two weeks precisely, each of its four seasons was thirteen weeks long divided into three months of thirty days each, plus an additional "remembrance" day (1QS 10.5-DSSE 89) linking one season to another ( $13 \times 7 = 91 = 3 \times 30 + 1$ ).. ... All the feasts of the year always fell on the same day of the week: Passover, the fifteenth day of the first month, was always celebrated on a Wednesday; the Feast of Week, the fifteenth day of the third month, always on a Sunday; the Day of Atonement, the tenth day of the seventh month, on a Friday; the Feast of Tabernacle, the fifteenth day of the seventh month on a Wednesday, etc.<sup>63</sup>

Furthermore, the observance of the feasts according to the solar calendar separated the community from other Jews who followed the lunar calendar, and caused a conflict between them. With regard to the practice of the lunar calendar, Leaney remarks,

Jub 6.34ff ascribed the lunar calendar to Gentile influence, and we may suspect that the hostility both in the Book of Noah (i.e. 1 Enoch 6-8) and in Jubilees is due to its introduction by the Seleucid rulers, for in Dan. 7.25 Antiochus Epiphanes "shall think to change the times". Thus, in the literature which we have been considering good angels teach Enoch the solar calendar, while the lunar calendar (which prevailed in rabbinic Judaism) is ascribed to the evil influence of fallen angels and its introduction into Palestine to pagan

---

<sup>61</sup> This issue has already been discussed in chapter 3: S. Talmon, "Calendar", 162-199 ; Beckwith, "The Modern Attempt to Reconcile the Qumran Calendar with the True Solar Year", *RQ* 7 (1969-71), 379-396; Vermes, *Qumran in perspective*, 175-177; Leaney, *Rule*, 93.

<sup>62</sup> Vermes, *Qumran in Perspective*, 176 ; Leaney, *Rule*, 94.

<sup>63</sup> Vermes, *Ibid.*, 176.

influence.<sup>64</sup>

This may provide a reason why the Qumran community was convinced that outsiders went astray. In the eyes of the community, the Sabbaths and Festivals observed by the Israel of the contemporary priests of Jerusalem had been corrupted by the observance of the Feasts according to the lunar calendar of pagan influence.<sup>65</sup>

In conclusion, the members of the community were convinced that their strict observance of the Sabbaths distinguished them from the other Jews, who, in their eyes, did not keep the Sabbaths strictly and, consequently, broke the covenant. The community regarded the Sabbaths as signs of a perpetual covenant between God and Israel. Hence the community was convinced that God had established the new covenant with them by revealing the hidden things in the law in relation to the Sabbaths so that they truly kept the law, particularly the law of the Sabbaths, as the new covenant people.

#### **4.3 The New Covenant and the Concept of the Temple**

The community pointed out the importance of the temple with regard to the covenant relationship between God and Israel. The Damascus Document indicates that one of God's responses towards Israel's breaking the covenant was to hide his face from his sanctuary (CD 1.3; cf. CD 2.8). CD 6.11f shows that all who had been admitted into the covenant were forbidden to participate in the Jerusalem temple cult. The community understood themselves as a spiritual temple related to their new covenant.

With regard to this close connection, many scholars maintain that the com-

---

<sup>64</sup> Leancy, *Rule*, 87.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 89-91



munity regarded their own community as a spiritual temple.<sup>66</sup> Two questions are raised here: (a) in what sense did the community believe that it was a spiritual temple? (b) how did the community perform the function of the Jerusalem temple, if they rejected the Jerusalem cult?

#### **4.3.1 The Community and the Jerusalem Temple**

By way of introduction I shall briefly examine the community's attitude towards the Jerusalem temple. Two things can be discussed: a) a difference between 1QS and CD; b) a difference within CD.

a). The distinctive difference between 1QS and CD lies in the fact that whereas the Damascus Document contains some specific regulations on the temple cult with criticism of the defilement of the Jerusalem temple, the Manual of Discipline made no mention of the temple and its defilement and, instead, stressed the purity of the community who were like priests in the Jerusalem temple. These differences may indicate that even though the Damascus Document contains the image of the community as a temple, the community's participation in the temple cult was restricted by the community's regulations, while the image of the community as a temple became a full-fledged ideology as a substitute for the Jerusalem temple.

b). On the other hand, the difference within CD is that while the laws in CD 9-16 imply that the members of the community could participate in the temple

---

<sup>66</sup> B. Gärtner, *temple*, 4-46; J. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law*, Leiden, 1977), 39-100; Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 50-93). B. Gärtner comments: "The community did not consider itself to have broken with the temple and the cultus in all its forms; instead they transferred the whole complex of ideas from the Jerusalem temple to the community. This undoubtedly meant that some measure of "spiritualization" had taken place, since the temple worship was now performed through the community's observance of the Law and through its own liturgy and cultus. The use of the word "spiritualization" must not be taken to mean that the "temple" which was the community was thought of any less realistically than the Jerusalem temple, or that the community's life of obedience to the Law was considered to be any less real than the blood sacrifices" (*Ibid.*, 18-19).

cult though strictly regulated, CD 6.11 indicates that the community members were forbidden to participate in the Jerusalem temple cult.

According to Davies, as far as the Damascus Document was concerned, the community “had not abandoned the temple cult”, but rather “participated in the temple cult, towards which they adopted a most scrupulous attitude”.<sup>67</sup> He argues that some part of CD 6.11f,<sup>68</sup> the crucial passage on this issue, was “an expansion from a community which had abandoned the temple cult”, “probably a Qumran gloss”.<sup>69</sup> He suggests, “the shortcomings of the text may be due to an idiomatic usage unknown to us, to an illiterate author, or to a textual corruption or emendation”.<sup>70</sup> As he proposes that “a definite solution lies in the last possibility: textual corruption or emendation”, he concludes that the text has been expanded from the phrase “closing the door” to “lighting of the altar in vain”.<sup>71</sup>

Even if Davies’ claim of an expansion in this passage may be acceptable, the image of the community as a temple can be found in CD. What is crucial for the argument on this issue is Davies’ recognition of the pericope of CD 3.12ff as an original source, where the “sure house” was mentioned. He also admits that the Qumran community had abandoned the temple cult and regarded itself as a spiritual temple.<sup>72</sup> Moreover, his comment on CD 6.11f suggests that the

---

<sup>67</sup> Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 295.

<sup>68</sup> CD 6.11b-13: “And all who have been admitted into the covenant (are not) to enter the sanctuary to light His altar in vain and become closers of the door as God said: Who among you will close its door, and you shall not light my altar in vain”.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>70</sup> P. Davies, “The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document”, *JJS* 33 (1982), 296.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.* Further, he comments: “The question now arises as to what motive other than a desire to display erudition prompted the addition. Our own conviction is that the glossator is reflecting a more hostile attitude towards the temple than this original source. Vain lighting of the altar is consistent with a scrupulous adherence to the temple cult, but shutting the door suggests something different. The probable answer is that this expansion of the text emanates from the community which had abandoned the temple cult; in other words, it is probably a Qumran gloss” (pp. 295-296).

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 288.

community eventually rejected the Jerusalem temple cult.

The description of the community as a house in 1QS was closely connected with the sure house in CD 3.19. Further, the function of the house as a temple in connection with the atonement confirms the close link with the function of the sure house in CD 3.19. Hence, if the phrase “sure house” in CD 3.19 was part of the original source, it is probably true that the idea of the community as a temple was not foreign to the Damascus Document. It is also worth noting that in CD 11.19ff the prayer of the righteous was regarded as an offering, preferable to unlawful sacrifice as in 1QS 9.3-5 where prayer and perfection of the way are regarded as the standard forms of sacrifice.

In short, the difference of attitude towards the Jerusalem temple not only between 1QS and CD but also within CD may indicate an evolution of thought within the Qumran community, even though they had the image of the community as a temple at an earlier stage, the community allowed the members' attendance at the Jerusalem temple cult with strict regulations until the image of the community as temple became a full-fledged ideology as a substitute for the Jerusalem temple cult. The sequence of the development of the community's concept as a temple is beyond the scope of this study.

#### **4.3.2 The Community as a Spiritual Temple**

The concept of the community as a spiritual temple can be seen in the facts that the community designated itself as the “sure house” and called the members the “sons of Zadok”. Furthermore, the description of the community as a “house of holiness for Israel” and a “house of truth in Israel” also indicates that the community regarded itself as a spiritual temple.

*i). The sure house and the sons of Zadok*

The community emphasized that God had built a “sure house” in Israel for those with whom He had established His covenant (CD 3.19). It is clear that the phrase “sure house” (*báyit ne’ēmān*) designates the community itself (cf. 1QS 5.6; 8.5, 9; 9.6). Among scholars there is a consensus that the term “house” in the OT can designate a dynasty or a temple. However, it is a matter of dispute as to what was the precise meaning of “sure house” here. Davies argues that the “sure house” here means a priestly dynasty promised to Zadok (1 Sam 2.35).<sup>73</sup> On the other hand, Klinzing advocates the view that the “sure house” in CD 3.19 must be understood as a temple.<sup>74</sup>

Davies suggests Ezek 44.15 midrash as evidence.

The phrase “sure house” leads very smoothly into the Ezek 44.15 midrash. “House” in the OT can be taken to designate the Temple or a dynasty, as commentators have generally acknowledged; in fact it would seem in this instance to be applied to a priestly dynasty, but a dynasty also which will enjoy the exclusive privilege of serving God in the temple”.<sup>75</sup>

He also warns against the view that this passage gives evidence that the community “exercising a quasi sacrificial function, possibly even regarded itself as the true temple”.<sup>76</sup>

Klinzing, however, understands CD 3.18ff in context with 2 Sam 7. He remarks that the change from “a house” to “your house” in 2 Sam 7.16 refers to a family, but the concept “house” occurs both in the context of the Davidic kingdom and of the temple and the use is frequently exchanged.<sup>77</sup> He also suggests

---

<sup>73</sup> Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 90.

<sup>74</sup> Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 77-78.

<sup>75</sup> Davies *Damascus Covenant*, 90-91.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>77</sup> Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 77-78: “Die in 2 Sam 7.16 begegnende Wendung bezieht sich zwar ebenfalls auf eine Familie, aber der Begriff *báyit* kommt im Kontext häufig und abwechselnd sowohl für das Davidische Königtum (7.11, 16f, 18f, 25f, 27, 29) als auch für den Tempel vor

that 4QFlor 1 shows that the designation of "house" referred to both the future temple and the seed of David in the interpretation of 2 Sam 7.<sup>78</sup> Further, Klinzing argues that the quotation of Ezekiel 44.15 is significant only if the "house" in CD is understood as the temple.<sup>79</sup>

What is of interest in Davies' argument is his understanding of the "sons of Zadok" as the whole community. He says, "the interpretation of the text applies all the terms to the community".<sup>80</sup> Moreover, concerning the "sons of Zadok", Davies claims that the name "sons of Zadok" is given to those who "choose (cf. 2.14) to enter the community".<sup>81</sup>

If, as Davies claims, the "sons of Zadok" here in CD 4.3 represent all the members of the community and, furthermore, if they "enjoy the exclusive privilege of serving in the temple", then Klinzing's understanding of the "sure house" as temple is more convincing, because even the members who were not actually the sons of Zadok would "enjoy the exclusive privilege of serving in the temple".<sup>82</sup> Therefore, it is probably true that the "sure house" here indicates the idea of the community as a temple. Further, the understanding of the "sure house" in CD 3.18 as a temple accords with the idea of the community as a temple in 1QS. I shall now discuss the idea of the community as a temple in 1QS.

---

(7.5, 6f, 13)".

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 78. He comments: "Nur wenn man das 'Haus' in CD 3.18 as Tempel verstand, ist der Anschluss des Zitats von Ez 44.15 sinnvoll: Die am *Haus Festhalten* (3.20) entsprechen denen, die den Dienst am *Heiligtum bewahrt* haben (4.1f). In folgenden (4.2-6) werden dann auch die im Zitat genannten Priester, Leviten und Söhne Zadoks auf die Gemeindeglieder gedeutet. Auf diese Auslegung wird noch in Ka 5.3 näher eingegangen werden. -Dass mit dem 'beständigen Haus' die Gemeinde als *Tempel* gemeint ist, lässt sich nur für den jetzigen Textzusammenhang nachweisen".

<sup>80</sup> Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 91.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 95: "They represent, I think, those who presently constitute the community, who join it at the 'end of days'. It also includes, potentially, those who are being addressed. According to 2.2-13, men are 'called by name' in each generation. Those who choose (cf. 2.14) to enter the community are themselves chosen. These will bear the name 'sons of Zadok' by virtue of belonging to the sure house which God established".

<sup>82</sup> Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 90-91.

*ii). A house of truth and holiness for Israel*

In 1QS the community is described as a “house of truth in Israel” (1QS 5.6) and a “house of holiness for Israel” (1QS 8.5; 9.6; 10.4; cf. 1QSb 4.28; 1QH 6.26ff). The contexts of these passages indicate that the image of the house was based on the idea of the strong foundation which was laid by God. O. Betz shows that the image of the community as a “house” is closely related to the image of the strong foundation in Isa 28.16.<sup>83</sup> In regard to the close connection between a “foundation of truth in Israel” and a “house of truth in Israel”, Leaney comments that the “stone laid by God in the Isaiah passage becomes a building, that is the community, grounded in truth and holy in character”.<sup>84</sup>

The image of the house as a permanent and protective building here accords well with the “sure house” in CD 3.19 where the sure house is described as the place where those who adhered to it would live forever. Further, in 1QS 5.5 the purpose of the laying of a foundation in Israel in order to make an eternal covenant with the community is also in accordance with the relationship between the sure house and the new covenant in CD 3.12ff.

On the other hand, the use of the term “house” in 1QS relates to the idea of the community as a temple and, consequently, to the function of the atonement. According to 1QS 9.6 the members of the community “shall separate themselves as a house of holiness for Israel and to be united as a holy of holies, and as a house of holiness for Israel who walk in perfection”. The text describes the community as a temple, in which there are two rooms, the “holy place” and the “holy of holies”, corresponding to the priests and the laymen, Aaron and Israel, in the community.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Betz, *Offenbarung*, 158-163.

<sup>84</sup> Leaney, *Rule*, 216.

<sup>85</sup> Gärtner, *Temple*, 29. Further, concerning the establishment of the temple, Klinzing says: “Die Errichtung des Tempels geschieht durch Absonderung und Vereinigung der Gemeinde: Das ist etwa - der genaue Sinn lässt sich grammatisch schwer feststellen - die Aussage der ersten

### 4.3.3 The Community's Function of Atonement

If the image of the sure house indicates that the community regarded itself as a temple over against the Jerusalem temple, the question is then raised as to whether this idea indicates that the community itself carried out atonement.

The image of the house as a temple is closely related to the idea of atonement (1QS 5.6; 9.4ff). 1QS 5.6 indicates that all who volunteered for the house of truth in Israel, that is, those who entered the covenant (1QS 1.7, 11; 5.1), could make atonement. 1QS 9.4ff shows that the community as a house of holiness would atone for the guilt of transgression through "prayer and perfection of way" by virtue of the Spirit of holiness that was already in the community (cf. 1QS 3.6ff; 5.13-14). The close relationship between the image of a house of holiness and atonement also indicates the parallel with the sure house and forgiveness of sins in CD 3.12ff. The Manual of Discipline also reveals a close link between the atonement of the community and the covenant (1QS 3.11f).<sup>86</sup> 1QS 3.11 says, "he (one who passed the process of atonement) shall be accepted by virtue of pleasing atonement before God and it shall be to him a covenant of the everlasting community".<sup>87</sup> The following three points show that the function of the community as temple is closely tied to the idea of atonement.

---

Satzhälfte nach Wiederausnahme der Konstruktion in 9.5f. Nur das zweite Glied des Schemas Aaron -Israel hat eine nähere Bestimmung, die etwas über das 'Haus' aussagt. Hier werden die, die Tempel und Haus darstellen, mit einer Wendung charakterisiert, wie sie auch sonst für die Gemeindeglieder gebraucht wird" (8.21; 9.8) (Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 66).

<sup>86</sup> I have already discussed in chapter 3 that on the basis of his covenant God forgave those who observed the law according to the exact interpretation of the law (CD 3.11f).

<sup>87</sup> Concerning the relationship between the covenant and the atonement in 1QS 3.11, P. Garnet comments: "(1QS 3.11) would seem to be an echo of Num 25.13, 'and it shall be unto him, and to his seed after him, the covenant of an everlasting priesthood; because he was jealous for his God, and made atonement for the children of Israel', where Phinehas was stated to have atoned for Israel by taking God's attitude towards sin and acting accordingly. The community frequently regarded itself as the Phinehas of its own generation, even to the point of condemning and punishing the wicked, and this thought is probably in the background in the present context" (*Salvation*, 59-60).

i). "Pleasing God" and the "perfect way of life"

1QS 9.4-5 reveals the replacement of blood sacrifice by "pleasing God" and the "perfect way of life".<sup>88</sup> The reliability of this understanding may depend upon the interpretation of the preposition *min* in the phrase "the flesh of burnt-offering and the fat of sacrifice" (*mib<sup>c</sup> šár 'ôlôt ūmēḥelbê zābāḥ*). Klinzing, refuting the two interpretations of this preposition as either "by means of" or "more than", suggests a third interpretation of this word as "without". He says: "Für die Präposition *min* gibt es noch eine dritte Deutungsmöglichkeit, bei der diese Schwierigkeit vermieden wird. Die Bedeutung 'weg von', 'abgesehen von', 'ohne' ist im Alten Testament genügend belegt".<sup>89</sup> Even though Sanders is aware of the difficulty in relation to the interpretation of this preposition, either "more than" or "without", he maintains, "in either case the atonement is clearly one in which deeds and piety replace the sacrificial system".<sup>90</sup>

ii). *The work of the Spirit of Holiness*

The "Spirit of Holiness" provided the basis of the community's atoning function. The Spirit of Holiness enabled the members of the community to live a perfect life and to please God. The members' perfect life and pleasing of God were the replacement of blood sacrifice, because the community became a habitation for the Spirit of Holiness, a living temple.<sup>91</sup> 1QS 3.1ff shows a similar idea.

<sup>88</sup> Text: They shall atone for guilty rebellion and for sins of unfaithfulness that they may obtain lovingkindness for the Land without the flesh of holocausts (burnt-offering) and the fat sacrifice. And prayer rightly offered perfection of way as an acceptable fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of way as a delectable free-will offering (Vermes, *DSSE*, 87).

<sup>89</sup> Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 40.

<sup>90</sup> Sanders, *PPJ*, 302.

<sup>91</sup> The community was described as a "house of holiness for Israel" and a "house of holiness for Aaron" (1QS 9.6 cf. 1QS 8.5, 6, 8). Some scholars understand these descriptions in relation to the community's belief of itself as temple in terms of the two divisions of the holy place and the holy of holies in the Jerusalem temple (F. F. Bruce, "The Holy Spirit in the Qumran Texts", *ALUOS* 6 (1969), 54; B. Gärtner, *temple*, 26f; Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 55-56; Newton, *Purity*, 37). F. F. Bruce says, "in 1QS 9.5ff the covenant community, like the temple in Jerusalem, is divided into two parts - the lay members corresponding to the outer compartments, the holy place, and the priestly members corresponding to the inner compartment, the holy of holies"



In 1QS 3.1ff the work of the Spirit of Holiness is an essential element of purification from uncleanness. Here uncleanness comes from stubbornness of heart, that is, the rejection of the precepts of God and of the “discipline of the community of his counsel”. No one can become guiltless by “waters of purification” alone, because, as long as he follows his stubborn heart, he can not have entered into the community where the Spirit of God’s counsel was operative. The context shows that “waters of purification” did not function *ex opere operato* without the work of the Spirit of Holiness.<sup>92</sup>

The community was convinced that purification came from the work of the Spirit of holiness, on the one hand, and a spirit of humility and submission to the precepts of God, on the other. It is clear in the context that there were certain characteristics common to both a spirit of humility and submission to God’s precepts. The Spirit of God’s counsel was available only to those who were in the community.<sup>93</sup> In short, the Spirit of God’s counsel enabled the members of the community to have a spirit of uprightness and humility, and to subject themselves to the precepts of God.

*iii). The community’s judging activity*

1QS 8.5-7 reveals that the community’s atoning function is closely connected with its judging activity.<sup>94</sup> This was especially the case where the object of the

---

(*Ibid.*).

<sup>92</sup> Regarding the atonement and the purification in 1QS 3.4ff, O. Betz warns against the view that purification would be obtained only through washing: “Dort wird vor der Illusion gewarnt, die Reinigung von Sünden könne allein durch Waschungen und Sühende Akte gewonnen werden. Denn nur durch den heiligen Geist, der in der ‘Gemeinschaft Seiner Wahrheit’ lebendig ist, wird man von allein Übertretung rein; das vollzieht sich praktisch durch die demütige Beugung unter die Gebote, in denen der Geist gleichsam investiert ist (1QS 3.4-6; vgl. 8.15f)” (“Rechtfertigung in Qumran”, in *Rechtfertigung. FS Käsemann*, ed. J. Friedrich, etc. (Tübingen, 1976), 33).

<sup>93</sup> Garnet, *Salvation*, 58.

<sup>94</sup> Text: When these are in Israel, the Council of the Community shall be established in truth. It shall be an Everlasting Plantation, a House of Holiness for Israel, an Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron. they shall witness to the truth at the Judgment, and shall be the elect of Goodwill who shall atone for the Land and pay to the wicked their reward. It shall be that tried wall that *precious corner-stone*, whose foundations shall neither rock nor sway in their

atonement was the land. P. Garnet appropriately comments that the “atonement is to be effected by the punishment of the wicked, so that the land will no longer be polluted with their abomination; Num 35.33 is the basic Old Testament background for these phrases, for there the motifs of atoning for the land and punishing the wicked are linked in the same relationship as here”.<sup>95</sup> Sanders, however, claims that the select fifteen atone “through practising righteousness and suffering” and that “perfection of way is substituted for sacrifice”.<sup>96</sup> Sanders also insists, “in 1QS 8 as it stands at present, the subject of ‘to atone’ and ‘to suffer’ can be read only as the select fifteen”.<sup>97</sup>

Nevertheless, Garnet argues that there was no atoning function for the fifteen. First, according to him 1QS 8.1-4 indicates that twelve men and three priests were experts in the law. He suggests that what is being referred to as certain matters which are “listed by means of the familiar *b<sup>e</sup>* plus the infinitive” is the content of the Old Testament.<sup>98</sup> Secondly, they were well versed in the things which the OT says about “accepting the punishment of iniquity amongst those who execute justice and accepting the refining trial of adversity”.<sup>99</sup> On the other hand, O. Betz maintains that the twelve men and three priests are not the selected ones but the smallest independent unit of the community.<sup>100</sup> Hence he also opposes the view that only the selected fifteen had the atoning function.

Whether or not the community was convinced that the atoning function was given to the selected fifteen or to the community as a whole, what is worth noting is that the judging activity was closely related to the atoning function.

---

place (Isa 28.16) (Vermes, *DSSE*, 85).

<sup>95</sup> Garnet, *Salvation*, 66; cf. Klinzing, *Undeutung*, 52.

<sup>96</sup> Sanders, *PPJ*, 302.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 327.

<sup>98</sup> Garnet, *Salvation*, 65.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>100</sup> Betz. Received by oral communication: cf. See above p. 130 n. 3.

#### 4.3.4 The Presence of God in the Community

The members of the community, who were convinced that the community constituted a new spiritual temple, demanded a high degree of purity, similar to that required in the Temple of Jerusalem so that God would be present with them. The community's idea of the presence of God in their midst can be seen mainly in two ways.

First of all, the community believed that it was itself a "dwellingplace which is a holy of holies for Aaron" and a "perfect house and truth in Israel" to establish a "covenant on eternal statutes" (1QS 8.8-9). Regarding the phrase "a holy of holies for Aaron" (*qôdeš qôdāšîm l' 'āhārôn*), Leaney comments that "the community is to take the place of the sanctuary of the temple".<sup>101</sup> The Hebrew word *mā'ōn* (dwellingplace) also referred to the temple as the dwellingplace of God (Ps 26.8; 2 Chron 36.15).

Further, it is to be noted that the community connected the dwellingplace with the establishment of a new covenant. God's dwellingplace in the midst of his people is one of the main themes of the covenant relationship between God and Israel. In the Mosaic covenant the tabernacle indicated that God would dwell among the sons of Israel (Exod 29.45).<sup>102</sup> In relation to the Davidic covenant, the temple was understood as the special dwellingplace of God. The prophet Ezekiel announced God's dwelling in the midst of his people in relation to the new covenant.

I will make a covenant of peace with them; it will be an everlasting covenant with them. And I will place them and multiply them, and will set My sanctuary in their midst forever. My dwellingplace also will be with them; and I will be their God, and they will be My people. and the nations will know that I am the Lord who sanctifies Israel, when My sanctuary is in their midst forever (Ezek 37.26-28).

---

<sup>101</sup> Leaney, *Rule*, 216.

<sup>102</sup> Clements, *God*, 115.

Therefore, it is sufficient to say that the community believed that they had a new covenant relationship with God, for the community was convinced that the presence of God was among them.

Secondly, the community was aware of God's presence by the work of the Holy Spirit among them. In the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Holy Spirit is designated as the Spirit of Holiness (1QS 3.7; 4.21; 9.3; 1QH 16.3); his Holy Spirit (1QA 8.16; CD 2.12; CD 7.3ff) and thy Holy Spirit (1QH 7.6; 9.32; 12.12; 14.13; 16.12; 17.26; 1QSB 2.24). Alongside these designations various functions were assigned to the Holy Spirit.<sup>103</sup> Of particular interest is the idea that God had poured the Holy Spirit into the individual (1QH 7.6) and the idea that the Holy Spirit dwelt among the community (1QS 3.7; 9.3).

In 1QH 7.6, the hymnist praises, "I thank Thee, O Lord, because thou hast upheld me by thy strength, and thou hast poured out thy Holy Spirit on me so that I shall not be moved". According to CD 7.3ff, the Holy Spirit was defiled when the people of God were guilty of sin. Therefore, the community was convinced that the Holy Spirit was present in the person concerned.<sup>104</sup>

On the other hand, the community was convinced that the Holy Spirit dwelt in the community. 1QS 3.7 indicates that the Holy Spirit was given to the community. Regarding the phrase a "foundation of the Holy Spirit" in 1QS 9.3, F. F. Bruce comments, "this appears to envisage the establishment of a living temple as habitation for the Holy Spirit".<sup>105</sup> The community was convinced that they were purified by the work of the Spirit of Holiness. The purification is mentioned in 1QS 3.7f where the cleansing is brought about by the Spirit of Holiness, preparing the way for a sprinkling of water which in turn enables one to walk perfectly

---

<sup>103</sup> F. F. Bruce, "Holy Spirit", 49-55.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 55.

in God's way (cf. 1QH 16.11, 12).<sup>106</sup>

The presence of God cannot be thought of without the tabernacle and the temple where Israel worshipped and encountered God. In these places, the presence of God depended on Israel's obedience to the commandments of God (Lev 26.3, 11, 12), particularly in regard to the consecration of the priesthood of the sons of Aaron and their services in perfect purity (Lev 21.17ff). This high level of purity in the temple was essential for the presence of God. The community claimed that the priests in the Jerusalem temple had become unclean (1QS 5.19, 20; CD 5.6, 7; 20.22). Hence the community was convinced that purification by the work of the Spirit of Holiness and their own maintenance of a high level of purity made God's presence possible among them.

To sum up, the community rejected the Jerusalem temple cult by claiming that the Jerusalem temple was defiled. They regarded their community as a spiritual temple. Concerning the relationship between the concept of the temple and the new covenant, it is to be noted that the community maintained that God built a "sure house" in Israel for those with whom He established his covenant. The sure house here was promised to the "sons of Zadok", who represented all the members of the community. This indicates that the members who were not actually the sons of Zadok would enjoy the privilege of serving in the temple. Accordingly, the sure house promised to the sons of Zadok shows the idea of the community as a spiritual temple. Furthermore, this idea accords well with the description of the community as a "house of truth in Israel" and a "house of holiness for Israel".

With regard to the function of the community as a spiritual temple it is to be noted that the community maintained that it had an atoning function. The community claimed that "pleasing God" and the "perfect way of life" replaced

---

<sup>106</sup> Newton, *Purity*, 38.

blood sacrifices. Moreover, the community believed that the Spirit of Holiness provided the basis for the community's atoning function, for the Spirit of Holiness enabled the members of the community to live a perfect life and to please God. It may be concluded that the community not only rejected the Jerusalem cult but also, positively, regarded themselves as a temple which carried out atonement.

It is generally accepted that the community's regulations motivated to maintain a high level of purity were closely connected not only with the function of atonement in the community but also with the presence of God in the community. The community maintained that they were purified by the work of the Spirit of Holiness. Hence they were convinced that purification by the Spirit of Holiness and their maintenance of a high level of purity made God's presence possible in the community.

#### **4.4 The Eschatology of the New Covenant in the Dead Sea Scrolls**

The community members were convinced that they were living in the last days (1QpHab 2.5-6), the age of the new covenant. By receiving the new revelation, the community believed that the new eschatological era had already been inaugurated.<sup>107</sup> Nevertheless, there was a tendency to apostasy among the new covenant people. Some unfaithful members, having once joined the new covenant community, had subsequently left it and rejoined the old covenant people living in the land of Judah (CD 19.33-20.1; 20.10-12). The community described their age as the "epoch of the wicked" (*hāqqēš hāriš'āh*) (CD 6.10; 12.23; 14.19) and "days of dominion of Belial" (*yômê memšelet b'liyyā'āl*) (1QS 2.19). According to CD 19.33-20.1, this tension would continue "from the day when the Teacher of

---

<sup>107</sup> H. W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindefrieden Von Qumran* (Göttingen, 1966). He maintains that the community was convinced that eschatological salvation had already entered the present age in the history and in the experience of the community.

Righteousness is gathered in until a Messiah should arise from Aaron and from Israel".<sup>108</sup>

#### 4.4.1 The Messianic Era

The eschatological era, in which the tendency to apostasy was found, would end with the coming of the Messiah. The community was awaiting the messianic era, in which there would be no apostasy. Accordingly, even though the new covenant had already been established, the community was awaiting the days of the accomplishment of the new covenant in its fullest sense, namely, the messianic era. Hence it may be assumed that as far as the eschatology is concerned, there is a realized and an unrealized aspect in the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>109</sup>

The messianic era can be characterized as a "time of visitation" for the judgment of the wicked and the reward of the faithful (1QS 3.18-19; 4.18-20, 26), an end of evil (1QS 4.18-19), the destruction of the wicked (CD 7.9), the deliverance of the righteous (CD 20.32-34) and the bliss of the people of God (1QS 4.6-8). The question raised here is whether there is any allusion to the new covenant in the messianic era.

#### 4.4.2 The Renewal of the Covenant of Perpetual Priesthood

According to 1QSb 3.25-27, "[God will re]new for the community the covenant of [eternal] priesthood". What must be asked is whether the renewal of the

---

<sup>108</sup> There is a variety of scholarly views concerning the number of Messiah(s). It is beyond the purpose of this study to examine them. One thing is clear, and that is that the Messiah or Messiahs would come at the end of days. References: R. E. Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran", *CBQ* 19 (1957), 53-82; F. F. Bruce, "The Messianic Hope", in *Second Thoughts*, 80-91; W. Grundmann, "Die Frage nach der Gottessohnschaft des Messias im Lichte von Qumran", *Bibel und Qumran* (Berlin, 1968), 86-111; K. G. Kuhn, "Die beiden Messias in den Qumran-texten und die Messiasvorstellung in der rabbinischen Literatur", *ZAW* 70 (1958), 200-208.

<sup>109</sup> E. Kim, *New Covenant*, 174.

covenant of a perpetual priesthood refers to the new covenant in the land of Damascus or to something else. The context shows that the renewal is related to the blessing of the immediate future days and the role of the priest is stressed in the renewal of the covenant. The priests also have a close relationship with the covenant which had already been established (1QSb 3.22-25a).

However, it is not easy to answer the question raised above, for the phrase *b<sup>e</sup>rît k<sup>e</sup>hūnnát 'ôlām* appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls only here (1QSb 3.26). Yet this phrase can be found several times in the OT (Num 25.13; Neh.13.29; Mal. 2.4, 8). After examining the Old Testament references of this phrase, E. Kim proposes three factors: (a) the "covenant of the perpetual priesthood" was given to Phinehas and his descendants. Throughout the history of the Israelites Phinehas and his posterity held the office of the priesthood; (b) however, the later prophets disclosed the corrupt state of the "covenant of the perpetual priesthood" in the later history of the Israelites; (c) since God is faithful to the "covenant of the perpetual priesthood", the covenant itself could only be broken by the priests, not by God himself.<sup>110</sup>

Given this OT background, it is not difficult to see that the phrase the "covenant of the perpetual priesthood" is to be identified with the new covenant in the land of Damascus. The community charged the priests in the Jerusalem temple with defiling the sanctuary by not keeping the stipulations of the "covenant of perpetual priesthood". In consequence the community separated themselves from these priests went to the wilderness and then established the "new covenant in the land of Damascus". They, as the sons of Zadok, considered themselves to be the priests who had responded properly to the covenant stipulations, while corruption was perceived in the priests in the Jerusalem temple. The renewed state of the covenant of the perpetual priesthood belongs in the future messianic era. 1QSb 5.20-23 indicates the same thought of the renewal of the new covenant

---

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 198-199.



in the messianic era. Here the “Prince of the Congregation”, namely the “Messiah of Israel” shall renew the covenant of his community and establish the kingdom.

Even though both texts are silent concerning the nature of the new covenant to be renewed in the messianic era, two things are to be noted concerning it.

First, in the messianic era, the children of darkness and the children of light would no longer co-exist, since both the power of Belial and the wicked would be destroyed forever (1QS 4.18-19; CD 7.9) and there would be no apostasy within the new covenant community (CD 19.32-20.1; 20.10-12). At the same time, the righteous would be gloriously vindicated (CD 20.32-34). They would have abundant peace with long life, multiplication of offspring together with endless blessings, everlasting joy with eternal life and a crown of glory together with a garment of majesty in everlasting light (1QS 4.6-8). From these characteristics of the messianic era, it can be concluded that the community was convinced that the dilemma of sins would no longer exist in the messianic era, since they believed that the source of sin would then be annihilated. If sin was no longer to be a problem in the messianic era, the function of the temple would have to be understood differently.

Secondly, the nature of the renewed covenant of perpetual priesthood must be understood in relation to the eschatological temple. H. Lichtenberger points out that in the temple Scroll the temple is an idealized temple, not the eschatological temple.

The temple of the temple Scroll is an idealized temple, the temple as it should have been, as it was ordained by God. The scroll depicts the cult that should have been celebrated.<sup>111</sup>

Further, he maintains that the “temple of the Temple Scroll is to be replaced

---

<sup>111</sup> H. Lichtenberger, “Atonement at Qumran”, in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, vol. 2, ed. W. S. Green (Missoula, 1979), 166.

by an eschatological temple".<sup>112</sup> Regarding the eschatological temple in the Temple Scroll 29.7-10, he comments

God desires his *kabod*, his glory, to dwell in the temple of the temple Scroll, and God himself will create (*br'*) a temple on the Day of Blessing, that is, at the end of time, which, like the covenant with Jacob at Bethel, will exist for eternity.<sup>113</sup>

It is important to note that what is stressed in the eschatological temple is not the proper sacrifice for atonement, but the indwelling of God in the temple and the blessing of his people there. If this is so, the community would expect the role of the priests and the function of the temple to be changed as well.<sup>114</sup>

#### 4.5 Summary

With regard to the entry of new members into the community of the new covenant, it is to be noted that the community distinguished themselves from other Jews and, furthermore, they regarded themselves as the only new covenant people. The initiation ceremony of new members was derived from the community's conviction that whereas the Israelites had broken the covenant, the new covenant had been established between God and the community by the repentance of the original members of the community and God's new revelation to them. The necessity of the four different stages for admission and the strict regulations for purity come from the facts that the community regarded other Jews as impure, and that a high level of purity was required for the community as the place of God's presence and as the spiritual temple.

Accordingly, the community emphasized the strict observance of the law according to the new revelation, which distinguished them from other Jews, espe-

---

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>114</sup> This point will be discussed further in the conclusion where the concept of the temple in the DSS will be compared with that in the NT.

cially in their strict observance of the Sabbaths according to the solar calendar. The community was convinced that while other Jews broke the covenant, because they kept the Sabbaths in accordance with the lunar calendar, God had established the new covenant with them by revealing the hidden things in the law in relation to the Sabbaths so that they truly kept the law, particularly the law of the Sabbaths, the perpetual sign of the covenant, as the new covenant people.

What is significant in relation to the community's function as the temple is their claim that "pleasing God" and the "perfect way of life" replaced the function of the blood sacrifice. Furthermore, they were convinced that the Spirit of Holiness provided the basis of the community's atoning function, for the Spirit of Holiness enabled the members of the community to live the perfect life and to please God.

With regard to the eschatology of the new covenant it is to be noted that even though the new covenant had already been established, the community was waiting for the days of the accomplishment of the new covenant in its fullest sense, viz., the messianic era. The community maintained that this would be realized by the renewal of the covenant of the perpetual priesthood in the messianic era. Moreover, the community believed that in the messianic era, there would be no apostasy within the new covenant community, and the eschatological temple would be the dwellingplace of God and the place of blessing for the new covenant people. What is important to note in connection with the eschatological temple is that if sin would no longer be a problem in the messianic era, the function of the temple must be understood differently. It may be concluded that the community were expecting the renewal of the covenant of perpetual priesthood in the messianic era as the consummation of the fulfilment of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff.

## Chapter 5

### The New Covenant in the NT

---

In chapter 3 I concluded that the Qumran community believed that the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled in its own history. This chapter argues that the NT passages where the term “new covenant” occurs and where the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost is described indicate that the early church was equally convinced that the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled in their community (Lk 22.20; 1 Cor 11.25; 2 Cor 3.6; Heb 8.8, 13; 9.15; cf. Mt 26.28; Mk 14.24 and Acts 2). The need for an examination of these passages lies in the fact that recently certain scholars have opposed the view that there is a close connection between these passages and Jer 31.31ff.<sup>1</sup> I shall not investigate in detail the new covenant in the Epistle to the Hebrews because it is generally accepted that the quotations there from Jer 31.31ff indicate that the writer is convinced that Jeremiah’s promise of a new covenant was fulfilled in the early church.<sup>2</sup> However, the views of Grässer on this subject will be briefly considered.

I shall argue in 5.1 that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels and Paul understand the new covenant established at the Last Supper in connection with the fulfilment of the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34. In 5.2 I shall consider how the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost can be understood in terms of the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff. I shall

---

<sup>1</sup> E. Grässer’s *Der Alte Bund im Neuen* is the most recent detailed study which rejects the connection. For further references, see p. 3 n. 3 and Grässer, *Bund*, 115-126.

<sup>2</sup> Grässer admits that the quotation of Jer 31.31ff in Hebrews indicates a belief that Jeremiah’s prophetic promise of a new covenant was fulfilled in the covenant of Christ (*Christus-Diatheke*) of Hebrews (*Ibid.*, 108-109).

argue in 5.3 that for Paul the new covenant people can keep the law as Jer 31.33 promised. 5.4 considers Grässer's claim that for the author of Hebrews the law is abolished in the covenant of Christ.

## 5.1 The New Covenant at the Last Supper

The aim of this section is not to investigate what actually happened at the Last Supper nor to determine the earliest form of the narrative, but to argue that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels and Paul understand the (new) covenant at the Last Supper as the fulfilment of the promise of the forgiveness of sins of Jer 31.34.

There is a great deal of controversy about what actually happened at the Last Supper and what is the earliest form of the narrative.<sup>3</sup> Some scholars insist that the original account of the Last Supper and the Lord's Supper were invented by the Hellenistic Christian community celebrating the last days of Jesus.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, others maintain that there is sufficient evidence to support a historical Last Supper.<sup>5</sup> In the various accounts of the Last Supper the covenant is the prominent theme in connection with the cup-word.<sup>6</sup> The cup-word indicates that Mark/Matthew understand that Jesus established the (new) covenant in

---

<sup>3</sup> I. H. Marshall comments, "the problems of ascertaining the original wording of the sayings of Jesus, which are variously recorded in the sources, are extraordinarily difficult, and any solution must remain hypothetical". Nevertheless, he continues, "in essence the varying reports of the sayings contain the same elements" (*Last Supper and Lord's Supper* (Exeter, 1980), 43); cf. J. Reumann, *The Supper of the Lord: The NT, Ecumenical Dialogues, and Faith and Order on Eucharist* (Phila., 1985), 2ff.

<sup>4</sup> H. Braun, *Jesus of Nazareth: The Man of His Time*, ET (Phila., 1979), 56-57; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* ET (London, 1952), 1. 144-51; Grässer, *Bund* (Tübingen, 1985), 125; J. Roloff, *Neues Testament* (Neukirchen, 1977), 221-227.

<sup>5</sup> A. J. B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament* (London, 1952); J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, ET (London, 1966); W. G. Kümmel, *The Theology of the New Testament*, ET (London, 1974), 94; I. H. Marshall, *Last Supper*; H. Schürmann, *Jesu ureigerer Tod* (Freiburg, 1975); J. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the NT: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (Phila., 1977), 161-168; L. Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament*, vol. 1. ET (Grand Rapids, 1980), 214-20.

<sup>6</sup> I. H. Marshall, *Last Supper*, 91-93; J. Reumann, *Supper*, 34-41.

relation to his blood being shed on behalf of many (Mt 26.28-29; Mk 14.23-24; Lk 22.20; 1 Cor 11.25).<sup>7</sup> This is significant because it makes it possible for the new covenant established at the Last Supper to be understood as the fulfilment of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff.

Grässer, in his book *Der Alte Bund im Neuen*, contradicts the idea of a close relationship between the new covenant in the NT and that of Jer 31.31ff. He claims that whereas there is a close connection between blood and the new covenant at the Last Supper, there is no relation between blood and the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff.

Aber während Mk 14.25/Mt 26.28 - freilich in typologischer Entsprechung zu Ex 24.8! - an die "Vergebung der Sünden" unmittelbar denken lässt (Mk) bzw. sie ausspricht (Mt), ist in 1 Kor 11.25 keines der Elemente von Jer 31.33f direkt angesprochen. Vor allem sagt Jer 31 nichts darüber, dass die neue Diatheke in irgendeiner Weise mit Blut zu tun habe. Darum wird auch von niemandem ernsthaft behauptet, dass die neue Diatheke bei Paulus und Lukas im Sinne des AT verstanden sei.<sup>8</sup>

- <sup>7</sup> A. Mt 26.28: τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἑκχυννόμενον εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν. ἐστὶν  
 B. Mk 14.24: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.  
 C. Lk 22.20: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἑκχυννόμενον.  
 D. 1 Cor 11.25: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι.

It is evident that even in the various accounts of the cup-word the covenant is the prominent theme. My aim is not to discuss why each account of the cup-word is different from others but to argue that "my blood of the covenant" can be identified with "the new covenant in my blood". Concerning Luke's account of the Last Supper, the shorter text omits 22.19b-20, which includes the cup-word. It is undoubtedly the more difficult reading, yet many scholars maintain the longer text as original.

For evidence several points have been suggested. Only a small group of MSS support this shorter text (Greek MS (D), some Latin versions, Syriac and Coptic evidence). It is also difficult to explain why Luke would have composed this shorter text, since it is extremely abrupt. Marshall, with other scholars, argues that "the Greek MS which omits the verses in question also omits other phrases from the text of Luke, about whose authenticity there can be no question; that is to say, the omission may well be due to some idiosyncrasy of one particular scribe" (*Last Supper*, 38; cf. Jeremias, *Eucharistic*, 145-52; J. Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Regensburg, 1977), 583f). In short, it is likely that the longer text can be regarded as authentic.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 119-120; cf. F. Filson, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London, 1971[60]), 274-275; V. Wagner, "Der Bedeutungswandel von *b<sup>e</sup>rit ḥādāsāh* bei der Ausgestaltung der Abendmahls Worte", *EvT* 35 (1975), 541ff; E. Kutsch, *Neues Testament, Neuer Bund? Eine Fehlübersetzung wird korrigiert* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1978), 119.

Further, in relation to the forgiveness of sins in the new covenant, Grässer insists that whereas what Jeremiah expected was the renewal of the old covenant, the new covenant in 1 Cor 11.25 is something qualitatively different, “nämlich die Kraft des Todes Jesu von Gott in Geltung gesetzte neue Heilsordnung, die der Sache nach *Herrschaft des gegenwärtigen Christus ist*”.<sup>9</sup>

Since Jer 31.31ff does not refer to the means by which the new covenant will be established, Grässer’s assertion cannot stand with any certainty. If this is so, then was it the writers’ intentions in formulating the Last Supper texts to allude to Jer 31.31ff (whether or not Jer 31.31ff implies the use of blood as a means of establishing the new covenant)? Accordingly, 5.1.1 examines whether OT allusions in the cup-word of the (new) covenant at the Last Supper can be understood in connection with the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff. Subsequently, in 5.1.2 I shall argue that the forgiveness of sin in the new covenant of Jer 31.34 can be understood in relation to blood.

### 5.1.1 The Blood of Jesus and the New Covenant

The close relationship between the blood of Jesus and the new covenant established at the Last Supper can be seen by the phrases i) “my blood of the covenant” (τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης) and ii) “the new covenant in my blood” (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου). The aim in this sub-section is, first of all, to examine whether these two phrases indicate that the (new) covenant established at the Last Supper can be understood in close connection with Jer 31.31ff. The second is to ascertain that “my blood of the covenant” and “the new covenant in my blood” are not different things.

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 120.

i). *My blood of the covenant*

Grässer, following J. Roloff and others who assume that the actual words of the Last Supper must be limited to "Das ist mein Leib - dieser Kelch ist mein Blut für viele",<sup>10</sup> says that Mark and Matthew combine two statements in the construction of the cup-word: "Mein Blut, das für die Vielen vergossen wird" (Deutung des gewaltsamen Todes Jesu als Sühnetod mit Anspielung auf Jes 53) und "das Blut des Bundes" (Sühnungsblut mit Anspielung auf Ex 24.8).<sup>11</sup>

My investigation starts with this assertion of Grässer that the cup-word of the Marcan formulation alludes not only to Exod 24.8 (Sühnungsblut) but also to Isa 53 (Sühnetod).<sup>12</sup>

a). Many scholars agree that the phrase τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης in Mark/Matthew is an allusion to Exodus 24<sup>13</sup> where the ceremony of the sealing of the covenant between God and Israel through Moses is described. The covenant here is sealed in blood. Verse 6 shows that half of the blood of the animal sacrifices was thrown upon the altar. The other half was thrown upon the people: "Moses took the blood and threw it upon the people and said 'Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you in accordance with all these words'" (v. 8). Two things are important to note here.

First, the blood of sacrifice was thrown not only against the altar (v. 6) but

<sup>10</sup> Grässer, *Bund*, 125; cf. J. Roloff, *Neue Testament*, 225; W. Wrede, "το αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης", ZNW 1 (1900), 69-74.

<sup>11</sup> Grässer, *Bund*, 123; cf. E. Kutsch, *Neue Testament*, 114ff.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> A. H. M'Neile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London, 1928[15]), 382; V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London, 1966[52]), 545; C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*, CGTC (Cambridge, 1959), 427; Filson, *Matthew*, 274; W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, THKNT 2 (Berlin, 1971), 286; D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NCB (London, 1972), 339; R. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, NovTS 18 (Leiden, 1967), 57f; R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: An Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (Grand Rapids, 1982[71]), 66; Pace B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London, 1961), 132-133.



also upon the people (v. 8). U. Cassuto remarks, "the throwing of half of the blood of the offering against the altar, which represented the Lord, and half on the people, or that which represented them, signifies a joining together of the contracting parties (*communio*), and symbolized the execution of the deed of covenant between them".<sup>14</sup>

Secondly, the blood of the covenant is understood in relation to the forgiveness of sin. B. Childs maintains, "the blood dashed on the altar in the place of a sacrifice speaks of God's gracious forgiveness in accepting this as an offering".<sup>15</sup> Further, E. W. Nicholson remarks that the blood of sacrificial victims "conveys holiness to that with which it is brought into contact (Exod 29.20f; Lev 8.22-30)".<sup>16</sup> He also says that the content of Exod 24.9-11 suggests that the covenant ceremony in Exod 24.3-8 has finally conveyed "Israel to Yahweh as His holy people".<sup>17</sup> If Nicholson's understanding is accepted, the assembled Israelites were consecrated as God's holy people by being sprinkled with blood. In this covenant ceremony the Israelites became the covenant people, the holy people of God.

Moreover, some scholars point to the Targumim (Onkelos and Yerushalmi 1), where the covenant blood is interpreted in terms of atoning blood.<sup>18</sup> It is interesting to see that even though Gnika is opposed to the view that the blood

<sup>14</sup> U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, ET (Jerusalem, 1967[51]), 312; M. Noth, *Exodus: A Commentary*, ET (London, 1966[59]), 198; cf. P. Hyatt, *Commentary on Exodus*, NCB (London, 1971), 256. Cassuto also says, "in this manner the union between Yahweh and the people is created, since the altar and the people share the common blood" (*Ibid*). Others also comment on this point (e.g. G. Davies, *Exodus*, 194; R. Clements, *Exodus: Commentary* CBC (Cambridge, 1972), 159; T. Robinson, *The Gospel of Matthew*, MNTC (London, 1939[28]), 216; P. Carrington, *According to Mark: A Running Commentary on the Old Gospel* (Cambridge, 1960), 312). Further, Hyatt remarks, "in the OT such a rite is never repeated, although in Israelite sacrifices the blood was sometimes thrown upon the altar (e.g. 29.16, 20; Lev 1.5, 11)" (*Exodus*, 256).

<sup>15</sup> B. Childs, *Exodus: A Commentary*, OTL (London, 1977), 506.

<sup>16</sup> Nicholson, *God*, 172 (cf. "The Covenant Ritual in Exodus 24.3-8", *VT* 32 (1982), 74-86).

<sup>17</sup> He illustrates this by pointing out the contrast between Exod 24 9-11 and Exod 19 (*Ibid*, 174).

<sup>18</sup> Jeremias, *Eucharistic*, 178ff, 225ff; H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians Hermeneia* (Phila., 1975[69]), 199; O. Betz, "Beschneidung", *TRE* V, 719; R. Pesch, *Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis*, 95f; M. Hengel, *The Atonement*, ET (London, 1982), 53-54.

of the covenant in Exod 24.8 was related to the forgiveness of sin, he admits that this atoning relationship can be seen in Targum Onkelos and Yerushalmi 1.<sup>19</sup> M. Hengel's comment with regard to the interpretation of the death of Jesus as covenant sacrifice, is worth quoting at length.

For in all probability the interpretation of the death of Jesus as covenant sacrifice along the lines of Exod 24.8 which is presupposed in the word over the cup in Mark 14.24 and which the (pre) Pauline tradition expands with a reference to the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff is already to be presupposed in Palestine, since the Targumim (Onkelos and Yerushalmi 1) expressly speak of the atoning effect of the blood rite in the covenant sacrifice of Exod 24.8 and Mark's version with its Semitic-type formula *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* also presupposes such an atoning understanding of the death of Jesus as eschatological covenant sacrifice.<sup>20</sup>

Thus the covenant blood of Exod 24.8 can be understood as blood of atonement through which the people were cleansed from their sins. The allusion in "my blood of the covenant" to Exod 24.8 may indicate that Mark/Matthew understand the death of Jesus as a covenant sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins. It seems that the covenant established by Jesus' blood must be a new covenant, different from the Sinaitic covenant, because whereas the Sinaitic covenant was established by the blood of animal sacrifice, the covenant at the Last Supper was established by the blood of Jesus.<sup>21</sup>

b). It is widely recognized that the phrase *τὸ ἐκχυννόμενος ὑπὲρ πολλῶν*<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> J. Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, EKKNT II (Köln, Basel and Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1979), 245.

<sup>20</sup> Hengel, *Atonement*, 53f.

<sup>21</sup> Marshall, *Supper*, 46; Pesch, *Markus* 2, 358; S. Kim, "The 'Son of Man'" as the Son of God WUNT 30 (Tübingen, 1983), 62; cf. A. H. M'Neile, *Matthew*, 382. M'Neile, observing *μου* attached to the blood of covenant, remarks, "this is my counterpart of τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης at Sinai" (*Ibid*).

<sup>22</sup> Mt: *τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον*. Many commentators seem to regard this difference between Mark and Matthew as an insignificant change. Jeremias says that in the NT *περὶ* occasionally takes place of *ὑπὲρ* (*Eucharistic*, 173; cf. BDF, 229.1). Gundry maintains that *περὶ* reflects sacrificial terminology in the LXX. He suggests that *περὶ* often occurs with *ἁμαρτίας*, "sin" (cf. Rom 8.3; Gal 1.4; Heb 5.3; 10.8, 18; 1 Pet 3.18; 1 John 2.2; 4.10) (*Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids, 1982), 528).

is an allusion to Isa 53<sup>23</sup> which describes how Yahweh wipes out Israel's sins through the suffering of the servant.<sup>24</sup> In Isa 53 the forgiveness of sins is a consequence of the suffering of "the servant" on behalf of many: "Surely he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows" (v. 4); "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquity" (v. 5); "Because he poured out his soul to death and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors" (v. 12).

It must be asked whether the verb *nāsā'* in v. 12 allows the meaning "to take away sin". The verb *nāsā'* means "to lift up" and "to carry".<sup>25</sup> It is used in the sense "to take away" in several places in the OT (Lev 5.17-19; Isa 17.7; 53.4; 57.13; Dan 2.3). In the context of Isa 53.12 the verb is clearly used with the meaning of "to take away the sins" of the many people (cf. v. 4, 5-6). Two clauses are noteworthy in understanding the means involved in the removal of sins here: "he makes an offering for sin" (v. 10) and "he poured out his soul to death" (v. 12). These clauses indicate clearly that the death of the servant is an expiatory sacrifice. C. Westermann suggests that the first part of v. 12 could be translated as "because he poured out his blood (*nepes*) to death".<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Jeremias, *Eucharistic*, 227f; Cranfield, *Mark*, 427; Gundry, *Use of OT*, 59; France, *Jesus*, 122, 124; Contra. M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the NT* (London, 1959), 82. Hooker opposes the idea that this phrase alludes to Isa 53.12 by claiming that ἀλμα ἔκχέω is the equivalent of the Hebrew *šāpāk dām*. Gundry, however, maintains that ἐκχυνόμενον exactly corresponds to the Hebrew *he'ērāh* (*Use of OT*, 59; cf. France, *Jesus*, 122, 124).

<sup>24</sup> Many scholars have attempted to give their own answer to the identification of the servant of the Lord. However, none of them, ranging from "Israel as a whole" (J. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, AB 20 (Garden City, New York, 1968), xliii-lv) to "the servant city of Zion-Jerusalem" (L. E. Wilshire, "The Servant City: a New Interpretation of the Servant of the Lord in the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah", *JBL* 94 (1975), 356-357) seems to identify the servant of the Lord satisfactorily (cf. W. C. Kaiser, *Toward an Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, 1978), 215; cf. J. Bright, *Kingdom of God* (New York, 1953), 150ff; J. Watts, *Isaiah*, WBC 25 (Waco, Texas, 1987), 116-118). I need not enter into this issue further because the present concern is not identification of the servant but forgiveness of sins through the vicarious death of the servant.

<sup>25</sup> BDB, 670f.

<sup>26</sup> C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, ET (London, 1966), 268.

This suggests a sacrifice of expiation, corresponding to the sacrificial term *'āšām* (guilt offering) in v. 10. These two clear pointers to an expiatory sacrifice as the explanation of the meaning of the servant's suffering and death deserve to have particular attention given them.<sup>27</sup>

R. Whybray, however, argues against the suggestion that the servant's suffering is punishment on behalf of the people. He insists, "the phrase 'bear sin' (*nāšā' hēt'*), which occurs almost exclusively in the laws of Exodus and Leviticus, always refers to a person's responsibility for his own sin, and is never used in connection with atoning sacrifice".<sup>28</sup> He concludes that the phrase means that "the servant shared with others a penalty which was appropriate for them but not for him". In addition, he claims, "in the four passages from the laws (Ex 28.38; Lev 10.17; 16.22; Num 18.1) which have been cited as proof of this meaning (vicarious punishment or suffering), the subject of the verb 'bear' is not involved in suffering at all".<sup>29</sup> Nevertheless, three points can be suggested to show that his argument is less than convincing.

1. If it is not a vicarious suffering, there is no explanation as to how the suffering of the servant becomes the source of well-being and healing for the transgressors (v. 5).

2. According to Whybray, the subject of the verb "bear" in this context is not involved in any suffering at all.<sup>30</sup> However, in v. 4 the same verb *nāšā'* is used to describe carrying others' sorrows and sicknesses. In fact, he takes away the sins of others.

3. To support this argument Whybray suggests that the bearing of sins which Ezekiel suffered is in no sense a vicarious punishment.<sup>31</sup> He is right in saying that no human being's suffering can be vicarious. He correctly comments that the suffering of Ezekiel is "a sign of the punishment which the people are themselves

---

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> R. Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66*, NCB (London, 1975), 183.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> *Isaiah*, 183.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

called upon to bear" (Ezek 4.4-6).<sup>32</sup> However, Isa 53 indicates that the sin of the people, for whom the servant bore the punishment, was forgiven. Isa 53.10 clearly indicates that the servant's death is a guilt offering. Further, Whybray says,

Nowhere else in the OT is it stated that a man's life can be a guilt-offering, whether in a literal or a metaphorical sense, and the idea would appear to be entirely foreign to OT thought. If the author had intended to introduce such a novel and astonishing idea, we should expect him to have stated it more clearly.<sup>33</sup>

Nevertheless, it is hardly deniable that in Isa 53 the writer describes the death of the servant as a guilt offering. For instance, there is no description of the servant's own transgression for which the servant deserves death. Moreover, the suffering of the servant is described as the source of well-being and healing for the transgressors. Yet again the description of his suffering "like a lamb that is led to slaughter" (v. 7) seems to indicate that the writer understood the death of the servant as the sacrificial lamb of a guilt offering for the remission of sins.

What is significant in Isa 53 for the present study lies not only in the fact that the suffering of the servant is vicarious but also in the fact that the servant can be understood in relation to a new covenant relationship between God and his people.<sup>34</sup> In other servant passages the servant himself is given as a covenant for the people (Isa 42.6-7; 49.8-9; cf. Isa 55.3; 59.21; 61.8).<sup>35</sup> In Isa 42.6 the servant is referred to as the means of a (new) covenant relationship between God and his people: "I will make you as a covenant to the people".<sup>36</sup> The next verse (Isa 42.7)

---

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 179.

<sup>34</sup> Marshall, *Supper*, 92.

<sup>35</sup> Kim, *Son of Man*, 62-63.

<sup>36</sup> Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 100; cf. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, 40. Westermann says: "The words, 'I make you as', means that the person addressed is destined to become a tool or means whereby God effects something on others. This is shown by the second part of the verse. 'I make you the light to the nations', which means, 'through you the nations are to experience light, illumination and salvation' " (*Ibid.*).

indicates that the purpose of the covenant is to provide salvation for the people. Here the servant himself, as the agent of the Lord, provides that salvation: "to open blind eyes, to bring out prisoners from the dungeon and those who dwell in darkness from the prison" (cf. Isa 29.8-9).<sup>37</sup>

In order to support the view that Mark/Matthew understand that the promise of the (new) covenant relationship between God and his people in Isaiah closely relates to the death of Jesus, two objections must be met. The first questions whether Mark/Matthew are aware of Isa 42.6f and 49.8f. Even though there is no direct allusion to Isa 42.6f and 49.8f in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, it is not difficult to deduce that they are aware of them. It is clear that Isa 42.1 is alluded to by the heavenly voice at Jesus' baptism (Mt 3.17; Mk 1.11; Lk 3.22). Furthermore, Isa 61.1f, which is very close to Isa 42.6f and 49.8f in content, is quoted in Lk 4.18f, the Lucan account of Jesus' preaching at Nazareth, and in Mt 11.5 and Lk 7.24, where it is alluded to in order to explain the ministry of Jesus.<sup>38</sup> These allusions seem to indicate that the Synoptic writers understand Isa 61.1f in conjunction with the earlier Isa passages and are therefore aware of their content. It is worth noting that an analogy of a close association of the new covenant with the death of Jesus can be found only in the servant's suffering of death in order to bring about a (new) covenant relationship and the forgiveness of sins.<sup>39</sup> It is likely that they understand the death of Jesus as the death of the servant in order to establish a new covenant relationship.

The second question is whether Mark/Matthew understand this new covenant relationship in connection with Jer 31.31ff. It is worth noting that Isa 59.20 says, "a redeemer will come to Zion, and to those who turn from transgression in Jacob, declares the Lord" (Isa 59.20). Isa 59.21 shows that this event is related

---

<sup>37</sup> McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, 40.

<sup>38</sup> Kim, *Son of Man*, 63.

<sup>39</sup> G. Dalman, *Jesus - Jeshua*, ET (London, 1929[22]), 170; H. Wolff, *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum* (Berlin, 1952), 65.

to God's covenant with them: "And as for Me, this is My covenant with them", says the Lord: "My Spirit which is upon you, My words which I have put in your mouth, shall not depart from your mouth ...". C. Westermann says that "verse 21 diverges so much in both style and subject-matter from 59.1-20 that this cannot have been its original placing".<sup>40</sup> J. Watts, however, says, "My Covenant refers to v. 20 and God's promise to Zion".<sup>41</sup> The position of the verse is not significant for present study but its substance shows that redemption for those who turn from transgression can be understood in relation to God's covenantal relationship with his people.

The phrases such as "turn from transgression", "My Spirit which is upon you" and "My words which I have put in your mouth [and the mouth of your offspring]" show that the covenant here has similarities with the new covenant of Jer 31.33-34. McKenzie observes, "the language echoes 2 Sam 23.2; Isa 51.16; Jer 1.9; Ezek 36.26-27 and the thought is related to Jer 31.33-34".<sup>42</sup> The question may be raised whether Mark/Matthew are aware of this passage. There is no direct allusion to Isa 59.21 in the Gospels. However, a similar idea can be seen in Mt 10.20: "it is not you who speak, but it is the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you" (cf. Lk 12.12; 21.15).

Furthermore, it is worth noting that Paul quotes Isa 59.20-21a in Rom 11.26b-27a: "The deliverer will come from Zion, He will turn away ungodliness from Jacob. And this is my covenant with them, [when I take away their sins]".<sup>43</sup> It is also to be noted that according to Rabbinic sources, this passage is known as a Messianic passage.<sup>44</sup> Since this passage which links covenant and forgiveness of sins was known to Paul, it is not unlikely that Mark/Matthew were also aware of

<sup>40</sup> C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 352).

<sup>41</sup> J. Watts, *Isaiah 34-66*, 287.

<sup>42</sup> McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, 171.

<sup>43</sup> This quotation accords with the LXX translation of Isa 59.20-21a except that  $\epsilon\kappa$  is substituted for the  $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$  of the LXX.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. b Sanh. 98a; Str-B, 4.981; Michel, *Römer*, 356; Cranfield, *Romans* 2, 578.

it. If so, then Mark/Matthew seem to understand the covenant here in relation to Jer 31.31ff. This assumption can be supported by Matthew's addition of the phrase "for forgiveness of sins" (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν) (Mt 26.28). which seems to show that Matthew relates the covenant established at the Last Supper to the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff.<sup>45</sup> Paul's addition of the phrase "ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν" in Rom 11.27b which is the quotation of Isa 59.20-21 also seems to support this connection.<sup>46</sup>

In conclusion, OT allusions<sup>47</sup> in the cup-word suggest that Mark and Matthew understand the death of Jesus not only in terms of covenant sacrifice (Exod 24.3-8) but also in connection with the vicarious suffering of the servant of the Lord (Isa 53) in order to establish a new covenant relationship between God and his people (Isa 42.6-7; 49.8-9; 59.20-21), different from the Sinaitic covenant which was established by the blood of animal sacrifice. Furthermore, the OT allusions and the close link between the (new) covenant established by Jesus and the forgiveness of sins together indicate that Mark/Matthew understand the (new) covenant in connection with the fulfilment of Jer 31.31ff. The next question is whether this new covenant can be the same new covenant as that in the Lucan and Pauline formulations.

## ii). *The New Covenant in My Blood*

The aim here is not to argue that the term "new covenant" itself indicates

<sup>45</sup> Many scholars advocate this view: Taylor, *Mark*, 546; Gundry, *Use of OT*, 58; *Matthew*, 528. France, *Jesus*, 94; D. Hill, *Matthew*, 339; E. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew*, ET (London, 1976[73]), 491; Taylor says, "the connexion of forgiveness with the idea of the new covenant is distinctive of Jer 38 (31).31-34" (*Ibid*).

<sup>46</sup> Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, ICC, vol. 2 (Edinburgh, 1983[79]), 579. I have already argued in chapter 2 that the close association of forgiveness of sins with the renewal of the covenant can be understood in conjunction with Jer 31.31ff (i.e. Jub 22.14-15; Pss Sol 18.5). See above pp. 70ff, 78f.

<sup>47</sup> If these OT allusions are denied, as Kim points out, the *religious or traditionsgeschichtliche* background of the idea that a covenant was established through a man's blood and not through an animal's blood" cannot be explained (S. Kim, *Son of Man*, 63; cf. Hengel, *Atonement*, 28-32).



that the new covenant in Luke and 1 Cor 11 both recall Jer 31.31ff. Even though many scholars maintain that the use of this term indicates a close relation between them,<sup>48</sup> Grässer insists that the new covenant here does not relate to the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff but only to the new order of salvation by the power of the death of Jesus.<sup>49</sup> My concern here is to argue that the “new covenant in my blood” is not different from the “blood of the covenant” in order to confirm a close relationship between the new covenant at the Last Supper and that of Jer 31.31ff.

The phrase “in my blood” (which is poured for you) in Lk 22.20 and 1 Cor 11.25 might suggest identification with the blood of the covenant of Mk 14.24 because when added to the new covenant in Lk 22.20 and 1 Cor 11.25 it seems to allude to Exod 24.8.<sup>50</sup> This phrase also implies the idea of expiation (Isa 53.12).<sup>51</sup> Many scholars maintain that both Marcan and Lucan/Pauline formulations of the cup-word signify substantially the same things.<sup>52</sup> Jeremias remarks,

The subject in Mark/Matthew is the red wine contained in the cup, and the same holds for Paul/Luke-with *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον* they do not mean the cup, but its content. Also the predicate agrees substantially in both formulations. Just like Mark/Matthew (the wine “is my blood of the covenant”), so also Paul/Luke (the wine “is the new covenant by virtue of [causal *ἐν*] my blood” ) compare the wine with the blood, through whose outpouring the new covenant

<sup>48</sup> J. Behm, “*διαθήκη*”, TDNT II, 133; H. Goudge, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London, 1903), 100; L. Ragg, *St Luke with Introduction and Notes* (London, 1922), 279; Cranfield, *Mark*, 427; W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, THKNT 3 (Berlin, 1971[61]), 398; C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, TNTC (London, 1968), 268; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 199; L. Goppelt, *Theology of the NT*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, 1981[75]), 219; R. Pesch, “The Last Supper and Jesus’ Understanding of His Death”, *Bible Bhashyam* 3 (1977), 69; Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, NIGTC (Exeter, 1978), 806; *Supper*, 92-93; F. Chenderlin, “*Do This as My Memorial*”: *The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of Anamnēsis in Corinthians 11.24-25* (Rome, 1982), 210; J. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV*, AB 28a (Garden City, New York, 1983), 1402; G. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, 1987), 555.

<sup>49</sup> Grässer, *Bund*, 120-21.

<sup>50</sup> Jeremias, *Eucharistic*, 168; Marshall, *Luke*, 807; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1402; Kim, *Son of Man*, 62.

<sup>51</sup> Pesch, “Last Supper”, 70.

<sup>52</sup> Dalman, *Jesus*, 159; Jeremias, *Eucharistic*, 168; Cranfield, *Mark*, 427; Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 268; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 555.

is established. The common text is therefore: "This (wine) (is) my blood (shed for the concluding) of the covenant".<sup>53</sup>

Grässer, however, insists that it is not αἶμα and σῶμα but σῶμα and διαθήκη which are parallel in Cor 11.24-25. Further, he claims that the phrase "ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι" does not belong to the word "covenant" but to the word "ἐστίν".<sup>54</sup> Thus he concludes that "Das Sterben Jesu ist die *causa efficiens*, die den von Gott gesetzten Neuen Bund ins Leben ruft und der durch den Kelch repräsentiert wird".<sup>55</sup>

With regard to the parallelism between body and blood, I. H. Marshall convincingly remarks "it seems clear that from the beginning the word 'body' was understood in terms of self-giving in death, so that there was a parallelism, rather than a correlation between 'body' and 'blood'".<sup>56</sup> Grässer insists that the position of "ἐστίν" between the phrase "the new covenant" and the phrase "in my blood" precludes the idea of a close connection between the phrases "in my blood" and "the new covenant".<sup>57</sup> His claim seems to be pedantic. Furthermore, it is evident that the blood seals the covenant, for the new covenant is established by virtue of Jesus' blood, which means by his death.<sup>58</sup> It is hardly deniable that "the cup refers to wine which in turn represents the blood that establishes the covenant".<sup>59</sup>

In conclusion, it is fair to say that the "new covenant in my blood" of the

<sup>53</sup> Jeremias, *Eucharistic*, 169.

<sup>54</sup> Grässer, *Bund*, 118; cf. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 199.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> Marshall, *Last Supper*, 49; cf. W. Orr and J. Walter, *1 Corinthians*, AB 32 (Garden City, New York, 1981[76]), 267. Marshall continues: "the reference to a correlation between the terms may well be a red herring, and the point which remains unrefuted is that there was a parallel between the two statements 'This is my body' and 'This is my blood'" (p. 49; cf. Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 268; Chenderlin, *Do This*, 208f.

<sup>57</sup> Grässer, *Bund*, 118.

<sup>58</sup> Goudge, *1 Corinthians*, 100; J. Moffatt, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, MNTC (London, 1959[39]), 168; Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 269; Behm, "διαθήκη", 133; Orr and Walter, *1 Corinthians*, 267.

<sup>59</sup> A. Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, ICC (1911), 247; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 554; Chenderlin, *Do This*, 208f; cf. D. Flusser, "The Last Supper and the Essenes", *Immanuel* 2 (1973), 26.

Lucan and Pauline formulations is identified with the “blood of the covenant” of Mark/Matthew, since the phrases “my blood of the covenant” and “the new covenant in my blood” may indicate that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels and Paul understand the new covenant established by the blood of Jesus in terms of the covenant sacrifice of Exod 24.8 and of the vicarious suffering of the servant for the forgiveness of sins. Furthermore, the close connection between the new covenant and the forgiveness of sins may indicate that Paul/Luke understand the new covenant, established by Jesus, in terms of the fulfilment of the promise of the forgiveness of sin in the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff. The final question, then, is how the writers of the Synoptic Gospels and Paul relate the new covenant, established by the blood of Jesus for forgiveness of sins, to the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34.

#### **5.1.2 The Forgiveness of sins**

The aim of this sub-section is to argue that the description of the death of Jesus as the covenant sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins can be related to the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34. I shall argue that the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34 can be understood in conjunction with blood.

Jer 31.31ff indicates that even though Israel broke the covenant which God had made with their fathers, God would make a new covenant with them and would forgive their sins. This announcement of the forgiveness of sins can be understood in terms of relief from the curse incurred by the violation of the covenant, because, according to Jer 34.8ff, the Israelites were under the same covenant obligation which had been imposed upon their forefathers. Jer 34.16-17 shows that they in fact transgressed the covenant commitments. With regard to the curse of the covenant, the description of the consequence of breaking the covenant in Jer 34.18-20 is relevant.

And I will give the men who have transgressed My covenant, who have not fulfilled the words of the covenant which they made before Me, when they cut the calf in two and passed between its parts - the officials of Judah, and the officials of Jerusalem, the court officers, and the priests, and all the people of the land, who passed between the parts of the calf - and I will give them into the hand of their enemies and into the hand of those who seek their life. And their dead bodies shall be food for the birds of the sky and the beasts of the earth (NASB).

Jer 34.18-20 shows that the Israelites by the transgression of their covenant with God, brought the curse of the covenant on themselves. The covenant ceremony indicates symbolically that the curse of the covenant is the death of the covenant-breaker.<sup>60</sup> It follows that the announcement of forgiveness of sin in Jer 31.34 can be understood in relation to relief from the curse of the covenant. I have argued in chapter 1 that even though Jer 31.31ff does not refer to how God will forgive sins, the announcement of the forgiveness of sins can be understood in relation to a new mode of forgiving sins in the new covenant.<sup>61</sup> Further, as I have argued above,<sup>62</sup> OT allusions in the cup-word may indicate that the new covenant established by Jesus is understood in connection with the servant's vicarious suffering of death for the forgiveness of sins. I have shown that in Isa 53 the forgiveness of sins is described as the result of the death of the servant on behalf of many, and the servant himself is given as a covenant for the people (cf. Isa 42.6; 49.8; 59.21).

We may suppose, then, that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels and Paul understand the announcement of the new covenant in Jesus' blood in connection with the suffering of the servant and the establishment of the covenant relationship between God and his people. If this understanding is acceptable, since in the covenant ceremony the death of the animal symbolically represents the curse of

---

<sup>60</sup> Nicholson, *Jeremiah 26-52*, 97; Thompson, *Jeremiah*, 612-613; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 645-646; cf. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford, 1972), 102-104; McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant* (Rome, 1981[61], 94).

<sup>61</sup> See above pp. 24ff.

<sup>62</sup> See above pp. 177ff.

the covenant upon the covenant-breaker (Jer 34.18ff), it would follow that these same writers understand the death of Jesus in relation to the suffering of the servant as representing those who had violated the covenant. Accordingly, I suggest that they understand the death of Jesus as effecting the relief of the covenant-breaker from the curse of the covenant and, at the same time, as establishing the new covenant relationship between God and his people.

At this point Gal 3.10ff is worth noting. In Gal 3.13a Paul says, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us" (Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα). The questions raised here are whether the phrases "the curse of the law" and "having become a curse for us" can be understood in relation to relief from the curse of the covenant. Verse 10 is significant for this question. Paul says in v. 10b, "cursed is every one who does not abide by all things written in the Book of the law, to do them" (Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὅς οὐκ ἐμμένει πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά). This clause has been recognized as a quotation from Deut 27.26.<sup>63</sup> Deut 27.26 is the conclusion of the twelve curses pronounced by Moses and the Levites standing on Mount Ebal, to each of which the people responded with an Amen (Deut 27.9-26). This procedure which was followed by the pronouncement of blessings must be understood as a part of a covenant-renewal ceremony (cf. Exod 24; Deut 29; Josh 24; Neh 9-10; 1QS 2.1-18).<sup>64</sup>

Thus the curse in Deut 27.26 must be pronounced in reference to the covenant-breaker. This close link between the curse of the law and the covenant-breaker can be supported by Paul's quotation of Deut 21.23 in v. 13c: "Cursed is every one who hangs on a tree" (Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμόμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου). As Dunn

<sup>63</sup> LXX: Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὅς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτούς.

<sup>64</sup> E. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition* (Oxford, 1967), 44ff; cf. F. F. Bruce, *Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on Greek Text* NGTC (Exeter, 1982), 158.

points out,<sup>65</sup> Deut 21.23 can be understood in reference to covenant inheritance.<sup>66</sup> Accordingly, whoever the term “ἡμᾶς” in Gal 3. 13 refers to,<sup>67</sup> v. 13 may suggest that Paul understands the death of Jesus as a means of releasing the covenant people from the curse of the covenant. The phrases “the blessings of Abraham” and “the promise of the Spirit” in v. 14 imply that Paul also understands the death of Jesus as a means of establishing the covenant (for Gentiles).<sup>68</sup>

To sum up, OT allusions in the cup-word seem to indicate that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels understand the death of Jesus in terms of the covenant sacrifice (Exod 24.8) and the vicarious suffering of the servant (Isa 42.6-7; 49.8-9; 53; 59.20f) in relation to Jer 31.31ff, because the close link between the covenant and the forgiveness of sins is prominent in these passages. Furthermore, Isa 42.6 can be understood in connection with the establishment of a (new) covenant.<sup>69</sup> If the writers of the Synoptics and Paul understand the death of Jesus in connection with these passages, the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34 can also be understood in relation to the blood (death) of Jesus as the means of establishing the new covenant. If this interpretation is correct, Grässer’s assertion that there is no relationship between blood and the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff is an inadequate rejoinder to the claim that a positive relationship was seen to exist between the new covenant of 1 Cor 11.25 and that of Jer 31.31ff.

<sup>65</sup> Dunn, “Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.10-14)”, *NTS* 31 (1985), 536.

<sup>66</sup> According to Deut 21.23, the corpse of one who hangs on a tree has to be buried on the same day so that the land which the Lord gives as an inheritance is not defiled.

<sup>67</sup> The identification of the term “ἡμᾶς” in v. 13 is controversial as to whether it refers to an inclusive group of Jewish and Gentile Christians or to Jewish Christians exclusively or to Gentile Christians exclusively. Who this term refers to does not affect my argument greatly. In any case “ἡμᾶς” here, who are redeemed from the curse of the law, refers to the covenant people, since v. 10 shows that those who are of the “works of the law” are still under a curse (cf. J. Bligh, *Galatians: A Discussion of St Paul’s Epistle* (London, 1969, 265)). For references of the identification of ἡμᾶς here see D. Donaldson, “The ‘Curse of the Law’ and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3.13-14”, *NTS* 32 (1986), 107, N. 2-4.

<sup>68</sup> I shall discuss this point further in 5.3 and in chapter 6.

<sup>69</sup> See above pp. 180ff.

## 5.2 The Outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost

Luke records that the outpouring of the Spirit took place on “the day of Pentecost” (τῇν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς) (Acts 2.1-4). “Pentecost” in the NT is connected with the Feast of Weeks (ἡμέρα ἡαqqāšîr) in the OT (Exod 23.16 (15); Lev 23.15-21; Deut 16.10; 2 Chron 8.13; Acts 20.16; 1 Cor 16.8). The Feast of Weeks was originally a farmers’ feast of harvest (Lev 23.15f) and the day of offering the first-fruits to God (Exod 34.22; Num 28.26). My consideration begins with the facts that the Spirit was given on the day of Pentecost, and that Pentecost in the NT is connected with the Feast of Weeks (ἡμέρα ἡαqqāšîr) in the OT.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>70</sup> Fitzmyer, “Ascension”, 430; Marshall, “Pentecost”, 347ff. Many scholars note that the festival was related to the giving of the law at Sinai (Exod 19.1; 2 Chron 15.10-12) (Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-interpretation of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (London, 1970), 48-49; Fitzmyer, “Ascension”, 432; Marshall, “Significance”, 347ff; M. Weinfeld, “Pentecost as Festival of the Giving of the Law”, *Immanuel* 8 (1978), 7-18). Fitzmyer, admitting that “it is difficult to find in the Lucan story of Pentecost any direct allusion to the Sinaitic Covenant”, suggests two points which indicate allusions to the Sinaitic covenant in Luke’s description of Pentecost in Acts 2 (Fitzmyer, “Ascension”, 433f). First, he observes that the setting of Peter’s sermon in company with the Eleven before the assembled Jews is “an echo of the saying of Jesus at the Last Supper in the Lucan Gospel” (*Ibid.*, 433). He continues, “Here Peter as the spokesman for the newly reconstituted Twelve confronts the assembled ‘house of Israel’ on its Feast of Weeks and lets it be known that despite what they had done in crucifying ‘this Jesus’, the promise of old made by God to that house was still valid for them and their children, far and near, as being those ‘whom the Lord our God calls to Him (2.39)’”.

Secondly, he refers to J. Dupont’s list of verbal allusions in Acts 2 to the important chapters 19 and 20 of Exodus, which describe the theophany at Sinai and the giving of the Torah: “the adverb *homou*, ‘together’ - or its variant *homothymadon* - may be an echo of *pas ho laos homothymadon* of Exod 19.8, ‘all the people together’. In Acts the ‘sound’ from heaven is *ēchos* (v. 2) and *phōnē* (v. 6); in Exod 19.16 one reads of *eginonto phōnai* (‘there were sounds’ [= thunders]) and *phōnē tēs salpingos ēchei mega* (‘a sound of the trumpet blasted loudly’). The source of the sound is *ek tou ouranou* (Acts 2.2) cf. Exod 20.22, *ek tou ouranou lelālēka pros hymas*, ‘I have spoken to you from heaven’. Yahweh’s descent to Mt. Sinai in fire (Exod 19.18) gives an OT background to ‘the tongues as of fire’ of Acts 2.3” (*Ibid.*; cf. J. Dupont, “The First Christian Pentecost”, in *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles* (Ramsey, NJ, 1979) 35-59).

M. Weinfeld relates the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost to the outpouring of the Spirit on the elders in the Sinai desert: “Just as the revelation at Sinai occurred on the day of the Pentecost so the revelation of the first Christian community happened on this very day” (Weinfeld, “Pentecost”, 17). He comments, “just as the revelation to the first Christian community was patterned after the revelation to the Israelites at Sinai so the revelation to Jesus was patterned after the revelation to Moses” (*Ibid.*, 18). Moreover, he compares the story of

It is interesting to note in the Book of Jubilees the covenant relationship between God and his people was made and renewed on the day of the Feast of Weeks (Jub 6.17; 14.20; cf. 1QS 1.16-2.25). Furthermore, that the idea of the eschatological renewal of the covenant relationship between God and Israel is related to the gift of the Spirit (Jub 1.23f). As I have argued in 2.2.3, the author seems to understand this renewal of the covenant in terms of a fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff.<sup>71</sup>

The question now raised is how Luke understands the event of Pentecost in connection with this eschatological renewal of the covenant. Even though it is difficult to find any explicit allusion, some similarities can be discerned between the author of Jubilees' description of the renewal and Luke's description of the event of Pentecost.

First of all, the author of Jubilees may have expected the promise of the renewal of the covenant in Jub 1.15ff to be realized on the day of the Feast of Weeks (i.e. Pentecost) because for him the covenant between God and his people was made and renewed on the day of the Feast of Weeks (Jub 6.17; 14.20).

Secondly, he points out that God himself will create for the people a holy spirit and purify them so that they would keep all of his commandments (Jub 1.23). He seems to understand the renewal in association with a holy spirit and the forgiveness of sins.

Thirdly, this renewal must be an eschatological renewal of the covenant because for the author this will be the final renewal of the covenant. God reveals to him, the author, what (was) in the beginning and what (will be) at the end (Jub 1.4, 26). The fact that there is no description of a future renewal of the

---

the transfiguration of Jesus with the story of Moses' ascending Mount Sinai with Aaron, Nadab and Abihu (Exod 24; 34; 40) (*Ibid*).

<sup>71</sup> See above pp. 70ff.



covenant after this particular renewal indicates that he understands this renewal to be the last of all. This idea can be supported by his emphasis on the fact that the people will never turn away from following God from the time of this renewal (Jub 1.23). At the same time, the author seems to understand this renewal as the beginning of a new age. The author clearly makes a distinction between the situation before and after the renewal (Jub 1). His use of the phrases such as "afterward" (Jub 1.15) and "after this" (Jub 1.23) also indicates that he stresses this distinction.

The main question here is whether Luke is familiar with this idea of the eschatological renewal of the covenant. It would seem to be more likely that he is familiar with this idea than that he is not. B. Noack, following K. Lake,<sup>72</sup> observes that the abstinence from pollutions of idols, fornication, strangling and blood in Acts 15.20, 29 is in accordance with the Noachian commands.<sup>73</sup> He observes that this is in perfect agreement with the Book of Jubilees, the commands of which are related to the renewal of the covenant.<sup>74</sup>

Moreover, this idea does not seem to be a new one originated by the author of Jubilees independently of any OT tradition. He seems to expect this renewal as a fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff, which is closely related to the new covenant idea of Ezek 11.19f and 36.26f.<sup>75</sup> A similar idea can be found in the Psalms of Solomon. The author relates the eschatological hope of the fulfilment of the promise of the covenant to the fear of God in the covenant people (Pss Sol 17.41, 43; 18.8) in order that there will be no unrighteousness and no arrogance among Israel in that time (Pss sol 17.43).<sup>76</sup>

Two other points can be suggested. Luke understands the gift of the Spirit as

---

<sup>72</sup> K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. 6 (London, 1933), 208.

<sup>73</sup> B. Noack, "The Day of Pentecost in Jubilees, Qumran, and Acts", *ASTI* 1 (1962), 92.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>75</sup> See above pp. 21f.

<sup>76</sup> See above pp. 78f.

a gift of the last days. The alteration of Joel's word "after this" (μετὰ ταῦτα in the LXX) into "in the last days" (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις) shows that for Luke the gift of the Spirit is given in the last days (Acts 2.17). On the other hand, Pentecost is understood as a farmers' feast, the day of offering the first-fruits.

In short, Luke seems to understand the outpouring of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost as the beginning of the eschatological new covenant community. Furthermore, the fact that the gift of the Spirit is closely linked with the forgiveness of sins,<sup>77</sup> seems to indicate that Luke also understands the gift of the Spirit in the light of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff. We might note that for Luke the gift of the Spirit would also have the effect of intimacy of relationship with God, as well as forgiveness of sins, for which Jer 31.34a looks.

For Luke the fundamental significance of Pentecost is that Jesus baptised the disciples with the Holy Spirit. At the Jordan, God anointed Jesus with the Spirit for the messianic task before him. At Pentecost, as the result of his death, resurrection and ascension, Jesus poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit on the disciples. Dunn points out the significance of this by focusing attention on the new relationship between Jesus and the Spirit, and between the Spirit and the believer: "first, when his human life was the creation of the Spirit (Luke 1.35); second, when he was anointed with the Spirit and thus became the Anointed One, the unique Man of the Spirit (Luke 3.22; 4.18); third, when he received the promise of the Spirit at his exaltation and poured the Spirit forth on his disciples, thus becoming Lord of the Spirit".<sup>78</sup>

What is noteworthy here is Dunn's view that, in the third phase, baptism in the Spirit initiates the individual into the new age and covenant.<sup>79</sup> A further important claim made by Dunn is that "as Jesus entered the new age and covenant

---

<sup>77</sup> See below pp. 248ff.

<sup>78</sup> Dunn, *Baptism*, 90.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 32. 41ff

by being baptised in the Spirit at Jordan, so the disciples followed him in like manner at Pentecost".<sup>80</sup> Turner however argues against Dunn's view of Jesus' relationship to the Spirit and of Jesus' experience as "archetypal" of Christian life in the Spirit.<sup>81</sup>

His main argument is that Jesus' reception of the Spirit should not be understood as "archetypal": as he puts it, "no disciple is called to follow in the footsteps of Jesus qua eschatological Prophet; no disciple receives a charism that makes him this".<sup>82</sup> The way he formulates his claim ("no disciple is called to follow ... eschatological prophet") indicates a misunderstanding of Dunn's view. Dunn does not say that Jesus' baptism at Jordan is an "archetype" of the disciples' baptism in the Spirit at Pentecost in terms of following in the footsteps of Jesus "*qua eschatological prophet*". Dunn may not deny the notion of Jesus as an eschatological prophet or a prophet-like-Moses, but this is not the point that he wishes to emphasize. Rather he is saying that, "as Jesus entered the new age and covenant by being baptised in the Spirit at Jordan", so the disciples entered the new age and covenant by being baptised in the Spirit at Pentecost.<sup>83</sup>

In conclusion, the baptism in the Holy Spirit at Pentecost indicates that for Luke Pentecost is the opening of a new age, the age of the new relationship between the Spirit and the people of God. Pentecost is the beginning of their participation in the new age, the age of a new covenant through the reception of the gift of the the Spirit. Pentecost was the beginning of the new covenant community made up of both the Apostles and those who associated with them.

---

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

<sup>81</sup> M. Turner, "Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective", *TynB* 32 (1981), 3-42; cf. Turner, *Luke and the Spirit. Studies in the Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Cambridge University, 1980). Dunn does not use the term "archetypal"; it is Turner's term in describing Dunn's view of Jesus' baptism at Jordan in relation to the disciples' baptism in the Spirit at Pentecost.

<sup>82</sup> Turner, "Jesus and the Spirit", 28.

<sup>83</sup> Dunn, *Baptism*, 40.

### 5.3 A Servant of the New Covenant (2 Cor 3.6)

We have seen that the concept of the new covenant is prominent in the Last Supper traditions, and is possibly also important in Luke's account of Pentecost. The purpose of this section is to argue that Paul's designation of himself as a servant of the new covenant<sup>84</sup> is related to the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff. I shall argue this under three sub-headings: 5.3.1 The contrast between tablets of stone and the tablets of human hearts; 5.3.2 The letter kills; 5.3.3 The Spirit gives life. In 5.3.1 I shall show that Paul's contrast between tablets of stone and tablets of human hearts indicates that he alludes to Jer 31.31ff. In 5.3.2 I shall investigate whether Paul's assertion, "the letter kills", indicates that the hardened Jews do not keep the law itself but the letter, the external code of the law so that for Paul, they in fact break the law in the same way as Jeremiah's contemporaries had transgressed the law. In 5.3.3 I shall argue that Paul's assertion, "the Spirit gives life", indicates that Paul understands his ministry of the new covenant in connection with the fulfilment of the prophecy of Jer 31.31ff with regard to keeping the law. In addition, in 5.3.4 I shall argue against those who claim that 2 Cor 3 indicates abrogation of the law.

#### 5.3.1 The Contrast between Tablets of Stone and Tablets of Human Hearts (2 Cor 3.3)

Paul points out that his ministry of the new covenant relates to the Corinthian Christians. In 2 Cor 3.2 he says that the Corinthian Christians are his letter (ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν ὑμεῖς ἐστε). In v. 3 he also says that they are "a letter of Christ" (ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ), "not (written) on tablets of stone, but on tablets of human hearts" (οὐκ ἐν πλαξίν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξίν καρδίαις

<sup>84</sup> 2 Cor 3.6 (Greek text): ὅς καὶ ἱκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης, οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος· τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, τὸ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ.

σαρκίναις). The main concern here is whether Paul's contrast between tablets of stone and tablets of human hearts indicates that he understands his ministry of the new covenant in relation to Jer 31.31ff.

The phrase "written in our hearts" (ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν) in v. 2 shows the reason why Paul does not need "letters of recommendation" (συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν). His connection with the Corinthian Christians is not confined to the external but is an internal relationship, which is permanent, not to be erased or forgotten. Furthermore, Paul points out that this relationship cannot be denied because it is known and read by all men (2 Cor 3.2c). At the same time Paul asserts that the Corinthian Christians are the letter of Christ written in their hearts. Here it is to be noted that Paul moves from the intimate relationship between himself and the Corinthian Christians to the intimate and inseparable relationship between them and Christ.

There are three things to note about the Corinthian Christians' being the letter of Christ.

- (1) This letter is written not in ink but with the Spirit of the living God.
- (2) It is written not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts.
- (3) The Corinthian Christians become the letter of Christ as the result of Paul's ministry of the new covenant.

These three things are inseparably connected. The Corinthian Christians become the letter of Christ through the work of the Spirit. At the same time, the Corinthian Christians come to be the letter of Christ through Paul's ministry of the new covenant. Hence many scholars maintain that Paul alludes to Jer 31.33 in 2 Cor 3.3 or 3.6.<sup>85</sup> Nevertheless, other scholars are opposed to this view. I

---

<sup>85</sup> C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (London, 1973), 112; F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, NCB (London, 1971), 190; C. Cranfield, "St Paul and the Law", *SJT*, 17 (1964), 57; *Romans*, vol 2, 853ff; V. Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, AB 32A (Garden City, New York, 1984), 183; C. J. A. Hickling, "The Sequence of Thought in 2 Corinthians, Chapter Three", *NTS* 21 (1975), 388f; M. Hooker, "Beyond the Things That are Written?"

shall examine their case.

H. Räisänen strongly insists that even though “καρδία σαρκῖναι is reminiscent of Ezek 11.19; 36.26”, 2 Cor 3.3 and 3.6 do not allude to Jer 31.31ff: “If Paul intends an allusion to Jer 31 in 2 Cor 3.3 or 3.6, it is all the more conspicuous that he omits what Jer 31 says about the law”.<sup>86</sup> On the other hand, C. Wolff insists that 2 Cor 3.3 alludes to neither Jer 31.33 nor Ezek 11.19 and 36.26f, but to Prov 3.3 and 7.3. Wolff claims not only that Jeremiah’s prophecy of a new covenant is not alluded to in Paul’s writing at all, but also that it is doubtful whether Paul ever uses the book of Jeremiah.<sup>87</sup> Before examining the idea that Paul does not allude to Jer 31.33 in 2 Cor 3.3 or 3.6, I shall first respond briefly to Wolff’s two claims.

First, concerning Paul’s allusion to Prov 3.3 and 7.3 in 2 Cor 3.3, it is to be noted that “the tablet of your heart” in Prov 3.3 and 7.3 indicates neither the idea of a “fleshly” heart nor of the Spirit, both of which are prominent in the case of 2 Cor 3.3. Thus it is difficult to conclude that Prov 3.3 and 7.3 alone are the source of Paul’s contrast between tablets of stone and tablets of the fleshly heart on which the Spirit works.

Secondly, with regard to whether Paul ever uses the book of Jeremiah, W. Lane points out that Paul’s description of his commission in terms of “building up” and “tearing down” is an explicit allusion to Jer 31.28 (2 Cor 10.18; 13.10; cf. Gal

---

St. Paul’s Use of Scripture”, *NTS* 27 (1981), 296; P. Hughes, *Second Corinthians*, NICNT (1962), 89-91; R. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40 (Waco, Texas, 1986), 54; T. Provenç, “Who is Sufficient for These Things? An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 2.15-3.18”. *NovT* 24 (1982), 60; M. Rissi, *Studien zum Zweiten Korintherbrief: Der alte Bund - Der Prediger - Der Tod*, ATANT 56 (Zurich, 1969), 22; E. Richard, “Polemics, Old Testament, and Theology: A Study of 2 Cor 3.1-4.6”. *RB* 88 (1981), 347-349; H. Windisch, *Der Zweite Korintherbrief*, NTD 7 (Göttingen, 1924), 106, 109.

<sup>86</sup> H. Räisänen, *Paul*, 243-245. Räisänen’s idea is echoed by Grässer. He quotes the above statement in his book *Der Alte Bund im Neuen*, 81.

<sup>87</sup> C. Wolff, *Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum*, TU 118 (1976), 135, 141f).

2.18).<sup>88</sup> Furthermore, Paul's use of the terms "new covenant" and "old covenant" also suggests that Paul seems to be aware of the book of Jeremiah. It has already been argued in chapter 4 that the new covenant in the Dead Sea Scrolls was closely related to Jer 31.31ff. It is also noteworthy that after Jeremiah designated the Mosaic covenant as the old covenant by implication in Jer 31.31ff, the term "old covenant" did not occur in any Jewish literature until Paul used it in reference to the Mosaic covenant. Moreover, Paul's assertion, "he who had set me apart from my mother's womb" in Gal 1.15 may also indicate that he is aware of Jeremiah's confession that God appointed him before he was formed in the womb (Jer 1.5).<sup>89</sup> Therefore, it is quite likely that Paul is aware of the book of Jeremiah.

Those who like Räisänen maintain that Paul does not allude to Jer 31.33 in 2 Cor 3.3, base their argument mainly on three points.

(a) The motif "heart of flesh" in 2 Cor 3.3 explicitly occurs in both Ezek 11.19 and 36.26 as against the "heart" motif in Jer 31.33.<sup>90</sup>

(b) The motif of the Spirit, which is so central to Paul's thought in 2 Cor 3.3, is missing altogether in Jer 31.31ff.<sup>91</sup>

(c) The characteristic idea of the law written on the heart in Jer 31.33 does not occur in 2 Cor 3.3.<sup>92</sup>

<sup>88</sup> W. Lane, "Covenant: Key to Paul's Conflict with Corinth", *TynB* 33 (1982), 9-10: "In describing the new covenant ministry entrusted to him, Paul speaks of his authority for building, and not for tearing down (2 Cor 13.10). The explicit allusion to Jeremiah 31.28 indicates that Paul understands his task as the eschatological ministry of establishing the New Covenant, an act of God prophesied through Jeremiah and achieved through Paul as the servant of the covenant" (*Ibid*).

<sup>89</sup> Cf. A. Oepke, *Der Brief des Paulus und die Galater*, THKNT 9 (Berlin, 1973), 60; F. Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, HTHNT IX (Freiburg, Basel and Wien, 1984), 81; G. Ebeling, *The Truth of the Gospel: An Exposition of Galatians* (Phila., 1985[81]), 76; Bruce, *Galatians*, 92.

<sup>90</sup> Räisänen, *Paul*, 243; S. Hafemann, *Suffering and Spirit: An Exegetical Study of II Cor 2.14-3.3 with the Context of the Corinthian Correspondence* (Ph.D. Dissertation at Tübingen, 1985), 317 (published in WUNT 2.19, 1986); cf. Grässer, *Bund*, 82.

<sup>91</sup> Hafemann, *Suffering*, 317.

<sup>92</sup> Räisänen, *Paul*, 243, 245; Hafemann, *Suffering*, 318; Grässer, *Bund*, 81.

(a). In relation to the motif “heart of flesh” in 2 Cor 3.3, Räisänen says, “the hearts are not characterized as ‘fleshly’ in Jer 31.33; on the other hand, nothing is written in the hearts in Ezek 11 or 36”.<sup>93</sup> Nevertheless, he maintains that the motif “human heart” in 2 Cor 3.3 alludes to the promise of a new heart in *Ezekiel*.<sup>94</sup>

It is obvious that the promise of a new heart in Ezek 36 is closely related to keeping the law (cf. Ezek 11). Even though Hafemann insists that 2 Cor 3.3 does not allude to Jer 31.33, he appropriately comments, “in view of Israel’s history of disobedience, it became common to emphasize the nation’s ‘hard heart’, while at the same time expressing hope in God’s corresponding eschatological promise to replace this ‘heart of stone’ with a *new* heart of flesh and a new spirit/Holy Spirit in order that his people might keep the law and thus remain faithful to the covenant”.<sup>95</sup> As the concept of the “heart” in the OT centers more on volition than on emotion,<sup>96</sup> the promise of putting the law on their hearts indicates that God will give them both the desire and the ability to keep the law.

This can be further supported by the reference in Jer 32.39-40 to an everlasting covenant in which the people will have the fear of the Lord in their hearts so that they will never turn away from Him. The clause “they will never turn away from me (the Lord)” indicates that the Israelites will keep the law. It is also clear that their keeping the law is the result of the fear of the Lord being put in their hearts.<sup>97</sup> It is to be concluded that when the new covenant has been established, the new covenant people will voluntarily keep the law because of obedience which

---

<sup>93</sup> Räisänen, *Paul*, 243.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid*, 244.

<sup>95</sup> Hafemann, *Suffering*, 325. He also suggests several further adaptations of this perspective in extra-biblical Jewish literature: IV Ezra 3.19-23. 36; 7.23f, 45-49. 72; 8.6f; 9.29-37 in comparison with 6.26; Jub 1.7. 10,21-23 (cf. 15.33f); Apoc.Moses 13.3-5; Test.Levi 18.10-11; Test.Judah 24.2f; Odes of Sol 4.3; Test.Job 48.34; 49.1; 50.1; Life of Adam and Eve 29.8f; I En 108.2; Sib.Or III 703.719; Ps-Philo, LAB 30.6; Baruch 1.17-21 (cf. 2.8); Ex.R 41.7.

<sup>96</sup> W. Holladay, “New Covenant”, 624.

<sup>97</sup> See above pp. 21, 71, 78f.



flows from within their hearts.

Ezek 36.26-27 may indicate that Ezekiel understood putting the law and the fear of God in the heart as two aspects of the same thing: the people will keep the law by the power of the Lord within them. As Jeremiah expressed the idea of putting the law in the heart in terms of putting the fear of God in the heart, it is not difficult to imagine that Ezekiel might well be expressing the idea of putting the law in the heart in terms of “giving fleshly heart” so that the Israelites would keep the law. If this understanding is accepted, Räisänen’s remark above cannot lead one to conclude that the motif “human” heart in 2 Cor 3.3 has no connection with the motif “putting the law in the heart” in Jer 31.33.

Hafemann also claims that Paul does not allude to Jer 31.33 in 2 Cor 3.3 because the “fleshly heart”-motif in 2 Cor 3.3 occurs in both Ez 11.19 and 36.26 rather than the “heart”-motif in Jer 31.33.<sup>98</sup> Nevertheless, Hafemann maintains that Paul intends to say in 2 Cor 3.3 that “the law is now being kept by those who have received the Spirit as Ezekiel prophesied”.<sup>99</sup> If this is so, then this interpretation also implies that Paul could have related the “fleshly hearts” motif in 2 Cor 3.3 not only to Ezekiel 36 (11), but also to Jer 31.33, because the heart motif in Jer 31.33 also indicates that the Israelites will keep the law. Accordingly, Hafemann’s claim is also unconvincing.

(b). Hafemann claims that the absence of reference to the Spirit in Jer 31.33 shows that Paul does not allude to Jer 31.31ff in 2 Cor 3.3.<sup>100</sup> It is true that Jer 31.31ff does not mention the Spirit of God. However, the promise of putting the law in the heart can be understood to mean that Jeremiah might have understood that there would be some work of the Spirit involved in relation to the establishment of the new covenant.

---

<sup>98</sup> Hafemann, *Suffering*, 317.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 326.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 317.

First, as mentioned above, putting the fear of the Lord in the heart (Jer 32.39-40) can be understood as a different expression of the same idea of putting the law in the heart: the Lord will put the fear of the Lord in the hearts of the new covenant people so that they keep the law and never turn away from the Lord. What is important to note here is that the promise of putting the fear of the Lord in the hearts can be understood in connection with the Spirit.

Jeremiah confessed, "God put his word in his heart and it burnt like a fire in his bones until it was released" (Jer 20.9). His confession indicates that God changed his heart, for originally he had a determination not to proclaim in the name of the Lord again (Jer 20.9a). It is to be assumed that Jeremiah's confession indicates the work of the Spirit of God in his heart, since elsewhere in the OT, the work of the Spirit is described as being active in giving ability and intelligence (Ex 31.3; 35.31), changing the heart (1 Sam 10.6) and endowing with power (Judg 14.6, 19; 1 Kgs 13.31; 17.9f). Furthermore, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that it is not a question simply of what Jeremiah intended. Rather it is more a question of how Jeremiah's words could have been understood, particularly by those who did not share his inhibitions about speaking of the Spirit. It is also noteworthy that in the OT the Spirit is the agent of God. Accordingly, Hafemann seems to be pedantic. Hence it is fair to say that even though the Spirit is absent in Jer 31.33, we can hardly conclude that the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff would not have been related to the work of the Spirit.

Secondly, if the fleshly motif in 2 Cor 3.3 is related to Ezekiel's promise of the Spirit in connection with keeping the law, it is not difficult to suppose that Paul could understand Jer 31.33 in the light of Jer 32.39-40 and of Ezekiel's prophecies in 11.19f and 36.26f. The fact that keeping the law is the common characteristic of these OT passages may suggest that Paul could understand Jer 31.33 in relation to the Spirit because Paul could well have regarded the two ideas of putting the fear of the Lord in the heart, and of giving a fleshly heart, as more

vivid interpretations of the motif of putting the law in the heart. Furthermore, these passages are connected to a new covenantal relationship between the Lord and his people.

In short, it is a reasonable deduction that Paul could understand Jer 31.33 in connection with the Spirit. Conversely, Hafemann's claim that the absence of the Spirit from Jer 31.33 is evidence that Paul does not allude to Jer 31.33 in 2 Cor 3.3 is less than convincing.

(c). Räisänen says, "if Paul intends an allusion to Jer 31 in 2 Cor 3.3 or 3.6, it is all the more conspicuous that he *omits* what Jer 31 says about the law".<sup>101</sup> He also says, "it is *not* the *law* in any sense that has been written in the Corinthians' hearts according to verse 3".<sup>102</sup> Two things can be suggested against Räisänen's view. In the first place, the omission of the term "law" cannot be the sole criterion for establishing whether or not Paul intends an allusion to Jer 31 in 2 Cor 3.3 or 3.6. As already argued above, it is not difficult to suppose that Paul might express Jeremiah's announcement of putting the law in the heart by the phrase " (written) on the tablets of human heart".

In the second place, one possible reason may be suggested for Paul's avoidance of the term "law" in 2 Cor 3. If Paul were to speak of the law here, he would probably be misunderstood by other Jews. Paul's understanding of keeping the law in the new covenant is different from that of his contemporaries. Paul does not maintain that in the new covenant believers should keep every commandment of the law. Moreover, he does not maintain that the new covenant people can keep the law perfectly, because believers are in the flesh and live in this evil age.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> Räisänen, *Paul*, 245.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>103</sup> See below p. 259 n. 63.

It is important to clarify the reason why Paul contrasts the two "materials", the tablets of stone and the tablets of the fleshly hearts. Hafemann understands this contrast as a contrast between the law and the Spirit in terms of the contrast between the impotence of the law under the old covenant and the potency of the Spirit, by which "the law itself is now able to be kept".<sup>104</sup> The contrast between stone tablets and fleshly hearts recalls the prophetic promise of the law written upon the heart in the new covenant (Jer 31.33).<sup>105</sup> This contrast implies that the new covenant is being fulfilled by the Spirit's work in changing the heart of the Corinthian Christians by means of Paul's own ministry of the new covenant (2 Cor 3.6). If this is so, then it follows that Paul intends to say that the Corinthian Christians - the letter of Christ, written on the fleshly hearts through the Spirit as the result of his own ministry - are the evidence not only of his ministry as the ministry of the new covenant, but also of the fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy of the new covenant, namely, the internalization of the law.

Hafemann claims, "while in the 'old age' the locus of God's activity and revelation was the law, in the 'new age' according to Ezekiel, God will be at work in the heart".<sup>106</sup> What is missing in this statement is the fact that Ezekiel understood the new age not only in terms of God's work on the heart, but also in connection with keeping the law as the result of God's work on the heart. Hafemann also claims that the old age characterized by the law is over "as the locus of God's revelatory activity".<sup>107</sup> However, the focal point in 3.3 is not only that the old age is over, but also that in the new covenant the law is internalized by the Spirit. Paul contrasts the tablets of stone with tablets of the fleshly hearts in order to show the different relationships to the law under the old and new covenants. Under the old covenant, the law was written on tablets

---

<sup>104</sup> Hafemann, *Suffering*, 327.

<sup>105</sup> Provence, "Sufficient", 60.

<sup>106</sup> Hafemann, *Suffering*, 326.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 327.

of stone. Thereby the hardened Israelites kept the law as an external ordinance. Consequently, they could not obey the commandments because of their hardness of heart. Under the new covenant, the law is written in the heart by the Spirit. As a result of this the new covenant people are enabled to fulfil the law in the Spirit.<sup>108</sup> Räisänen seems to ignore the different relationships to the law under the old and new covenants.

His [Paul's] thought flies from the stone heart to its opposite number, the heart of *flesh*; this he mentions as a contrast to the stone *tablets*, omitting to mention the heart of stone altogether. The reference is thus to the new life created by Christ with his Spirit in the hearts of the Corinthian believers - by Christ with his Spirit and not by the law for which the tablets of stone here stand.<sup>109</sup>

Paul's allusion to Ezek 11.19 (36.26) may indicate the different relationships to the law under the old and new covenants. What is more significant is Paul's intention in his change of the "stone heart" (LXX: καρδία ἡ λιθίνη) in Ezek 36.26 into "tablets of stones" (πλακὲς λιθίνοι) in 2 Cor 3.3. By it Paul could change the contrast between stone heart and new heart in Ezekiel into the contrast between the law in the old covenant and the law in the new covenant. This is because while "written on stone tablets" indicates the law in the old covenant (cf. Exod 24.12), "written on human hearts by the Spirit" indicates the fulfilment not only of the promise of a new heart in Ezek 11 (36) but also of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff, in reference to the keeping of the law. Paul's intention in contrasting the relationships to the law under the old and new covenants is best seen in the context of his contrast between the phrase "the letter kills" and the phrase "the Spirit gives life" which is examined in the following sections.

---

<sup>108</sup> Hughes, *Second Corinthians*, 94.

<sup>109</sup> Räisänen, *Paul*, 244.

### 5.3.2 The Letter kills (2 Cor 3.6)

Paul asserts that he is not a servant of the letter because the letter kills (2 Cor 3.6). The aim of this section is to examine whether this assertion may relate to the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff. In 2 Cor 3.7-15 Paul explains what the letter is and shows why “the letter kills”. He points out that Moses used to put a veil over his face (2 Cor 3.12-13). What is noteworthy concerning “the letter kills” is Paul’s interpretation of the veiling of Moses’ face. He says “the same veil is unlifted until this very day at the reading of the old covenant” (2 Cor 3.14). Furthermore, he asserts, “to this day whenever Moses is read, a veil lies over their hearts” (2 Cor 3.15). Paul’s use of the term “letter” in relation to the antithesis between the letter and the Spirit in 2 Cor 3.6 has been one of the most controversial areas of debate.<sup>110</sup> This investigation begins by considering the context in which Paul uses the term “letter”.

i). In the first place, Paul relates the veil over Moses’ face to the hardness of the Jewish heart. He points out that the purpose of veiling the face of Moses was *πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου* (2 Cor 3.13). Interpretations differ according to the meaning assigned to *τέλος*

<sup>110</sup> Some of the references regarding various interpretations on Paul’s antithesis between the letter and the Spirit are as follows (excluding commentaries and quoted references in this chapter): K. Prümm, “Der Abschnitt über die Doxa des Apostolats, 2 Kor 3.1-4.6 in der Deutung des Hl. Johannes Chrysostomos. Eine Untersuchung zur Auslegungsgeschichte des paulinischen Pneuma”, *Biblica* 30 (1949), 161-196, 377-400; B. Schneider, “The Meaning of St. Paul’s Antithesis ‘The Letter and the Spirit’”, *CBQ* 15 (1953), 163-207; E. Kamlah, “Buchstabe und Geist’, Die Bedeutung dieser Antithese für die alttestamentliche Exegese des Apostels Paulus”, *EvT* 14 (1954), 276-282; R. Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit* (London, 1957), 105-114; G. Ebeling, “Geist und Buchstabe”, in *RGG*<sup>3</sup>, 2 (Tübingen, 1958), 1290-1296; Moule, “Obligation in the Ethic of Paul”, in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies presented to John Knox*, ed. W. Farmer, C. Moule and R. Niebuhr (Cambridge, 1967), 389-406; P. Richardson, “Spirit and Letter: A Foundation for Hermeneutics”, *EQ* 45 (1973), 208-218; P. Stuhlmacher, “Das Gesetz als Thema biblischer Theologie”, *ZThK* 75 (1978), 251-280; for recent summaries about various interpretations of Paul’s antithesis between the letter and Spirit see S. Hafemann’s *Suffering* (introduction of his thesis (pp. 7-21) and S. Westerholm’s “Letter and Spirit: The Foundation of Pauline Ethics”, *NTS* 30 (1984), 229-248.

(either termination or goal)<sup>111</sup> and τοῦ καταργουμένου.

Concerning the meaning of τοῦ καταργουμένου it is important to note that grammatically καταργουμένου can be neuter or masculine.<sup>112</sup> If καταργουμένου here is used in the neuter sense,<sup>113</sup> it may be referring to the entire ministry of the old covenant (cf. 2 Cor 11). For Paul, the glory reflected on the face of Moses was transient (v. 7), yet the purpose of the veil (v. 13) may not be to prevent the Israelites looking intently on the τέλος of the fading glory on the face of Moses. The question then arises as to why Paul thinks that Moses prevented the Israelites from looking intently on the τέλος of the entire ministry of the old covenant. Martin, with Collange, observes that the key word in v. 13 is not κάλυμμα, but the verb ἀτενίζω, which has a strong meaning, "to gaze at intensely".<sup>114</sup> In relation to this verb, Martin comments,

The fault of Israel - though not of Moses - is that they persisted in looking at a face that symbolized a "ministration" (διακονία) which in turn was on the way out. The fading glow on Moses' face betokened the temporary nature of nomistic religion. But the Jews, both in Moses' day and ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας ("until the present day"), have shown their obtuseness by looking to Moses as the final embodiment of God's salvation.<sup>115</sup>

It is important to note that for Paul the focal point is neither that Moses

<sup>111</sup> Commentators differ on the meaning of τέλος here: a) as termination: Barrett, *2 Corinthians*, 120; Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 207; b) as goal: Rissi, *Zweiten Korintherbrief*, 32-33; Provence, "Sufficient", 75-76; cf. Larsson interprets τέλος here both as "end" and "goal" (*Christus als Vorbild: Eine Untersuchung zu den paulinischen Tauf und Eikontexten*, ASNU 23 (1962), 278; cf. H. Köster, "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment", *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 325f). The meaning of τέλος in Rom 10.4 is also controversial (see p. 221 n. 154).

<sup>112</sup> Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 68; L. Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver, 1987), 163.

<sup>113</sup> H. A. W. Meyer, *The Epistles to the Corinthians*, ICC, vol 2. ET (Edinburgh, 1879), 204, 207; Hooker, "Beyond", 303f; Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 207; W. J. Dumbrell, "Paul's use of Exodus 34 in 2 Corinthians 3", in *God Who is Rich in Mercy: Essays Presented to Dr. D. B. Knox*, ed., P. T. O'Brien (Homebush, 1986), 187; cf. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 68. Meyer maintains that the participle here cannot be masculine. He says, "[it] must be the same as was meant by τὸ καταργούμενον in the application intended by Paul of the general proposition in ver 11" (*Ibid.*, 207).

<sup>114</sup> R. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 68; cf. J. Collange, *Enigmes de la deuxième épître de Paul aux Corinthiens*. SNTSMS 18 (Cambridge, 1972), 96-97.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*

wanted to hide *τελος* of the old covenant,<sup>116</sup> nor that the veil was to prevent people seeing that the old covenant was going to be annulled.<sup>117</sup> What Paul stresses here is the fact that *their own minds are hardened* (v. 14a).<sup>118</sup> The word *ἀλλά* at the beginning of v. 14 indicates that Paul relates Moses' veil to the fact that the Israelites' minds were hardened. Furnish comments that *ἀλλά* "introduces a clarification of the preceding reference to Moses' veiling himself before the Israelites: not that Moses sought to deceive; rather their own minds were hardened".<sup>119</sup>

ii). In the second place, the phrase "the same veil" (*τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα*) seems to indicate that Paul uses Moses' veil as a metaphor (or a type) for the hardness of the Jewish heart in connection with their reading of the old covenant and Moses.<sup>120</sup> Paul says, "*ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης μένει*" (v. 14b). The phrase *τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα* itself apparently seems to indicate the veil on Moses' face because the word *αὐτό* must refer to the previous veil that Moses used to put on his face (v. 13). Nevertheless, the phrases "*ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας*" and "*ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης μένει*" show that the veil here does not indicate simply the veil on the face of Moses. If this is so, then how can the phrase "*τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα*" be understood here? The phrase *ἀλλὰ ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν* may provide a clue.

<sup>116</sup> Hickling, "Sequence", 390f.

<sup>117</sup> Barrett, *2 Corinthians*, 119.

<sup>118</sup> Paul's interpretation seems to accord with the broad context of Exod 34 because the veil on the face of Moses can be understood in connection with Israel's apostasy in Exod 32. T. Provenge, drawing attention to the rabbinic literature which notes a connection between the fear and the sin of making the golden calf, comments: "Even though Moses had previously gone before the Lord and the Israelites were apparently unafraid of the reflected glory upon Moses' face, now, because of their sin, they were unable to look at his face" ("Sufficient", 70-71; cf. Str-B III, 515f; Dumbrell, "Paul's use", 187-188).

<sup>119</sup> Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 207; cf. Barrett, *2 Corinthians*, 120.

<sup>120</sup> D. Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*, ET (Edinburgh, 1987), 259, 268f; cf. Windisch, *2 Korintherbrief*, 121; S. Schulz, "Die Decke des Moses: Untersuchungen zu einer vorpaulinischen Überlieferung in 2 Cor 3.7-18", *ZNW* 49 (1958), 27-30.



This phrase is related not only to v. 13 but also to v. 14b. Verse 14a explains the reason why Moses used to put a veil over his face and why, at the same time, the same veil remains over the Israelites even during Paul's own day. As already noted, Paul explains that it is because *their minds are hardened*. In Moses' case, he put the veil on his own face. In the case of Paul's contemporaries, the veil lies over their hearts. Verse 15a makes this clear. For Paul the outward veil on Moses' face was related to the hardness of the Jewish hearts. Paul stresses that this hardness has remained from Moses' day to Paul's own day in the reading of the old covenant (v. 14) and has affected the Israelites whenever they read Moses (v. 15a). Even though there is no explicit reference to the Sinaitic covenant as such, it would be difficult to deny that the term "old covenant" refers to the covenant made on Mount Sinai, since the stone tablets of the Mosaic law (vv. 3, 7) are set against the new covenant. Furthermore, v. 15 indicates that the "reading of the old covenant" is a parallel reference to "when Moses is read". In the clause, "when Moses is read", Moses may stand for "the books of Moses" (2 Chr 25.4; Neh 13.1; Mk 12.26).<sup>121</sup>

iii). In the third place, it is not difficult to see that Paul means that the hardness of Jewish heart affects the reading of the old covenant and Moses, that is, the law. The hardened Jews' reading of the law affects their religious life, particularly their keeping of the law as the covenant people. In other words, the Jews can not properly apply the law to their religious life because their hearts are hardened. Furthermore, it is quite likely that the emphasis made by the hardened Jews on keeping the law produces a faulty application of the law to their religious life. For Paul the hardened Jews keep only the letter of the law rather than the law itself. Hence Paul asserts, "*the letter kills*" (2 Cor 3.6a). This understanding can be supported by Paul's use of the term "letter" in other places in the NT. What we need to know here is how it is that the law works as "the letter" in

---

<sup>121</sup> Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 210.

relation to the hardness of the Jewish hearts. Here I shall examine Rom 2.27-29 and Rom 7.6 where Paul makes an antithesis between the letter and the Spirit.

a). Rom 2.27-29

In this pericope Paul argues that one who is physically uncircumcised, but keeps the law, judges another who is circumcised but who breaks the law. Paul has already pointed out that Jews who apparently rely upon the law and boast in God, in fact, transgress the law and dishonour God (Rom 2.17, 23). Here again Paul stresses the point that the Jews who keep the law through the letter (γράφμα) and circumcision (περιτομή), nonetheless break the law (v. 27).<sup>122</sup>

It is not necessary to point out the importance of circumcision as a sign of the covenant people (Gen 17.9-14). It is clear that keeping the laws of circumcision became the sign of zeal for the Torah for the covenant-keeping Jews (1 Macc 1.48, 60-61; 2 Macc 6.10; Jub 15.16, 31-34).<sup>123</sup> Whether or not γράμμα in v. 27 is viewed as an instrument (genitive διὰ),<sup>124</sup> in v. 29 Paul relates γράμμα to the external observance of περιτομή. In this case the περιτομή ἐν γράμματι indicates that γράμμα here indicates an instrument.<sup>125</sup>

In vv. 28-29 Paul points out the difference between outward circumcision in the flesh (ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή) by the letter (ἐν γράμματι) and inward circumcision by the Spirit (περιτομή καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι). Here Paul makes

<sup>122</sup> Some scholars maintain that the Rabbis would not have accepted Paul's argument here (Str-B 3.119-21; Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen, 1966[55], 133; cf. Dunn, *Romans*, WBC 38 (Waco, Texas, 1988), 114). I am grateful to Prof. Dunn for giving me the opportunity to use the manuscript on *Romans* before publication.

<sup>123</sup> See above pp. 49f, 64ff.

<sup>124</sup> There are different interpretations concerning the genitive διὰ in v. 27: whereas some think that genitive διὰ indicates attendant circumstance (i.e. W. Sanday and A. Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1900<sup>4</sup>, 67; H. Schmidt, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Berlin, 1966<sup>2</sup>), 55; Cranfield, *Romans* 1, 174; S. Westerholm, "Letter: and Spirit", 234). Schrenk maintains that διὰ here has instrumental force (TDNT, "γράφμα", I, 765; cf. A. Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief* (Stuttgart, 1935), 110).

<sup>125</sup> G. Schrenk, TDNT I, 765.

a contrast between  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha$  and  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ . It is important to note that for Paul the  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha/\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  antithesis does not indicate that the law is in opposition to the Spirit. The Spirit here is related to inward circumcision (v. 29). It is clear that the Spirit here is connected with keeping the law.<sup>126</sup> One who is circumcised inwardly by the Spirit keeps the requirements of the law (v. 27; cf. Rom 8.4).<sup>127</sup> The contrast between outward circumcision and inward circumcision also indicates this. It is worth noting that in the OT this contrast is also stressed in terms of the contrast between breaking the law and keeping the law (Deut 10.6; 30.6; Jer 4.4; 9.25-26; cf. Ezek 37.26-27).

Dunn, pointing to circumcision as a badge of Jewish identity distinguishing them from the Gentiles, maintains that "when Paul speaks of the law as *gramma*, what he has in view is precisely the law as the visible definition of the covenant people".<sup>128</sup> What is significant is that for Paul outward circumcision in the flesh by the letter is no longer sufficient as the sign of the covenant people (v. 29). As Paul's assertion, "if you are a breaker of the law, your circumcision is made uncircumcision", as F. F. Bruce notes, "has already been taught in part by Jeremiah".<sup>129</sup>

<sup>126</sup> J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, 1968[59]), 87.

<sup>127</sup> In Rom 8 Paul points out, "those who live according to the Spirit can fulfil the requirements of the law" (v. 4). He contrasts "those who live according to the Spirit" with "those who live according to the flesh" (v. 4, 5, 9). He does not contrast them with "those who live according to the law". Moreover, he points out that those who set their minds on the flesh are not subject to the law of God.

<sup>128</sup> Dunn, "Works of the Law", 530; cf. C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (London, 1971[57]), 60: "The 'outward Jew', is the Jew marked by 'works of the law', who externalizes his religion and esteems his membership of the people of God as a visible privilege which he can parade before the world. He regards his circumcision as a kind of visible badge or passport".

<sup>129</sup> Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London, 1963), 94. As evidence he quotes Jer 9.25f: "Behold, the days are coming, said the Lord, when I will punish all those who are circumcised but yet uncircumcised - Egypt, Judah, Edom ... for all these nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel is uncircumcised in heart". Then he comments that "if Israel and Judah departed in heart from God, their physical circumcision would be in God's sight no better than that of their neighbours - so far as any religious value was concerned, it was no circumcision at all".

Paul, pointing to a close association of *γράφμα* with the external observance of *περιτομή* as the means of breaking the law, accuses his fellow Jews of changing the law into an external code. In relation to this, Dunn's remark is worth noting: "In a final confirmation of what had become increasingly evident throughout, that Paul is attacking a concept of law-keeping which was tightly tied to membership of the Jewish nation (what we can properly call 'national righteousness'), comes this explicit association of 'Jew', 'circumcision' and 'letter/written code'."<sup>130</sup> Paul seems to use the term "*γράφμα*" here to indicate the Jews' wrong application of the law to their religious life, particularly in relation to maintaining their status as the covenant people.

b). *Rom 7.6*

Paul says, "now we have been released from the law, having died to that by which we were restrained, so that (*ὥστε*) we serve in the newness of the Spirit (*ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος*) and not in the oldness of the letter (*οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος*)" (*Rom 7.6*). The question raised here is whether the believers' release from the law, and their serving not in the oldness of the letter but in the newness of the Spirit, indicate that for Paul believers are freed from the obligation of keeping the law.

In v. 5 Paul says, "when you were in the flesh, the sinful passions by the law were at work in the members of our body to bear fruit for death" (*Rom 7.5*). Here "to bear fruit for death" (*εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ*) is related not only to "when we were in the flesh" (*ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί*) but also to "the sinful passions by the law" (*τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ νόμου*). Even though Paul's use of *ἐν σαρκί* does not always indicate the pre-conversion state (cf. *Gal 2.20*; *Phil 1.22*), it is clear that *ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν*

---

<sup>130</sup> Dunn, *Romans*, 128.

τῇ σαρκί here refers to the believers' pre-conversion period.<sup>131</sup>

In v. 6 Paul points out that believers were restrained by the law before they were released from it. The ἐν ᾧ in ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα clearly refers to the law from which believers had been released (κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου).<sup>132</sup> He says, "But now we have been released from the law" (νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου) (Rom 7.6). The phrase νυνὶ δέ indicates that this clause is in contrast with the clause ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί.<sup>133</sup> He stresses that they have been released from the law because they have died to the law (ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ). How and when did this occur? Paul answers, "you were made to die to the law through the body of Christ" (ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (Rom 7.4). For Paul, the death of Christ is the division between being restrained by the law and being released from the law.

Furthermore, for Paul the contrast between being restrained by the law and being released from it is the division between serving in the oldness of the letter and serving in the newness of the Spirit. The ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς indicates this.<sup>134</sup>

Those who have been released from the law do not serve in "the oldness of the letter" (παλαιότητι γράμματος) (v. 6). For Paul, "serving in the oldness of

<sup>131</sup> Michel, *Römer*, 221; Cranfield, *Romans* 1, 337; Bruce, *Romans*, 146; Wilckens, *Römer*, EKKNT VI (Zurich, 1980), 67; Dunn, *Romans*, 363.

<sup>132</sup> Most commentators maintain this view: i.e. Sanday, *Romans*, 175; O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief* (Regensburg, 1959), 438; Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, ET (London, 1980), 189; Schmidt, *Romans*, 122; Wilckens, *Römer*, vol. 2, 69; *Contra Zahn*, *Römerbrief* (Leipzig, 1925<sup>3</sup>), 335.

<sup>133</sup> Michel, *Römer*, 221; Murray, *Romans*, 224; Cranfield, *Romans* 1, 339; cf. Barrett, *Romans*, 137.

<sup>134</sup> Murray, *Romans*, 246; Cranfield, *Romans* 1, 229. Concerning the meaning of ὥστε, Cranfield suggests three possibilities: (a) an actual result; (b) a potential result; (c) a purpose. He maintains that ὥστε here seems to mean an actual result. The word ὥστε with an infinitive quite often indicates an actual consequence and, moreover, this meaning agrees best with the course of the argument (*Ibid*). On the other hand, Sanday and Headlam claim that ὥστε with infinitive states "the contemplated result which in the natural course ought to follow" (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 175f).

the letter" is not keeping the law, but breaking the law: "serving in the oldness of the letter" results not in life, but in death, not because of the law but because of sinful passions which are still present (vv. 10-13; cf. v. 5). Paul says, "for sin, taking opportunity through the commandment deceived me and through it killed me" (Rom 7.11). On the other hand, the believer's release from the law is related to serving in the newness of the Spirit (ἐν κληρότητι πνεύματος). I have argued that the work of the Spirit relates to keeping the law (Rom 2.27-29). For Paul the Spirit is not in opposition to the law itself<sup>135</sup> but only to the letter of the law.

Furthermore, Paul maintains that "the law is spiritual" (Rom 7.14; cf. Rom 7.12: the law is "holy, just and good"). Cranfield, observing this assertion, says, "Paul does not use 'letter' as a simple equivalent of the law".<sup>136</sup> Cranfield remarks, "since 'the law is spiritual' (v. 14), the letter of the law in isolation from the Spirit is not the law in its true character, but the law as it were denatured".<sup>137</sup> He also maintains, "letter is rather what the legalist is left with as a result of his misunderstanding and misuse of the law".<sup>138</sup>

<sup>135</sup> See above p. 210.

<sup>136</sup> Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 339-340. Provençe, following Cranfield, comments: "In Rom 7.6 Paul does indeed claim that we, as Christians, have been released ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ... ἐν τῷ κατειχόμεθα and established a connection between this νόμος and the γράμμα. But then he immediately launches into a defense of the law which he characterizes as "holy, just and good" (v. 12) and even "spiritual" (πνευματικός, v. 14). Since it is impossible to give the law any higher commendation than this, the law of vv. 12 and 14 cannot be the same as the γράμμα of v. 6. The law, or γράμμα, from which we are released (v. 6) is the one without the Spirit (i.e. not πνευματικός) and thus the very opposite of the "spiritual" law of v. 14. It is therefore impossible to understand the law discussed in vv. 12 and 14 to be the same as the γράμμα, the opposite of the πνεῦμα (Provençe, "Sufficient", 64).

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. H. Hübner, *Law in Paul's Thought*, ET (Edinburgh, 1984), 137-148.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.* Since E. P. Sanders has characterized ancient Palestinian Judaism before 70 AD as 'covenantal nomism' (*PPJ*), new interpretations of Paul's negative statements on the law are suggested. Sanders himself insists that the view of Paul's negative statements on the law as his criticism of a legalistic perversion of the law is not correct because there was no evidence of legalistic perversion of the law in ancient Palestinian Judaism before 70 (*PPJ*). He asserts, "Paul apparently contradicts himself in the attitudes he expresses toward the law" ("Torah and Paul", in *God's Christ and His People: In Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl*, ed. J. Jervell and W. Meek (Oslo, 1977), 132; *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Phila, 1983)). His idea has been taken up by Räisänen. He insists that Paul's statements on the law are riddled

In short, what does the believer's release from the law mean? It seems to indicate not the release from the law itself but from the law understood and observed as letter, that is, a wrong application of the law to Jewish religious life. It also means release from condemnation of the law, from death as the result of serving in the oldness of the letter, since for Paul keeping the letter is, in fact, breaking the law.

iv). What I have examined so far is in what sense Paul uses the term *γράμμα* in 2 Cor 3.3, Rom 2.27-29 and 7.6. Two things are noted here. First, "the letter" is closely related to the Jews' hardened hearts. The second is that for Paul the

---

with contradictions and misrepresent his opponents (*Paul*; "Legalism and Salvation by the Law: Paul's Portrayal of the Jewish Religion as a Historical and Theological Problem", in *Die Paulinische Literatur und Theologie*, ed. S. Pedersen (Aarhus, 1980), 68, 72, 77, 81).

Opposing this idea, Dunn suggests that Paul's negative statements on the law do not come from the antithesis between grace and legalism, but come from the use of the law not only as *identity and boundary* of the Jewish community, but also as national restrictions, to make out the separation of Jew from Gentile ("The New Perspective on Paul", *BJRL* 65 (1983), 95-122; "The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2.11-18)" *JSNT* 18 (1983), 3-57; "Works of the Law", 523-542). It is to be noted that Paul's negative statements on the law are related to the external observance of the law such as circumcision and dietary law. It is not difficult to see that to Jews who stress the external observance of these commandments, the law works simply as the letter.

On the other hand, since Sanders has proposed his thesis of "covenantal nomism", some scholars maintain the view of Paul's negative statement of the law as his criticism of a legalistic perversion of the law: C. K. Barrett, *Freedom and Obligation: A Study of the Epistle to the Galatians* (London, 1985), 61f; D. Moo, "Law", 'Works of the Law', and Legalism in Paul", *WTJ* 45 (1983), 91-98. T. Schreiner, "Paul and Perfect Obedience to the Law: An Evaluation of the View of E. P. Sanders", *WTJ* 47 (1985), 263-265). D. Moo, perceiving that by *covenantal nomism* Sanders and Räisänen have difficulty in explaining satisfactorily "the apparently 'legalistic' positions that Paul's adversaries appear to espouse", and, moreover, "Sanders regularly dismisses apparently legalistic statements by claiming them to be practically motivated and improper material for incorporation into the 'pattern of religion'," suggests that since "first century Judaism was not as unified in its pattern of religion as Sanders asserts" and "the evidence of the gospels and Paul's epistles should also 'count' in any assessment of first century Judaism", it is necessary to ask "whether Paul may provide a more accurate picture of his opponents" than Sanders and Räisänen reconstruct, even if the polemical nature of these books is admitted. He also mentions, "it would still be preferable to admit our ignorance of much of first century theology and let them remain unidentified", awaiting further competent work to explore the mass of Jewish material for the proper understanding of first century Judaism, "rather than accuse Paul of misrepresentations or force the texts to say something that they do not appear to be saying" ("Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years", *SJT* 40 (1987), 292, 298, 302). On the other hand, Schreiner, admitting Dunn's contribution to the understanding of Paul's view of "works of law", suggests that the external observances of the law such as circumcision and dietary law cannot be separated from the rest of the law ("Paul", 265).

hardened Jews' keeping the letter of the law is, in fact, a breaking of the law.

Further enquiry is justified as to whether these two points may indicate that Paul's assertion, "the letter kills", is similar to Jeremiah's announcement in Jer 31.31ff that Israel had broken the covenant in Jer 31.31ff. Jeremiah warned the people to repent. He urged the men of Judah and Jerusalem to return to the Lord with circumcision of the heart (Jer 4.4: "remove the foreskins of your heart"). However, his contemporaries insisted that they were wise and had the Torah with them (Jer 8.8a). Jeremiah replied: "but behold, the lying pen of the scribes has made it into a lie; the wise men are put to shame, they are dismayed and caught" (Jer 8.8b-9a). Jeremiah might thus indicate that the wise men's (written) Torah was false.<sup>139</sup> Moreover, Jeremiah realized that the fact that Israel broke the law was not due to the law itself, but was due to the Jews' hardened (wicked) hearts which would not and could not keep the law (Jer 7.24; 9.14; 11.8; 12.2; cf. 3.17). He also pointed out that the sin of Judah was engraved upon the tablets of their hearts (Jer 17.1) and "the heart is more deceitful than all else and is desperately sick" (Jer 17.9 cf. 9.8). He recognized the hardened heart as the cause of the Israelites' transgression of the law. He proclaimed that they had broken the covenant and that God would punish them.

Therefore, it is likely that for Jeremiah, the problem with the old covenant was that even though the hardened Jews supposed that they kept the law (the will of God), in reality they no longer kept the law itself, but only (in Paul's terms) the letter of it because their hearts were hardened. In actual fact, their external observance of the letter broke the law. Here we may conclude that Paul's assertion that "the letter kills", which is in contrast with the new covenant, is

---

<sup>139</sup> Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 228. He comments: "The *torah* is false in the sense of having been falsified by the scribal activity which produced it (both *torah* and scribes' pen are qualified by the term *seger*, 'false'). What precisely this means is not clear from the text. The *torah* may be false because it is written, or because this particular group's scribal activities have some how made it false".



similar to Jeremiah's assertion that the Israelites in their hardness of heart had transgressed the law under the old covenant, which is also in contrast with the new covenant.

### **5.3.3 The Spirit Gives Life (2 Cor 3.6)**

I have so far discussed two things. The first is that Paul's contrast between the tablets of stone and the tablets of human hearts (§5.3.1) indicates the contrasting relationships of the law under the old and new covenants. The second is that Paul's assertion, "the letter kills" (§5.3.2), indicates that the Jews' strict external observance of the letter of the law in fact breaks the law itself because their hardened hearts misunderstand the law and misuse it.

The purpose of this sub-section is to argue that Paul's assertion, "but the Spirit gives life" (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ), further indicates that the new covenant in 2 Cor 3.6 is closely related to Jer 31.31ff. In 2 Cor 3.6 Paul says that God enables him to be a minister of a new covenant, not of the letter, but of the Spirit, for "the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life". It is necessary to bear in mind that the motif of the new covenant in the NT is rooted in the tradition that Jesus established at the Last Supper, and is part of the liturgy of the Lord's Supper which Paul introduced into the Corinthian church. Paul's understanding of the new covenant must be bound up with the new covenant at the Last Supper and the Lord's Supper because Paul believes the tradition to be sacred. Furthermore, if my argument in 5.1 is correct, it is fair to say that Paul understands the new covenant in relation to Jer 31.31ff. In order to confirm this, I shall discuss the work of the Spirit in relation to removal of the hardness of the heart. My main concern in 5.3.3 is to determine whether Paul's assertion, "the Spirit gives life", is connected with Jer 31.31ff with regard to keeping the law.

Paul says, "the hardness of the heart is removed in Christ" (2 Cor 3.14). He

also remarks, "the veil, which is closely related to the hardness of the heart (v. 14) is taken away whenever a man turns to the Lord" (v. 16). Furthermore, he asserts immediately that the "Lord is the Spirit" (v 17). Whether or not the Lord here is Christ,<sup>140</sup> clearly the veil of hardness of heart is removed not only in the Lord (ὁ κύριος), but also in the Spirit.<sup>141</sup> My concern here is how Paul relates the Spirit to the removal of the hardness of the heart because the understanding that hardness of the heart is removed by the Spirit seems to be a most important point for establishing a close connection between the work of the Spirit and the keeping of the law in the new covenant.<sup>142</sup> Two things are significant in answering this question: i) for Paul there is a close connection between the work of Christ and that of the Spirit; ii) the freedom to which Paul refers when he says, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, is freedom", includes freedom from the veil which is related

<sup>140</sup> Concerning the identification of the Lord here there have been two major views. I incline to the latter.

1) The Lord as God: Dunn, "The Lord is the Spirit", *JTS* 21 (1970), 309-320; Moule, "2 Cor 3.18b, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος", In *Neues Testament und Geschichte*, FS. O. Cullmann (Tübingen, 1972), 231-37; Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 216; Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 71.

2) The Lord as Christ: I. Hermann, *Kyrios und Pneuma*. *SANT* 2 (1961), 56ff; Barrett *2 Corinthians*, 112; S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, *WUNT* 2.4 (1981), 12-13.

<sup>141</sup> W. van Unnik, " 'With Unveiled Face'. An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 3.12-18", *NovT* 6 (1963), 65; Provençe, "Sufficient", 80.

<sup>142</sup> Stuhlmacher interprets Paul's antithesis between the letter and the Spirit in conjunction with Paul's experience of Christ, in other words, Paul's christological experience. This idea leads him to understand Paul's letter/Spirit antithesis in terms of the letter/Scripture antithesis. He remarks: "Seit Paulus und seinen berühmten ausführungen in 1 Kor 2.6ff; 2 Kor 3 und 4.1-6 unterscheiden wir christlich zwischen *gramma* und *graphie*, zwischen tötendem Buchstaben und lebensschaffendem Geist, zwischen den Urkunden des alten Bundes und der in Christus eröffneten Offenbarung des Neuen Bundes, die zu einen vertiefen Verständnis des Alten Testamentes führt. Diese Unterscheidungen sind so lange sinnvoll und unentbehrlich, als das sachgemässe Verständnis des alttestamentlichen Schrifttums zwischen Juden und Christen umstritten bleibt" ( *Vom Verstehen des Neuen Testaments: Eine Hermeneutik* (Göttingen, 1986), 69). Furthermore, he says "über der Gesetzesverlesung und -auslegung in den Synagogen sieht Paulus eine die wahre Gotteserkenntnis hindernde und die Sinne in einen Verblendungszusammenhang einhüllende Decke liegen, die das Verständnis Christi hindert (vgl. 2 Kor 3.14 mit Jes 25,7)" (*Ibid.*, 68).

Even though the veil may hinder one's true understanding of Christ (2 Cor 4.4), what Paul intends to say in 2 Cor 3.14ff is not that the veil hinders one's understanding of Christ, but that the veil which indicates the hardness of the heart is removed not only in Christ but also in the Spirit. It is not sufficient to interpret Paul's antithesis between the letter and the Spirit without considering the work of the Spirit in relation to the removal of the veil.

to the hardness of heart.

i). In 2 Cor 3 Paul shows that there is a close relationship between the work of Christ and that of the Spirit. In v. 3 he says that the Corinthian Christians become the letter of Christ as the result of the work of the Holy Spirit. In vv. 7-11 he relates the surpassing glory and righteousness of the new covenant to the ministry of the Spirit which is contrasted with the ministry of condemnation in the old covenant. It is significant that for Paul righteousness is closely related to the work of Christ (cf. Rom 5.12-21).<sup>143</sup> In vv. 12-16 Paul attributes the ministry of the Spirit to the ministry of Christ by suggesting that the veil is removed in Christ. In vv. 17-18 Paul shifts from Christ to the Spirit again. For Paul the veil is removed not only in Christ but also by the Spirit because "the Lord is the Spirit and where the Spirit of the Lord is, is freedom" (v. 17). Paul makes the shifts from the Spirit to Christ (κύριος) and from Christ back to the Spirit, because for Paul the relationship of Christians to Christ can be established through the experience of the Spirit, viz., the work of the Spirit.<sup>144</sup>

ii). Paul also asserts, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, is freedom" (v. 17b). Paul elaborates on the meaning of this assertion in v. 18.<sup>145</sup> Freedom (ἐλευθερία) here includes the freedom from the hardness of heart displayed by the Jews in reading Moses (that is, the law) because the phrase "with unveiled face" in v. 18 relates the removal of the veil to the hardness of the heart. This is clear inasmuch as the phrase "with unveiled face" contrasts not with the veil covering Moses'

<sup>143</sup> In Rom 5.12-21 Paul shows that while condemnation is the result of Adam's trespass of the law (cf. Gal 3.10), righteousness is given to all men through Christ's obedience (cf. 1 Cor 1.20).

<sup>144</sup> For Paul those who are in Christ are those who are in the Spirit (Rom 8.9f; cf. 1 Cor 12.12f; Gal 4.6; Phil 1.19). According to Paul, the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ (Rom 8.9; Gal 4.6; Phil 1.19) and, moreover, Christ is the life-giving Spirit (1 Cor 15.45).

<sup>145</sup> Concerning the word δέ, while Furnish regards the conjunction δέ here as a simple conjunction describing its meaning, Collange regards it as adversative implying that some false understanding of freedom needs to be corrected (Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 213; Collange's idea is quoted by Furnish.)

face, but rather with the veil that lay over the hearts of those who read or heard the old covenant or Moses. Here Paul is making a contrast between those who are veiled and others who are not.<sup>146</sup>

It is important to note that from v. 13 onward the meaning of “the veil” is changed. It no longer indicates a means of concealment but a hindrance to insight and understanding.<sup>147</sup> Some scholars interpret “freedom” here in connection with the idea of the boldness in v. 12.<sup>148</sup> Nevertheless, this interpretation does not exclude the notion that “freedom” here is related to the removal of the veil of hardness from the heart, because the idea of boldness in v. 12 is contrasted with the veil on the face of Moses. Accordingly, the term “freedom” here cannot be understood as freedom from the law itself<sup>149</sup> but must be regarded as freedom from misunderstanding and misuse of the law, resulting from hardness of the heart. In other words, it is freedom from the letter of the law. This interpretation gains further support from Rom 8.1ff.

In Rom 8.1 Paul asserts, “there is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus”. In v. 2 he says, “the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you free from the law of sin and of death”.<sup>150</sup> Clearly the use of the

<sup>146</sup> Bultmann, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*, ET (Minneapolis, 1985), 93-94; Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 213-214; *Contra*. Plummer, *2 Corinthians*, 105.

<sup>147</sup> E. Wong, “The Lord is the Spirit (2 Cor 3.17a)”, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis* 61 (1985), 65; cf. *The Lord is the Spirit. A Study of 2 Cor 3.17a in Conjunction with 2 Cor 3.16* (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation at Leuven, 1984).

<sup>148</sup> van Unik, “Unveiled”, 166; Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 237; Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 71; F. Jones, “*Freiheit*” in *den Briefen des Apostels Paulus: Eine historische, exegetische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie* GHA 34 (Göttingen, 1987), 67.

<sup>149</sup> Jones, *Freiheit*, 68-69.

<sup>150</sup> It is disputable what the two phrases “the law of the Spirit of life”, and “the law of sin and death”, mean here. Most commentators maintain that the νόμος in these phrases does not refer to the Torah. Dunn, however, argues that Paul uses νόμος here in reference to the Torah. Observing on the one hand Paul’s assertion in v 4, “the just requirement of the law” is fulfilled in those “who walk according to the Spirit”, and on the other a strong link between the law, the Spirit and life in ch 7 (7.10 - ἡ ἐντολὴ ἣ εἰς ζωὴν; 7.14 - ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστίν, he remarks: “Paul is able to think of the law in two different ways: the law caught in the nexus of sin and death, where it is met only by σάρξ, and is the law as γράμμα, caught in the old epoch, abused and destructive (See 2.28-29 and 7.6); but the law rightly understood,

particle *γάρ* at the beginning of v. 2 and the repetition of the phrase *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* show that these two verses are closely related.<sup>151</sup> Here Paul relates the believer's liberation from condemnation not only to Jesus but also to the Spirit. The phrase *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* indicates that the Spirit's work of liberation is based on Christ's work of liberation.

In v. 3 Paul explains how the liberation of believers from condemnation is related to Jesus Christ. Paul points out that the liberation is based on the fact that Jesus Christ died as "a sin offering" (*περὶ ἁμαρτίας*)<sup>152</sup> and thereby condemned sin in the flesh (*κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί*). It is worth noting that what Jesus did was not abolish the law but condemn sin in the flesh. In v. 4 Paul explains how this liberation is connected with the Spirit. He stresses that the purpose of condemning sin in the flesh is to fulfil the requirement of the law in believers, who walk according to the Spirit. For Paul, believers are free from condemnation not only because there is no condemnation in Christ, but also because the law of the Spirit sets them free from condemnation, since the Spirit enables them to fulfil the requirement of the law.<sup>153</sup>

---

and responded to *ἐν πνεύματι οὗ γράμματι* is pleasing to God (2.29). The twofold law of v. 2 therefore simply restates the two-sidedness of the law expounded in 7.7-25 in terms which would already be familiar to his readers" (*Romans*, 416f).

His understanding of the law here as Torah in two different ways in relation to the *γράμμα/πνεῦμα* antithesis accords also with Paul's antithesis between *γράμμα* and *πνεῦμα* in terms of the distinction between the ministry in the old covenant and that in the new covenant. Whereas the ministry of the old covenant is death and condemnation because keeping the letter is, in fact, breaking the law, the ministry of the new covenant is life and righteousness because the Spirit gives life (enables the believer to keep the law).

<sup>151</sup> Murray, *Romans*, 276.

<sup>152</sup> Many commentators draw attention to the LXX translation of the Hebrew word *ḥātā'* into *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* quite often (e.g. Lev 5.6-7, 11; 16.3, 5, 9; Num 6.16; 7.16; 2 Chron 29.23-24; Neh 10.33; Ezek 42.13; 43.19) (e.g. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 193; Schlatter, *Gerechtigkeit*, 257; Michel, *Römer*, 251; Cranfield, *Romans* 1, 382; Wilckens, *Römer* 2, 127; Dunn, *Romans*, 422).

<sup>153</sup> Cranfield, with others, maintains that the fulfilment of the requirement of the law is the fulfilment of the prophecy of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff and Ezek 36.26f (*Romans* I, 384; cf. F. F. Bruce, *Romans* (London, 1963), 161-162; Stuhlmacher, *Versöhnung, Gesetz und Gerechtigkeit: Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie* (Göttingen, 1981), 161).

### 5.3.4 The New Covenant and the Question of Abrogation of the Law

In contrast to the above argument there are those who claim that 2 Cor 3 envisages abrogation of the law. Rom 10.4 has become the main text for the claim that for Paul the law is abrogated;<sup>154</sup> but I will limit the scope of this examination to the context of 2 Cor 3 as my concern is to argue against the view of H. Räisänen and J. Murphy-O'Connor that in 2 Cor 3 Paul suggests abrogation of the law rather than observance of the law.

#### a). Räisänen's view

<sup>154</sup> Scholars maintain that Christ is the end (termination) of the law mainly on the basis of Rom 10.4 (Michel, *Römer*, 326; Käsemann, *Romans*, 281-283; Stuhlmacher, "Das Ende des Gesetzes". Über Ursprung und Ansatz der paulinischen Theologie", in *Versöhnung*, 166-191; A. Lindemann, "Die Gerechtigkeit aus dem Gesetz: Erwägungen zur Auslegung und zur Textgeschichte von Römer 10.15", *ZNW* 73 (1982), 231-250; B. Martin, "Paul on Christ and the Law", *JETS* 26 (1983), 271-282; cf. O. Hofus, "Das Gesetz des Moses und das Gesetz Christi", *ZThK* 80 (1983), 262-286).

Other scholars, however, have argued that in Rom 10.4 Paul explains the relationship between Christ and the law, not as an antithetical one in terms of Christ as the end (termination) of the law, but a teleological one, Christ as the goal (fulfilment) of the law (Cranfield, *Romans*, Vol. 2. 515-520; J. Toews, "The Law in the Letter to the Romans: A Study of Romans 9.30-10.13" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1977); W. S. Campbell, "Christ the End of the Law: Romans 10.4", *Studia Biblica* 1978; JSNTS 3 (Sheffield, 1980), 73-81; P. Meyer, "Romans 10.4 and the End of the Law", in *The Divine Helmsman*, <sup>essays</sup> presented to Lou H. Silberman, ed. James L. Crenshaw (New York: KTAV, 1980), 59-79; C. T. Rhyne, "Nomos Dikaiosynes and the Meaning of Romans 10.4", *CBQ* 47 (1985), 486-499; R. Badenas, *Christ the End of the Law*, JSNTS 10 (Sheffield, 1985); cf. M. Barth, "St Paul - A Good Jew", *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 1 (1980), 7-45; *The People of God*, JSNTS 5 (Sheffield, 1983), 52-53).

Some scholars maintain that *τέλος* might mean not only "goal" but also in a certain sense "end" (A. J. Bandstra, *The Law and the Elements of the World: An Exegetical Study in Aspects of Paul's Teaching* (Kampen, 1964), 101ff; V. P. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (New York, 1968), 161; G. E. Ladd, "Paul and the Law", in *Soli Deo Gloria. In honour of W. C. Robinson*, ed. J. McDowell Richards (Richmond, 1968), 58; J. W. Drane, *Paul - Libertine or Legalist? A Study in the Theology of the Major Pauline Epistles* (London, 1975), 133). Moo comments: "What defenders of this view argue is not that the word has dual meaning here, but that both English words are necessary to capture the full force of *τέλος*. To argue that Paul is claiming Christ as the ultimate goal of the law, and that having attained its goal, the law is in some important manner no longer applicable, may very well do justice both to exegetical considerations and to the larger picture of the law in Paul (compare Rom 3.21 'witnessed to by the law and the prophets', and 6.14 'no longer under the law')" ("Paul and the Law", 304).

Räsänen, arguing against Cranfield's view that for Paul *γράφμα* means Jewish legalism rather than the Torah, insists, "in 2 Cor 3 Paul speaks quite clearly of the inferior, transient and temporary character of the law given at Sinai".<sup>155</sup> For evidence he suggests two points: a) a deprecatory reference to the tablets of stone and b) the participle "fading away" (*τὸ καταργούμενον*). Concerning the tablets of stone, he claims, "Paul makes a deprecatory reference to the *tablets of stone*".<sup>156</sup> Furthermore, he says, "v. 7 reinforces the point: the ministry of Moses was a ministry of death, being in the service of that which was carved in *letters on stone*".<sup>157</sup> However, Räsänen's view is unsatisfactory.

First of all, it is important to note that Paul's intention is not to make a deprecatory reference to the tablets of stone. What is missing in Räsänen's argument is the recognition that the focal point in 2 Cor 3.3 is that in the new covenant the law is internalized by the Spirit. It is in this verse that Paul contrasts the tablets of stone with the tablets of the fleshly hearts in order to show the different relationships to the law under the old and new covenants. 2 Cor 3.3, as Räsänen admits,<sup>158</sup> alludes to Ezek 11.19 (36.26). It is clear that the main theme of Ezek 36.26 is not abolition of the law but observance of the law by the Spirit (cf. Ezek 11.19). What is important to note in 2 Cor 3.3 is the change of the "stone heart" (LXX *καρδία ἡ λιθίνη*), which appears in Ezek 36.26, into "tablets of stone" (*πλακῆς λιθίνοι*) in 2 Cor 3.3. It is likely that Paul's intention here is to change the contrast between the stone heart and the new heart referred to in Ezekiel, which implies the contrast between disobedience to the law and obedience to the law, into a contrast between the law in the old and new covenants in relation to the keeping of the law.

---

<sup>155</sup> Räsänen, *Paul*, 45-46.

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*, 244.

Secondly, Räisänen's claim of a close relationship between the tablets of stone and the killing letter is less than convincing. It is difficult to relate the killing letter to the letters engraved on stone. "The letter" in Paul's assertion, "the letter kills", must be understood as Paul's technical term rather than "the law written on tablets of stone" (cf. Rom 2.26ff; Rom 7.6). Paul's assertion that "the letter kills" is not based on the fact that the law was simply written on tablets of stone, but based on the fact that hardened Jews do not keep the law but only the letter (cf. Rom 2.26ff). Again, the fact that the ministry of Moses was a ministry of death is not because the law was engraved on tablets of stone but because the hardened Jews could not keep the law.

Thirdly, concerning the participle "fading away" in vv. 11, 13, he says that "it is just as clear that the ingenious piece of exegesis in v. 13 does not merely speak of the face of Moses; this, too, is offered as a symbol of the old system of the law, which was 'fading away'."<sup>159</sup> Paul may think that the old system which is related to the law was fading away. Nonetheless, Paul does not maintain that the law is abolished in the new covenant because for him in the new covenant the law is internalized by the Spirit.

b. Murphy-O'Connor's view

Opposing the view that the new covenant in 2 Cor 3.6 is closely related to the keeping of the law in Jer 31.31ff, J. Murphy-O'Connor insists that in 2 Cor 3.6 Paul made a distinction between two types of new covenant, one which he saw as characterized by "letter" and the other by "Spirit".<sup>160</sup> In connection with the new covenant, he supposes the situation in Corinth at the time of Paul to be as follows.

---

<sup>159</sup> Räisänen, *Paul*, 45.

<sup>160</sup> J. Murphy-O'Connor, "The New Covenant in the Letters of Paul and the Essene Document", 3. This article will be published in the forthcoming Festschrift for J. Fitzmyer. I am grateful to Prof. Murphy-O'Connor for giving me access to this manuscript.



There were some at Corinth who were using the new covenant in a sense that Paul could not accept. In consequence, he called them "letter-ministers". They were certainly Christians; otherwise they would not have invoked the new covenant theme. They were also intruders, for they had come to Corinth with letters of recommendation (2 Cor 3.1). More importantly, they were Judaizers. This is clear, not only from the use of *gramma* "letter" in 3.7. but also from the unexpected appearance of *en plazin lithinai* "on tablets of stone" in 3.3.<sup>161</sup>

Murphy-O'Connor's argument can be summed up as follows. Paul could not have rejected the concept of the new covenant put forward by the Christian Judaizers, because it was rooted in a tradition that he believed to be sacred and was also part of the Eucharistic liturgy that he had introduced into Corinth. The only avenue open to Paul was to make a distinction between an authentic and an inauthentic vision of the new covenant. This Paul does with the formula "the letter kills but the Spirit gives life".<sup>162</sup> Murphy-O'Connor concludes, "Paul, therefore, was prepared to accept the idea of covenant and a fortiori that of the new covenant, provided that it was completely divorced from Law".<sup>163</sup>

Even though grammatically οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος (not of the letter but of the spirit) may qualify καινῆς διαθήκης, the question as to whether or not there were two types of new covenant in Corinth, one characterized by

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, 4-5.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, 14. He attempts to confirm this idea on the basis of Gal 3-4. What Murphy-O'Connor misses in his conclusion that "the new covenant was completely divorced from law" is the fact that for Paul the law can be fulfilled (Gal 5.14), and believers are obliged to fulfil the law of Christ (Gal 6.2). Furthermore, for Paul the fulfilment of the law of Christ is the fulfilment of the whole law (Gal 5.14; cf. Rom 13.8ff). If this is so, what does Paul intend to say in Gal 3-4? Murphy-O'Connor claims that the role of the law "ceased once the promise has been fulfilled in Christ (Gal 3.14)".

It is clear that the promise in Gal 3.14 refers to the Spirit. It is important to note that for Paul, the Spirit is the one who enables believers to fulfil the law (Gal 5.14ff). When believers receive the promise of the Spirit, their relationship with the law is changed. The Israelites were kept in custody under the law before faith in Jesus Christ was revealed. In the new covenant those who have received the promise of the Spirit can fulfil the law, the law of Christ in the Spirit. Clearly Paul points out that "to love one another" is the fulfilment of the whole law: 'the whole law is fulfilled in one word, 'you shall love your neighbour as yourself'" (Gal 5.14). In Gal 6.2 Paul maintains that "to bear one another's burdens" is "to fulfil the law of Christ". It is fair to say that for Paul the new covenant was not completely divorced from the law but in the new covenant the believer can fulfil the law in love.

“letter” and the other by “spirit”, is beyond the scope of this section. The concern here is not to verify this, but to investigate Paul’s understanding of the relationship of the law to the new covenant in 2 Cor 3. It is clear that Paul’s antithesis between the letter and the Spirit indicates that his ministry of the new covenant was a ministry of the Spirit. Moreover, his ministry was different from the ministry of the letter. Whether or not the letter-ministers claimed their ministry to be a ministry of the new covenant, it is evident that Paul did not recognize them as ministers of the new covenant. He explained the difference between his ministry and their ministry by referring to the distinction between the ministries of the old and new covenants. Furthermore, even if we admit that in Corinth there were two different ideas of the new covenant, or that Paul was not in a position to reject the concept of the new covenant in terms of the validity of the law, as Murphy-O’Connor claims, we cannot conclude that Paul’s idea of the new covenant was completely divorced from the law.

Two points can be suggested to support this. First of all, it is significant that Paul does not use the term “law” at all in 2 Cor 3.1-4.6. Moreover, there is no evidence here that Paul denigrated the law itself. Secondly, “the Spirit gives life” does not mean freedom from the law. Here “the freedom that the Spirit gives” must be understood not as freedom from the law, but as freedom from the misunderstanding and misuse of the law because of the hardness of heart.

To sum up, even though the hardened Jews suppose that they keep the law, for Paul they no longer keep the law itself but the letter of the law because their hearts are hardened. On the contrary, their strict external observance of the letter of the law in fact breaks the law. Paul points out that in the new covenant the hardened heart is removed in Christ by the work of the Spirit so that believers can fulfil the requirement of the law.

For Paul, keeping the law in the Spirit must be the fulfilment of the promise

that God would send the Spirit and transform the hardened heart by the Spirit so that the law would be kept (Ezek 11.19-20; 36.26-27). Accordingly, keeping the law in the Spirit must be understood as a parallel expression to putting the law in the heart (Jer 31.33) and to putting the fear of God in the heart (Jer 32.40) in order to keep the law in the new covenant. Furthermore, Paul's contrast between the letter and the Spirit indicates a contrast between the relationship to the law under the old covenant and that under the new covenant. Thus Paul's understanding of himself as a servant of the new covenant and his view of the keeping of the law in the Spirit indicate that Paul understands his ministry of the new covenant in connection with the fulfilment of the promise of Jer 31.31ff.

#### 5.4 The New Covenant in Hebrews

It is not necessary to discuss whether the writer to the Hebrews believes that the new covenant is fulfilled through the work of Christ. His quotations from Jer 31.31ff in Hebrews indicate that for him Jeremiah's promise of a new covenant is fulfilled in the early church. However, in the light of my discussion of the views of Räsänen and Murphy-O'Connor, it is appropriate here to consider the claim of E. Grässer that for the author of Hebrews the law is abolished in the covenant of Christ.<sup>164</sup> Even though he admits that Jeremiah stresses that God's people have a new obligation to the law written on the heart, Grässer insists that Hebrews stresses the uselessness and impending end of both the former commandment and the law by means of the fulfilment of Jer 31 in the covenant of Christ.<sup>165</sup> His argument has two main points: that the old covenant is obsolete and that there is a lack of continuity between the old and new covenants. Grässer argues these two points by his interpretation of the author's intention when quoting Jer

<sup>164</sup> Grässer, *Bund*, 109.

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.* He says: "denn während Jeremia mit dem ins Herz geschriebenen Gesetz die Neuverpflichtung (*b<sup>e</sup>rît h<sup>a</sup> dāšāh*) des alten Gottesvolkes und damit die Kontinuität betont, hebt der Hebr mittels der Erfüllung von Jer 31 in der Christus-diatheke auf die 'Unbrauchbarkeit und Todesnähe' der ersten Setzung samt ihres Gesetzes ab (vgl. 7.18)".

31.31ff in Heb 8.8ff and 10.16f. He says that what is striking is not that the author draws out the better promises from Jer 31.31ff, but "*warum er sie dort sucht und wie er sie auswertet*".<sup>166</sup> In his view the frame verses of 8.7-8a and 13, and the recourse to the prophetic word in Heb 10.15-18 give information concerning why the author looks for (sucht) the passage there and how he makes use of it.<sup>167</sup>

First of all, Grässer claims that Heb 8.7f and 13 show that the old covenant is obsolete. The following is a summary of his argument. Heb 8.7 shows that it is the insufficiency of the old covenant which explicitly provides the reason why the old covenant had to yield to a better covenant; if that first (old covenant) had been faultless, there would have been no occasion for a second. The factual statement is that the first covenant was not without fault. The facts of the case described in Heb 8.7ff meant not only that the first covenant became ineffective because of Israel's unbelief but also that the earthly cult based on the first covenant is insufficient because of its inability to forgive sins.<sup>168</sup>

Secondly, he argues that Heb 8.7f and 13 show no continuity between the old and new covenants. He insists that the relationship between the covenant at Sinai and the covenant at Mount Zion is not between provisional and final order, promise and fulfilment, law and gospel, but is the relationship of the two-fold divine order of salvation in the course of earthly history. One has had its time; its validity is over. The other becomes eschatological; its validity is in the present age. Thus there is no earthly continuity from the former to the latter. Furthermore, he insists that, even with the help of Jer 31, a bridge can by no means be built to the second covenant, for the absolute opposition of the first to the second covenant would be sacrificed for that (the bridge).<sup>169</sup>

---

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, 106.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, 107-108.

Concerning the author's further quotation of Jer 31.31ff in Heb 10.16ff, Grässer says that the actual statement is about the forgiveness of sins. The reduction of the quotation and the focal point of the quotation ἁφες in v. 18 indicate this. Furthermore, with regard to the author's quotation of Jer 31.31ff in Heb 10.16ff, Grässer comments that the fact that the radicalization against the OT is no less sharp than in chapter 8 can be seen in the following expressions. a) Through the introductory formula μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον the Holy Spirit confirms the correctness of what has been said in vv. 11-14 to the Christian community. b) Through the expansion of addressees the promise is no longer valid to τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ, but πρὸς αὐτούς. The covenant of Christ which was fulfilled eschatologically as the covenant of forgiveness of sin is the ethnically unbounded covenant. c) Through the conclusion of the author in v. 18 it can be seen that no further sacrifice is required. The one sacrifice of Jesus demonstrates release from the continuing sacrifice of the old covenant and its end.<sup>170</sup>

I raise no objection to his view that the author of Hebrews emphasizes that the old covenant is obsolete. Nevertheless, I am opposed to his claim that for the author the law is abolished in the covenant of Christ.<sup>171</sup>

First of all, for the author of Hebrews the promises of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff were being fulfilled amongst the early Christians. Grässer himself admits that, besides the forgiveness of sins (the most important thing to the author of Hebrews), the author mentions the law written on the heart and the grant of unmediated knowledge of God, which Jeremiah ascribes as the other benefits of the new covenant. According to Grässer these are the experience of baptism as enlightenment, the inner taste of the heavenly gift and the reception of the

---

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*, 110.

<sup>171</sup> If he uses "the law" in a limited sense, such as the law concerning the sacrificial system for the forgiveness of sins, I would have no objection; but it seems that this is not the case.

Holy Spirit (6.4f): a sincere heart (10.22) and the knowledge of truth (10.26).<sup>172</sup> Furthermore, he says that for the author all of these have already been realized in the covenant of Christ.<sup>173</sup> If so, then it is to be concluded that for the author the promises of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff were fulfilled in the early Christians.

Secondly, it is difficult to suppose that Heb 7.18f shows, as Grässer implies, that the author sees the whole law abolished in the new covenant. In v. 18 the author says, "there is a setting aside of a former commandment because of its weakness and uselessness". The former commandment here seems to refer to the regulation concerning the Levitical priesthood and its succession, because the context indicates that this commandment contrasts with that of another priesthood which is after the order of Melchizedek (vv. 11ff).<sup>174</sup> The author points out the abrogation of the Levitical priesthood because of its weakness and uselessness. The weakness comes from the fact that perfection was not attained through the Levitical priesthood (v. 11; cf. v. 28). For the author perfection comes from the perfect offering of him who is Jesus Christ, high priest according to the order of Melchizedek (v. 28; cf. 10.14). The uselessness lies in the fact that another priesthood is established according to the order of Melchizedek (vv. 11ff). Furthermore, it is because a better hope is introduced by Christ (v. 19).

If this is so, then do these two verses indicate abolition of the whole law? It is important to note that the former commandment here is only a part of the law, namely, the commandments which prescribed the Levitical priesthood for the sacrificial system.<sup>175</sup> According to the author, this legislation reminded the

---

<sup>172</sup> Grässer, *Bund*, 109.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>174</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 188; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 264.

<sup>175</sup> Räisänen says: "in *Hebrews* the law is viewed exclusively as cultic law. As such it is disparaged, retaining its value only insofar as it in a shadowy way points to Christ. The cultic law is scorned from a rational point of view: it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins (Heb 10.4). The moral side of the Torah is hardly touched upon" (*Paul*, 30).

people of their sinfulness and of their need for forgiveness of sins (Heb 10.1ff). Therefore, when perfection has come, the former commandment is set aside. If the author thinks that the total law is abolished in the new covenant, why does he include the idea of the law written on the heart in his reduction of the quotation of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff in Heb 10.16f?

Thirdly, Grässer insists that the focal point of the quotation of Jer 31.33f in Heb 10.16f is the forgiveness of sins in connection with the Day of Atonement. Nevertheless it is important to note that the reduction of the quotation leaves untouched the theme of the law written on the heart. This seems to indicate that the author sees the law written on the heart and the forgiveness of sins as the very essence of the new covenant.<sup>176</sup> The author's emphasis on the forgiveness of sins here is not because the idea of the law written on the heart is absent in the new covenant, but because the thrust of the author's argument is the forgiveness of sins in contrast with the ineffectiveness of the old sacrifices for the cleansing or washing away of sins.

In conclusion, it is difficult to assume that for the author of Hebrews the law is abolished in the new covenant, the new covenant promised in Jer 31.31ff. Rather, it is likely that even though the former commandment concerning the Levitical priesthood is set aside, and even though the law made nothing perfect because of sinful man, the fact that the author encourages Christians to love one another (Heb 10.24) indicates that they are able to keep the law, the will of God, through the inward work of the Holy Spirit.

## **5.5 Conclusion**

We may conclude, then, that for three of the principal New Testament writers the fulfilment of Jer 31.31ff's promise of a new covenant was an important feature

---

<sup>176</sup> Hughes *Hebrews*, 403.

of their belief as Christians.

The Synoptic writers and Paul seem to regard the new covenant, established by the blood of Jesus for forgiveness of sins, as a fulfilment of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff. For Luke the outpouring of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost was the beginning of the eschatological new covenant community, the fulfilment of Israel's eschatological hope. According to Paul and the writer of Hebrews, believers are able under the new covenant to keep the law by the Spirit. For Paul the hardened heart is removed in Christ by the work of the Spirit. The writer of Hebrews' exhortation of "to love one another" also seems to indicate that believers are able to observe the law by the inward work of the Spirit.



## Chapter 6

### The Distinctive Nature of the New Covenant in the NT

---

In chapter 5 I have argued that the NT passages, in which the term “new covenant” occurs, and the account of outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost seem to indicate that at least some NT writers were convinced that the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled in the earliest churches. I have argued three things. First of all, the phrases “the blood of the covenant” and “the new covenant in my blood” seem to indicate that the Synoptic writers and Paul understand Jesus as having applied to himself the concept of the covenant sacrifice (Exod 24.7f) and the role of the vicarious suffering of the servant (Isa 53) and as having established the new covenant for the forgiveness of sins as the fulfilment of Jer 31.34. Secondly, at Pentecost the disciples were baptized with the Spirit and thereby in Luke’s view they had entered the new age, the age of the new covenant. Thirdly, Paul’s concept of the keeping of the law by the Spirit reflected in 2 Cor 3 can be understood as the fulfilment of the promise of the internalization of the law of Jer 31.33.

In this chapter I shall inquire into the distinctive nature of the new covenant in the NT under four headings: The New Covenant and Forgiveness of Sins (§6.1); The New Covenant and the Law (§6.2); Entry into the New Covenant (§6.3); The New Covenant and the Christian Community as a Temple (§6.4). In doing so I hope, first of all, to provide further evidence that in the NT the new covenant is understood in terms of the fulfilment of the promise of Jer 31.31ff. As I have shown in chapter 3 and 5, the close relationships between the new covenant and the forgiveness of sins, and between the new covenant and the observance of the law lend support to the idea that the new covenant in the NT was understood in

terms of the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff. Secondly, this chapter allows a comparison of the distinctive nature of the new covenant in the NT with that in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Chapter 4 has shown that the process of entry into the new covenant and the concept of the community as a spiritual temple are important for understanding the new covenant concept in the DSS. Accordingly, in order to make a comparison with the DSS, I shall consider the question of entry into the new covenant community in the NT and the concept of the temple there.

## **6.1 The New Covenant and the Forgiveness of Sins**

I shall consider the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Pauline Epistles and Luke-Acts because the authors of these writings use the term "new covenant". The aim in this section is to investigate the extent to which the connection between the forgiveness of sins and the new covenant elsewhere in the NT was understood in terms of the fulfilment of the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.31ff.

### **6.1.1 The Epistle to the Hebrews**

It is clear that for the writer of Hebrews the old covenant was inadequate, because the Levitical sacrifices could not actually take away sins, serving only as a reminder of sins (Heb 10.1-4). Therefore, it is conceivable that with such a view of the inadequacy of the Levitical sacrifices, the author would readily relate the idea of the forgiveness of sins by virtue of the death of Christ to the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34. In fact, the writer points out that the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34 was fulfilled by the death of Christ (Heb 8.8ff; 9.13ff; 10.1-18).<sup>1</sup> He cites the promise of Jer 31.31-34 in Heb 8.8ff and it is

---

<sup>1</sup> B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1903[1889]), 266f; J. A. Moffatt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1924),

hardly a matter of doubt that he does so because he is convinced that this promise is being fulfilled.<sup>2</sup> He again quotes Jer 31.33-34 in Heb 10.16f which indicates that Christ's death as a sacrifice for the sins of the people was understood as the fulfilment of the promise relating to the forgiveness of sins.<sup>3</sup> What is of concern here is how the writer argues that the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34 was fulfilled by means of the death of Christ.

*i). The inadequacy of the forgiveness of sins under the old covenant*

The writer mentions three main things about the inadequacy of the forgiveness of sins under the Levitical priesthood: first, the weakness of the high priests; second, the nature of the priesthood as only a copy and shadow of the heavenly reality; third, the imperfection of animal sacrifices.

First, the high priests were appointed in their "weakness" (*ἀσθενείαν*) (Heb 7.28). In context, the weakness of the high priests is to be seen in two main respects.<sup>4</sup> They were mortal and had numbered many because they were prevented from continuing in office by death (v. 23). They were also sinful themselves so that they had to offer sacrifices for their own sins before they offered sacrifices for the sins of the people (v. 27). The multiplicity of such priests and sacrifices is itself a sign of the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood in providing for the forgiveness of sins.<sup>5</sup>

---

112; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Göttingen, 1984[36]), 294f, 316; H. W. Montefiore, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1964), 142; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1964), 178f, 242; A. Strobel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, NTD 9 (Göttingen, 1975), 194; P. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, 1977), 366f, 403f; Grässer, *Bund*, 109f.

<sup>2</sup> In connection with the author's quotation of Jer 31.31ff in Heb 8.8ff, Grässer says that what is striking is not that the author finds out the better promises from Jer 31.31ff, but "warum er sie dort sucht und wie er sie auswertet" (*Bund*, 106). However, it is clear that as far as Grässer is concerned, the promise of Jer 31.31ff was fulfilled in the covenant of Christ (cf. *Bund*, 109).

<sup>3</sup> Grässer, *Bund*, 110.

<sup>4</sup> Westcott interprets *ἀσθενείαν* here to include the limitations of humanity as well as the personal imperfections and sins of the particular priests (*Hebrews*, 200).

<sup>5</sup> Michel, *Hebräer*, 276; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 268.

Secondly, the Aaronic priests served as a copy and shadow of the heavenly things (Heb 8.4f). The phrase "a copy and shadow" (ὑποδειγμάτων καὶ σκιῶν) in v. 5 indicates that the tabernacle was associated with the true heavenly tabernacle (cf. v. 2). The word "copy" here shows that the earthly tabernacle was a copy of an archetype, the heavenly reality.<sup>6</sup> As a "shadow" presupposes a "substance" which casts a shadow, the word "shadow" here indicates that the Levitical order was the shadow of a new priesthood which would be the substance of the Levitical one.<sup>7</sup> Thus when the new priesthood comes, it not only replaces the old, which was its the copy and shadow, but also fulfils the old because the new order is both the archetype and substance of the old.<sup>8</sup> For the writer, the substance of the Levitical priesthood is to be found in that of Christ, which has been enacted on better promises, the promises of the new covenant (Heb 8.6). Accordingly, for the writer the Levitical priesthood is obsolete when the new covenant is enacted through the more excellent priesthood of Christ (Heb 8.6, 13).

Thirdly, the sacrifices offered by the Aaronic priests could not make the worshipper perfect in conscience (Heb 9.9). The writer stresses that the blood of bulls and goats could not actually take away sins (Heb 10.4). According to him the function of animal sacrifices was limited to external things rather than matters

---

<sup>6</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 281; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 106; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 167; M. Rissi, *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs*, WUNT 41 (Tübingen, 1987), 37f. The phrase τῶν ἑπουρανίων here is rendered in various ways: the heavenly sanctuary (RSV); the heavenly (NEB); heavenly things (VG and KJV); the heavenly realities (JB). Since the phrase λατρεύουσιν τῶν ἑπουρανίων here clearly links with τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός in v. 2, τῶν ἑπουρανίων seems to signify the heavenly sanctuary (cf. Heb 9.8; 10.19; 13.11).

Concerning the author's description of the earthly sanctuary as a copy and shadow of the heavenly sanctuary, some scholars insist that the author was influenced by Platonism expounded by Philo and other Jewish-Alexandrian philosopher (e.g. Moffatt, *Hebrews*, xxxi, 106; T. H. Robinson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, MNTC (London, 1933), 107f; cf. Philo, *Vita Moysis*, ii, 72ff). However, some other scholars maintain that even though some affinity may be found between the language of philonic Platonism and that in Heb 8.5, there is no trace of the essential thought of Philo in Heb 8.5 (e.g. R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event* (Richmond, 1959), 91; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 166; R. Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Leiden, 1970), 557; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 294f).

<sup>7</sup> Bruce, *Hebrews*, 166; Rissi, *Theologie*, 38.

<sup>8</sup> Hughes, *Hebrews*, 293; cf. Bruce, *Hebrews*, 166.

of the conscience. Heb 9.10 shows that animal sacrifices dealt only with external things, such as food, drink and various ablutions, which were regulations for the body.<sup>9</sup> Thus the writer says that sacrifices under the Levitical order could not perfect the conscience of the worshipper (cf. Heb 10.1-4).<sup>10</sup> The continual repetition of the Levitical sacrifices worked only as a reminder to the worshipper of his sinfulness,<sup>11</sup> because if these sacrifices could indeed have made the worshipper perfect in conscience, he would no longer have been conscious of his sins (Heb 10.2f).

What is worth noting for the present study is that the writer stresses that when there is a new covenant, the Levitical priesthood is obsolete. He expresses this idea in various ways. a) The first covenant has not been faultless (Heb 8.7).<sup>12</sup> Since the first covenant was faulty, it had to be replaced by a better covenant, that is, the new covenant. b) The old order was a symbol for the present age.<sup>13</sup> The regulations of the old order were imposed until the time of reformation, the time when the shadow would be replaced and fulfilled by the substance. The writer indicates that the symbolic ceased in the present age, when

---

<sup>9</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 256; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 324; D. Guthrie, *the Letter to the Hebrews* (Leicester, 1983), 184.

<sup>10</sup> Moffatt interprets *κατὰ συνείδησιν* here in terms of a consciousness of sin (*Hebrews*, 118; cf. Michel, *Hebräer*, 308).

<sup>11</sup> Some commentators understand *ἀνάμνησις* here in relation not only to the people but also to God (Bruce, *Hebrews*, 228). Hughes comments, "the yearly sacrifices not only reminded the people of their own sinfulness but also reminded them that God remembers sin" (*Hebrews*, 392).

<sup>12</sup> Many commentators maintain that the law itself is not blamed, but the fault is due to those who receive it (cf. v. 8) (Westcott, *Hebrews*, 221; Michel, *Hebräer*, 295; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 170; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 297; Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 174). In relation to the forgiveness of sins the faulty nature of the first covenant had been already mentioned.

<sup>13</sup> The phrase *παραβολῇ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ἐνεστηκότα* has been interpreted in two different ways: a) the time then present; b) the time now present. According to the former, the present age was the age which would be followed by the age to come (Westcott, *Hebrews*, 254). According to the latter, the present age is nothing but the age to come. W. Manson, maintaining this view, comments that this phrase indicates that the sacrifices offered in Jerusalem had no power to qualify the worshippers in respect of conscience for access to God (*The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1951), 132). Further this phrase points to the free access to God through Christ (cf. Bruce, *Hebrews*, 195; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 323).

Christ appeared as a high priest of “the good things to come” (τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν) (Heb 9.11). c) In particular the animal sacrifices for forgiveness of sins offered by Aaronic priests were a “shadow of the good things to come” (Heb 10.1ff). Clearly for the writer “the good things to come” which the Levitical priesthood foreshadowed had been fulfilled in Christ.<sup>14</sup> Hence he asserts that there is no longer any necessity for an offering for the sins of the people.

Therefore, for the writer, animal sacrifices, a copy and shadow of the good things to come, were unable to effect forgiveness of sins and were replaced and fulfilled by Christ’s once for all offering of himself for the sins of the people. This brings me to consider how the writer explains that the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34 was fulfilled by means of the death of Christ.

*ii). The fulfilment of the promise of the forgiveness of sins*

The writer maintains that the promise of the forgiveness of sins was fulfilled by the death of Christ. Christ offered himself once for all for the sins of the people (Heb 7.26), and is the “mediator of a better covenant” (Heb 8.6), namely, the “mediator of a new covenant” (Heb 9.15; 12.24). In Heb 9.13ff the author asserts that Christ is the “mediator of a new covenant” (διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης) because the blood of Christ cleansed their conscience from dead works to serve the living God (vv. 14-15; 12.24).<sup>15</sup> He points out that Christ is the mediator in order that those who have been redeemed from the transgressions committed under the first covenant may receive the promise of an eternal inheritance (v. 15).

First of all, with regard to the forgiveness of sins by virtue of the death of Christ, it is important to note the writer’s conviction that Christ as a high priest

---

<sup>14</sup> Montefiore insists, “the good things to come” are not to be identified with the Christian dispensation, but will come at the consummation of the age (*Hebrews*, 164). This interpretation is less than convincing because the writer makes it clear that Christ appeared as a high priest of “the good things to come” (Heb 9.11).

<sup>15</sup> διὰ τοῦτο at the beginning of v. 15 indicates the reason why Christ is the mediator (cf. Michel, *Hebräer*, 316).

offered himself once for all for the sins of the people (Heb 7.27; 9.12, 26; 10.10-14). Hence he stresses that there is no longer any necessity for an offering for sins because the sins of the people are forgiven once for all by the sacrifice of Christ (Heb 10.12ff, 18). In order to get this idea across, the writer emphasizes two things. The first is Christ's identifying himself with his brethren in order that he, as high priest, might offer sacrifice for sins on the behalf of the sins of the people (Heb 2.11ff; 5.1).<sup>17</sup> The second is that Christ's high priesthood is not after the order of Aaron but after the order of Melchizedek.

According to the OT, a high priest had to be appointed from among the Levites (Lev 16). If this was so, then according to this OT tradition, Christ who

---

<sup>17</sup> The writer points out that Christ identified himself with his brethren in order to be a high priest on their behalf. He says that he is not ashamed to call "those who are sanctified" (οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι) brethren because both "he who sanctifies" (ὁ ἁγιάζων) and "those who are sanctified" (οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι) are all from one (ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες) (Heb 2.11). The phrase ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες is however controversial. Many scholars maintain that ἑνός refers to God (Westcott, Moffatt, Windisch, Montefiore, Bruce). Hughes, however, argues that this interpretation tends to confuse the fact that the difference between creator and creature is essential and absolute. He, advocating the pronoun ἑνός as neuter, interprets it as relating primarily to the community of human nature (*Hebrews*, 104ff). Hughes' understanding seems to be in accord with the author's emphasis on Christ's identification with humankind: "he who sanctifies" calls the "sanctified ones" his brethren (cf. G. W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews. Tradition, Comment and Conclusions*, AB 36 (Garden City, New York, 1972, 32f). The context shows that ὁ ἁγιάζων refers to Christ, because ὁ ἁγιάζων is the same one who is not ashamed to call τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους brethren (Michel, *Hebräer*, 150; Strobel, *Hebräer*, 103; Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 32f; H. Braun, *An die Hebräer*, HNT 14 (Tübingen, 1984), 60).

The writer emphasizes that Christ had not only shared in flesh and blood but was made like his brethren in all things (vv. 14, 17). He points out the necessity and the purpose of Christ's identification with mankind in Heb 2.17. The phrase "to be made like his brethren in all things" (ὥφειλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι) shows the necessity of Christ identifying himself completely with mankind (Michel, *Hebräer*, 163; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 119; Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 94; M. Riszi, *Theologie*, 60). The *ὥστε* clause in v. 17b speaks of the purpose of Christ's identification with his brethren. That was "to become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people" (ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ) (Heb 2.17). The word *ὥστε* here expresses the immediate end (Westcott, *Hebrews*, 57). Christ could not be a representative of men unless he was fully human (cf. 5.1) (H. Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 67).

It is to be noted that the author emphasizes Christ's identification with his brethren in order to argue that Christ was qualified to be a high priest. For the writer, Christ's identification with mankind is a necessary qualification to be high priest, since a high priest is appointed from among men and on behalf of men in order to offer both "gifts and sacrifices for sins" (Heb 5.1).

belonged to the tribe of Judah was not qualified to be a high priest. However, by using Psalms 110.4 and Gen 14.8ff in Heb 5.6ff; 7.1ff, the writer is able to argue that a priest other than one named after the order of Aaron is needed because perfection was not attainable through the Levitical priesthood (Heb 7.11f). Furthermore, he asserts that Christ was descended from Judah and his high priesthood is not after the order of Aaron but after the order of Melchizedek. In Heb 7.1ff the writer characterizes Melchizedek as being: a) royal (king of righteousness and king of peace - v. 1f); b) timeless (without father, without mother, without genealogy, and without either beginning of days or end of life - v. 3); c) changeless (he abides a priest perpetually - v. 3).<sup>18</sup> Melchizedek the writer explains the resemblance of Christ's priesthood to Melchizedek's in two ways. Unlike the Levitical priesthood Christ's becoming a priest was not according to the legal requirement concerning bodily descent (Heb 7.11-16). Also, he is priest for ever because his priesthood is determined by the power of an indestructible life (Heb 7.16).<sup>19</sup>

Secondly, the writer points out the superiority of Christ's high priesthood to the Aaronic high priesthood. He suggests three main points: a) its permanent and sinless character; b) its execution in the true heavenly tabernacle which is the substance of the copy and shadow; c) single sacrifice for sins. These are compared with the inadequacies of the Aaronic priesthood.

a) In comparison with the fact that the Aaronic priests are mortal and sinful, Christ's high priesthood after the order of Melchizedek is permanent because he

---

<sup>18</sup> The writer introduces Melchizedek in a mysterious way by using the silence of the Genesis narrative concerning the birth, death, parentage and posterity of Melchizedek (Gen 14). However, it is to be noted that he mentions a few historical details, which indicates that he assumes his readers' knowledge of the Melchizedek tradition (cf. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, vi 438; *Ant.*, i 180f). For a fuller treatment of this subject see F. L. Horton's *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Cambridge, 1976).

<sup>19</sup> The priest after the order of Melchizedek mentioned in Ps 110 is to be a priest forever. Thus this priest is determined by the power of an indestructible life. For the writer, Christ, who died but was raised up and lives forever, manifests this power (Heb 1.3; 8.1; 11.19).



continues forever (Heb 7.24).<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, Christ was holy, innocent, undefiled and separated from sinners (Heb 7.26f). Therefore, it was not necessary for Christ to offer any sacrifice for his own sins. He offered himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the people. This shows the superiority of Christ's high priesthood to the Aaronic high priesthood, under which the high priests had to offer sacrifices for their own sins before they offered sacrifices for the sins of the people (Heb 7.27).

b) Whereas the Aaronic priests served as a copy and shadow of the heavenly things according to the first covenant (Heb 8.4f), Christ obtained a more excellent priesthood and entered into the heavenly holy place once for all as a mediator of the better covenant, that is, the new covenant (Heb 8.6; 9.11f).

The Aaronic priest<sup>s</sup> entered only the outer tabernacle (Heb 9.6). The implication is clear that there is no direct access to God under the Levitical priesthood.<sup>21</sup> However, for the writer Christ, as a high priest of "the good things to come" (Heb 9.11) entered the holy place, the perfect tabernacle, which is not of this creation, entered the very presence of God, through his own blood (Heb 9.11f, 24). Christ's entry into the heavenly holy place opens the way for all to draw near to the throne of divine grace (Heb 4.19; 9.15, 23; 10.19ff).

c) While the sacrifices offered by the Aaronic priests could not make the worshipper perfect in conscience (Heb 9.9), the blood of Christ cleansed the conscience from dead works to serve the living God (Heb 9.14).

The writer emphasizes that the continual repetition of the Levitical sacrifices could not actually take away sins and worked only as a reminder to the people of

---

<sup>20</sup> It is true that Christ had died. However, for the writer Christ's death was not the termination of his priesthood but rather the essential priestly offering for the sins of the people (Hughes, *Hebrews*, 269; Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 166). Even though he does not mention the resurrection of Christ here, there is hardly any doubt that he is convinced that Christ was resurrected and continues to be the ever living high priest (cf. Heb 1.3; 7.16; 8.1; 11.19; and particularly 13.20) (Bruce, *Hebrews*, 411).

<sup>21</sup> Bruce, *Hebrews*, 194.

their sinfulness. In comparison with this he stresses that Christ offered a single sacrifice once for all for sin through his own blood (Heb 10.14f).<sup>22</sup> There is a sustained emphasis on the contrast between the Aaronic priesthood and that of Christ in that whereas the repeated offerings under the Levitical priesthood could never take away sins (Heb 9.9; 10.1-4, 11), Christ offered himself as one sacrifice for sins for all time (Heb 7.27; 9.12, 26; 10.10, 12, 14; cf. 7.28; 9.14; 10.18).<sup>23</sup> We can conclude that for the writer the once for all forgiveness of sins by means of the death of Christ is eschatological.

To sum up, the writer maintains that the promise of the forgiveness of sins was fulfilled by means of Christ's once for all sacrifice for sin. He points out that whereas the Levitical priest served as a copy and shadow of the heavenly reality, Christ as a high priest of "the good things to come" entered the holy place, the substance of the copy and shadow, through his own blood, and obtained eternal redemption. In other words, Christ, the mediator of the new covenant, whose ministry was based on better promises of the new covenant (Heb 8.8-12 - a quotation of Jer 31.31-34), redeemed the transgressors under the first covenant (Heb 9.15). Moreover, after quoting Jer 31.33f in Heb 10.16f, the writer asserts, "now where there is forgiveness of these things, there is no longer any offering for sin". There is no doubt that for the writer the promise of the new covenant that God "will remember their sins no more" was fulfilled by virtue of the death of Christ, since Christ offered himself once for all for the sins of the people for all time and since the blood of Christ cleanses the conscience from dead works.

---

<sup>22</sup> The writer emphasizes two points about the perfection of Christ's once for all sacrifices. The first is that whereas the Levitical priests offered animal sacrifices, Christ offered himself. The second is that Christ did not need to offer any sacrifice for himself because he was holy, innocent, undefiled and separated from sinners (Heb 7.26; cf. 8.14).

<sup>23</sup> In Heb 10.11f the writer points out that whereas every priest stands (*ἐσσηκεν*) daily at his service, Christ sat down (*ἐκάθισεν*) at the right hand of God after he had offered a single sacrifice for sins for all time. This shows the fundamental difference between the Levitical priesthood and that of Christ. The Levitical priest stands because there was a ceaseless repetition of sacrifices. On the other hand, Christ sat down because his single sacrifice for sin was accepted for all time (Michel, *Hebräer*, 340; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 238f; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 400f).

### 6.1.2 The Pauline Epistles

The aim of this subsection is to establish that even though there is no explicit connection between the forgiveness of sins and Jer 31.34 in the Pauline epistles, nonetheless Paul seems to understand forgiveness of sins in connection with the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff. Since I have argued in 5.1.2 that Paul understands the death of Jesus in terms of the curse of the covenant effecting release from the curse of the law and, at the same time, establishing a new covenant,<sup>24</sup> my consideration here is limited to showing how Paul understands the death of Jesus as a more effective means for the forgiveness of sins than the old cultic means of dealing with sin.

The terms for forgiveness (*ἀφῆσις* or *ἀφίεναι*) are rare in the Pauline epistles (Rom 4.7; Col 1.14; Eph 1.7). If Paul has the belief that Jer 31.31ff has been fulfilled, then why does he not use the important concept of the forgiveness of sins of Jer 31.34 more frequently in his epistles?

This question can be answered in two ways. First of all, even though Paul uses the word very rarely, there is hardly any doubt that for Paul, forgiveness of sins is mediated through the death of Jesus. In Rom 4.25, he indicates that Christ's death was necessary because of our sins. In other places Paul says that Christ died for us, that is for sinners (Rom 5.6, 8; 14.15; 2 Cor 5.14; 1 Thess 5.10). Furthermore, in 1 Cor 15.3, Paul introduces the important tradition, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scripture". Many scholars consider this verse as a part of the earliest Christian tradition.<sup>25</sup> This would indicate that the understanding of the death of Jesus as being for the forgiveness of sins of the believer was already well established in the early churches. Thus it is fair to say

---

<sup>24</sup> See above pp. 186ff.

<sup>25</sup> See references in J. Kloppenborg, "An Analysis of the Pre-Pauline Formula in 1 Cor 15.3b-5 in Light of Some Recent Literature", *CBQ* 40 (1978), 351-67 and in J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Tradition and Redaction in 1 Cor 15.3-7", *CBQ* 43 (1981), 582-89).

that Paul understands the death of Jesus as effective for forgiveness of sins of the believer.

Secondly, as R. Bultmann notes, Paul expresses the idea of the forgiveness of sins in such terms as *δικαιοσύνη* and *καταλλαγή*.<sup>26</sup> In Rom 4.6f Paul equates the blessing of forgiveness (v. 7) with that of being reckoned righteous (v. 6).<sup>27</sup> Since, as Dunn observes, "forgiveness was too much tied up with the language of the covenant" in Jewish thinking,<sup>28</sup> Paul seems to express the concept of the forgiveness of sins by using his own important ideas such as righteousness by faith (Rom 4 ; Gal 3). By doing this, he can distinguish the forgiveness of sins mediated through the death of Christ from the forgiveness of sin provided by the cultic means. It is worth exploring the logic of Paul's thinking on this subject a little further.

Paul, like the author of Hebrews, maintains that what Jesus has done is more effective than the traditional cultic means of dealing with sin. The following three points in Paul's understanding of the death of Jesus accord well with what the writer of Hebrews says of the adequacy of Christ's once for all sacrifice compared with the inadequacy of the old cultic animal sacrifices.

First, Paul emphasizes that Jesus identified himself with man in his flesh (Rom 8.3; Phil 2.7f; cf. 1 Tim 3.16) in order to explain the death of Jesus as a representative of men (1 Cor 15.22; 2 Cor 5.14).

In Rom 8.3 Paul says that God sent his own Son "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (*ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*). Here *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας* indicates that Jesus shared in fallen humanity.<sup>29</sup> A similar idea can be seen in

<sup>26</sup> Bultmann, "Ἄφεσις, TDNT 1, 512.

<sup>27</sup> A. Nygren, *Commentary on Romans*, ET (London, 1952[44]), 171; F. J. Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans*, ET (London, 1961[57]), 116; Jeremias, *The Central Message of the New Testament*, ET (New York, 1965), 66; Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 233; Dunn, *Romans*, 206.

<sup>28</sup> Dunn, *Romans*, 207.

<sup>29</sup> Barrett, *Romans*, 156; Dunn, "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus", in *Recon-*

Phil 2.7f: "being made in the likeness of man and being found in appearance as a man" (ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος). The phrases ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων and ὡς ἄνθρωπος indicate that Jesus became what men are.<sup>30</sup>

It is important to note that, as far as the forgiveness of sins is concerned, Jesus represents only those who are justified through faith in Christ.<sup>31</sup> Paul emphasizes that since Christ died for our sins, we can be justified before God through the blood of Jesus (Rom 3.25f; 5.9). In other words, believers might be made the righteousness of God in Christ (2 Cor 5.21).<sup>32</sup> How is this so? For Paul it is because believers died to sin in Christ (Rom 6.2; 6.8, 10f) and believers are alive to God through Christ the resurrected (Rom 6.5, 11). Paul sees the

---

*ciliation and Hope: NT Essays on Atonement and Eschatology*, ed. R. Bank (Exeter, 1974), 128. Concerning Paul's use of the word ὁμοίωμα here, Cranfield comments, "the Son of God assumed the selfsame fallen human nature that is ours, but that in His case that fallen human nature was never the whole of Him - He never ceased to be the eternal Son of God" (*Romans*, I, 382; L. Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Leicester, 1988), 302). U. Wilckens remarks that Paul carefully chose this word in order to avoid the possible misunderstanding that Christ became a sinner (*Römer*, VI, 125).

<sup>30</sup> O. Michel, "Zur Exegese von Phil 2.5-11", in *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis, Festschrift K. Heim* (Hamburg, 1954), 90ff; R. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Phil 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*, SNTSMS 4 (Cambridge, 1967), 199-211; G. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, WBC 43 (Waco, Texas, 1983), 87.

Paul expresses the idea of Jesus as a representative of men through an Adam-Christ analogy. He asserts that in Adam all die (1 Cor 15.22). In 2 Cor 5.14 he maintains, "one died for all, therefore all died". These assertions indicate that Paul understands the death of Jesus as a representative man (Windisch, *Zweite Korintherbrief*, 182f). Paul uses a similar analogy to illustrate Jesus as a representative of the believer relative to his resurrection: whereas Adam was the first man as a representative of men, Christ is the second and the last Adam as a representative of the resurrected men (1 Cor 15.45-49; cf. H. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids, 1975[66]), 53-57; R. Gaffin, *The Centrality of the Resurrection; A Study in Paul's Soteriology* (Grand Rapids, 1978), 85).

<sup>31</sup> Dunn makes a distinction between Jesus's representative capacity before and after resurrection: "Jesus' representative capacity before resurrection (sinful flesh - Rom. 8.3) is different from his representative capacity after resurrection (spiritual body - 1 Cor 15.44-45). All die. But only those 'in Christ' experience the new creation (2 Cor 5.17). In short, as Last Adam, Jesus represents only those who experience the life-giving Spirit (1 Cor 15.45)" ("Paul's Understanding", 131).

<sup>32</sup> There has been a great deal of debate on the interpretation of δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ here. For the present study, it is not necessary to enter into the arena of the debate. What is clear is that the righteousness referred to above is mediated through Christ. For a brief review of the debates, see G. Klein, "Righteousness in the NT", IDBSup, 750-2; Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 156-158.

death of Jesus as death for the sins of the believer and the resurrection of Jesus as resurrection for the believer. Therefore, believers can be justified by faith in Christ. Here we may say that, for Paul, justification by faith in Christ is the reality of God's forgiveness of the sins of the believer. The sins of believers are forgiven because Jesus died for their sins as their representative.

Secondly, Paul understands the death of Jesus as a sacrifice in relation to animal sacrifices in the Jewish traditions, particularly the animal sacrifice on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16).

a). In Rom 3.25 Paul points out that Jesus was made a "means of expiation" (ἱλαστήριον) in his blood (ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι).<sup>33</sup> The close link between Jesus' blood and expiation would suggest that Paul understands Jesus' death in connection with animal sacrifice in the Jewish traditions, in particular the animal sacrifice on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16.12-19).<sup>34</sup> This suggestion is supported

<sup>33</sup> The word ἱλαστήριον must be used here as a sacrificial reference. This word is used so often in the LXX for the "mercy-seat" (káppōret), the lid of the ark (e.g. Exod 25; Lev 25). There is a great deal of controversy as to whether its use in Rom 3.25 should be understood as "expiation" or "propitiation" (expiation: C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle to the Romans*, MNTC (London, 1932), 54f, 56-58; N. H. Young, " 'Hilaskesthai' and Related Words in the New Testament", *EvQ* 55 (1983), 169-76; O. Hofius, "Sühne und Versöhnung: Zum paulinischen Verständnis des Kreuzestodes Jesu", in *Versuche, des Leiden und Sterben Jesu zu Verstehen*, ed W. Maas (Munich, 1983), 26-31; propitiation: L. L. Morris, "The Meaning of ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3.25-26a", *NTS* 2 (1955-56), 33-43; *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (London, 1955), chap. 4 and 5; H. Ridderbos, *Paul*, 189-90). It is unnecessary to polarize one against the other, because it is to be assumed that this passage shows not only that the wrath of God which Paul expounds in Rom 1.18-3.20, is averted by the death of Jesus but also that God is envisaged as offerer of the sacrifice (Dunn, *Romans*, 171). Whatever may be the meaning here, there is hardly any doubt that Paul expresses the death of Jesus as a sacrifice dealing with sin (J. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul*, SNTSMS 20 (Cambridge, 1972), 190-194; "Salvation Proclaimed", *ExpT* 93 (1981-82), 356-359).

<sup>34</sup> In connection with Paul's understanding of Jesus' death as a sacrifice some scholars note that the word ἱλαστήριον is used to describe the significance of the Maccabean martyrs' death for a cleansing effect on Israel (4 Macc 17.22) (E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht* (Göttingen, 1963<sup>3</sup>), 152 n. 4; D. Hill, *Greek Words*, 41-45; S. K. Williams, *Jesus' Death as saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept*, HDR 2 (Missoula, 1975). It is possible that Paul could have been influenced by this idea. Nevertheless, this possibility should not be understood as an alternative to the view of Paul's understanding of Jesus' death as a sacrifice, particularly on the Day of Atonement (Dunn, *Romans*, 171; cf. K. Kertelege, "Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus (Münster, 1967), 57-58).

by Paul's understanding of the death of Jesus as a representative, in the same way as in Lev 16.20-22 where the animal comes to represent the sins of the people by the symbolic action of having the sins of the people laid on its head.<sup>35</sup> In this way the sins of the people are removed.

b). Rom 8.3 shows that Paul understands the death of Jesus as a sacrifice for sin (περὶ ἁμαρτίας). In Rom 8.3 Paul states that the purpose of Jesus being sent as περὶ ἁμαρτίας is that "the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us". It is to be noted that the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας is regularly used in the LXX to translate the Hebrew (ל')הַאֲתִיָּא as a sin offering (e.g. Lev 5.6-7, 11; 16.3, 5, 9; Num 6.16; 7.16; 2 Chron 29.23-4; Neh 10.33; Ezek 42.13; 43.19).<sup>36</sup> Some scholars maintain that it is better to take this phrase in a general sense.<sup>37</sup> It is important to note that as Dunn points out, the law of sin offering must be included as part of "the just requirement of the law" which might be fulfilled through Jesus who was sent as περὶ ἁμαρτίας.<sup>38</sup> For Paul the law of the sin offering was fulfilled in Jesus' death.

Apart from these two passages there are several other passages which show that Paul understands Jesus' death in reference to a sacrifice (Rom 5.6-9; 8.32; 1 Cor 5.7; 2 Cor 5.21; Eph 1.7; 2.13; Col 1.20). In 1 Cor 5.7b Paul says that "Christ our 'passover' (πάσχα) has been sacrificed (ἐτύθη). Even though it is frequently claimed that "the paschal victim was not a sin-offering or regarded as a means of expiating or removing sins",<sup>39</sup> it is important to note that the passover was already connected with atonement in Ezek 45.18-22.<sup>40</sup> It is likely

<sup>35</sup> H. H. Rowley, *Worship in Ancient Israel* (London, 1967), 133; H. Gese, "Atonement", in *Essays on Biblical theology* (Minneapolis, 1981), 105-106; B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*, WMANT 55 (Neukirchen, 1982), 199-221.

<sup>36</sup> Bruce, *Romans*, 161; Wilckens, *Römer*, VI, 126f; Dunn, *Romans*, 422.

<sup>37</sup> Michel, *Römer*, 190, n. 2; E. Gaugler, *Der Römerbrief*, Vol. 1 (Zurich, 1958), 262f; Barrett, *Romans*, 156; Craufield, *Romans*, Vol. 1, 382.

<sup>38</sup> Dunn, "Death of Jesus", 132.

<sup>39</sup> G. B. Gray, *sacrifice in the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1925), 397.

<sup>40</sup> Jeremias, *Eucharistic*, 222ff.

that Jesus' death as a paschal lamb indicates that Paul understands Jesus' death in association with a sacrifice for sin.<sup>41</sup> In 2 Cor 5.21 Paul states that God made Christ who knew no sin to be sin on behalf of the believer. Paul's statement that the sinless one was made to be sin for the believer may allude to the unblemished animal which was offered for sacrifice in order to remove the sins of the people on the Day of Atonement<sup>42</sup> as well as to the suffering servant of Isa 53.<sup>43</sup>

In short, in view of the passages considered above, it is likely that Paul understands the death of Jesus in terms of OT cultic sacrifice. Furthermore, this understanding of Jesus' death is in accordance with that of the writer of Hebrews.

Thirdly, Paul understands the forgiveness of sins achieved by means of the death of Jesus as being eschatological. In Rom 3.25f Paul points out that the death of Christ was a pivotal point in history, embracing both the past and the present. Paul emphasizes that the death of Christ as a means of expiation (ἱλαστήριον) demonstrates God's righteousness in the present time (ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ). There is hardly any doubt that "on account of the passing over the sins committed in previous times" (τῇν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων) also relates to the demonstration of God's righteousness (εἰς ἐνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης) by setting forth a means of expiation in Jesus' blood.<sup>44</sup> It is not difficult to suppose that, for Paul, "ἱλαστήριον in Christ's

<sup>41</sup> Dunn, "Death of Jesus", 132; cf. Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 128; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 99.

<sup>42</sup> Windisch, *Zweite Korintherbrief*, 198.

<sup>43</sup> Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, ET (Phila., 1957), 76; J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God*, ET (London, 1965), 97, n. 441.

<sup>44</sup> The meaning of πάρεσις here is controversial. Kümmel advocates that Paul uses πάρεσις here in the sense of "forgiveness" ("πάρεσις und ἐνδειξις: Ein Beitrag Zum Verständnis der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre", in *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte* (Marburg, 1965), 262f; cf. F. J. Leenhardt, *Romans*, 107). However, many other scholars maintain that πάρεσις here does not mean "forgiveness" (e.g. Michel, Barrett, Cranfield, Bruce, Wilckens and Dunn). Barrett remarks: "It is hard to see why, if Paul simply means 'forgiveness', he does not use the ordinary word. ... The question is why God manifested his righteousness in an act of redemption in Christ crucified. The answer is: In the past he had overlooked men's sins, and decisive action was necessary if his righteousness was to be vindicated" (*Romans*, 79f).



blood" has justified God's passing over the sins committed in previous times. In other words, without the death of Christ as ἱλαστήριον, the OT provision of sacrifice for forgiveness of sins would have been inadequate for dealing with the sins of the people, because the sins previously committed were passed over in the forbearance of God (v. 25).

Accordingly, the reference to the death of Christ as ἱλαστήριον seems to indicate that for Paul there is continuity between the death of Christ as a sacrifice and the animal sacrifices for sin in the OT, because he seems to regard the death of Jesus as the final sin offering and the fulfilment of OT sacrificial provision for the sins of the people.<sup>45</sup> Paul's emphasis on the present time by an emphatic use of "but now" (νυνὶ δέ) in v. 21<sup>46</sup> and the phrase "in the present time" (ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ) in v. 26 also indicates this.<sup>47</sup> Here we may conclude that, for Paul, the forgiveness of sins which is based on the death of Christ as ἱλαστήριον is eschatological.

In conclusion, Paul, like the author of the Hebrews, has a conception of what Jesus has done as being the more effective and final means of dealing with sin than the old cultic means did. Here we may conclude that for Paul what Jeremiah looked for as a more effective covenant relationship in terms of dealing with sin has been fulfilled in Christ.

### 6.1.3 Luke-Acts

The aim of this subsection is to investigate whether and how Luke under-

<sup>45</sup> Dunn, *Romans*, 182f.

<sup>46</sup> Even though Paul sometimes uses this to indicate logical contrast (Rom 7.17; 1 Cor 1 Cor 18; 13.13), his use here indicates a pivotal point, "the transition from one epoch to another, where a decisive new element has transformed the circumstances which previously pertained (as in 5.9-11; 8.1; 11.30-1; 13.11; elsewhere especially 1 Cor 15.20; Eph 2.13), i.e., the eschatological 'now'" (Dunn, *Romans*, 164).

<sup>47</sup> The phrase ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ as the divinely appointed time which embraces both the past and future (cf. Rom 8.18; 11.5; 2 Cor 8.8).

stands the forgiveness of sins as the fulfilment of the new covenant promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34. Since there is no explicit allusion in the forgiveness of sins in Luke-Acts to Jer 31.34, first of all, I shall consider how Luke understands the forgiveness of sins. Secondly, I shall examine whether Luke's understanding of the forgiveness of sins can be understood in connection with the fulfilment of the new covenant promise in Jer 31.34.

In Luke-Acts there is a repeated emphasis that the forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in the name of Jesus to all nations (Lk 24.47; Acts 1.4ff). The disciples were commissioned to proclaim repentance for the forgiveness of sins (Lk 24.47) and this is repeated in Acts 1.4ff. According to Luke, the forgiveness of sins was proclaimed to the multitude on the day of Pentecost: "Repent, and let each of you be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ for forgiveness of your sins and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2.38). This passage shows that the forgiveness of sins is closely associated with the gift of the Spirit which comes with repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus.

In Acts 2.39 the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit are interpreted as the fulfilment of the promise of God to his people, those whom the Lord called to himself (cf. Lk 24.29; Acts 2.32f). Verse 39 strongly indicates Luke's understanding of the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit as God's promise to Abraham: "the promise is for you and for your children and for all who are far off, as many as the Lord our God shall call" (ὅμῳ γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν) (cf. Gen 17.7-10). Moreover, Luke's understanding of the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit as the fulfilment of the Father's promise indicates that he understands the forgiveness of sins as being eschatological, because he points out that the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost has taken place in the last days (ἐν ἑσχαταῖς ἡμέραις) as the

fulfilment of God's promise through the prophet, Joel (Acts 2.17).<sup>48</sup>

In Acts 2.41 Luke describes how the multitude were baptised, but does not say anything about the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit. However, he seems to imply that they received the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit, because the phrase "gladness and sincerity of heart" (ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας) shows that they experienced forgiveness of sins (Acts 2.46). Presumably convicted people (Acts 2.37) could hardly be glad without the assurance of forgiveness of sins (cf. Acts 8.8; 8.39; 16.34). We may conclude, then, that words such as "continuing" (προσκαρτεροῦντες) (Acts 2.42, 46) and "sincerity of heart" (ἀφελότητι καρδίας) (Acts 2.46) indicate that Luke understands that the promise of v. 38 has been fulfilled in their case. Since he evidently sees no need to repeat all the elements of v. 38, Luke's record of their baptism and of their acceptance into the new community provides sufficient indication that they had also experienced the forgiveness of sins (Acts 2.42-47; cf. 2.21).

Luke also emphasizes that forgiveness of sins has been obtained through faith in Jesus.<sup>49</sup> At Cornelius' house, Peter said, "of him all the prophets bear witness, that through his name every one who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins" (Acts 10.43). While Peter was saying this, "the Holy Spirit fell upon all those who were listening to the message" (Acts 10.44). The implication seems to be that Cornelius and his household are to receive forgiveness of sins (cf. 11.14). In Acts 22.16 Luke also records that Paul was urged to have his sins washed away by calling on Jesus' name. It is worth noting that calling on the name of Jesus

<sup>48</sup> Luke understands the gift of the Spirit as the gift of the last days. The alteration of Joel's word "after this" (μετὰ ταῦτα in the LXX) into "in the last days" (ἐν ταῖς ἔσχαταις ἡμέραις) shows that for Luke the gift of the Spirit is given in the last days.

<sup>49</sup> Luke records that the use of the name of Jesus did not succeed without faith (Acts 19.13ff). Silva New points out that whereas usually the name works *ex opere operato* in the practice of exorcists, "the Christian community of this period resented the use of his [Jesus] by any but themselves, and did not believe in its efficacy unless supported by Christian faith" ("The Name, Baptism, and The laying on of Hands, in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part 1. Vol. 5 (London, 1933), 133.

is equivalent to faith in Jesus.<sup>50</sup> According to Acts 9.17, Paul was filled with the Holy Spirit. This indicates that Luke understands Paul's case to be parallel with Acts 2.38 and 10.43ff.

In view of the passages considered above three clear implications can be drawn out concerning God's new way of dealing with the sins of the people. First of all, forgiveness of sins is related not to cultic sacrifice but to Jesus Christ. Secondly, forgiveness of sins is closely associated with the gift of the Spirit which comes with repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus. For Luke the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit are linked with the promise of God (Lk 24.47-49; Acts 1.4ff; 2.16-21; 2.39; 10.43f). Thirdly, the Gentiles are included in God's new way of dealing with the sins of the people (Acts 10.43ff; 11.18).

The next step is to examine whether Luke's thinking of the forgiveness of sins in such ways can be connected with the fulfilment of the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34.

The chief point of significance here is that forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit were understood by Luke as the fulfilment of the promise of God to his people. To start with, Luke understands the significance of the birth of Jesus in relation not only to the forgiveness of sins but also to the OT promise of the covenant. He relates the significance of the birth of Jesus to David and Abraham (Lk 1.69, 73) and, furthermore, to God's remembrance of his covenant and the bestowal of the knowledge of salvation by the forgiveness of sins (Lk 1.76-77).<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> New, "Name", 132ff; cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, "Jesus in the Early Church through the Eyes of Luke-Acts", *Scripture Bulletin*, 17 (1987), 28-29.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Matthew who points out that "Jesus is the son of David and the son of Abraham" (Mt 1.1), with whom God had established his covenant and promised the seed (cf. Gen 17; 2 Sam 7). Moreover, he also points out the significance of the birth of Jesus which had to do with forgiveness of sins (Mt 1.21) and God's actual dwelling in the midst of his people (Mt 1.22). In John, one corollary of Jesus' birth is God's dwelling in the midst of his people (John 1.14). In Mark, Jesus is introduced as one who has the authority to announce forgiveness of sins (Mk 2.5-10; cf. Lk 7.48).

As mentioned above, the close link between the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit is interpreted as the fulfilment of the promise of God to his people, those who the Lord called to himself (Acts 2.38f; cf. Lk 24.47-49; Acts 2.33; 10.43ff; 11.18). Here, it is worth observing that for Luke the coming of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost is the fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham, since Luke understands that the gift of the Spirit is God's promise to all nations (Acts 2.39). The phrase "all who are far off" (all nations) seems to include the Gentiles because for Luke the reception of the gift of the Spirit is the mark that God has accepted the Gentiles (Acts 10, 11). Nor should it be forgotten that for Luke (as for Matthew), God is able to raise up children to Abraham apart from the physical offspring of Abraham (Lk 3.8; cf. Mt 3.9).

The close association of the forgiveness of sins with the gift of the Spirit as God's promise to his people is significant for the question of the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff. This is because the forgiveness of sins is not only the essential element of the new covenant established by Jesus at the Last Supper but is also one of the important promises of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff and Ezek 36.25ff. I have already noted that Luke relates the significance of the birth of Jesus to David and Abraham (Lk 1.69, 73) and, furthermore, to God's remembrance of his covenant and the bestowal of the knowledge of salvation by forgiveness of sins (Lk 1.76-77).

In conclusion, the close connection between the forgiveness of sins and the fulfilment of the promise of the covenant with regard to Jesus indicates that Luke understands the gift of the Spirit to be associated with forgiveness of sin. Presumably, then, he understands this to be the fulfilment not only of the promise of the Abrahamic covenant but also of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff, since for Luke, Jesus established the new covenant for the forgiveness of sins.<sup>52</sup> Here therefore we may assume that although Luke does not refer to Jer 31.31ff in

---

<sup>52</sup> See above pp. 184ff.

Luke-Acts, he nevertheless understands the forgiveness of sins experienced by the first Christians as the fulfilment of Jer 31.

#### **6.1.4 Synopsis**

The writer of Hebrews states that the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34 was fulfilled by the death of Christ. For him the forgiveness of sins mediated through the death of Jesus is eschatological, because Christ offered himself once for all for the sins of the people as high priest and mediator of the new covenant (Heb 8.8ff; 9.13ff; 10.1-18).

Even though Paul does not say explicitly that the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34 was fulfilled by the death of Jesus, it is not difficult to assume that he too understands the death of Jesus to be this fulfilment, as the writer of Hebrews does. First of all, it is clear that for Paul the death of Jesus is a more effective and final means of dealing with sin than the cultic means. Secondly, as I have argued in 5.1.2, Paul interprets the death of Jesus in terms of the curse of the covenant in order to redeem the people from the curse (Gal 3.13). He relates the purpose of Christ's death to the reception of the promise of the Spirit which he connects with the blessing of Abraham (Gal 3.14; cf. Gal 4.5).

In short, Paul's association of the death of Jesus with redemption from the curse of the covenant and with the gift of the Spirit seems to indicate that for Paul the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34 was fulfilled by the death of Jesus (Gal 3.13f). This is an idea which is not mentioned by the author of Hebrews.

It is also clear that for Luke the forgiveness of sins is related not to the cultic sacrifices but to the death of Christ. The forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in the name of Jesus to all nation (Lk 24.47; cf. 10.43; 11.18). The forgiveness of

sins of believers is closely linked to their repentance, baptism in the name of Jesus Christ and the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2.38). Furthermore, Luke understands the forgiveness of sins as being eschatological. Here we can compare Luke's thinking on the forgiveness of sins with that of Paul and of the author of Hebrews.

First of all, Luke's close association of the forgiveness of sins with the death of Jesus can be understood in the light of the way he presents Jesus' identification with the people as their representative at Jordan (Lk 3.21) and of his designation of Jesus' death on the cross as his baptism, the cup [of wrath] (Lk 12.49f; 22.42; cf. Mk 10.38). Luke's understanding here seems to be in accordance with that of Paul and the author of Hebrews that Jesus died for believers as their representative.

Secondly, his understanding of the close connection between the forgiveness of sins and the Father's promise accords with Paul's view of the connection between redemption from the curse of the law and the promise to Abraham (Gal 3.13f). Luke's position also accords with that of the author of Hebrews regarding the forgiveness of sins in the new covenant and the eternal inheritance (Heb 9.13ff).

Thirdly, Luke's understanding of the forgiveness of sins as eschatological accords with that of Paul and the author of Hebrews.

Fourthly, Luke's close association of the forgiveness of sins with the gift of the Spirit is similar to Paul's linking the death of Jesus with redemption from the curse of the law and with the gift of the Spirit (Gal 3.13f).

In conclusion, Paul and Luke do not say as explicitly as the author of Hebrews does that the promise of the forgiveness of sins in Jer 31.34 was fulfilled by the death of Jesus. The author of Hebrews, Paul and Luke have different emphases in their understanding of the forgiveness of sins. Nevertheless, as I have shown above, it is not difficult to see that they are moving in the same circle of ideas. Therefore, we can say with some degree of confidence that the promise of the

forgiveness of sins and its fulfilment were more influential in shaping Paul's and Luke's understanding of God's saving action, than at first seems to be the case. Although Paul and Luke do not refer to Jer 31, they understand the forgiveness of sins as the fulfilment of Jer 31 just as does the author of Hebrews.

## **6.2 The New Covenant and the Law**

I have already argued in chapter 5 that 2 Cor 3 shows that for Paul the new covenant people can keep the law in the Spirit because in the new covenant the hardened heart is removed for those who are in Christ by the work of the Spirit. The aim here is to ascertain whether Paul's understanding in 2 Cor 3 that the new covenant people can keep the law in the Spirit is also present in the other Pauline epistles, and whether a similar idea can be found in Hebrews and Luke-Acts.

### *i). The Pauline Epistles*

I shall begin my argument by further consideration of 2 Cor 3. In 2 Cor 3.18 Paul relates the removal of the hardness of heart to transformation into the image of the Lord. He points out that those who see the glory of the Lord with unveiled face are being transformed into the image of the Lord. Paul explains the work of the Spirit in terms of "being transformed into the same image from glory to glory" (2 Cor 3. 18). The "same image" (*ἡ αὐτῇ εἰκῶν*) here must be understood in terms of the image of Christ because "the glory of the Lord" (*ἡ δόξα κυρίου*) in v 18, which is related to the same image, can be understood as "the glory of Christ" (*ἡ δόξα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*) who is the image of God (2 Cor 4.4; cf. 4.6).

Paul maintains in 2 Cor 3.18 that already in their present life believers experience the process of being transformed into the image of Christ from glory to glory



through the work of the Spirit, even though that glory will not be completed until the resurrection, when Christ will transform their bodies to become like the body of his glory (Phil 3.21; cf. 1 Cor 15.49; Col 3.4). Here we can see the fact that for Paul the work of the Spirit in this transformation into the image of Christ is closely connected with believers' sharing the glory of Christ.<sup>53</sup> My concern here is whether the believer's ongoing transformation by the work of the Spirit is related to keeping the law. The context does not answer this question though it does speak about the work of the Spirit in the transformation. However, it is to be assumed that transformation into the image of Christ means becoming like Christ, that is, reproducing the characteristics of Christ's life. It is not necessary to argue that for Paul the outstanding characteristic of Christ's life was his love for others.

For Paul believers are being transformed into the image of Christ in the process of loving others (Rom 13.8ff; Gal 5.13-14; 6.2; Phil 2.1ff; cf. John 13.34). In Rom 13.8ff, having exhorted the Christians in Rome to "love one another" (vv. 8-10), Paul urges them to "put off the works of darkness" (v. 12) and to "put on the Lord Jesus Christ" (v. 14). Paul here speaks of the believer's conduct.<sup>54</sup> The implication seems to be that Paul encourages believers to model their conduct on Christ. Paul's use of the term "put on" here as an imperative indicates that believers should model their conduct on that of Jesus (cf. Col 3.9-10; Eph 4.24).<sup>55</sup> In the broader context, the phrase "ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν" must be understood in relation to the believer's love of his neighbour under the

<sup>53</sup> Dunn, *Jesus and Spirit*, 320f.

<sup>54</sup> In Gal 3.27, Paul uses "Χριστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι" in connection with baptism into Christ. However, it is clear that Paul does not refer to the baptism here: whereas in Gal 3.27 Paul uses the past indicative, here he uses the imperative - continuing force (Cranfield, *Romans*, II, 688; Dunn, *Baptism*, 109-111; *Romans*, 791).

<sup>55</sup> Dunn, *Romans*, 790f; "Paul's Knowledge of the Jesus Tradition: The Evidence of Romans", 6 (ms) (forthcoming Festschrift for W. Trilling). Dunn remarks that Paul "recalls the 'putting on' language used for the transforming enduement and empowering of the Spirit in the OT (Judg 6.34; 1 Chron 12.18, 19; 2 Chron 24.24; so also Luke 24.49)" (p. 7 (ms)).

heading of Rom 12.9: "Let love be without hypocrisy". Many of the echoes of the Jesus tradition in Rom 12.9-21 probably indicate that Paul was familiar with the collection of Jesus' sayings on the theme of love of neighbour and enemy found in the "Sermon on the Plain" (12.14, Lk 6.28; 12.17, Lk 6.27-36; 12.21, Lk 6.27-36; cf. 14.10, Lk 6.37).<sup>56</sup>

The significant point of these passages is the fact that for Paul "to love one's neighbour" is the summary of the whole law (Rom 13.9) and the fulfilment of the law (Rom 13.8, 10). In Rom 13.8 Paul says, "he who loves his neighbour has fulfilled the law". He explains this further in vv. 9-10. In v. 9, after quoting certain commandments from the decalogue, he says, "if there is any other commandment, it is summed up in this saying, 'you shall love your neighbour as yourself'." Moreover, he says in v. 10, "love does no wrong to a neighbour, therefore, love is the fulfilment of the law". In Rom 15.2 Paul again exhorts, "let each of us please his neighbour for his good, to his edification". Since this is the only other occasion that Paul uses *πλησίου* (apart from the Lev 19.18 quotation in 13.9 and Gal 5.14), he is presumably still thinking in terms of 19.18.<sup>57</sup> It is worth noting that in the NT Lev 19.18 is the most frequently cited passage in all the Pentateuch (Mt 5.43; 19.19 Mk 12.31, 33; Gal 5.14; James 2.8). What is significant for the present study is that for Paul the fulfilment of the law is summed up as loving one's neighbour as oneself. For him "to love one's neighbour" sums up the law.<sup>58</sup>

Paul introduces the same idea in Gal 5.13-6.2. In Gal 5.13 he says, "you were called to freedom, brethren; only do not turn your freedom into an opportunity

---

<sup>56</sup> D. C Allison, "The Pauline Epistles and the Synoptic Gospels: The pattern of the Parallel", *NTS* 28 (1982), 11f; Dunn, *Romans*, 738.

<sup>57</sup> Käsemann, *Romans*, 356; Michel, *Römer*, 355; Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 2, 731; Dunn, *Romans*, 779f.

<sup>58</sup> Dunn observes that in the NT Lev 19.18 is the most frequently cited passage in all the Pentateuch (Mt 5.43; 19.19 Mk 12.31, 33; Gal 5.14; James 2.8 (*Romans*. 779).

for the flesh, but through love serve one another". In v. 14 he again points out, "to love one another" is the fulfilment of the whole law: "the whole law is fulfilled in one word, 'you shall love your neighbour as yourself'." In Gal 5.25-6.1 he goes on to urge that those who are led by the Spirit must walk by the Spirit. And in Gal 6.1-2 he concludes that "to bear one another's burdens" is to fulfil the law of Christ (Gal 6.2) in an exhortation paralleling Rom 15.1-3, where the parallel strengthens the likelihood that by "the law of Christ" Paul means the law interpreted by Christ, the love command.<sup>59</sup>

Paul implies that the fulfilment of the requirement of the law is possible for those who live "according to the Spirit" (Rom 8.4). In Gal 5.16ff Paul points out that if believers live in the Spirit and walk by the Spirit, they are able to bear the fruit of love (vv. 22-23). The Spirit imparts the love of Christ into the hearts of the believers. In other words, the Spirit gives an inward power and willingness to love, so that believers can fulfil the requirement of the law, that is, the law of Christ.

A further question raised here is whether the fulfilment of the law of Christ entails observance of the law of Moses. This question can be answered by Paul's assertion that the uncircumcised man keeps the law (Rom 2.26ff). In Rom 2.26ff Paul maintains that if the uncircumcised man keeps the law, his uncircumcision will be regarded as circumcision because circumcision is of the heart by the Spirit. Keeping the law here is related to the circumcision of the heart by the Spirit. It is noteworthy that in the OT circumcision of the heart was also promised in con-

---

<sup>59</sup> Bruce comments, "the law of Christ is for Paul the whole tradition of Jesus' ethical teaching, confirmed by his character and conduct (cf. Rom 13.14; 2 Cor 10.1) and reproduced within his people by the power of the Spirit (cf. Rom 8.2)" (*Galatians*, 261). This idea accords with the Gospel writings. According to John, Jesus said to the disciples, "a new commandment I give to you, that you love one another, even as I have loved you, that you also love one another" (John 13.34). The law of Christ cannot be different from the commandment "to love another", which is the second part of the summary of the whole law (cf. Mt 22.40; Mk 12.31b; Lk 10.27) (Barrett, *Freedom*, 80, 83).

nection with keeping the law (Deut 10.16; 30.6; cf. Jer 4.4; 9.25-26). The promise of circumcision of the heart must be understood as identical to the promise that God will send the Spirit and transform the hardened heart by the Spirit in order that those whose hearts have been circumcised will keep the law (Ezek 11.19-20; 36.26f; cf. Jer 31.33f). U. Wilckens, observing that the phrase "ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι" is similar to the antithesis ἐν τῷ φανερωῷ/ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, maintains that Paul alludes to Jer 31.33 and Ezek 19.19f (36.26) here in v. 29 and also in 2 Cor 3.3, 6.<sup>60</sup> It is clear that Paul intends to say here in Rom 2.26ff that believers keep the law by the Spirit.

Käsemann maintains that Paul is speaking hypothetically here in Rom 2.26ff when he refers to the Gentiles' keeping of the law. He says, "it is improbable that Paul would say that the Jews could not keep the law and then argue that the Gentile does".<sup>61</sup> However, there is no evidence in the context to provide clear support for such a hypothetical interpretation. Furthermore, the work of the Spirit in v. 29 indicates that Paul is thinking of a genuine keeping of the law by the Spirit. Paul's argument here is not that whereas the Jews cannot keep the law perfectly, the Gentile does<sup>62</sup> but that the Gentile is able to keep the law by the work of the Spirit.

It is necessary to clarify the fact that keeping the law by the Spirit does not mean fulfilling ritual laws and outward requirements because Paul points out that Jews who merely observe these commandments in fact break the law. Rather, keeping the law by the Spirit must be understood in terms of loving one's neighbour (Rom 13.8).<sup>63</sup>

<sup>60</sup> U. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*. EKKNT VI/1 (Zurich, Köln and Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1978), 156). He says "dass Paulus hier (im Unterschied zu V 15) an Jer 38 (31).33; Ez 11.19f; 36.26 denkt, zeigt eine Stelle aus dem früheren 2 Korintherbrief (3.3, 6)".

<sup>61</sup> E. Käsemann, *Romans*, 73; cf. Käsemann, "The Spirit and the Letter", in *Perspectives on Paul*, ET (Phila., 1972), 140-141.

<sup>62</sup> T. Schreiner, "Paul", 271.

<sup>63</sup> In connection with the idea of keeping the law, two more questions can be raised: a)

ii). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*

whether the new covenant people are obliged to keep every OT law and b) whether they can keep it perfectly. I shall now consider these questions briefly.

First of all, with regard to a), it is to be noted that for Paul, some commandments of the OT are no longer considered binding for the new covenant people. This applies at least to circumcision (1 Cor 7.19), the special days of Israel (Gal 4.10; cf. Col 2.16-17) and the food laws (Rom 14.2f; cf. Col 2.16-17). In 1 Cor 7.19, Paul says, "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God". Circumcision is a very important commandment in the OT. Is Paul then contradicting himself or is he unaware of any tension between "the commandments of God" and "circumcision"? It is hardly conceivable that either of these could be the case. Rather, for Paul, believers are able to fulfil the law, even though they do not keep it in every particular. Barrett seems to be right when he comments, "it is possible, in his [Paul's] view, to be circumcised and not to keep God's commandments, and equally to keep God's commandments without being circumcised" (Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 169).

Nevertheless, Paul's attitude towards the law has recently been hotly debated. Here I shall selectively mention some of the different understandings of Paul's view of the law. One group of scholars maintains that Paul's understanding of the law underwent a development during his missionary work (e.g. J. W. Drane, *Paul*; Hübner, *Law*). Another group claims that "contradictions and tensions have to be accepted as constant features of Paul's theology of the law" (Räsänen, *Paul*, 11; cf. Sanders, *Paul and Law*). Both groups claim that Paul has different thoughts about the law in different letters and that his thinking on the law in Galatians is different from that in Romans. However, opposing this idea, Dunn suggests that the focal point in understanding Paul's view of the law is to recognize that Paul's negative statements on the law are directed against the use of the law not only as "identity and boundary" of the Jewish community, but also as "national restrictions, separation of Jew from Gentile" ("New Perspective", "Incident" and "Works of the Law"; cf. see p. 221 n. 154). As far as the commandments mentioned above are concerned, Dunn's suggestion seems to be more convincing. It is to be noted that these commandments are related to national restrictions, the Jews' separation from the Gentiles. Even though Paul did not distinguish explicitly between moral and ceremonial elements in the law, the implication is fairly clear that for Paul, believers were not bound by those commandments which distinguished or separated Jews from Gentiles. Paul is convinced that in Christ there is no distinction between the Jews and the Gentiles (Gal 3.28).

On the other hand, S. Westerholm opposes the idea that while Paul does not believe that the believer is to observe the OT ceremonial law, he does believe that the believer is obliged to observe its moral commands (Cranfield, "Law", 67; H. Wendland, *Ethik des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen, 1978), 57). He submits, "were that the case, .... Paul would have had to provide his churches with detailed instruction as to which commands they were obliged to observe and which they were not: this is obviously a very important matter!" ("Letter and Spirit", 242-243). Then he concludes "but there is no evidence that he made any such distinctions" (*Ibid*).

Even though Paul does not distinguish between moral and ceremonial law in the Torah, as mentioned above, he points out that there are some commandments which are no longer binding on Christians. On the other hand, however, Christians are obliged to fulfil the commandment, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself", which is the summary of the moral elements in the Torah. Furthermore, even though Paul may not have provided his churches with detailed instructions, his churches probably did not find it difficult to determine which commands they were obliged to observe and which they were not. This is because for Paul any commandment which makes a distinction between the Jews and the Gentiles is no longer binding for Christians.

Secondly, concerning b), it is worth noting that Paul makes an antithesis between the flesh

The author of Hebrews, having quoted Jer 31.33f in Heb 10.16f, emphasizes that believers have a new way of living (vv. 10.19ff). It is likely that, for the author, the forgiveness of the sins of Christians is inseparable from their new way of life (Heb 10.19ff). He points out that Christians whose hearts are cleansed from an evil conscience must consider how to stimulate one another to love and good deeds. According to Heb 9.14 the purpose of cleansing the conscience of Christians from dead works is that they might serve the living God. Michel, observing that good deeds stand against dead works (Heb 6.1; 9.14), remarks that the good deeds refer to mutual service in a new obedience ("sie [die guten Werke] beziehen sich auf den gegenseitigen Dienst im neuen Gehorsam").<sup>64</sup>

How does the author think that Christians should carry out this mutual service in love and good deeds? As mentioned above, the conscience of Christians is cleansed from dead works in order that they may to serve the living God (Heb 9.14). Furthermore, Christians have experienced enlightenment, the inward operation of the Holy Spirit, so that they can do the will of God with endurance (Heb 10.32, 36; cf. 6.4; 10.29). This idea seems to be similar to Ezekiel's promise concerning the observance of the law in conjunction with the cleansing of the heart and the giving of the Spirit (Ezek 36.25ff). The author's emphasis on loving one another is also similar to that of Paul. Paul's case is that to "love one

---

and the Spirit (Rom 8.5; Gal 5.16-17). In Gal 5.16-17 Paul says, "walk by the Spirit and you will not carry out the desire of the flesh, for the flesh sets its desire against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are in opposition to one another, so that you may not do the things that you please". Furthermore, it is also important to note that Paul points out that believers live not only in the new age (2 Cor 5.17; 6.2), but also in the evil age (Gal 1.4; 1.13; 6.12; Eph 2.2; cf. Rom 12.1f) at the same time. In short, the antithesis between the renewed mind and the flesh in believers, together with the fact that believers live not only in the new age but also in the evil age must be the reason why the new covenant people cannot and do not keep the law perfectly.

In conclusion, for Paul, believers are no longer bound by those commandments which separate Jews from Gentiles, since in Christ there is no distinction between them. On the other hand, even though the new covenant people can keep the law in the Spirit, they cannot and do not keep it perfectly, because their freedom from the sinful passion of the flesh is not yet completed in this world. Hence believers look forward to the coming *parousia*, when all the promises of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff will be consummated.

<sup>64</sup> Michel, *Hebräer*, 348.

another” is the fulfilment of the law. Here we may say that the author seems to understand the Christians’ new way of living, mutual service in love and good deeds, in connection with the idea of the law written on the heart in Jer 31.33 in order that it might be kept.

*iii). Luke-Acts*

There are various views concerning Luke’s understanding of the relationship between the law and the believers. J. Jervell maintains that the law is not invalidated, abridged or outmoded.<sup>65</sup> D. Catchpole expresses a similar view. According to him, “Luke’s view [is] that Gentile converts participate in that true Judaism set out by Moses and fulfilled in Jesus, provided they respect the law”.<sup>66</sup> On the other hand, C. Blomberg says that in the early church “the law was not abolished but it was no longer directly relevant for the church *apart from* its fulfilment in and interpretation by the Lord Jesus”.<sup>67</sup> Furthermore, according to S. G. Wilson, for Luke a few or basic (often ethical) commands in summaries of the law are “considered to be incumbent upon all Christians regardless of their origin (Lk 10.25f; 11.41; Acts 10.35; 15.20f)”.<sup>68</sup> M. A. Seifred proposes, “for Luke another ethic, one based on the messianic status of Jesus, has replaced the Mosaic Law as the imperative which is incumbent on both the believing community and the world at large”.<sup>69</sup> Further, he clarifies his view that the stipulations of the Mosaic law are binding only in the situations in which this new ethic, derived from the resurrected Lord, enforces them”.<sup>70</sup> In short, in view of these various

---

<sup>65</sup> J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis, 1972), 143.

<sup>66</sup> D. Catchpole, “Paul, James, and the Apostolic Decree”, *NTS* 23 (1977), 428.

<sup>67</sup> C. Blomberg, “the Law in Luke-Acts”, *JSNT* 22 (1984), 70; M. Turner maintains a similar view: “it [the law] was not imposed on Gentiles and it was theologically irrelevant to the salvation of Jewish Christians (“The Sabbath, Sunday, and the Law in Luke/Acts”, in *Sabbath*, 123-24).

<sup>68</sup> S. G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, SNTSMS 50 (Cambridge, 1983), 103.

<sup>69</sup> M. A. Seifred, “Jesus and the Law in Acts”, *JSNT* 30 (1987), 40.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.* in other words, Luke “maintains an ethic which transcends Torah”.

views cited above, it is to be noticed that the dominant opinion is that for Luke the law was not totally abrogated to the believer.

With regard to the present study the concern here is whether there is any evidence in Luke-Acts that the new covenant people can fulfil the law in Christ by the work of the Spirit. I propose here the possibility that this idea can be found in such passages as Acts 2.41ff and 4.32ff, summaries of the life of the early church. Two things can be suggested to support this as being plausible.

First of all, the life of the new covenant community was the result of the Spirit's coming. Luke's description of a summary of the life of the early church in Acts 2.41ff, as mentioned elsewhere,<sup>71</sup> clearly indicates that their daily life was inspired by the Spirit. A further summary of the life of the early church can be seen in Acts 4.32-37. Luke's description of the life of early church here also indicates that their life was related to the Spirit, since Luke indicates that "they were filled with the Spirit" (v. 31).<sup>72</sup>

Secondly, the sharing of wealth and the communal meal with others characterize the believers' love for their neighbours. In Acts 2.45 Luke records that the believers sold their property and possessions and shared them with all who might have need (cf. Acts 4.34f). This sharing with others was a distinctive feature by which the believer lived together and practised some kind of common ownership.<sup>73</sup>

Some commentators suggest that the Qumran community adopted this way of Life (cf. 1QS 1.11-13; 6.2, 16-25; 7.6-8).<sup>74</sup> However, it is necessary to clarify

---

<sup>71</sup> See above pp. 190ff.

<sup>72</sup> Dunn, *Baptism*, 51.

<sup>73</sup> D. L. Mealand, "Community of Goods and Utopian allusions in Acts 2-4", *JTS* 28 (1977), 96-99; Marshall, *Acts*, 84.

<sup>74</sup> e.g. G. Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1. Teil (Freiburg, Basel and Wien, 1980), 288; Marshall, 84; cf. Josephus, *Bell*, II, 122f.



the difference between them. The Qumran community had a strict regulation that the new convert's wealth was transferred to the community after he had completed two years among the community and this transfer was decided by the full members' "lot" (1Qs 6.21-23). Furthermore, the new member's wealth was transferred to the community and was irrespective of the needs of other poor members. On the other hand, in Acts, the selling of property was clearly voluntary. R. B. Rackham notes evidence, such as, "the special commendation bestowed upon Joseph Barnabas so doing" (Acts 4.36f), "the word of Peter to Ananias" (Acts 5.1ff) and the reference to "the house of Mary the mother of Mark" (Acts 12.12).<sup>75</sup>

Moreover, they did this for the poor by the work of the Spirit (Acts 2.45; 4.33f; 5.3). It is to be observed that Luke does not use the word ἀγάπη anywhere in Luke-Acts except in Lk 11.42. This indicates that Luke seems to be less interested in ethical conduct as the sign of the Spirit's working. Rather he is concerned about the charismatic experience of believers, i.e. the joy experienced by believers, which resulted from the Spirit's work in them (Acts 2.46; 13.52). However, the implication seems to be that the motive for the common use of wealth is derived from the believers' love for their fellow believers. Luke's description of the communal meal in Acts 2.46 also indicates this: "they were taking their meals together with gladness and sincerity of heart". It is generally recognized that for the oriental a communal meal was a sign of acceptance, trust and brotherhood.<sup>76</sup> The communal meal with gladness and sincerity of heart shows that the motive of these meals is what other NT writers could designate "love", since the joy which characterizes their daily affairs was governed by the Spirit (cf. 13.52).<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> R. B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1909<sup>4</sup>), 42.

<sup>76</sup> Jeremias, *New Testament Theology. Part one: The Proclamation of Jesus*, ET (London, 1971), 115; Dunn, *Unity*, 162.

<sup>77</sup> I. H. Marshall, *Acts*, 85.

In conclusion, even though in these two passages Luke does not use the word ἀγάπη, these passages indicate that one of the distinctive features of the life of believers in the early church is love of neighbour in the Spirit. It is hardly to be denied that this mode of the life originated from the work of the the Spirit within the believer. His description of the believers' mutual love in the Spirit in the sharing of wealth and the communal meals with others shows that Luke speaks of a reality which Paul would have called "to love" in the Spirit, the fulfilment of the law of Christ, the whole summary of the law.

### **6.3 Entry into the New Covenant Community**

In chapter 5 I examined the early church belief that Jesus established the new covenant at the Last Supper and that the disciples entered into the new age, the age of the new covenant on the Day of Pentecost. Accordingly, they formed the new covenant community. Luke reports that the number of this new community increased day by day (Acts 2.47). In contrast it was shown in chapter 4 that the members of the Qumran community were convinced that they were the only members of the new covenant. In consequence the Qumran community applied a distinct procedure for new members' entry into its new covenant. Here, then, arises the equivalent question of entry into the new covenant community established on the Day of Pentecost: How does entry into this "new covenant community" compare with that of the Qumran community?

It is generally accepted that Luke describes the pattern for Christian entry into the new covenant community in Acts 2.38.<sup>78</sup> Luke connects this entry with a number of elements - hearing the kerygma (the preaching of Christ) and response

---

<sup>78</sup> E.g. J. H. E. Hull, *The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1967), 88, 95; G. Stählin, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, NTD 5 (Göttingen, 1968), 53; Dunn, *Baptism*, 90; Gaffin, *Perspective on Pentecost* (Phillipsburg, NJ, 1979), 31-32; J. Stott, *Baptism and Fullness: The Work of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove, ILL, 1977), 29.

to it (repentance), baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. In this section  $\epsilon$  . . . in addition to examining these elements,<sup>80</sup> I shall look briefly at some passages in the Pauline epistles and in the epistle to the Hebrews to see whether a similar sequence can be found.

*i). Hearing of the kerygma and response to it*

Luke recounts how on the Day of Pentecost Peter, himself filled with the Holy Spirit, explained the coming of the Spirit to the multitude by preaching Christ. He declared that God had made Jesus, whom they had crucified, both Lord and Christ (Acts 2.36). The response of Peter's audience was to call out "Brethren what shall we do?" This response implies a conviction of guilt. In Acts 2.41 those who were baptised were described as those who had received his word. The phrase "those who had received Peter's word" seems to indicate that they had repented of their sins because he urged them to repent before baptism (v. 38).<sup>81</sup>

In the case of Philip's work in Samaria, Luke records that Philip proclaimed Christ to the Samaritans (Acts 8.4-5). In this case, the response of Philip's hearers is their faith in Jesus Christ: they believed Philip's preaching of the good news about the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ (v. 12). In v. 14 this whole sequence is described as "Samaria had received the word of God". Here "to believe Philip's preaching" (and to be baptized) is the same as "to receive the word of God". A similar description is found in the case of Cornelius' household (Acts 11.1). At Cornelius' house Peter also proclaimed Christ. Luke's description of the readiness of Cornelius to hear Peter's message (Acts 10.33),

---

<sup>80</sup> I shall not consider the forgiveness of sins here because I have already discussed it in 6.1 and it is closely related to the gift of the Spirit.

<sup>81</sup> See above pp. 249ff.

and that of his household (Acts 10.44), indicates that the hearers were listening to the message with faith.

Here we can see the two elements which occur in the response to the hearing of the *kerygma* - repentance and faith. It is important to note that these two elements are closely linked with each other in Acts. For Luke "to repent" is parallel with "to receive the word of God". He describes the case of Cornelius' household both with regard to their receiving the word of God (Acts 11.1) and God's granting to them repentance unto life (Acts 11.18). Dunn remarks on the indispensable link between repentance and man's act of faith by pointing to the three principal words used by Luke: *μετανόειν*, *ἐπιστρέφειν*, *πιστεύειν*.<sup>82</sup>

Luke's description of the hearing of the *kerygma* and response to it with repentance and faith is similar to Paul's teaching that conversion is initiated by hearing the word of Christ and by response to it with faith (Gal 3.1ff; cf. 1 Thess 1.5-9; 2.13). The author of Hebrews seems likewise to relate the hearing of the *kerygma* (Heb 2.1ff), repentance and faith to conversion-initiation (Heb 6.1, 6). In Heb 2.1 the author admonishes the readers that they must pay close attention to what they have heard. That is the message of salvation which was spoken to them by those who had been instructed by the Lord Christ (Heb 2.3). The author regards repentance and faith as a foundation (*θεμέλιον*) for Christian doctrines, and therefore they do not need to be renewed or repeated (Heb 6.1, 6). It is likely that for the author, the hearing of the *kerygma*, repentance and faith are fundamental elements for entry into the new covenant.

*ii). Baptism in the name of Jesus Christ*

It is clear that baptism in the name of Jesus Christ was regarded as an

---

<sup>82</sup> Dunn, *Baptism*, 91: "each described the act from a different angle: *μετανόειν* always has the sense of turning away from (*ἀπό*) sin; *ἐπιστρέφειν* always has the sense of turning to (*εἰς*) God; and *πιστεύειν* has essentially the sense of commitment to (*εἰς*) Christ".

important element for entering into the new community (Acts 2.38; 8.16; 10.48; 19.5; cf. 1 Cor 1.13). It is to be noted that the new convert was baptised *in the name of Jesus Christ*.<sup>83</sup> Since it is not specified who actually spoke the name of Jesus at the rite of baptism, it is difficult to say whether it was the baptizer or the baptizand or both. However, it is likely that the phrase “the name of Jesus Christ” was called not only by the baptizer but also by the baptizand.

In 1 Cor 1.10-17 Paul emphasizes that the baptizands were baptised *in the name of Jesus* by pointing out that no baptizer baptized in Paul’s name. It is important to note that Paul’s emphasis here is related to the fact that divisions had arisen among the Corinthian Christians centred His emphasis here on the name of Jesus indicates that baptism signifies the baptizand’s belonging to Christ and his commitment to him.<sup>84</sup> In Hebrews also it is not difficult to see that baptism is closely related to entry into the new covenant community (Heb 6.1-4; 10.22).<sup>85</sup>

In short, the significance of baptism in the name of Jesus Christ lies in the fact that the baptizand is baptised in order to confess publicly that he has repented and committed himself to Jesus Christ. Furthermore, the fact that the baptizer baptizes in the name of Jesus Christ indicates that he performs the actual rite through Jesus’ power and by his authority. Baptism signifies not only the baptizand’s commitment to Jesus Christ but also his acceptance into the community in the name of Jesus Christ.

### *iii). The Gift of the Spirit*

The gift of the Spirit is closely related to entry into the new covenant com-

---

<sup>83</sup> Christian baptism can be characterized as baptism *ἐῖς, ἐν* and *ἐπὶ* the name of Jesus (*ἐῖς* -Mt 28.19; Acts 8.16; 19.5; 1 Cor 1.13-15; *ἐν* -Acts 10.48; 1 Cor 6.11; *ἐπὶ* -Acts 2.38).

<sup>84</sup> Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 47; Orr and Walter, *1 Corinthians*, 151.

<sup>85</sup> Dunn, *Baptism*, 207, 211ff.

munity. It is clear that for Luke the gift of the Spirit is the fundamental element for entry (Acts 2.1-4; 37ff; 8; 10; 19).

As mentioned above, for Luke the gift of the Spirit gave new converts an assurance of divine forgiveness of sins because their experience of the work of the Holy Spirit assured them that their sins were forgiven by God, since the gift of the Spirit was promised at the same time as the forgiveness of sins.<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, the gift of the Spirit convinced the new community that God had accepted the new converts, as well as convincing the new converts that the new age of the Spirit had come.

In the case of the Samaritans, their receiving of the Holy Spirit presumably convinced the apostles in Jerusalem that the Samaritans had received the word of God with genuine faith in Christ. Having heard about the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, the Samaritans were baptised (v. 12). However, they did not receive the gift of the Spirit until Peter and John came from Jerusalem and laid their hands upon them (cf. Acts 8.17f). What is important to note here is that the Samaritans' reception of the Spirit indicates that when they were baptised, they had a genuine faith in Christ.<sup>87</sup> This is because if their faith had been spurious, Peter and John would have had to correct their faith or baptise them again as in the case of the Ephesian disciples.

It is important to note that Luke seems to understand the facts concerning Samaritans in relation to the foundational spreading of the gospel through the activity of the apostles. Luke emphasizes three things. First, it is Samaria that has received the word of God, not merely certain individuals, but Samaria as a whole (v. 14). Secondly, it is the apostles who, having heard the news, send Peter and John. Thirdly, Peter and John are not merely individuals, but representatives

---

<sup>86</sup> See above pp. 249ff.

<sup>87</sup> *pace* Dunn, *Baptism*, 55-68.

of the entire group of apostles. In that capacity they establish the foundational witness to the Samaritans. This shows that the epochal spreading of the gospel from the boundary of Judea into Samaria was accomplished as part of the direct ministry of the apostles in fulfilment of the promise of Acts 1.8.<sup>88</sup> Therefore, their receiving of the Holy Spirit seems to have convinced the new covenant community that it should accept them without further questions.<sup>89</sup>

In the case of Cornelius' household, their reception of the Spirit again convinced the new covenant community that God had granted to the Gentiles repentance unto life and had opened the way for accepting Gentiles into the Christian community. In the case of some disciples at Ephesus (Acts 19.1-7), the gift of the Holy Spirit assured both Paul and them that what the water baptism of John had pointed to, was now fulfilled in their lives. It is true that in these several instances in Acts some have seen the reception of the Spirit as a second stage of Christian-initiation, namely, "second blessing", but Dunn has refuted this view.<sup>90</sup>

For Paul the gift of the Spirit enables the believer not only to be united with Jesus the crucified but also to share in the risen life of Jesus and so to live a new life. Paul's question to the Galatian Christians in Gal 3.3, "Having begun by the Spirit, are you now perfected by the flesh?" indicates that the gift of the Spirit is closely related to the entry of believers into the new covenant (cf. Gal 3.5f; 4.5f).<sup>91</sup> Similarly 1 Cor 12.13 indicates "baptism in the Spirit" as the mode of entry into the body of Christ, and Rom 8.9 defines "belonging to Christ" in terms of "having the Spirit".

---

<sup>88</sup> Y. K. Yu, "The Purpose of Glossolalia in the NT", Unpublished Th.M. Thesis, Westminster Theo. Seminary (1980), 62-72).

<sup>89</sup> Cf. G. H. W. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers* (London, 1967<sup>2</sup>), 69f; F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of the Acts* (Grand Rapids, 1954), 182f; Dunn, *Baptism*, 67.

<sup>90</sup> Dunn, *Baptism*.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Dunn, *Baptism*, 107f, 113f; D. J. Lull, *The Spirit in Galatia: Paul's Interpretation of Pneuma as Divine Power*, SBLDS 49 (Chico, CA, 1980), 103ff.

The author of Hebrews also seems to understand the new covenant people's experience of the Spirit in relation to entry into the new covenant (Heb 6.4f). For the author, those who had once been enlightened and those who had tasted of the heavenly gift were those who had been made partakers of the Holy Spirit (v. 4). In v. 4 there are three participles: φωτισθέντας; γευσάμενους; γεννηθέντας. The word ἅπαξ seems to indicate that the participle φωτισθέντας describes the once-for-all experience. Some commentators, noticing that the next two participles are closely linked together by τε ... καί, maintain that these participles seem to explain the once-for-all illumination.<sup>92</sup> If this is so, then here the partakers of the Holy Spirit must be the ones who received the gift of the Spirit, the important mark of entry into the new covenant.

In conclusion, any one could become a member of the new covenant community by repenting from his sins, being baptised in the name of Jesus Christ and receiving the gift of the Spirit in association with the forgiveness of sins. Unlike entry into the Qumran community, stages of admission to the NT new covenant community were not necessary for any process of purification. It is important to note that the reception of the Spirit, the fundamental element for entry into new covenant community, was not a sign of second stage initiation. It was the once-for-all experience of entry into the new covenant community (Acts 2, 8, 19; Gal 3.1ff; Heb 6.1ff). Furthermore, the receiving of the Spirit by new converts convinced both the new covenant community and new converts that God had accepted those new converts into the community. The Gentiles' reception of the Spirit was in fact the decisive act which opened the way for their acceptance into the new covenant community.

---

<sup>92</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 149; J. Moffatt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1924), 78; cf. Michel, *Hebräer*, 241.



#### 6.4 The New Covenant and the Christian Community as a Temple

I discussed in chapter 4 how the Qumran community related the concept of their community as a spiritual temple to the new covenant, and rejected the Jerusalem temple cult. Since there have recently been a number of studies on the concept of the temple in the NT,<sup>93</sup> I shall not elaborate on this here but simply investigate the relationship between the new covenant and the temple in the NT in order to complete my comparison with the DSS in the conclusion.

Even though there is no explicit expression which indicates a close link between the new covenant and the temple in the NT, it is not difficult to establish a connection between them.<sup>94</sup> In this section, first of all, I shall argue that a relationship between the new covenant and the temple in the Pauline Epistles can be found in the idea of the Christian community as the temple of God. Secondly,

---

<sup>93</sup> Gärtner, *Temple*; R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford, 1969); Klinzing, *Umdeutung*; Newton, *Purity*.

<sup>94</sup> Jeremiah's saying, "I will be their God and they shall be my people" in Jer 31.33 indicates the covenant relationship between God and the new covenant people. OT writers describe this relationship as an essential part of the covenant between God and Israel (Exod 6.7; 19.5ff; 29.45; Ezek 11.20; 36.28; cf. Gen 17.7; 2 Sam 7.14). This relationship is closely related to God's dwelling among his people in the tabernacle and the temple (Exod 29.44ff; cf. Exod 25.8; Num 5.3; Deut 12.11) (U. Cassuto, *Exodus*, 388f; J. P. Hyatt, *Exodus*, 290f; B. S. Childs, *Exodus*, 540, 550).

God commanded Moses to make the tabernacle so that he might dwell among his people (Exod 25.8). God also promised that he would consecrate the tent of meeting, and dwell among the sons of Israel and be their God (Exod 29.45; cf. Lev 9-13). A similar notion can be found with regard to the construction of the temple (2 Kg 9.3; 2 Chron 7.16). Furthermore, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the tabernacle and the temple are not only the places where God dwells among his people but also the places where the sins of the covenant people are atoned for.

The reason for the twofold function of the tabernacle and temple as the place of God's dwelling and as the location of atonement may lie in the fact that God is dwelling among his people and this requires an element of holiness of the people, since God is holy (Lev 11.44f). Here we can say that the tabernacle and the temple, as the places for atonement, are closely related to forgiveness of sins. Accordingly, the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff, which promises the forgiveness of sins and implies the promise of God's dwelling among his people, could be understood in relation to the temple. In connection with this, it is worth noting that in Ezek 37.26ff, Ezekiel relates the future establishment of the sanctuary not only to God's dwelling in the midst of his people but also to a new covenant theme (Ezek 37.25-28) which promises the forgiveness of sins (vv. 23, 26ff).

I shall discuss the relationship between the Christian community as the temple of God and the heavenly temple in Hebrews. I shall not examine Luke-Acts because Luke does not seem to make a distinctive contribution in area.<sup>95</sup>

*i). The Pauline Epistles*

First of all, concerning the relationship between the new covenant and the temple in the Pauline Epistles, it is to be noted that the idea of the Christian community as the temple of the living God is understood in connection with God's dwelling among his covenant people.<sup>96</sup> In 2 Cor 6.16ff, Paul points out that Christians are the temple of the living God (ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἔσμεν ζῶντος): "What agreement has the temple of God with idols? For we are the

---

<sup>95</sup> In Luke, it is not difficult to see the emphasis on the temple. The Gospel begins with the theme that an angel appeared to Zechariah in the temple (Lk 1.5-22) and closes with the theme that those who had seen the ascension of Jesus were continually in the temple, praising God (Lk 24.53). Jesus was taken to the temple after his birth (Lk 2.22-39). He was found by his parents in the temple (Lk 2.41-50). He drove the money changers out of the temple (Lk 19.45f). He was heard teaching the people and preaching the gospel in the temple (Lk 19.47-20.1ff). Jesus committed his spirit into the father's hands after the tearing of the curtain of the temple, and then died (Lk 23.45f). J. Dawsey, observing that the temple mount (ἱερόν) of Luke was the object of the pilgrimage at the ancient festival, and proclamation and worship were not mutually exclusive in a festival setting, remarks that the temple theme in Luke characterizes the epiphany of the Lord in the form of Jesus at the temple and the fulfilment of the expectation that God would purify his temple ("The Temple Theme in Luke", *Milita Theologica* 38 (1987), 29-30; cf. K. Baltzer, "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lucan Writings", *HTR* 58 (1965), 263-77). It is difficult to assume that the temple in Luke is replaced by the church.

In Acts Luke describes how the Jerusalem believers met in one another's houses, teaching (preaching Jesus as Christ), breaking bread and praying to God (Acts 2.42-47; 4.23-31; 5.42; 12.12). He also points out that the Apostles were standing in the temple and teaching the people (Acts 5; cf. 3.11-26). Furthermore, Acts 7.48 may indicate that for Luke or Stephen Jerusalem was not the dwelling place of God (cf. 17.24; Mk 14.58; Heb 9.24). However, some passages may imply that believers took part in the worship of the temple (Acts 2.46; 3.1-10; cf. Lk 24.52f). According to Luke, Paul observed the rites and customs of the temple (Acts 21.26; 24.6, 12, 18; 26.21). Here we may say that the clear idea of the Christian community as the temple of God on the basis of Christ's death as sacrifice for sin cannot be found in Acts.

<sup>96</sup> In 1 Cor 14.24f Paul says that if all prophesy, an unbeliever, who enters and is convicted, will fall on his face and worship God, declaring that "God is certainly among you" (v. 25). This passage may allude to Isa 45.14 and Zech 8.23 (cf. Dan 2.25). R. Martin, observing this, comments, "what was predicted of the end time, namely, the turning of the Gentiles to Israel in an acknowledgment that Israel's God was 'truly' to be found among his people, is now a present reality" (*The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12-15* (Grand Rapids, 1984), 74). For Paul the believer's true worship signifies God's presence among them.

temple of the living God; just as God said, I will dwell in them and I walk among them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (vv. 16f).<sup>97</sup> Paul, introducing the OT texts by combination and paraphrase, relates the Christian community as the temple of God to the OT concept of the temple as God's dwelling place among his covenant people. The first part of his quotation seems to be taken from Lev 26.11-12 and Ezek 37.27.<sup>98</sup> Both OT texts indicate God's dwelling among his people. The clause "I will be their God and they will be my people" clearly shows that they are God's covenant people. Paul's quotation "I will be a father to you and you will be my sons and daughters" seems to support this because it is likely that Paul freely quotes Nathan's prophecy here as found in 2 Sam 7.14, which was the blessing given to the covenant people in connection with the promise of the temple. The phrase "the sons and daughters" here seems to be a generalization of "son" in 2 Sam 7.14 (cf. Isa 43.6).<sup>99</sup> Paul's free quotations seem to be designed to emphasize the fulfilment of OT prophecies in the Christian community, the new covenant community (cf. 1 Cor 6.2).<sup>100</sup> Hence it is likely that for Paul, Ezekiel's prophecy of establishing the sanctuary in the midst of God's covenant people is fulfilled in the Christian community as the temple of the living God (cf. Jub 1.17).

Concerning the Christian community as the temple of God, what is significant is the fact that this temple is not a place for atonement but the place of God's

---

<sup>97</sup> The authenticity of 2 Cor 6.14-7.1 has been debated. R. Martin summarizes the arguments against Pauline authorship under four heading: a) the large number of *hapax legomena*; b) the spirit of exclusiveness; c) an affinity with Qumran; d) the un-Pauline use of "flesh" and "spirit" in 7.1 (*2 Corinthians*, 191ff). He, then, advocates Pauline authorship with other scholars (W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, ET (London, 1975<sup>2</sup>), 288; Hughes, *2 Corinthians*, 242; G. D. Fee, "II Corinthians VI-VII.1 and Food Offered to Idols", *NTS* 23 (1977), 140-61; M. E. Thrall, "The Problem of 2 Cor 6.14-7.1 in Some Recent Discussion", *NTS* 24 (1978), 132-48).

<sup>98</sup> Gärtner, *Temple*, 52f; McKelvey, *New Temple*, 95; Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 364; Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 204.

<sup>99</sup> McKelvey, *New Temple*, 96.

<sup>100</sup> Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 203f; cf. D. Georgi, *Opponents*, 258-264.

dwelling among his people.<sup>101</sup> In Rom 12.1f Paul appeals to Roman Christians to present their bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is their spiritual worship. In Rom 15.16 he says that he ministers to the Gentiles, acting as a priest in order that the Gentiles might become an offering. Nevertheless, it is clear that these verses do not indicate any function of atonement in the Christian community as the temple of God.<sup>102</sup> Here we can see Paul's spiritualization of the temple concept.<sup>103</sup>

The question to be raised here is, how did the early church understand that the Christian community was able to be the dwelling place of God without having an atoning function? The answer may lie in the fact that the notion of the Christian community as the temple is itself related to Jesus Christ. In 1 Cor 3.16f Paul says that the Christian community is the temple of God. He builds up this idea by introducing the image of the field (vv. 5-9) and of the building (vv. 9-15). Clearly the metaphor of the Christian community as a spiritual building is in accordance with the image of the Christian community as the temple.

Even though Christ is not mentioned in relation to the Christian community as the temple in 1 Cor 3.16-17, the fact that Christ is the foundation (*θεμέλιον*) of the spiritual building (v. 11) indicates that for Paul, Christ is inseparable from the idea of the Christian community being the temple. The implication is fairly clear that, for Paul, Christ is the foundation of the temple (cf. Eph 2.20-22). 1 Cor 6.15ff supports this idea. In this verse Paul links the close relationship between Christ and the Christian community to the relationship between Christ and the members of his body. Furthermore, he says that each of the members of

---

<sup>101</sup> In relation to Paul's use of the word *ναός* instead of the word *ἱερόν*, some scholars point out the significance that whereas *ἱερόν* refers to the whole temple, *ναός* usually refers to the "Holy Place" and the "Holy of holies, the dwelling place of God" (Gärtner, *Temple*, 53; Newton, *Purity*, 54f).

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 353, 405; Michel, *Hebräer*, 369f; Cranfield, *Romans*, II, 599ff; 755.

<sup>103</sup> Käsemann, *Romans*, 327.

his body is a temple of the Spirit (1 Cor 6.19).<sup>104</sup> It is not difficult to suppose that the idea of the Christian community as a temple of the Spirit is related to their union with Christ. For Paul, the Christian community as the temple of God is based on their union with Christ in the Spirit. This idea seems to accord with Eph 2.18-22, where the new temple is constituted by Christ and can function through him.<sup>105</sup> Christ is here described as the corner stone from which the whole building is growing into a holy temple, the dwelling place of God in the Spirit.

In short, the Christian community is able to be the dwelling place of God because of the union of believers with Christ by whom atonement has been made. Here we may conclude that the new covenant which implies the promise of God's dwelling in the midst of his people is fulfilled in the Christian community, the temple of the living God.

*ii). The Epistle to the Hebrews*

The author of Hebrews introduces the heavenly temple. He speaks of the heavenly temple as the true tent (ἡ σκηνὴ ἡ ἀληθινή) (Heb 8.2) and of its counterpart, the Jerusalem temple, as a copy (υπόδειγμα) and shadow (σκιά) (Heb 8.5; 9.23). The heavenly temple is neither made with hands nor of this creation, but is the greater and more perfect tent (Heb 9.11f, 24).

The writer relates this heavenly temple to Jesus. Jesus entered the holy place of the heavenly temple as high priest (Heb 9.24; cf. 6.19-20), and offered one

---

<sup>104</sup> there has been debate as to whether Paul's statement in 1 Cor 6.19 has been influenced by Hellenistic thought. Even though some scholars claim Hellenistic influence, McKelvey seems to be right when he distinguishes between Paul's thought and the Hellenistic idea. He points out that God's temple is the body (σωμα), which was a foreign idea to the Greek. He also remarks that an individual Christian becomes the temple of God as a member of the Christian community (McKelvey, *New Temple*, 104; cf. Newton, *Purity*, 57f.

<sup>105</sup> Gärtner, *Temple*, 100

sacrifice through his own blood for sins for all time (Heb 9.12; 10.10ff). Even though Christ is the high priest forever, there is no suggestion that Christ's priesthood continues in order to offer the sacrifice repeatedly.<sup>106</sup> Rather, the writer strongly emphasizes that Jesus' offering of himself as the sacrifice is the once-for-all sacrifice for the sins of the believer (Heb 9.22; 10.12ff).<sup>107</sup> He states that this is the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff (Heb 10.16f). Hence he emphasizes that there is no longer any offering for sin (Heb 10.18).

Furthermore, the writer emphasizes not only that Jesus opened up the way of access to God's presence for the believer but also that believers are already enjoying God's presence and sharing in the worship of the heavenly temple. The writer points out that Jesus entered into the heavenly temple as a forerunner (*πρόδρομος*) for the believer (Heb 6.19f; 9.24; cf. John 14.2).<sup>108</sup> Just as a forerunner is one who goes on ahead in order to open up the way for those who follow after, so Jesus opened up the way of access to God.<sup>109</sup> In Heb 10.19f, the writer states that believers can enter the holy place by the blood of Jesus, since Jesus inaugurated the way for them through the veil, that is, his flesh.<sup>110</sup> Concerning the believer's entry into the heavenly temple, God's presence, the writer states two things. On the one hand, believers are pilgrims to the heavenly Jerusalem (Heb 3.7-4.16; 10.19-12.29). On the other hand, believers have already come to the heavenly Jerusalem (Heb 12.22).<sup>111</sup> By implication, then, the writer thinks that

---

<sup>106</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 276f; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 124; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 385f.

<sup>107</sup> Michel, *Hebräer*, 325f.

<sup>108</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 166; Michel, *Hebräer*, 254; McKelvey, *New Temple*, 151.

<sup>109</sup> Hughes, *Hebrews*, 236.

<sup>110</sup> Concerning the writer's close connection between the veil and Jesus' flesh, see O. Hofius, *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes*, WUNT 14 (Tübingen, 1972), 76-84; Rissi, *Theologie*, 42f.

<sup>111</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 415; E. Käsemann, *The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the Hebrews*, ET (Minneapolis, 1984[57]), 53f. McKelvey, against Montefiore's translation of *προσελθῆτατε* as "have drawn near" (*Hebrews*, 229f), argues that "this epistle shares with the New Testament generally, the paradox of future hope and present realization of the 'not yet' - even now'." In relation to the translation "you have come to Mount Zion", he

even though the full realization of believers' entering into the heavenly Jerusalem is in the future, believers are already enjoying God's presence and are already sharing in the worship of the heavenly Jerusalem (Heb 12.22ff).<sup>112</sup>

It is significant that the writer says that believers themselves have an altar and offer a sacrifice to God (Heb 13.10, 15). The writer speaks of this altar in contrast to the sin offerings (Lev 4.1ff), the annual sacrifices for sin on the Day of Atonement in particular (Lev 16). The phrase "those who serve the tent have no right to eat" and the fact that the bodies of the sacrificial animals are totally burned outside the camp indicates that the author refers to the annual sacrifice on the Day of Atonement.<sup>113</sup> Otherwise, the writer is ignoring the fact that the Levitical priests can eat the sacrifices (Lev 7; cf. 1 Cor 9.13; 1 Cor 10.18). Heb 13.12ff implies that this altar is related to the death of Jesus,<sup>114</sup> but it should not be related to the believer's offering sacrifice for sin, because for the writer there is no longer any offering for sin (Heb 10.18). It is likely that the writer here indicates that believers enjoy the privilege of partaking of Christ's sacrifice, whereas the Levitical priests have no right to partake of their offering.<sup>115</sup> Concerning the believers' offering of sacrifice, the writer encourages believers to continually offer up a sacrifice to God through Christ (Heb 13.15). He points out that sacrifices here are the fruit of the lips, the acknowledgement of his name and good deeds to others and sharing with others (Heb 13.15f). He declares that such sacrifices are pleasing to God (Heb 13.16). Clearly these sacrifices are not the sacrifices for forgiveness of sins.<sup>116</sup>

---

suggests that "*προσεληλύθατε* is itself a cultic *terminus technicus* in the epistle for the access of Christians to God (4.16; 7.25; 10.22; 11.6; cf. 10.1; 12.18)" (*New Temple*, 153. cf. C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (Paris, 1952), I, 281).

<sup>112</sup> Gärtner, *Temple*, 88ff (cf. Spicq, *Hébreux*, II, 403); McKelvey, *New Temple*, 154.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Hughes, *Hebrews*, 575.

<sup>114</sup> Even though some commentators interpret the term "an altar" here as a reference to the sacrament of eucharist, most commentators explain this altar in terms of the sacrificial death of Jesus (see Hughes' *Hebrews* pp. 579f for references).

<sup>115</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 441.

<sup>116</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 441, 445f; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 244ff; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 575ff, 583f).

Believers are not only on the way to the heavenly Jerusalem but have also already come there, and are enjoying God's presence (Heb 12.22ff). Furthermore, the writer points out that believers have an altar and offer a sacrifice to God, which is not related to the believer's sacrifice for sin. Thus believers' access to God and their offering a sacrifice to Him seem to indicate that the idea of the Christian community as the temple of God is not alien to the writer's mind. It is likely that the idea of believers' enjoying God's presence through the blood of Jesus is little different in effect from the idea of the Christian community as the temple of God, of which Jesus is the foundation. Whereas the former emphasizes the believers' access to God's presence through Jesus, the latter emphasizes God's gracious presence in the midst of his people on the basis of Jesus' death for the sins of the believer. It is interesting to see that Eph 2.18 shows that the Christian community as the temple of God includes the idea of believers' access to God. Here we may conclude that these two ideas are two sides of the same coin, that of believers' communion with God through Christ.

Thus, although little developed by other NT writers (but cf. 1 Pet 2.5), the concept of the new covenant community as a temple is sufficiently relevant and congenial to play a part in their thinking.



## Conclusion

---

The main purpose of this thesis has been to consider the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31.31-34 and investigate the way the Qumran community and the early church applied it to themselves. After an initial study of Jer 31.31ff and its context, chapter 2 considered the concept of the covenant in 1 and 2 Maccabees, the Book of Jubilees and the Psalms of Solomon. This was to provide a background for a better understanding of the distinctive features of the new covenant in the DSS. Chapter 3 and chapter 5 examined the contexts in which the term "new covenant" occurs in the DSS and in the NT and argued that the members of the Qumran community and the early Christians were equally convinced that the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled among themselves. Chapter 4 and chapter 6 considered the distinctive features of the new covenant in the DSS and the NT. It remains to compare the two.

Accordingly, I shall compare (1) the concept of the new covenant in the NT with that in the DSS and (2) the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff and the concepts of its fulfilment as understood in the DSS and in the NT. In this connection, I shall consider the question of continuity and discontinuity between the old and new covenants. A further concern is to assess the extent to which the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant in the NT sheds light upon the relationship between the Old and New Testaments.

### 1. Comparison

Following the pattern adopted earlier, the comparison of the distinctive features of the new covenant in the NT with those in the DSS will be considered under four headings: i) the forgiveness of sins; ii) the relationship between the

new covenant and the law; iii) entry into the new covenant community; iv) the relationship between the new covenant and the temple.

*i). The forgiveness of sins*

Concerning the relationship between the new covenant and the forgiveness of sins we can say that even though there is some similarity, at the same time there are fundamental differences between the DSS and the NT. The similarity between them is that the forgiveness of sins is associated with the establishment of the new covenant and with repentance. The Qumran community related the forgiveness of sins to God's establishment of his covenant with the founders of the community (CD 4.6ff; 1QS 3.11) and to their repentance (CD 2.5f). In the NT forgiveness of sins is also closely related to the new covenant, in this case established by Jesus, (Mt 26.28; Mk 14.24; Lk 22.20; 1 Cor 11.25; Heb 8.8ff; cf. 1 Cor 15.3; Gal 1.4; Heb 5.1,3; 1 Peter 2.24), and to repentance (Lk 24.47ff; Acts 1.4ff; 2.37ff; 11.18; Heb 6.1ff).

The fundamental difference between them lies in the fact that, whereas in the DSS the forgiveness of sins is closely related to the "sure house" (CD 3.19), in the NT the forgiveness of sins is understood in relation to the blood or death of Jesus Christ and to union with him in the Spirit. The Qumran community was convinced that the community had an atoning function. This function related to the community as a whole rather than to any individual. The early church on the other believed that the promise of the forgiveness of sins had already been fulfilled by the death of Jesus as the covenant sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins.

The forgiveness of sins is related to the work of the Spirit in both the DSS and the NT. The Qumran community emphasized "the Spirit of holiness" by claiming that the Spirit of holiness enabled the members of the community "to live a perfect life and to please God". For them "to live a perfect life and to please

God" was the means of effecting atonement for the guilt of transgression because the community became a living temple by virtue of the habitation of the Spirit of holiness in it. However, in the NT the Spirit is closely related to the believer's forgiveness of sins. For Luke the forgiveness of sins is closely associated with the gift of the Spirit. In the Pauline epistles the work of the Spirit is understood in terms of its role in the believer's union with Christ the crucified, a sharing in his death, the death to sin. Although the early church regarded itself as the eschatological equivalent of the temple of God, there is no function of atonement in the NT idea of the church as the temple of God.<sup>1</sup>

Here we may conclude that in the Qumran community forgiveness of sins was closely related to the community's on-going function of atonement. On the other hand, in the NT forgiveness of sins is eschatological, since the promise of the forgiveness of sins has already been fulfilled by the death of Jesus as a once-for-all sacrifice for forgiveness of sins and this forgiveness of sins is known by all those who are united with the death of Jesus in the Spirit.

*ii). The New Covenant and the Law*

Here also there are clear similarities and dissimilarities between the DSS and the NT, at least as far as Paul's letters are concerned. The similarities can be discerned at two points: a) both the Qumran community and Paul maintained that the new covenant people kept the law; b) continuity and discontinuity between the old and new covenants can be found in the DSS and in Paul's letters.

The differences between them can be seen in two key areas. First of all, the Qumran community maintained that God had established the new covenant with them by revealing to them the hidden things in the Books of the Law (CD 3.10-14; cf. 1QS 5.11). The reason for the establishment of the new covenant with them,

---

<sup>1</sup> See below pp. 286f.

they suggested, was that while all the rest of Israel broke the covenant which God had made with their fathers and all the rest of Israel went astray in the hidden things, they alone adhered to the commandments of God. Accordingly, the community emphasized the strict observance of the law of Moses according to the new interpretation of the sons of Zadok.

For Paul the problem with the old covenant lay not in the fact that there are hidden things in the law, but in the fact that the minds of the Israelites were hardened. Even though the hardened Jews supposed that they kept the law, for Paul they no longer kept the law itself but only the letter because their hearts were hardened. In fact, for Paul their external observance of the letter actually broke the law. Paul points out that on the other hand, in the new covenant the hardened heart is removed in Christ by the work of the Spirit. What he emphasizes is that the believer needs to walk by the Spirit in order to fulfil the law of Christ, that is, "to love one another". Paul seems to understand the keeping of the law in the Spirit as the fulfilment of the promise: God will send the Spirit and transform the hardened heart by the Spirit so that his people will be able to keep the law (cf. Ezek 11.19-20; 36.26-27). Here we may say that the ability to keep the law through transformation of the hardened heart by the Spirit can be understood in terms of the law being put in the heart (Jer 31.33) and the fear of God being put in the heart (Jer 32.40) for the observance of the law.

Secondly, there is a difference in that the Qumran community emphasized the strict observance of the laws of Moses, such as the holy sabbaths and food laws. Their emphasis on these commandments intensified their separation from fellow Jews because they believed that the sabbaths, in which all Israel had gone astray, had been corrupted by observing the feasts according to the lunar calendar of pagan influence. Paul argues, on the other hand, that certain commandments of the OT are no longer binding for the new covenant people, in particular cir-

cumcision (1 Cor 7.19), the special days of Israel (Gal 4.10; cf. Col 2.16-17), and the food laws (Rom 14.2f; Col 2.16-17), because in Christ there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile (Gal 3.28).

In short, even though both the Qumran community and the early church maintained that as new covenant people they kept the law, they differed in their observance and application of it. The Qumran community understood the law according to the new interpretation of the sons of Zadok and applied the law to their separation even from other Jews. Paul, however, understood the law according to the tradition of Jesus, that is, the commandment of love given by Jesus, and applied it in order to dismantle the wall of the distinction between Jews and Gentiles. It is this opening up of the covenant community to the Gentiles that makes such an obvious difference.

*iii). Entry into the New Covenant Community*

Here again there are similarities and dissimilarities between the Qumran community and the early church. The similarity between them is that they both maintained that Israelites who believed themselves to be within the covenant of God must nonetheless enter into a new covenant. However, it is not difficult to see clear differences between them.

First of all, the Qumran community ruled that those who wanted to join the community must voluntarily enter into their new covenant by taking a binding oath "to return to the Torah of Moses" in accordance with the new revelation. In the NT there is no such oath to return to the Torah of Moses in the process of entering into the new covenant community. However, as we have already seen, this does not mean that the early church believed that the new covenant people had no obligation to observe the law. Rather, the observance of the law did not depend upon returning to the Torah but on the work of the Spirit within the

hearts of the new covenant people.

Secondly, in the Qumran community the new applicant had to pass through four different stages of admission to the community, a process which took more than two years. These four stages were necessary for purification, because the applicant needed to be clean before he entered into the new covenant. These characteristics of the process of entry indicate that the community distinguished itself from other Jews.

On the other hand, the early church, according to Luke, believed that anyone could become a member of the new covenant community simply by repenting from his sins, being baptised in the name of Jesus Christ and receiving the gift of the Spirit in association with the forgiveness of sins. Stages of admission to the new covenant community were not necessary for any process of purification, and there is no ground for any argument that the Spirit was reserved till a second stage of initiation. Moreover, while it is true that the early church was separate from other Jews, the early church's evangelistic drive and outreach made it far more outward looking than the introverted Qumran community.

Thirdly, in the DSS the new applicant was examined by the "overseer" on his understanding and deeds. Subsequently, his entrance from one stage to the next was decided by the lot of the full members of the community. In the early church, there was no such method of casting lots for deciding on the new convert's admission to the community. Entry into the new covenant was ultimately based not on the decision of the community but on the divine calling, the will of God, as manifested in the gift of the Spirit. It was their reception of the Spirit which opened the way for Gentiles to be accepted into the new covenant community.

Fourthly, in the Qumran community, even a full member who sinned was regarded as unclean. Thus he had to complete again the full progression of

initiatory stages. However, in the early church entry into the new covenant community was a once for all experience. The writer of Hebrews in fact warns that there is no second repentance after apostasy, since for him repentance and faith which are closely related to the gift of the Spirit form a once-for-all experience of conversion-initiation as an entrance into the new covenant community (Heb 6.1ff).

The Qumran community's main concern therefore was to maintain new covenant status by applying strict regulations to the new applicant's entry into the new covenant community. On the other hand, the early church's main concern was to announce the fulfilment of the promise of God in Jesus in terms of the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit. The early church urged other Jews and even Gentiles to accept the divine calling by repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ and thus become members of the new covenant community. In summary, whereas the Qumran community was exclusive, the early church was inclusive.

#### iv). The New Covenant and the Temple

There have recently been a number of comparative studies of the DSS and the NT, with specific reference to their respective concepts of the temple. Comparison here is therefore limited to their concepts of the community as the spiritual temple of God as it relates to the new covenant.

The Qumran community was convinced that the community as a spiritual temple had an atoning function, and this function together with the maintenance of a high level of purity made possible God's presence among them. Here we can see that the concept of the community as a spiritual temple is a concept not only of the place of atonement but also of the place of God's dwelling. On the other hand, even though in the NT the Christian community regarded their community

as the temple of God, atonement does not require an ongoing function.

It is important not to lose sight of the fact that in the NT forgiveness of sins is mediated through the death of Jesus as a covenant sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins in order to establish a new covenant. It is true that Jesus is not explicitly said to be the temple. However, it is worth noting that he is called the foundation, cornerstone and basis of the new temple (1 Cor 3.11; Eph 2.20f).<sup>2</sup> This designation indicates that the concept of the Christian community as the temple relates to their union with Jesus Christ who, as the new covenant mediator, had made the final atonement for the new covenant people and guaranteed the abiding presence of God (cf. John 2.21; 1 Cor 15.3; Heb 9.14-15, 26; 10.12, 18). This, together with the understanding of the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost and the reception of the Spirit in association with the forgiveness of sins, seems to have convinced the early Christians that they were the eschatological temple of God in which the Spirit of God dwelt.

Here we see the contrast between the DSS and the NT with regard to the concept of the community as the spiritual temple. Whereas in the NT the Christian community as the temple of God is not the place for atonement, in the DSS it is the community itself which carried out the function of atonement. However, we should also notice that according to the DSS, the eschatological temple in the messianic era would no longer be the place of sacrifice for atonement, since the community believed that the source of sin would be destroyed in the Messianic era (1QS 4.6-8; cf. 11QTem 29.7-10).<sup>3</sup> Here we may say that what the Qumran community was expecting with regard to the eschatological temple is similar to what the early church believed to have already been realized and, at the same time, was looking forward to the consummation of in the future (Eph 2.20; Heb 9.19ff).

---

<sup>2</sup> Gärtner, *Temple*, 103.

<sup>3</sup> See above pp. 168f.



## 2. Promise and Fulfilment

The theme of OT promise and its fulfilment in the NT is too vast to be explored fully here. Hence my intention is, by summing up what I have investigated so far, to draw a conclusion which may shed some light upon the relationship between the Old and New Testaments. I have argued that both the Qumran community and the early church were convinced that the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled within their own community. My argument is based not on how their convictions corresponded to the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff but on the fact that they were convinced that the promise was being fulfilled in their communities. My concern is not to determine from a twentieth century viewpoint whether their convictions were right but to determine how they themselves understood the fulfilment of the promise.

### *i). The Qumran New Covenant*

As far as the internalization of the law and the universal knowledge of God are concerned, the Qumran new covenant does not correspond to the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff. However, the question I have raised is how, in spite of these differences, the Qumran community was convinced that the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff was being fulfilled in their own community.

First, a strong relationship between the Qumran new covenant and that of Jer 31.31ff can be discerned in the community's conviction that God had made a new covenant relationship with them by establishing an everlasting covenant with them (CD 3.11ff). Two things are important to note with regard to the community's understanding of the necessity of a new covenant relationship with God. The community claimed that God established a new covenant with them because Israel had broken the covenant which God had established with their fathers. This idea is distinctive, for the authors of the post-exilic biblical writings

and of the early Jewish literature emphasized that the covenant relationship which had been established between God and their forefathers still existed even in their own days. Therefore, for them there was no notion of the necessity of a new covenant between God and them. Furthermore, the community's description of themselves as the "root of planting" is significant, because this phrase indicates that they distinguished themselves from fellow Jews who did not belong to the community. Hence the Qumran community's understanding of the necessity of a new covenant seems to be derived from the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff.

Secondly, the community's emphasis on the strict observance of the law according to the new revelation of the hidden things indicates both continuity and discontinuity between the Qumran new covenant and the covenant which God had established with their fathers: whereas observance of the law of Moses indicates continuity, observance of the law according to the new revelation shows discontinuity. With regard to the law, both continuity and discontinuity can be seen between the old and new covenants in Jer 31.31ff: the same law ("my law") indicates continuity, but the writing of the law in the heart is discontinuous with the old covenant. However, the continuity is sufficiently strong to confirm a clear relationship between the concept of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff and that in the DSS.

Thirdly, the community closely related God's establishment of the everlasting covenant to the forgiveness of sins. According to CD 4.4-9, God forgave and would forgive those who entered into the covenant which he had established with the founders of the community (cf. CD 3.18f; 1QS 5.6). Furthermore, the community claimed that it had a function of atonement. They were convinced that their "pleasing God", and "prayer and perfect way of life" replaced the function of blood sacrifice. 1QS 9.4ff shows that the community as a house of holiness would atone for the guilt of transgression through their "pleasing God", and "prayer

and perfect way of life” by virtue of the Spirit of holiness, that was already in the community (cf. 1QS 3.6ff; 5.13f). Thus it is conceivable that the Qumran community found the origin of their understanding of the forgiveness of sins in the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff, where God is the one who forgives the sins of his people on the basis of His new covenant relationship with his people.

*ii). The New Covenant in the NT*

The author of Hebrews clearly points out that the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff was fulfilled by the death of Jesus, his death as high priest and mediator of the new covenant. The writers of the Synoptic Gospels and Paul also seem to understand the covenant established by the blood of Jesus as the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff.

First, the phrase “my blood of the covenant” and “the new covenant in my blood” indicate that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels and Paul understand that at the Last Supper, anticipating the shedding of his blood on the cross, Jesus established the covenant for the forgiveness of sins in terms of the covenant sacrifice of Exod 24.8 and the vicarious suffering of the servant for the forgiveness of the sins of God’s people (Isa 53). The important question here is how they understand the covenant established by Jesus in terms of the fulfilment of the promise of Jer 31.31ff. This question can be answered by the allusions to the OT in the cup-word.

It is generally accepted that “my blood of the covenant” is an allusion to Exod 24.8. According to the Targum (Onkelos and Yerushalmi 1), the covenant blood of Exod 24 is interpreted in terms of atoning blood. Hence the allusion in “my blood of the covenant” to Exod 24.8 may indicate that Mark/Matthew understand the death of Jesus as the covenant sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins in order to establish a new covenant, different from the one which was established through

Moses by animal's blood in the wilderness. The phrase "to be shed on behalf of many" is also accepted as an allusion to Isa 53. Isa 53 describes how Yahweh wipes out Israel's sins through the suffering of the servant. The significance of the allusion to Isa 53 lies not only in the fact that the suffering of the servant is vicarious but also in the fact that the servant can be understood in terms of the new covenant relationship between God and his people (Isa 42.6-7; 49.8f; 55.3; 59.29; 61.8).

The view of the death of Jesus as the covenant sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins can be understood in relation to the forgiveness of sin in Jer 31.34, since forgiveness of sins there can also be understood in connection with blood. The forgiveness of sin in Jer 31.34 can be understood in terms of relief from the curse incurred by violation of the covenant because Jer 31.32 says that Israel had broken the covenant. According to Jer 34.8ff, the Israelites were under the same covenant obligation which had been imposed upon their fathers. Jer 34.18-20 describes how the covenant ceremony indicates symbolically that the curse of the covenant is the death of the covenant-breaker. In the light of all this, the forgiveness of sin of Jer 31.34 can be understood in relation to relief from the curse of the covenant.

Secondly, Paul's designation of himself as a servant of the new covenant together with his assertion that "the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life" and the contrast between tablets of stone and tablets of human hearts also indicate that Paul understands the new covenant to which he refers in 2 Cor 3.6 as the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff. For Paul "the letter kills" because the strict external observance of the letter of the law with hardened hearts in fact breaks the law itself. On the other hand, Paul's assertion that "the Spirit gives life" seems to be based on his understanding that in the new covenant the hardened heart is removed in Christ by the work of the Spirit so that believers can fulfil the law of Christ, that is, love one another in the Spirit.

*iii). Continuity and Discontinuity*

Even though in the DSS there is no notion of the divine inscription of the Torah upon men's hearts, which is promised in Jer 31.31ff, the Qumran community applied to themselves the distinctive features of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff such as the observance of the law and the forgiveness of sins. Accordingly, the Qumran community called their covenant "the new covenant in the land of Damascus" in terms of the fulfilment of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff.

With regard to the close connection between the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff and that in the NT, it is important to note that the OT allusions in the cup-word indicate that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels and Paul understand the new covenant established by the blood of Jesus by relating the event not to Jer 31.31ff alone but to Jer 31.31ff in combination with other OT texts. In other words, the fulfilment of the promise of the new covenant of Jer 31.31ff in the NT does not seem to have been conceived of as a one (Jer 31.31ff) to one (the new covenant established at the Last Supper) correspondence. Rather, this fulfilment can be understood by relating the significance of the death of Jesus to Jer 31.31ff through the process of interpretation of other OT texts. I have argued that the process of interpretation in the light of the event of Christ can also be discerned in Paul's designation of himself as a servant of the new covenant, which is closely connected with his assertion that "the letter kills but the Spirit gives life", and with the contrast between tablets of stone and tablets of human hearts.

Finally, what light can the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31.31ff and its fulfilment in the NT shed on the relationship between the Old and New Testaments? I have noted that Jer 31.31ff shows both the newness of the new covenant and continuity between the old and new covenants. I have also argued that there is some similarity between the new covenant concept in Jer 31 and that in the DSS even in the face of dissimilarity. A similarity between them can be discerned

with regard to the law, that is, continuity and discontinuity between the old and the new covenants both in Jer 31 and in the DSS. As in Jer 31 the same law (my law) indicates continuity and the writing of the law in the heart shows discontinuity, in the DSS the emphasis on the keeping of the law of Moses shows continuity with the old covenant, but the keeping of the law according to the new revelation indicates discontinuity.

The new covenant in the NT also shows continuity with the old covenant as well as its own "newness". The newness of new covenant is distinctive. In the OT, the law was inscribed upon tablets of stone and written in a book to be deposited in a sacred place. The hardened Jews were not able to keep the law. In the NT, this law is internalized in the heart by the Spirit so that the law may be kept, as Jer 31.33 promises. Thus in Paul's view at least, new covenant people are able to keep the law in the Spirit. The continuity/discontinuity can be seen in the fact, then, that new covenant people are obliged to "love one another", which is both the fulfilment of the law of Christ, and the summary of the whole law.

The same pattern of the new covenant's continuity with the old covenant and its newness can be discerned in the announcement of the forgiveness of sins. Jer 31.34 shows that it is God himself who will forgive the sins of the new covenant people, as he forgave the sins of the old covenant people. However, as far as the means of forgiveness of sins is concerned, the visible mode of forgiveness of sins in the new covenant can be understood differently from that in the old covenant. It is true that in the Qumran community it was God himself who forgave the sins of the members of the community. However, the fact that it is not the temple but the community itself which has a function of atonement shows the difference from the old covenant. In the NT the understanding of the death of Jesus as the sacrifice for forgiveness of sins shows continuity with OT provision of sacrifice for sin. The difference on the other hand can be discerned in the fact that the

sacrifice is not of an animal but is the death of Jesus, and forgiveness of sins is given to everyone who shares the benefits of the death of Jesus in the Spirit.

In short, we can say that the promise of the new covenant in Jer 31 and its fulfilment in the NT are to be understood not simply in terms of discontinuity between the Old and New Testaments, but also as denoting a strong continuity between them.

## Bibliography

Only those works explicitly cited appear in the bibliography.

---

- Abel, F., *Les Livres des Maccabées*. Paris: Gabalda, 1949.
- Abraham, A., *The Baptismal Initiation of the Qumran Community*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton Theo. Seminary, 1973.
- Ackroyd, P. R., "The Book of Jeremiah - Some Recent Studies", *JSOT* 28 (1984), 47-59.
- Allegro, J., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of Christianity*. New York: Criterion, 1957.
- Allison, D. C., "The Pauline Epistles and the Synoptic Gospels: The Pattern of the Parallels", *NTS* 28 (1982), 1-32.
- Anderson, B. W., "The New Covenant and the Old", in *The Old Testament and Christian Faith: A Biblical Discussion*. Ed. B. W. Anderson. New York: Herder, 1969, 225-242.
- Attridge, H. W., "1 Maccabees" and "2 Maccabees", in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Ed. M. Stone. Phila.: Fortress, 1984.
- Bacchiocchi, S., "Sabbatical Typologies of Messianic Redemption", *JSJ* 17 (1986), 153-176.
- Bach, R., "Bauen und Pflanzen", in *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen*. Eds. R. Rendtorff and K. Koch. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961, 7-32.
- Badenas, R., *Christ the End of the Law: Romans 10.4 in Pauline Perspective*. JSNTS 10. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.
- Baltz, K., *The Covenant Formulary*. Phila.: Fortress, 1971 (*Das Bundes Formula*. WMANT 4. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964).
- "The meaning of the Temple in the Lucan Writings", *HTR* 58 (1965), 263-77.
- Bandstra, A. J., *The Law and the Elements of the World: An Exegetical Study in Aspects of Paul's Teaching*. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1964.
- Barrett, C. K., *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1947.
- *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. London: Black, 1957.
- *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: Black,



- 1968.
- *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: Black, 1973.
- *Freedom and Obligation: A Study of the Epistle to the Galatians*. London: SPCK, 1985.
- Barth, M., "St Paul - A Good Jew", *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 1 (1980), 7-45.
- *The People of God*. JSNTS 5. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
- Baumgärtel, F., "καρδία", TDNT III, 606-7
- Baumgarten, J., *Studies in Qumran Law*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.
- Beckwith, R. T., "The Modern Attempt to Reconcile the Qumran Calendar with the True Solar Year", *RQ* 7 (1969-71), 379-96.
- Behm, J., "διαθήκη", TDNT II, 106-134.
- Betz, O., *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*. WUNT 6. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1960.
- "Rechtfertigung in Qumran", in *Rechtfertigung*. FS Käsemann. Ed. J. Friedrich, etc. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1976, 17-36.
- "Beschneidung II", TRE V, 716-722.
- Bickerman, E., "Couper une alliance", in *d'Histoire du Droit Oriental* 5 (1950-51), 133-156.
- Bietenhard, H., "ἔννομα" TDNT V, 242-281.
- Black, M., *The Essene Problem*. London: William's Trust, 1961.
- *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the NT*. London: Nelson, 1961.
- Blass, F. and A. Debrunner., *A Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Trans. R. Funk, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bligh, J., *Galatians. A Discussion of St Paul's Epistle*. London: St Paul Publications, 1969.
- Bloch, R., "Midrash" in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice*. Brown Judaic Studies 1. Vol. 1. Ed. W. Green. Missoula: Scholar Press, 1978, 29-50 ("Midrash" in *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Vol. V (Paris, 1957)).
- Blomberg, C., "The Law in Luke-Acts", *JSNT* 22 (1984), 53-80.
- Bowman, R., *Ezra*. IB 3. New York: Abington, 1955.

- Braun, H., *Jesus of Nazareth: The Man of His Time*. ET. Phila.: Fortress, 1979.
- Braun, H., *An die Hebräer*. HNT 14. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1984.
- Bright, J., *Kingdom of God*. New York: Abington, 1953.
- *A History of Israel*. London: SCM, 1960.
- *Jeremiah*. AB 21. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965.
- "Exercise in Hermeneutics: Jer 31.31-34", *Int* 20 (1966), 188-210.
- *Covenant and Promise*. London: SCM, 1976.
- Brockington, L., *Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther*. CB. London: Nelson, 1969.
- Brown, R. E., "The Messianism of Qumran", *CBQ* 19 (1957), 53-82.
- Brownlee, W. H., "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls", *BA* 14 (1951), 54-76.
- *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1964.
- *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Bruce, F. F., *Commentary on the Book of the Acts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.
- "The Messianic Hope", in *Second Thoughts on the Dead Scrolls*. London: Paternoster, 1956, 81-91.
- *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*. London: Tyndale, 1959.
- *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. London: Tyndale, 1963.
- *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1964.
- "Holy Spirit in Qumran Texts", *ALUOS* 6 (1969), 49-55.
- *1 and 2 Corinthians*. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1971.
- *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1982.
- Buchanan, G. W., *To the Hebrews. Tradition, Comment and Conclusions*. AB 36. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1972.
- Bultmann, R., *Theology of the New Testament*. ET. London: SCM, 1952.
- *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. ET. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publ., 1985.
- Burrow, M., *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1956 (New York, 1955).

- Campbell, W., "Christ the End of the Law: Romans 10.4", in *Studia Biblica 1978: III Papers on Paul and Other NT Authors*. Ed. E. A. Livingstone. JSNTS 3. Sheffield: JSOT, 1980, 73-81.
- Carrington, P., *According to Mark. A Running Commentary on the Old Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1960.
- Carroll, R. P., *From Chaos to Covenant. Uses Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah*. London: SCM, 1981.
- *Jeremiah*. OTL. London: SCM, 1986.
- Carson, D. A. Ed., *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical Historical and Theological Investigation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.
- Cassuto, U., *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. ET. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967[51].
- Catchpole, D. R., "Paul, James, and the Apostle Decree", *NTS* 23 (1977), 428-44.
- Charles, R. H., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testaments in English*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977[13].
- Charlesworth, J. H. Ed., *John and Qumran*. London: Chapman, 1972.
- "The origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the DSS: Four Transitional Phases among the Qumran Essenses", *RQ* 10 (1980), 213-33.
- "Review on J. Schüpphaus' Book *Die Psalmen Salomos*" in *JAAR* 50 (1982), 292-93.
- Chenderlin, F., "Do This as My Memorial": *The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of Anamnēsis in Corinthians 11.24-25*. AnBib 99. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982.
- Clements, R. E., *God and Temple*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- *Exodus: Commentary*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1972.
- Childs, B., *Exodus: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM, 1977[74].
- Coggins, R., *The Book of Ezra and Nehemiah*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976.
- Collange, J., *Enig mes de la deuxième épître de Paul aux Corinthiens*. SNTSMS 18. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1972.
- Collins, R. F., "The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its Comparison with the New Testament", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 39 (1963), 555-594.
- Conzelmann, H., *1 Corinthians*. Hermeneia. Phila.: Fortress, 1975[69].
- Coppens, J., "La Nouvelle Alliance en Jer 31.31-34", *CBQ* 25 (1963), 12-25.

- "‘Mystery’ in the Theology of Saint Paul and its Parallels at Qumran", in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Ed. Murphy-O'Connor. London: Chapman, 1968, 132-158.
- Cranfield, C. E. B., *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*. CGTC. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1972[59].
- "St Paul and the Law", *SJT* 17 (1964), 43-68.
- *The Epistle to the Romans*. ICC. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1985[75], 1983[79].
- Cross Jr., F. M., *The Ancient Library<sup>of</sup> Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1958 (Grand Rapids, 1980).
- Cullmann, O., *Baptism in the NT*. ET. London: SCM, 1950.
- *The Christology of the New Testament*. ET. Phila.: Westminster, 1959.
- Dahl, N., "Review of Paul and Palestinian Judaism", *RSR* 4 (1978), 153-58.
- Dalman, G., *Jesus - Jeshua*. ET. London: SPCK, 1929[22].
- Dancy, J., *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954.
- Davenport, G. L., *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- Davies, G., *Exodus. Introduction and Commentary*. London: SCM 1967.
- Davies, P., "Hasidim in the Maccabean period", *JJS* 28 (1977), 127-140.
- "The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document", *JJS* 33 (1982), 287-301.
- *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*. JSOTS 25. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
- Dawsey, J., "The Temple-Theme in Luke", *Milita Theologica* 38 (1987), 26-32.
- Delcor, M., "The Courts of the Church of Corinth and the Courts of Qumran", in *Paul and Qumran*, 69-84.
- Dentan, R. C., "Heart", IDB IV. New York: Abington, 1962, 549-550.
- Dimont, D., "Qumran Sectarian Literature", in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Ed. M. Stone. Phila.: Fortress, 1984, 483-550.
- Dodd, C. H., *The Epistle to the Romans*. MNTC, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.
- Donaldson, D., "'The Curse of the Law' and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3.13-14", *NTS* 32 (1986), 94-112.
- Doran, R., *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*. CBQMS 12. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of

- America, 1981.
- Drane, J. W., *Paul - Libertine or Legalist? A Study in the Theology of the Major Pauline Epistles*. London: SPCK, 1975.
- Dressler, H. P., "The Sabbath in the Old Testament", in *Sabbath*, 21-41.
- Dumbrell, W. T., "Paul's Use of Exodus 34 in 2 Corinthians 3", in *God Who is Rich in Mercy: Essays Presented to Dr. D. B. Knox*. Ed. P. T. O'Brien. Homebush: Lancer Book, 1986, 179-194.
- Duncan, G., *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*. MNTC. London: Hodder and Stoughton 1934.
- Dunn, J. D. G., *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. London: SCM, 1970.
- "The Lord is the Spirit", *JTS* 21 (1970), 309-320.
- "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus", in *Reconciliation and Hope: NT Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris on His 60th Birthday*. Ed. R. Bank. Exeter: Paternoster, 1974, 125-141.
- *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Phila.: Westminster, 1975.
- *Unity and Diversity in the NT: An Inquiry Into the Character of Earliest Christianity*. Phila.: Westminster, 1977.
- "The New Perspective on Paul", *BJRL* 65 (1983), 95-122.
- "The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2.11-18)" *JSNT* 18 (1983), 3-57.
- "Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.10-14)", *NTS* 31 (1985), 523-542.
- *Romans*. WBC 38. 2 Vols. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1988.
- "Paul's Knowledge of the Jesus Tradition: The Evidence of Romans" (forthcoming Festschrift for W. Trilling).
- Dupont, J., "The First Christian Pentecost", in *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*. ET. New York, Ramsey, Toronto: Paulist, 1979, 35-59.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. ET. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961[59].
- Ernst, J., *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1977.
- Ebeling, G., "Geist und Buchstabe", in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch Für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*.<sup>3</sup> Bd. 2. Ed. Kurt Galling etc. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1958, 1290-1296.

- *The Truth of the Gospel: An Exposition of Galatians*. ET. Phila.: Fortress, 1985[81].
- Ellis, E. E., *The Gospel of Luke*. CB. London: Nelson, 1966.
- Fairweather, W. and Black, J., *The First Book of Maccabees*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1936.
- Farmer, W. R., *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman World*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood, 1973.
- Fee, G., "II Corinthians VI.14-VII.1 and Food Offered to Idols", *NTS* 23 (1977), 140-61.
- *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Feinberg, C. L., *Jeremiah*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.
- Filson, F., *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: A. and C. Black, 1971[60].
- Fitzmyer, J., *Essays on the Semitic Background of the NT*. London: Chapman, 1971.
- *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV*. AB 28a. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- "The Ascension of Christ and Pentecost", *TS* 45 (1984), 409-440.
- Flusser, D., "The Last Supper and the Essenes", *Immanuel* 2 (1973), 23-27.
- France, R. T., *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982[71].
- Furnish, V., *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. New York: Abington, 1968.
- *2 Corinthians*. AB 32A. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- Gaffin, R., *The Centrality of the Resurrection: A Study in Paul's Soteriology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978.
- *Perspective on Pentecost: New testament Teaching on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit*. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1979.
- Garlington, D., 'The Obedience of Faith': A Pauline Phrase in Historical Context. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Durham University, 1987.
- Garnet, P., *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls*. WUNT Reihe 2.3. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1977.
- Gärtner, B., *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. SNTSMS 1. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1965.

- Gaster, T. H., *The Scripture of the Dead Sea Sect*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1957.
- Gaston, L., *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver: Univ. of British Columbia Press, 1987.
- Gaugler, E., *Römerbrief*. Vol. 1. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1958.
- Gehman, H., "An Insight and a Realization: A Study of the New Covenant", *Int* 9 (1955), 279-293.
- Georgi, D., *The Opponent of Paul in the Second Corinthians*. ET. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1987.
- Gese, H., "Atonement", in *Essays on Biblical Theology*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.
- Gnilka, J., *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. EKK II/2. Köln, Basel and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979.
- Goldstein, J. A., *1 Maccabees*. AB 41. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- *2 Maccabees*. AB 41A. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Goppelt, L., *Theology of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. ET. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981[75].
- Goudge, H., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: Methuen, 1903.
- Grant, R., *The Letter and the Spirit*. London: SPCK, 1957.
- Grässer, E., *Der Alte Bund im Neuen: Exegetische Studien zur Israelfrage im Neuen Testament*. WUNT 35. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985.
- Gray, G. B., *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925.
- "The Psalms of Solomon", in *APOT*. Vol. 2, 625-652.
- Grundmann, W., "Die Frage nach der Gottessohnschaft des Messias im Lichte von Qumran", *Bibel und Qumran*. Ed. S. Wagner. Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968.
- *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. THKNT 2. Berlin: Evangelische Verlag, 1971.
- *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. THKNT 3. Berlin: Evangelische Verlag, 1971.
- "The Teacher of Righteousness of Qumran and the Question of Justification by Faith in the Theology of the Apostle Paul", in *Paul and Qumran*, 85-114.
- Gundry, R., *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*. NovTS 18. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

- *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Gutberlet, C., *Das Erste Buch der Machabäer*. Münster: Aschendorf, 1920.
- Gutbrod, W., "ἄνομος", TDNT 4, 1086f.
- Guthrie, D., *The Letter to the Hebrews*. Leicester: IVP, 1983.
- Haenchen, E., *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1959.
- Hafemann, S., *Suffering and Spirit: An Exegetical Study of II Cor 2.14-3.3 with the Context of the Corinthian Correspondence*. (Ph.D. Dissertation at Tübingen, 1985), 317, published in WUNT Reihe 2.19, 1986).
- Hanson, R. P. C., *Allegory and Event*. Richmond: John Knox, 1959.
- Hawthorne, G., *Philippians*. WBC 43. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983.
- Hasel, G. F., *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah*. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews Univ. Press, 1980[72].
- Hengel, M., *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Vol 1. ET. London: SCM, 1974.
- *The Atonement*. ET. London: SCM, 1981.
- Hermann, I., *Kyrios und Pneuma*. SANT 2. München: Kösel, 1961.
- Hickling, C. J. A., "The Sequence of Thought in 2 Corinthians, Chapter Three", NTS 21 (1975), 380-95.
- Higgins, A. J. B., *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1952.
- Hill, D., *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967.
- *The Gospel of Matthew*. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1972.
- Hofius, O., *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes*. WUNT 14. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1972.
- "Sühne und Versöhnung: Zum paulinischen Verständnis des Kreuzestodes Jesu", in *Versuche, das Leiden und sterben Jesu zu Verstehen*. Ed., W. Maas, Munich: Schnell and Steiner, 1983, 25-46.
- "Das Gesetz des Moses und das Gesetz Christi", ZThK 80 (1983), 262-286.
- Holladay, W., "The New Covenant", IDBSup, 1976.
- Hooker, M., *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the NT*. London: SPCK, 1959.



- "Beyond the Things That are Written? St. Paul's Use of Scripture", *NTS* 27 (1981), 295-309.
- Horgan, M. P., *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. CBQMS 8. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.
- Horton, F. L., *The Melchizedek Tradition: a Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976.
- Hübner, H., *Law in Paul's thought*. ET. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1984.
- Huffman, H., "The Treaty Background of Hebrew YADA", *BASOR* 181 (1966), 31-37.
- Hughes, P., *Second Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.
- *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Hull, J. H. E., *The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles*. London: Lutterworth, 1967.
- Huntjens, J. A., "Covenant and Law in the Texts from Qumran", *RQ* 31 (1974), 362-80.
- Hyatt, J. P., "Torah in the Book of Jeremiah", *JBL* 66 (1941), 381-96.
- *Commentary on Exodus*. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1971.
- Janowski, B., *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*. WMANT 55, Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1982.
- Jaubert, A., "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte Qumrân. Ses Origines Bibliques", *VT* 3 (1953), 250-264.
- *La notion d'alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l'ère Chrétienne*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1963.
- Jeremias, G., *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1967.
- Jeremias, J., *The Servant of God*. ET. London: SCM, 1965.
- *The Central message of the New Testament*. ET. New York: Scribner, 1965.
- *The Eucharistic words of Jesus*. ET. London: SCM, 1966.
- *New Testament Theology. Part One: The Proclamation of Jesus*. ET. London: SCM, 1971.
- *Neutestamentliche Theologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1979.
- Jervell, J., *Luke and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.
- Jones, F., "Freiheit" in den Briefen des Apostels Paulus: Eine historische, ex-

- agetische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie*. GHA 34. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1987.
- Käsemann, E., "The Spirit and the Letter", in *Perspectives on Paul*. ET. Phila.: Fortress, 1972.
- *Commentary on Romans*. ET. London: SCM, 1980.
- *The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the Hebrews*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984[57].
- Kaiser, W. C., "The Old Promise and the New covenant: Jeremiah 31.31-34", *JETS* 15 (1972), 11-23.
- *Toward an Old Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.
- Kamlah, E., "'Buchstabe und Geist', Die Bedeutung dieser Antithese für die alttestamentliche Exegese des Apostels Paulus", *EvT* 14 (1954), 276-282.
- Kertelege, K., *"Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1967.
- Kidner, D., *Ezra and Nehemiah*. Leicester: IVP, 1979.
- Kim, E. W., *An Eschatological Examination of the New Covenant Based on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1981.
- Kim, S., *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. WUNT Reihe 2.4. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1981.
- *"The 'Son of Man'" as the Son of God*. WUNT 30. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983.
- Kimbrough, S., "The Concept of Sabbath at Qumran", *RQ* 5 (1966), 483-502.
- Klein, G., "Righteousness in the NT", *IDBSup*, 750-2.
- Klinzing, G., *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT*. SUNT 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1971.
- Kloppenber, J., "An Analysis of the Pre-Pauline Formula in 1 Cor 15.3b-5 in Light of Some Recent Literature", *CBQ* 40 (1978), 351-67.
- Knibb, M. A., "Exile in the Damascus Document", *JSS* 25 (1983), 99-117.
- Köster, H., "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment," *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 317-32.
- Kuhn, H. W., *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesus*. SUNT 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1966.
- Kuhn, K. G., "Die beiden Messias in den Qumrantexten und Messiasvorstellung in der rabbinischen Literatur", *ZAW* 70 (1958), 200-208.

- *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1960.
- Kümmel, W. G., "παρεσις und ἔνδειξις: Ein Beitrag Zum Verständnis der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre" in *Heisgeschehen und Geschichte*. Herausgegeben von E. Grässer, O. Merk and A. Fritz. Marburg: Elwert Verlag, 1965, 260-70.
- *Introduction to the New Testament*. ET. London: SCM, 1975<sup>2</sup>.
- *The Theology of the New Testament*. ET. London: SCM, 1974.
- Kuss, O., *Der Römerbrief*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1959.
- Kutsch, E., *Neues Testament, Neuer Bund? Eine Fehlübersetzung wird korrigiert*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.
- Ladd, G. E., "Paul and the Law", in *Soli Deo Gloria. In Honour of W. C. Robinson*. Ed. J. McDowell Richards. Richmond: John Knox, 1968, 50-67.
- Lake, K., *The Beginning<sup>6</sup> of Christianity*. London: MacMillan, 1933.
- Lampe, G. W. H., *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers*. London: SPCK, 1967<sup>2</sup>.
- Lane, W., "Covenant: Key to Paul's Conflict with Corinth", *TynB* 33 (1982), 3-29.
- Larsson, E., *Christus als Vorbild: Eine Untersuchung zu den paulinischen Tauf und Eikonexten*. Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis 23. Lund, Uppsala: Gleerup, 1962.
- Leaney, A. R. C., *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*. London: SCM, 1966.
- Leenhardt, F. J., *The Epistle to the Romans*. ET. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961[57].
- Lemke, W. E., "Jeremiah 31.31-34", *Int* 37 (1983), 183-187.
- Licht, J., *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea. 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB*. translated title (written in Hebrew).
- Lichtenberger, H., "Atonement at Qumran", in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*. Vol. 2, Brown Judaic Studies 9. Ed. W. S. Green. Missoula: scholars, 1980, 159-167.
- Liebermann, S., "The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline", *JBL* 71 (1952), 199-206.
- Limbeck, M., *Die Ordnung des Heils: Untersuchung zum Gesetzesverständnis des Fröjudentums*. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1971. \n
- Lincoln, A. T., "A Biblical and Theological perspective", in *Sabbath*, 342-412.

- Lindars, B., *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM, 1961.
- Lindemann, A., "Die Gerechtigkeit aus dem Gesetz: Erwägungen zur Auslegung und zur Textgeschichte von Römer 10.15", *ZNW* 73 (1982), 231-250.
- Lohmeyer, E., *Das Evangelium des Markus*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1959.
- Lohse, E., *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch mit Masoretischer Pünktung, Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen*. München: Kösel, 1971.
- Longenecker, R., *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Lull, D. J., *The Spirit in Galatia: Paul's Interpretation of Pneuma as Divine Power*. SBLDS 49. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1980.
- Maier, J., *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*. Vol. 1 (Übersetzung), Vol. 2 (Anmerkungen). München und Basel: Reinhardt, 1960.
- Marsh, H. G., *Origin and Significance of New Testament Baptism*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1941.
- Marshall, I. H., "The Significance of Pentecost", *SJT* 30 (1977), 347-69.
- *the Gospel of Luke*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.
- *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1980.
- *The Acts of the Apostles*. TNTC. Leicester: IVP, 1980.
- Martin, B., "Paul on Christ and the Law", *JETS* 26 (1983), 271-282.
- Martin, R., *Carmen christi: Phil 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the setting of Early Christian Worship*. SNTSMS 4. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967.
- *The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12-15*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- *2 Corinthians*. WBC 40. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1986.
- Martin-Achard, R., "Quelques Remarques sur La Nouvelle Alliance chez Jeremie", in *Questions Disputées d'Ancien Testament. Methode et Theologie*. Ed. C. Brekelmans. Leuven: Duclot and Leuven Univ. Press, 1974.
- McCarthy, D. J., "Covenant in the OT", *CBQ* 27 (1965), 217-40.
- *OT Covenant*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.
- *Treaty and Covenant*. AnBib 21A. Rome: Bib. Inst., 1981[63].
- McKelvey, R. J., *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford:

- Oxford Univ. Press, 1969.
- McKenzie, J., *Second Isaiah*. AB 20. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.
- McKenzie, S. L. and Wallace, H. N., "Covenant Themes in Malachi", *CBQ* 45 (1983), 549-563.
- Mealand, D. L., "Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts 2-4", *JTS* 28 (1977), 96-99.
- Meyer, H. A. W., *The Epistle to the Corinthians*. Critical and Exegetical Handbook Vol. 2. ET. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.
- Meyer, P., "Romans 10.4 and the End of the Law", in *The Divine Helmsman; essays presented to Lou H. Silberman*. Ed. James L. Crenshaw. New York: KTAV, 1980, 59-78.
- Meyer, R., "περιτομή", TDNT VI, 73-84.
- Michel, O., *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984[36].
- "Zur Exegese von Phil 2.5-11", in *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis. Festschrift für K. Heim zum 80 Geburtstag*. Hamburg: Furche Verlag, 1954, 77-95.
- *Brief an die Römer*. Kritische-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament IV. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1966[1955].
- Milik, J., *Ten Years Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*. London: SCM, 1959.
- Milikowsky, G., "Again: Damascus Document and in Rabbinic Literature", *RQ* 11 (1982), 97-108.
- M'Neile, A., *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: MacMillan, 1928[15].
- Moberly, R. W. L., *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34*. JSOTS 22. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
- Moffatt, J., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1924.
- *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. MNTC. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1959[39].
- Montefiore, H., *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: A. and C. Black, 1964.
- Moo, D., "'Law', 'Works of the Law', and Legalism in Paul", *WTJ* 45 (1983), 91-99.
- "Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years", *SJT* 40 (1987), 287-307.
- Moore, G., *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1958[27].

- Morris, L. L., "The Meaning of ἑλαστήριον in Rom 3.25-26a", *NTS* 2 (1955-56), 33-43.
- *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*. London: Tyndale, 1955.
- *The Epistle to the Romans*. Leicester: IVP, 1988.
- Moule, C. F. D., "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul", in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*. Ed. W. M. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and Niebuhr. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967, 389-406.
- "2 Cor 3.18b, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κύριου πνεύματος", in *Neue Testament und Geschichte. FS O. Cullmann zum 70 Geburtstag*. Ed. H. Batensweiler. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1972, 234-235.
- *The Birth of the New Testament*. London: A. and C. Black, 1981.
- Muilenburg, J., "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations", *VT* 9 (1959), 347-65.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. Ed., *Paul and Qumran*. London: Chapman, 1968.
- "The Essenes and Their History", *RB* 81 (1974), 215-244.
- "Tradition and Redaction in 1 Cor 15.3-7", *CBQ* 43 (1981), 582-89.
- "Damascus Document Revisited", *RB* 92 (1985), 223-246.
- "The New Covenant in Letters of Paul and the Essene Document", (forthcoming Festschrift for J. Fitzmyer).
- Murray, J., *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968[59].
- Mussner, F., *Der Galaterbrief*. HTHNT IX. Freiberg, Basel and Wien: Herder, 1974.
- Neusner, J., "The Fellowship in the Second Commonwealth", *HTR* 53 (1960), 125-42.
- Silva New, A. M., "The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of hands", in *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part 1. Vol. 5. Ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. London: MacMillan, 1933.
- Newton, M., *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*. SNTSMS 53. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985.
- Nicholson, E. W., *Deuteronomy and Tradition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1967.
- *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapter 1-25*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1973.
- *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapter 26-52*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1975.

- "The Covenant Ritual in Exodus 24.3-8", *VT* 32 (1982), 74-86.
- *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the OT*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. "Review on C. Vanderkam's *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*", *JAOS* 100 (1980), 83f.
- *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction*. London: SCM, 1981.
- "Jubilees", in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, 97-104.
- Noack, B., "The Day of Pentecost in Jubilees, Qumran, and Acts", *ASTI* 1 (1962), 74-95.
- North, R., "The Damascus of Qumran Geography", *PEQ* 87 (1955), 34-48.
- Noth, M., *Exodus: A Commentary*. ET. London: SCM, 1966[59].
- Nygren, A., *Commentary on Romans*. ET. London: SCM, 1952[44].
- Oepke, A., *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*. THKNT 9. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1973.
- Orr, W. and J. Walter, *1 Corinthians*. AB 32. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1981[76].
- von der Osten-Sacken, P., "Die Bücher der Tora als Hütte der Gemeinde", *ZAW* 91 (1979), 423-435.
- Perlitt, L., *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament*. WMANT 36. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Pesch, R., "The Last Supper and Jesus' Understanding of His Death", *Bible Bhashyam* 3 (1977), 58-75.
- *Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis*. Freiburg: Herder, 1978.
- van der Ploeg, "The Meal of the Essenes", *JSS* 3 (1957), 163-175.
- Plöger, O., *Theocracy and Eschatology*. ET. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- Plummer, A., *I Corinthians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1911.
- Potter, H. D., "The New Covenant in Jeremiah 31.31-34", *VT* 33 (1983), 347-357.
- Priest, J., "The Messiah and Meal in 1QS<sup>a</sup>", *JBL* 82 (1963), 95-100.
- Provence, T., "Who is Sufficient for These Things? An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 2.15-3.18", *NovT* 24 (1982), 54-81.
- Prümm, K., "Der Abschnitt über die Doxa des Apostolats, 2 Kor 3.1-4.6 in der Deutung des Hl. Johannes Chrysostomos. Eine Untersuchung zur Auslegungsgeschichte des paulinischen Pneuma", *Biblica* 30 (1949), 161-196, 377-400.

- Rabin, C., *The Zadokite Documents*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954.
- *Qumran Studies*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1957.
- Ed., *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958.
- von Rad, *OT Theology*. Vol. 2. ET. London: SCM, 1965.
- Räsänen, H., "Legalism and Salvation by the Law: Paul's Portrayal of the Jewish Religion as a Historical and Theological Problem", in *Die Paulinische Literatur und Theologie*. Aarhus: Forlaget Aros, 1980, 63-83.
- *Paul and the Law*. WUNT 29. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983.
- Ragg, L., *St Luke with Introduction and Notes*. London: Methuen, 1922.
- Raitt, T., <sup>A</sup>*Theology of Exile. Judgment/Deliverance in Jeremiah and Ezekiel*. Phila.: Fortress, 1977.
- Renaud, B., "La Loi et Les Lois dans Les Livres des Maccabées", *RB* 68 (1961), 39-67.
- Reumann, J., *The Supper of the Lord: The NT, Ecumenical Dialogues, and Faith and Order on Eucharist*. Phila.: Fortress, 1985.
- Rhyne, C. T., "Nomos Dikaiosynes and the Meaning of Romans 10.4", *CBQ* 47 (1985), 486-499.
- Richard, E., "Polemics, Old Testament, and Theology: A Study of 2 Cor 3.1-4.6", *RB* 88 (1981), 340-67.
- Richardson, P., "Spirit and Letter: A Foundation for Hermeneutics", *EQ* 45 (1973), 208-218.
- Ridderbos, H., *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. ET. Grand Rapids, 1978.
- Ringgren, H., *Faith of Qumran*. ET. Phila.: Fortress, 1963.
- Rissi, M., *Studien zum Zweiten Korintherbrief: Der alte Bund - Der Prediger - Der Tod*. ATANT 56. Zurich: Zwingli, 1969.
- *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs*. WUNT 41. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987.
- Robertson, O. P., *Christ of the Covenants*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980.
- Robinson, H. W., *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel*. Phila.: Fortress, 1964.
- Robinson, T. H., *The Gospel of Matthew*. MNTC. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1939[28].
- *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. MNTC. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1933.
- Roloff, J., *Neues Testament*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Arbeitsbücher, 1977.



- Roth, C., "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis", *VT* 10 (1960), 51-56.
- Rowland, C., "A Summary of Sabbath Observance in Judaism at the Beginning of the Christian Era", in *Sabbath*, 43-55.
- Rowley, H., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. London: SPCK, 1957.
- "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect", in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. Manson*. Ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1959.
- Sanders, E. P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Phila.: Fortress, 1977
- "Torah and Paul", in *God's Christ and His People: In Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl*. Ed. J. Jervell and W. Meeks. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977, 132-140.
- *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Phila.: Fortress, 1983.
- Sanday, W. and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902.
- Schiffmann, L., *The Halakhah at Qumran*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
- *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Missoula: Scholars, 1983.
- Schlatter, A., *Gottes Gerechtigkeit: Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1935.
- Schlatter, A., *Die Korintherbriefe*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1974.
- Schmidt, H., *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. THKNT 6. Berlin: Evangelische Verlag, 1966.
- Schneider, B., "The Meaning of St. Paul's Antithesis 'The Letter and the Spirit'," *CBQ* 15 (1953), 163-207.
- Schneider, G., *Die Apostelgeschichte*. 1. Teil. Freiburg, Basel and Wien: Herder, 1980.
- Schneider, J., "ἡμοίωμα", *TDNT* V, 191-199.
- Schreiber, R., *Der Neue Bund in Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Tübingen University, 1955.
- Schreiner, T., "Paul and Perfect Obedience to the Law: An Evaluation of the View of E. P. Sanders", *WTJ* 47 (1985), 245-278.
- Schrenk, G., "γράφμα", *TDNT* I, 762-769.
- Schulz, S., "Die Decke des Moses: Untersuchungen zu einer vorpaulinischen Überlieferung in 2 Cor 3.7-18", *ZNW* 49 (1958), 1-30.

- Schunck, K., *1 Makkabäerbuch*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1980.
- Schüppenhaus, J., *Psalmen Salomos: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentum 7. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.
- Schürmann, H., *Jesu ureigerer Tod*. Freiburg: Herder, 1975.
- Schweizer, E., "πνεῦμα", TDNT VI, 396-415.
- *The Lord's Supper according to the New Testament*. ET. Phila.: Fortress, 1967.
- *The Good News According to Matthew*. ET. London: SPCK, 1976[73].
- Smend, R., *Bundesformel*. Zurich: EVZ Verlag, 1963.
- Smith, R. L., *Micah-Malachi*. WBC 32. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1984.
- Sohn, S., *The Divine Election of Israel*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1986.
- Spicq, C., *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1952.
- Stählin, G., *Die Apostelgeschichte*. NTD 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1968.
- Stendahl, K., *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the OT*. Lund, Uppsala: Gleerup, 1968[1954].
- Ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1958 (New York, 1957).
- Stott, J., *Baptism and Fullness: The Work of the Holy Spirit*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1977.
- Strack, H. and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*. Vol. I, 3, 4. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, vol. 1 (1922), vol. 2 (1924), vol. 3 (1926) and vol. 4 (1928).
- Strobel, A., *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. NTD 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975.
- Stuhlmacher, P., *Vom Verstehen des Neuen Testaments: Eine Hermeneutik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1979.
- *Versöhnung, Gesetz und Gerechtigkeit. Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1981.
- " 'Das Ende des Gesetzes'. Über Ursprung und Ansatz der paulinischen Theologie", *ZThK* 67 (1970), 14-39 (*Versöhnung*, 166-191).
- "Das Gesetz als Thema biblischer Theologie", *ZThK* 75 (1978), 251-280 (*Versöhnung*, 136-165).

- Sutcliffe, E. F., "The First Fifteen Members of the Community", *JSS* 4 (1959), 134-138.
- Talmon, S., "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert", in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 162-199.
- "The 'Manual of Benediction' of the Community of Judean Desert", *RQ* 2 (1959-60), 475-500.
- Taylor, V., *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: MacMillan, 1966[52].
- Testuz, M., *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*. Geneva and Paris: Droz, 1960.
- Thompson, J., *The Book of Jeremiah*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Toews, J., *The Law in the Letter to the Romans: A Study of Romans 9.30-10.13*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1977.
- Thrall, M. E., "The Problem of 2 Cor 6.14-7.1 in Some Recent Discussion", *NTS* 24 (1978), 132-148.
- Turner, M., "Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective" *TynB* 32 (1981), 3-42; cf. *Luke and the Spirit: Studies in the Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Cambridge University, 1980.
- "The Sabbath, Sunday, and the Law in Luke/Acts", in *Sabbath*, 114-24.
- van Unnik W., "'With Unveiled Face'. An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 3.12-18", *NovT* 6 (1963), 153-169.
- Unterman, J., *From Repentance to Redemption: Jeremiah's Thought in Transition*. JSOTS 54. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.
- Urbach, E., *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1976.
- Vanderkam, C., *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Harvard Semitic mono 14. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.
- Vermes, G., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin Books, 1975[1962].
- "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting", *ALUOS* 6 (1969), 85-97.
- "Lion-Damascus-Mehokek-Man-Symbolical Traditions in Dead Sea Scrolls", in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973, 40-66.
- *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. London: Collins, 1977.
- "The Essenes and History", *JJS* 32 (1981), 18-31.
- Wacholder, B., *The Dawn of Qumran*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983.

- "The 'sealed' Torah versus the 'Revealed' Torah: An Exegesis of Damascus Covenant V.1-6 and Jeremiah 32.10-14", *RQ* 12 (1986), 351-368.
- Wagner, V., "Der Bedeutungswandel von *b<sup>e</sup>riṭ ḥādāsāh* bei der Ausgestaltung der Abendmahlsworte", *EvT* 35 (1975), 538-544.
- Watts, J., *Isaiah 34-66*. WBC 25. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987.
- Weinfeld, M., *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel", *ZAW* 88 (1976), 2-56.
- "*b<sup>e</sup>riṭ*" TDOT II, 253-279.
- "Pentecost as Festival of the Giving of the Law", *Immanuel* 8 (1978), 7-18.
- Weippert, H., "Das Wort vom Neuen Bund in Jeremiah 31.31-34", *VT* 29 (1979), 336-351.
- Wernberg-Møller, P., *The Manual of Discipline. Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judea. Vol. 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957.
- Westcott, B. F., *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: MacMillan, 1903.
- Westerholm, S., "Letter and Spirit: The Foundation of Pauline *Ethics*", *NTS* 30 (1984), 229-248.
- Westermann, C., "The Way of the Promise through the OT", in *Old Testament and Christian Faith*, 200-224.
- *Isaiah 40-66*. OTL. ET. London: SCM, 1966.
- Whybray, R., *Isaiah 40-66*. NCB. London: Olī p̄hān̄ṣ, 1975.
- Wilckens, U., *Der Brief an die Römer*. EKKNT VI/1, 2. Zurich, Köln and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger, Eisiedeln and Neukirchener, 1978, 1980.
- Williams, S. K., *Jesus' Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept*. HDR 2. Missoula: Scholars, 1975.
- Williamson, R., *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- Wilshire, L. E., "The Servant City: a New Interpretation of the 'Servant of the Lord' in the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah", *JBL* 94 (1975), 356-367.
- Wilson, S., *Luke and the Law*. SNTSMS 50. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983.
- Windisch, H., *Der Zweite Korintherbrief*. NTD 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1924.
- Winter, P., "Psalms of Solomon", IDB III, 598-560.
- Wintermute, O. S., "Jubilees", in *OTP*. Vol. 2, 35-142.

- Wolff, C., *Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum*. TU 118. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1976.
- Wolff, H., *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlag, 1952.
- Wong, E., "The Lord is the Spirit (2 Cor 3.17a)", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis*. 61 (1985), 48-72 (cf. *The Lord is the Spirit. A Study of 2 Cor 3.17a in Conjunction with 2 Cor 3.16*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Leuven, 1984).
- Wrede, W., "τὸ ἄλμά μου τῆς διαθήκης", *ZNW* 1 (1900), 69-74.
- Wright, R. B., "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes", in *1972 Proceedings: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the Society of Biblical Literature Pseudepigrapha Seminar*. SCS 2. Missoula, 1972, 136-147.
- "The Psalms of Solomon", in *OTP*. Vol. 2, 639-670.
- Young, N. H., "Hilaskesthai' and Related Words in the New Testament", *EvQ* 55 (1983), 169-76.
- Yu, Y., "The Purpose of Glossolalia in the NT", unpublished Th.M. Thesis, Westminster Theo. Seminary, 1980.
- Zehnle, R. F., *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3*. Nashville: Abington, 1971.
- Zeitlin, S., *The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and its Significance*. Phila.: Dropsie College, 1939.
- *The First Book of Maccabees with Introduction and Commentary*. ET. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- *The Second Book of Maccabees with Introduction and Commentary*. ET. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
- "Jubilees and the Pentateuch", *JQR* 48 (1957-58), 218-235.
- Ziesler, J., *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul*. SNTSMS 20, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1972.
- "Salvation Proclaimed: Romans 3.21-26", *ExpT* 93 (1981-82), 356-59.
- Zimmerli, W., *Ezekiel*. Vol. 2. Hermeneia, ET. Phila.: Fortress, 1983.

